

The Studies of the Organizations and the Validity of the Classics to Explain the Current Problems

Augusto Renato Pérez Mayo¹, Nohemí Roque Nieto^{2*}, Fernando Romero Torres³

¹Department of Studies of Organizations and Sociology of Organizations, Autonomous University of the State of Morelos, Cuernavaca, Mexico

²Research Department of Studies of Health Organizations and Studies, Autonomous University of The State of Morelos, Cuernavaca, Mexico

³Department of Organization Studies, Instituto Nuevo Latinoamericano, Cuernavaca, Mexico
Email: *nohemi.roque@hotmail.com

How to cite this paper: Mayo, A. R. P., Nieto, N. R., & Torres, F. R. (2023). The Studies of the Organizations and the Validity of the Classics to Explain the Current Problems. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 11, 721-735.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2023.113040>

Received: July 30, 2023

Accepted: September 18, 2023

Published: September 21, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

The organization has evolved over time and therefore few have generated new theoretical approaches to analysis, which from the point of view of ontological and epistemological scholars have carried out in the organization. This situation has led to a proliferation of approaches or paradigms to explain it, since the organization as a complex phenomenon cannot be considered a well-defined theoretical phenomenon whose behavior obeys simple laws, but rather, according to field scholars, the organization is a phenomenon complex. The objective of this research proposal is to carry out an analysis of the studies on the organization through a historical journey that discovers what its evolution has been at an epistemological, methodological, and disciplinary level. In addition to proving that the vision of the classics of organization theory is still valid. The research method used was the documentary.

Keywords

Organization, Theory of Organizations, Epistemology, Methodology

1. Conceptual Background

The organizations have existed since prehistoric times, but it was not until the early twentieth century were developed and disseminated formal theories of the organization.

The rationalist in studies of the organization, which was the first to see the

light, continues to prevail, and the positivist theory of the organization has evolved based on the classics of management and incorporated the contributions of human relations.

Points at the technological aspects of programming decisions, formalization of activities and control the behavior of members of the organization, but leaves out the informal aspects, power relations, conflict of interest and the influence of context.

During the 1940, 1950 and 1960 prevailed the organizational field: institutional, decision theory and human relations. Its seeds are the works of [Barnard \(1938\)](#) and [Weber \(1947\)](#). In this stream, [Barnard \(1959\)](#) argues that organizations are by their very nature, cooperative systems, and minimum requirements for an organization are the objective, social structure, welfare and common purpose with the will and relationships.

Categories such as Cooperatives Systems, Abstract Systems, External and Internal Balance, formally complex structure, formal and informal organization ([Barnard, 1938](#)) among others, led to the conceptualization of the role of the executive as a leader, that is, consider it as the leader who has to understand to the organization as a cooperative system in a systematic relationship specific in reason for the cooperation of two or more persons for a common goal in order to make decisions accurate, and codes, as a contribution and encouragement to each member and the formal organizational system. Weber's proposal, meanwhile, argues that people cooperate bound by the hierarchy of authority and the separation between place and person. Both Barnard and Weber, agree in defining organizations as an impersonal or super-individual system of coordination of forces and activities, making organizations more rational than individuals.

[Simon \(1947\)](#) and [March & Simon \(1958\)](#) develop and reconcile the ideas of Weber and Barnard, arguing that an organization is a group of people and what the organization does is done by people, but they have limited rationality and therefore their behavior can be controlled by the organization. These behaviors controlled shape the organizational structure: authority, communication and the execution or programming decisions and activities (technology) are the means to control these behaviors. The organization defines the objectives and goals. The conflict is seen by these authors as an impersonal problem as a conflict of goals.

For its part, [Stogdill \(1967\)](#) argues that the organization is something much more complex than assumed by many theoretical systems and poses a systemic perspective that was very popular in the field of OT. This is presented as a methodological tool to integrate different variables in different dimensions. The different dimensions presented by Stogdill paradigmatic perspectives show us differences in their attempt to make a structure of OT. These dimensions were provided by Barnard, although he did not elaborate on its analysis. Both authors address the dichotomy of formal and informal organizations very similar, although differences can give rise to debate issues.

For his part, [Scott \(1992\)](#) notes that organizations are cognitive structures and activities, rules and regulations, which provide stability and meaning to social behavior and are reproduced by the culture, structures and routines.

2. Theory and Hypothesis Development: The Epistemological and Methodological Debate between Paradigms

The absence of these ideological discussions in the classical paradigms made the discipline develop more than ever. Today, it seems that the discipline of administration has become stagnant by accepting at its core this type of debate that we will comment on below and that is currently taking place.

To understand the studies of the organizations is necessary to know the great debates that present and serve as guides for future studies in the field.

One of the major debates that take place, is about the most appropriate methodology to achieve this, that is, what is the best method for field research. In this sense, there are different opinions among scholars of the area: first, [Martin and Frost \(1996\)](#) indicate that some people are inclined to seek consensus, such as [Donaldson \(1985\)](#), [Pfeffer \(1997\)](#) and [Reed \(1996\)](#), while others feel it is better proliferation of paradigms, as [Burrell and Morgan \(1979\)](#) and [Van Maanen \(1995\)](#). Notable here is the debate between positivist organization theory and critical theory.

Regarding the object of study, Donaldson notes that much of the discussion about the traditional studies of the organization is in the fundamental question. Can there be a science of organizations? This question has two implications:

- 1) Ontological status of organizations and
- 2) Epistemological status of the Theory of the Organization

For Donaldson, a supporter of positivist organization, organizations are solid concrete things that can be studied with the methods of natural science. This author proposes the functionalist theory to match the organization's study, framed within the social sciences, natural sciences, so it is possible to understand their opponents, adding their criticism.

The application of the methodology used to study organizations from natural sciences and the belief of that the organizations are solid concrete things, were questioned by critics of Donaldson's proposals. These criticisms of the positivist theory of the organization are a misinterpretation of the philosophy of science or reflect a misunderstanding of sociological theory. So Donaldson defends the positivist theory of the organization using the advances in the philosophy of realism.

To defend the application in studies of the organization, of methods and techniques of the natural science research, Donaldson proposes to extend the theory of organization, assimilating to their rivals, to incorporate their criticism. To defend its position, Donaldson uses three arguments:

First defense: the distinction between organization and society. This social re-

relationship is expressed in physical metaphor analysis levels internal/external and micro/macro. Relatively microphenomena organization is a subsystem of society, the organization theory is a subdiscipline of sociology. The theory of organization refers to those parts of the social structure located within the organization; sociology deals with the wider society. Through this distinction, it is protected from criticism by those who argue for a sociology of organizations: “the wrong level, a different object of study.”

Thus, the possibility of a Marxist theory of organizations, is dismissed as a contradiction in terms: “Marxism is a theory of society, therefore, cannot be a theory of organizations.”

Second defense: the scope of organizational theory. Its focus is the goal-oriented behavior, coordinated toward a goal. The organization theory does not attempt to explain everything that happens within the “legal package” of organizations. To be precise, the theory of organization studies a narrow subset of a subsystem of society. Donaldson said then that the strategy of delineating phenomena that cannot handle the theory of the organization and then use another to “prove” the inadequacy of the approach is very common and not very valid. For Donaldson what the theory cannot explain is not a matter of organization theory, has no organization (i.e., society, the wrong level) or within the organization but beyond its subset.

Third defense mechanism: the teleological explanation of the positivist theory of the organization. The formal theory of the organization as a new discipline that defined and legitimate struggle away from its origins in the sociology of Weber. For Donaldson sociology is problematic in two important respects:

- 1) Addresses the wrong level (the larger society) and is outdated (sociology always classic, never contemporary). Critics conservatives become custodians of ancient orthodoxy. The paradigm shift is not a purely cerebral, but depends on the results of political conflicts between the guards and opponents of a paradigm. Resistance to change is the norm. Positivism has functioned as a hegemonic approach to all this. Dominant concept of the science establishes control over the production of knowledge.

- 2) Specifies what is knowable (the ontology), and it how they will know (epistemology) concepts that have shaped the scope and content of studies of the organization and the nature of the rules (Practice research, criteria for success) that govern the academic profession. Moreover Karpin (cited in Hassard, 1995: p. 28) adds that the debate is necessary because “his absence really threaten the discipline”.

Despite all these discussions, there are researchers who favor the use of two approaches for the same investigation, even if this means a greater work effort, time and money. This was already practiced by the classics of the organization. They made use of the two paradigms mentioned in this section. The three defenses raised, reveal an ideological discussion rather than a scientific or methodological one that was not taken into account in the classical theories.

3. The Validity of the Classics?

In this section, we intend to provide answers to the following questions: can there be a science of organization? What are the contributions to the enrichment of organizational studies? What are the ontological and epistemological conditions of organizational studies? What are the epistemological and methodological debates that arise in the field of study? What is the future of organizational studies? The return to the classics? The validity of the classics?

Much is discussed in university classrooms that the classics are out of date and have lost their heuristic capacity. In other cases they are only mentioned as historical background and nothing else. The original books are not read and they rule out their validity.

Let's see then. Taylor's in the Scientific Administration, said that the working conditions of employees must be scientifically selected and must be adequate in order to comply with labor regulations, he realized that the education about the instruments (tools), the adequacy of a good physical work environment, and the taking of times and movements are essential for the organization to function properly (Taylor, 1911).

Taylor carried out experiments, first in Midvale and then in several other stores, and mentioned the nine qualities that characterize an upright man, and that it is difficult to find workers who combine 5 qualities and 6, 7 or 8 it is almost impossible to achieve and precisely these last ones are: judgment, common sense and good health. In other words, the success of the intervention of this proposal in the workers is attributed to the high wages that were able to earn with the differential rates, and to the pleasant feeling fostered by this system (what is now known as the work environment) (Taylor, 1911). There are indications in Taylor's proposal that indicate the danger of reaching harmful organizational and structural factors that slowly make workers or employees sick to the point of death. Mayo (1945) in the last 50 years, found changes, the common denominator, were the human problems in the industry.

3.1. The Perspective of Eltón Mayo and His Vision to Study the Reduction of Hours in the Working Day

In 1893 the experiment of reducing the weekly working day from fifty-four to forty-eight hours was tested; after two years of experience, the change brought a considerable increase in production and a decrease in the amount of downtime and fewer human problems. By the year 1917, the working day was reduced from twelve to ten hours a day promoted by the Committee of Ammunition Workers. Later, in 1925, Dr. C. S. Myres, who said that laboratory investigations into muscular and mental fatigue of workers proved to be far from practical application, because the conditions of laboratory experiments are far removed from those of everyday life.

Fatigue is studied as a result of a normal physiological condition that can become pathological; it was questioned whether it was possible to measure fatigue,

since there is no doubt that workers are fatigued as a result of daily work and for this reason, tests were used to assess the degree of fatigue, which occurs in variations in the production and quality of the work performed: lost time, job rotation, illness and mortality, accidents, and degree of effort made.

The dynamics in the company assumes that the work is something that is taken from the worker, wages are paid as compensation for the vaguely conceived loss, wages are paid by time, consequently, the loss must be continuous in the business economic idea of fatigue. In this way fatigue is not an entity, but simply a word to describe a variety of phenomena (Mayo, 1945).

According to Mayo, not only should the formal organization, technical rationality, cost logic and efficiency logic be studied, that is, the economic function, but also the distribution of satisfactions, which included the informal organization, interpersonal relationships, the so-called logic of feelings, not only for the efficiency and performance of the organization, but also to build human resource management models that would allow a balance between the worker and the social system (company) (Mayo, 1945).

3.2. For an Efficient Management Model for the Worker. The Vision of Roethlisberger and Dickson, Barnard in the Same Line of Work

Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) affirm that the company exercised certain policies applied to the workers, such as: promotion of the practice of saving, family protection insurance, association of loans for savings, investment or construction, available money plan, savings and savings account with current interest rates, benefit plans for sickness, accident or death of the worker, pension plan to which the worker was entitled at a certain age, promotion of safety and health, program of recreational, social and sports activities. It is necessary to comment that it is precisely in the promotion of safety and health, where they express their concern for the diseases generated in the organization. Barnard (1968) affirmed that the main function of the executive is not to direct people, since they must direct themselves when they work under a cooperative regime. It was necessary to develop and maintain a communication system with the informal organization as a strategy to enable the effectiveness of the formal organization. Barnard is credited with emphasizing the management of the informal organization, what today might be called organizational culture. Undoubtedly the highest competence of the executive consisted of managing the informal organization to achieve the compatibility of the personnel and obtain the maximum cooperation in it.

He insisted on promoting the formation and maintenance of a human resources system, including motivating people with effective incentives. Obtaining the services of individuals is accomplished by two fundamental principles:

- 1) Establish cooperative relationships between individuals and the organization.
- 2) Induce people's services through incentive pay, persuasion, and negotia-

tion.

Barnard (1968) does not overemphasize foreman control, but gives great importance to motivation to achieve objectives effectively and efficiently while taking care of the organization's environment.

3.3. The Management Model of Mary Parker Follet and the Leadership Variable

Mary Parker Follet would be of great help to build a more productive and fair organization where management is incorporated with leadership to achieve development and highlight the potential of the individual in a work group and within the same society. This would be achieved by strengthening the processes of human talent in organizations to obtain as a result the development of more effective administrators, responsible citizens and, most importantly, better people. The positive effect of human talent in modern industry based on Follet's theory was and still is very important (**McLarney & Rhyno, 1999**).

Follet was convinced that no person could feel complete unless they were part of a group and that humans grew thanks to their relationships with other members of the organizations. In fact, she claimed that management was the art of doing things with people.

She started from Taylor's premise, in the sense that workers and bosses shared a common purpose as members of the same organization, but she thought that the artificial difference between managers and subordinates obscured their natural association.

She was a firm believer in group strength, in which individuals could combine their various talents to achieve something greater. Moreover, his model of systemic control (group control of the whole and not its parts) took into account not only individuals and groups, but also the consequences of environmental factors, such as climate, culture, leadership, politics, economics, and biology. The insistence of human relations theorists to take care of the human resource was evident.

3.4. The Contributions of Maslow and Herzberg to the Safety of the Current Worker

Returning to the classics of the new human relations, it is necessary to identify which are the elements that could solve the problems that have been described, since, although the safety and hygiene regulations that govern us are important and necessary for human resources in organizations; however, most companies and service organizations (not factories), both public and private, need "another" type of security, especially MiPymes in Mexico and in public bureaucracies.

The foundational work on hygiene as a type of motivation refers to psychological aspects and is located within the school of new human relations; with a profound influence of psychological discipline, in particular security, understood as a psychological factor from the second link of the **Maslow (1954)** and **Herzberg (1966)** pyramid, that is, feeling safe in terms of work, for example, having a

job where you cannot be fired, that is, what we call in Mexico being definitive in the job market or at work, not having an aggressive boss who threatens you (which within psychoanalysis could represent the terrible father or persecutor threatening), threats to do something that is not in your contract or functions or in terms of workplace or sexual harassment (and that has nothing to do, for example, with ergonomic problems, as if the shape of the chair was responsible for chronic stress at work).

This type of security is what we refer to as a psychological need. This is what in the long run produces low motivation; a psychological prison, and burnout syndrome, emotional exhaustion, frustration, insomnia due to being hypervigilant and feeling paranoia or persecution; where the reactive formation of frustration is aggression, which can be of two types: against other members of the organization, against clients such as social security, or against oneself, which is when we get sick. All this produces and is produced by a toxic organizational climate; over time, this type of climate generates physical and mental illnesses, cardiac illnesses and that can degenerate into fibrillation, that is, cardiac arrest.

Given this panorama, we must recognize the original idea of Maslow (1954), author of the text that defined psychological motivation under the hygiene factor, beyond the interpretation of the physical context of the modern company that locates the regulatory needs in issues such as the ergonomics of furniture, chairs, comfort and safety such as the use of helmets and signs of evacuation routes or fire plans, but in current companies, even virtual ones, we would have to have regulations for fire extinguishers in buildings that do not exist.

What does exist are human relationships, which are what build organizations and, therefore, societies. But in all this social construction of organizations, there are at least multiple possibilities of finding cases with types of relationships that do not positively build relationships and, therefore, good performance within them. A toxic relationship between leadership and worker, between workers, that could take us from something simple, to a chronic problem, if not even physical death above organizational death.

In 1959, Herzberg published his book *Motivation at Work*, which is a report of his own research and that of his collaborators on mental health in industry and in which he formally expounded his well-known motivation-hygiene theory.

Herzberg and his collaborators concluded that motivation in work environments derives from two sets of independent and specific factors. The first, associated with the negative feelings or dissatisfaction that employees claimed to experience in their jobs and that they attributed to the context of their jobs.

Herzberg called these factors “hygienic” because they acted in a manner analogous to the principles of medical hygiene: eliminating or preventing health hazards. Hygiene factors cover aspects such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, physical working conditions, remuneration, benefits, safety at work, and company administrative policies and practices, among others (Manso Pinto, 2002).

According to Herzberg, when these factors are not present or applied incor-

rectly, they do not allow the employee to achieve satisfaction. However, when they are present, they do not give employees a strong motivation, but only contribute to diminish or eliminate dissatisfaction.

The second set of factors was associated with the satisfying experiences that employees had and that they tended to attribute to the content of their jobs. Herzberg called these types of factors “motivators”.

These include aspects such as the feeling of personal fulfillment obtained in the job, recognition of performance, the interesting and transcendental nature of the task being performed, the greater responsibility of management, and the opportunities for professional advancement and personal growth obtained at work, among others. Herzberg argued that, if these factors are present in the workplace, they contribute to causing a high level of motivation in the employee, thus stimulating him to a superior performance.

This finding allowed Herzberg to establish one of the most important principles in the field of work motivation: satisfaction and dissatisfaction as distinct and independent concepts. This proposal is valid to this day.

3.5. Maslow, Herzberg’s and MacGregor’s Proposal to the Personal Growth of the Worker

Consequently, we must understand that in the original work it was already understood that psychological personal growth was what was sought as a motivator and that security also referred to it as a psychological aspect, as mentioned by Maslow (1954) himself. About the psychological needs Maslow (1954) and Herzberg (1966) speak of security needs (stability, dependency, protection, freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos); need for structure, order, law, limits and the strength of the protector; that is how we understand that in the face of uncertainty processes such as the COVID-19 pandemic, but also job uncertainty due to threats from bosses, imply a problem of mismatch, due to and as a consequence of instability based on the context, while law and order are detailed based on the need for the structure of the human being expressed based on clear rules, defined by the bureaucracy, which would eliminate job uncertainty from the psychological aspect since there is a clear institutionalism that gives psychological labor certainty, thus eliminating the discretion of the toxic and threatening bosses.

Finally, the force of the protector, from psychoanalysis, would be seen as a transfer of the role of the father to the company that should be represented by the figure of authority, that is, the boss, and not as a threatening figure. Nor persecutory, which ultimately produces psychological pain and a sense of internal persecution.

In this way, Maslow (1970) points out that “we can develop effects in the face of loss of security, develop fear, nightmares, need for protection (...) also generate anxiety, since parents play the role of protectors, providers, affective”, thus nightmares produce a hypervigilant effect where it becomes a psychic prison, since even in dreams one cannot escape from work, this is what is called in mili-

tary psychology a psychological casualty, since even at night one cannot escape from work to escape daily terrors, and this produces intrusive thoughts over time, that is, post-traumatic stress disorder and chronic depression, since the roles that bosses should play as protective parents, through the transfer would be a type of leadership type Y, to develop what Maslow defined as the need for self-esteem, which is produced from social relationships within the company such as human relationships of affection in the group and the unconditional acceptance of the positive elements of the subject, rather than punishment for the Mistakes produced by type X leadership. Leadership and its effect on organizations.

The type of leadership is what finally produces an influence on the type of organizational culture, which, if it is highly controlled, will be a type of paranoid culture, where everyone will feel observed and, therefore, persecuted, which lowers morale and productivity, but also has negative effects on health and human relationships, which is due to excessive control, [McGregor \(1972\)](#), tells us about satisfying a need.

Where security exists, there is no margin of control of behavior (...) it is no longer so easy to fire people (...) due to the wave of public animosity, the declared war that accompanied the unionization of industries (...), the general reaction against authoritarianism (...) the ability to develop imagination and creativity (...) self-realization (...) that in current conditions (...) the intellectual potential of the human being is being used only in the part (...) creative.

MacGregor's ideas in relation to the use of the cerebral hemispheres as a creative capacity, among others, and the efficient leadership profile, is what is required in today's companies. The fundamental principle of Theory Y is that of integration or the creation of conditions that allow the members of the organization to better achieve their own objectives, directing their efforts towards the success of the company ([McGregor, 1972: p. 50](#)), therefore, the leader should instead of controlling and attacking the workers as is done in general in companies today in the world and particularly in Mexico, under the idea that if it is not done they will be fired. What is needed is to find a way to help the worker so that he can do his job well; motivate him, that is, the leader should seek to help and support, rather than attack and threaten, this simple basic principle is not understood.

On one hand and on the other, we have the problem of hiring and designing positions, and the personality of management personnel; position where most of the time leaders who take risks are sought; people who like to take risks and who have no problem with leading and like power, plus they have no tolerance for frustration or impulse control. They do not have a sense of guilt or empathy in order to achieve their goals in a world where there is competition in the market, they are psychopaths, that is, characters who desperately need validation and recognition from others, mainly because their self-esteem is low and they are generally selfish. They are little interested in others and have a great empathy deficit. For that reason, they can't show much consideration for other people.

Finally, the psychopath is narcissistic, which implies a high and unrealistic level of grandiosity and superiority.

From another point of view, it is a profile of the managerial position or middle managers, it is serial killers, and they are the ones who are in managerial positions, in general throughout the world and in particular in Mexico, for this reason they have no qualms about sacrificing low or operational positions; they do not have feelings of guilt, they overcome more or less well formed, what we will call group C, that is, the dependents, who seek acceptance from authority figures or bosses (psychopaths in companies), the obsessive compulsives, (who seek to do things well) and the avoidants, who are afraid of assuming positions of authority. Thus, managers tend not to feel any type of guilt, and they are the ones that produce the toxic organizational climate worldwide. A recent study considers that in the corporate world up to 21% of managers may be psychopaths or have characteristics of psychopaths (Revista Forbes, 2021).

3.6. Argyris and the Organizational Learning of Workers

Argyris (1975: p. 269) already stated that:

The individual is developed in a culture (...) tends to develop from a state of passivity as an infant to a state of increasing activity as adults (...) lack of self-initiative and self-determination (...) It is a degree of personal growth (...) self-actualization only occurs in relation to others; we tend towards frustration because our own expression has been blocked (...) with high control and theory X (...). The nature of the formal principles of the organization causes subordinates, at all levels, to experience competition, rivalry, hostility among subordinates, and development of a part rather than the whole.

It is within the educational system that a type of individuals that are formed for more than a century that are congruent with the type of disciplined people, who tried to act as automata, sacrificing human capacities, reflection, creativity, innovation, and critical thinking. In schools, they were basically educated to be passive (traditional or behavioral education), and the treatment adopted by the company is type X, that is, the worker as conceptualized by Taylor (1911), the lazy person by nature who did not want to work and, therefore, had to be forced, with harsh treatment, who was an appendage of the machine, that is, he was there because the machine required it, for which he was seen as a necessary evil and that the only way to motivate him was with money, and this has been the response adopted by multiple companies that fail to capture human resources after the COVID-19 pandemic, because they do not want to return to work, for example, at McDonald's or Apple, where the minimum wage has tripled from 7 to 21 dollars per hour, that is, approximately 48,000 Mexican pesos (Milenio & González, 2021) and the hiring age has been reduced to 14 years for operational positions, and even then they have not managed to hire staff.

And finally another evidence of the relevance of the classics where the use of

all the theories and methodologies of the Hawthorne experiment developed by Mayo in the applied project called Gung Ho at the Walton Works 2 plant is seen, where he uses the theoretical contributions-methodologies of the classics to present characteristics related to the study of human behavior through observation and the few results in terms of productivity, there is great resistance to change, absence of collaborative work and demotivation of workers due to little or no recognition of the work done by them. Which, through this methodology, increased productivity was achieved and its closure was avoided within the established period.

4. Methodology

The research proposal presented here is theoretical in nature. The collection and analysis of the information was carried out using documentary techniques. Throughout the investigation was carried out activities of collection, categorization and management, analysis and integration, interpretation, reinterpretation, critical and systematic exposition of organizational theories, which are obtained from various literature sources, periodicals and electronic. Documentary research allows in this research carried out: theoretical answer to the research, analyze historically the evolution of organizational theories, present in an organized and teaching different organizational theories that exist and to compare different theoretical perspectives and research methodologies in the field of organizational theories and organizational studies.

The research method used is analog, as they establish similarities and differences between the theories to reach a breakthrough in knowledge. The research will be back because this will leave back, analyzing the origins of organizational theory to reach organizational studies.

5. Conclusion and Findings

Organizational studies is a discipline with a field of research that borders on the other disciplines of the social sciences, which has generally rested on a tradition of empirical research, and today is part of a long-range effort to build a debate global and comparative between paradigms. It is an Anglo-Saxon invention, which has provided various theoretical formulations to explain the triumphant modernity and has served to provide an intellectual reference to the new fundamental trends in transition towards a postmodern era in the economic, political, and social spheres. These authors further argue that Organizational Studies as a social science has to reflect the contradictory forces of unification and diversification in various areas of social life. In this sense, in Organizational Studies, standardized research procedures or the principles of empirical research can be shared, giving them a dimension of universal canons. In Mexico, management studies were introduced in the 1950s, partly in engineering schools and more frequently in accounting schools, where management studies were seen as exclusively technical knowledge. In the eighties, the introduction of the theory of or-

ganizations began in Mexico, also imported from the United States. Some higher education institutions begin the creation of small research groups having as their main reference the dominant model of the sociology of North American organizations, particularly contingency, reproducing empirical studies, without a specific search for theoretical reconstruction of the specificities of the country. However, the most interesting approach that can guide the development efforts of organizational studies in Mexico is its transfer from an eminently technical discipline to be located in the field of social sciences and in a perspective that can privilege research. This would make it possible to take advantage of the wealth of approaches present in Mexico, due to its greater permeability to North American and European currents, as well as an interesting tradition of its own in the fields of sociology, ethnography and social anthropology.

Just as examples, the theoretical evidence of the experiments of human relations and of the new human relations shows us the vital need that is still in force, to study the informal part (logic of feelings) of organizations in balance with the formal part. The problems with the regulations regarding safety and hygiene is that they do not review the impact of the types of leadership that are unaware of the logic of emotions of the workers, in general, the relationship between work stress, safety and hygiene is unknown, with respect to the regulations.

The answers to the current problems of organizations and the problems of emotional exhaustion in the world and in Mexico in particular, are there and have always been from 1927-1939 with the proposal of the theories of human relations with Mayo (1945), *the human problems of industrial civilization*, Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939); *management and the worker, brochure*, Barnard and *the theories of the new human relations*, from Bennis (1966); *changing organizations*, McGregor (1960); *the human aspect of companies*, Argyris (1973); *personality and organization theory revisited*, among others (Guerrero Sánchez et al., 2023).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Argyris, C. (1973). Some Limits of Rational Man Organizational Theory. *Public Administration Review*, 33, 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.2307/974803>
- Argyris, C. (1975). The Impact of the Formal Organization upon the Individual. In D. S. Pugh (Eds.), *Organization Theory* (pp. 261-278). Penguin Books.
- Barnard, C. I. (1959). *Las funciones de los elementos dirigentes*, Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos. pp. 245-264.
- Barnard, C. L. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C. L. (1968). *The Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press.
- Bennis, W. G. (1966). Changing Organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 2, 247-263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002188636600200301>

- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis* Gower. Aldershot.
- Donaldson, L. (1985). *In Defense of Organizational Theory. A Reply to the Critics*. Harvard University Press.
- Guerrero Sánchez, P., Perez Mayo, A. R., Guerrero Grajeda, J., & Romero Torres, F. (2023). La vigencia de los clásicos de la teoría de las organizaciones como respuesta a los problemas actuales. *Revista Gestión Y Estrategia*, No. 63, 77-90. <https://doi.org/10.24275/uam/azc/dcsh/gye/2023n63/Guerrero>
- Hassard, J. (1995). *Sociology and Organizational Theory, Positivism, Paradigms and Postmodernity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man* (pp. 71-129). Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Manso Pinto, J. F. (2002). El legado de Frederick Irving Herzberg. *Revista Universidad*, 128, 79-86.
- March, J., & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Martin, J., & Frost, P. (1996). The Organizational Culture War Games: A Struggle for Intellectual Dominance. In S. R. Clegg et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Studies* (pp. 599-621). Sage.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Word* (pp. 35-104). Harper & Row Publishers.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- McGregor, D. (1972). *El aspecto humano de las empresas* (pp. 27-66). Diana.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill.
- McLarney, C., & Rhyno, S. (1999). Mary Parker Follett: Visionary Leadership and Strategic Management. *Women in Management Review*, 14, 292-304. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429910291131>
- Milenio, D., & González, P. W. (2021). EU. McDonald's pagará 21 dólares por hora a sus empleados. Grupo Milenio. <https://www.milenio.com/internacional/estados-unidos/eu-mcdonald-pagara-21-dolar-es-hora-empleados>
- Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New Directions for Organization Theory: Problems and Prospects*. Oxford University Press.
- Reed, M. (1996). Organizational Theorizing: A Historically Contested Terrain. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizations Studies* (pp. 31-56). Sage.
- Revista Forbes (2021). *Uno de cada cinco CEOs podría ser un psicópata*. Forbes España.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Harvard University Press (Oxford University Press).
- Scott, W. R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems* (pp. 3-26). Prentice Hall.
- Simon, H. (1947). *Administrative Behaviour: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organisations*. The Free Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1967). Dimensiones de la Teoría de la Organización. In J. D. Thompson (Eds.), *Teoría de la Organización, Bibliográfica Omeba* (pp. 15-72). Bibliográfica Omeba.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Shop Management*. Harper & Brothers.

Van Maanen, J. (1995). Style as Theory. *Organization Science*, 6, 133-143.

<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.1.133>

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. The Free Press and the Falcon's Bring Press.