Autocratic Leadership and Authority: A Comparative Analysis of Max Weber and Michel Crozier's Concepts

القيادة الاوتوقراطية والسلطة: تحليل مقارن بين مفهومي ماكس فيبر وميشـال كروزيه

Aissa Guerroudj [1] , Al-Azhari Ben Issa [2] , Tayab Maache [3]

1 Social Empowerment and Sustainable Development in the Desert Environment - University of Laghoaut (Algeria) ,
ai.guerroudj@lagh-univ.dz

2 Social Empowerment and Sustainable Development in the Desert Environment - University of Laghoaut (Algeria) ,
I.benaissa@lagh-univ.dz

3 Social Empowerment and Sustainable Development in the Desert Environment - University of Laghoaut (Algeria) ,
t.maache@lagh-univ.dz

ABSTRACT:

This research aims to explore the concepts of autocratic and authoritarian leadership through a comparative analysis of the theories of Max Weber and Michel Crozier. Weber's model highlights bureaucratic authority within a rational-legal framework, while Crozier emphasizes the role of organizational dynamics and the management of uncertainty in power relations. Comparing these two theorists demonstrates differing perspectives on leadership authority. Weber's bureaucratic model enhances efficiency and predictability, whereas Crozier underscores the significance of informal dynamics and the need for adaptability and responsiveness. By integrating these two perspectives, we gain a more nuanced understanding of authoritarian leadership that acknowledges both the strengths and limitations of each approach. This comprehensive perspective is significant for contemporary leaders navigating complex organizational landscapes, where traditional hierarchies may not always apply.

Keywords: Leadership, Autocratic Leadership, Bureaucratic Authority, Power Dynamics.

الملخص:

يستكشف هذا البحث مفاهيم القيادة والسلطة الأوتوقراطية الاستبدادية من خلال تحليل مقارن لنظريات ماكس فيبر وميشـال كروزيه. في حين يركز نموذج فيبر على السلطة البيروقراطية المؤطر في سياق قانوني عقلاني، يؤكد كروزيه على دور ديناميكيات التنظيم وإدارة عدم اليقين في علاقات القوة. مقارنة هذين المنظرين في اختلاف وجهات نظرهما بشأن سلطة القيادة. ففي حين يعزز نموذج فيبر البيروقراطي الكفاءة والقدرة التنبؤ، يسلط كروزيه الضوء على التركيز الذي يبديه على ديناميكيات غير الرسمية وعلى الحاجة إلى القدرة على التكيف والاستجابة. ومن خلال دمج هذين المنظورين، يمكننا اكتساب فهم أكثر دقة للقيادة الاستبدادية التي تعترف بكل نقاط القوة والقيود لكل نهج. وهذه النظرة الشـاملة حيوية للقادة المعاصرين الذين يتعين عليهم التنقل عبر المناظر التنظيمية المعقدة حيث لا تنطبق التسلسلات الهرمية التقليدية دائما.

كلمات مفتاحية: القيادة، القيادة الاوتوقراطية، السلطة البيروقراطية، ديناميكيات القوة.

1- Introduction:

The concepts of leadership and authority have been widely debated in political and social thought. Autocratic leadership and authority, in particular, have sparked discussions concerning their effectiveness in fulfilling short-term goals through rapid and decisive decision-making. However, questions arise about their potential negative effect on employee creativity and sense of belonging.

Drawing on Max Weber's theory of authority types and Michel Crozier's actor strategies, this research examines two prominent thinkers who approached the concept of authority from different perspectives. Each developed a unique framework regarding authority, its distribution, and its effect on societal organization. While Weber focused on three types of authority and their legitimacy, Crozier analyzed authority from the perspective of dominance and control over individuals through complex social mechanisms, often equating authority with authoritarianism.

Weber's model highlights bureaucratic authority within a rational-legal framework, whereas Crozier emphasizes organizational dynamics and the role of uncertainty in power relations, providing a comprehensive view of autocratic leadership. Weber's theory of bureaucracy is foundational in the study of organizational behavior, defining bureaucracy as a system distinguished by hierarchical structures, formal rules, and a clear division of labor. In this framework, authority derives from established positions within the organization, rather than from the leader's personal traits. This structure creates a predictable, stable environment with well-defined roles and transparent decision-making processes. Conversely, Michel Crozier's approach offers a different perspective by focusing on the informal aspects of organizations and the uncertainty leaders must navigate. Crozier argues that power is not solely a function of formal authority but also depends on the ability to manage relationships and informal networks. In his view, the unpredictability of human behavior and the complexities of organizational dynamics play a significant role in how authority is exercised. This perspective challenges traditional views of leadership by suggesting that effective leaders must excel at managing ambiguity and leveraging informal power structures to fulfill their goals. In this regard, the following problem statement arises: What are Weber's and Crozier's perspectives on leadership and authority? How can the impact of authority be analyzed through these two concepts? This research seeks to answer these questions through a comparative analysis of Weber's and Crozier's concepts of autocratic leadership and authority.

2- Leadership:

Britans (2004) highlights that leadership is tied to fulfilling organizational goals by managing and organizing resources to accomplish a shared objective (Vasileva, 2021, p. 59). Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group of individuals in an effort to achieve a goal in specific situations. It is a relational concept that includes both the influencer and the influenced (Muhammad Aamir, 2012, p. 192). According to Fiedler (1967), leadership is a relationship among individuals where power and influence are distributed unequally, with one person directing and controlling the behaviors of others. Leadership is viewed as a reciprocal relationship in which the leader influences followers through persuasion to fulfill shared organizational objectives. The following elements are central to leadership:

– Leadership occurs in group settings.
– Leadership involves transactional interactions between the leader and followers.
– Leadership entails influencing followers.
– Leadership includes fulfilling goals.

2-1- Autocratic or Authoritarian Leadership:

Authoritarian leadership is defined as an extreme form of transactional leadership, where the leader exercises considerable authority and provides team members with minimal opportunities to make recommendations, even if those recommendations could benefit the team or organization (Muhammad Arslan Sarwar, 2021, p. 3). This style is distinguished by individual control over all decisions, with little input from group members. Autocratic leaders typically make decisions grounded in their own ideas and judgments, rarely accepting advice from subordinates. This leadership style includes absolute control and authority over the group (Cherry, n.d., p. 2).

Such leaders make significant decisions independently, favor strict regulations and instructions, implement rigorous monitoring processes, and maintain formal, professional relationships with their subordinates (Dyczkowska, p. 159). Bass agreed that the autocratic leadership style is task-oriented and particularly effective in conveying a clear vision and outlining strategic goals (Veliu & Liridon, 2017, p. 61).

2-2- Features of the Autocratic Leadership Model:

One feature of an autocratic leader is the desire for control and the tendency to make decisions independently. Their distrust and skepticism toward subordinates often lead to anxiety and psychological instability (Al-Agha, 2003, p. 264). The autocratic leader is defined by centralized decision-making and directive authority in their hands, creating a clear hierarchical structure. This centralization of power may trigger feelings among subordinates that they are being disregarded, which raises perceptions of inequality and may impede the work climate and performance of individuals. This leadership style is sometimes referred to as the classical model, where the leader holds all decision-making power and exercises authority without consulting subordinates or allowing them to contribute. In contrast, the leader expects full compliance with orders and instructions without offering explanations. Autocratic leadership is distinguished by four typical behaviors, according to Farh and Cheng:

– First: Leaders exercise strict control over their subordinates and demand obedience without question. They do not seek to empower their subordinates, in order to maintain their absolute dominance within organizations. This style shares little information with employees, adopting a top-down communication approach.

– Second: They tend to deliberately ignore suggestions and contributions from subordinates, attributing success to themselves and failure to their subordinates.

– Third: Leaders place considerable emphasis on their own dignity and always display confidence. They control and manipulate information to maintain a power distance and create a positive image, conserving it through manipulation.

– Fourth: They strongly demand that their subordinates fulfill optimal performance within the organization, making all important decisions within their team. They severely punish subordinates for poor performance (Zhen Wang, 2019, p. 14-15).

2-3- Autocratic Leadership in the Organizational Environment:

Mintzberg explains that the myth of the leader is perpetuated in the organizational environment because it reinforces leaders in their roles. According to the author, this myth embodies the essence of the concept of "control," which is highly valued in the foundations of classical management. However, he questions this approach and argues that it may no longer be the most appropriate way to conceptualize the leader's role. Reflecting on the monitoring approach that gained him considerable success in describing the tasks and roles of managers, he emphasizes the decision-making variable, which refers to the degree of delegation of decision-making authority and the extent of employee participation in the decision-making process. There are various approaches to decision-making, where decisions may be made by a single individual (the managerial leader), typically described as the autocratic leadership style.

Classical management theories highlighted the need to complete work according to a pre-established method or approach. Consequently, strict control is applied to ensure that employees perform tasks in line with the prescribed method. This control is exercised through supervision, reflecting the concept of the autocratic manager. This managerial style aligns with the assumptions of Theory X, which suggests that individuals cannot be trusted to complete their daily work on their own. If left unchecked, they would waste work time on unproductive activities. Thus, the focus is placed on work processes to increase productivity (Saadi, 2021, p. 223).

Eric (1981) agrees that the authoritarian leader heavily depends on authority, control, power, manipulation, and hard work to accomplish tasks. Structures, procedures, processes, and centralized formal mechanisms are clearly defined and enforced to ensure that subordinates perform their duties efficiently within the set rules. Sanctions are often implemented when mistakes are made, usually in the form of withholding attention or making individuals feel guilty. Motivation under this leadership style is grounded in external economic incentives tied to performance. Authority is rarely delegated. Autocratic management focuses on the principle of centralized power and decision-making in the hands of top leadership. It defines goals, develops plans, and sets policies (Al-Hariri, 2016, pp. 154-155).

3- Authority:

3-1- Definition of Authority:

Authority includes the rights, privileges, obligations, and duties associated with specific positions within an organization or social system. Typically, a leader's authority includes the right to make certain decisions on behalf of the organization. In this context, the leader exercises direct authority over the individual concerned, granting them the right to issue requests within the scope of their authority, with the expectation that the individual will comply. Power, or authority, refers to the ability of participants to influence each other's circumstances. It is defined as the extent to which one person can impose his plans and judgments on others (Al-Zanati, 2024, p. 36). Ahmed Zaki Badawi, in his book Dictionary of Social Science Terminology, defines authority as the ability to influence, which takes on a legitimate form within the framework of social life. Authority represents a natural power or legal right that allows an individual to act or issue commands within a specific society. This

type of power is tied to a social position deemed legitimate by the members of the society, who, in turn, comply with the directives or orders of the individual in power.

To explain the sources of authority in administrative leadership, two theories have emerged in management thought:

– Theory of Official Authority: Proponents of this theory argue that a leader's power is derived from their functional position within the organization. This authority follows a hierarchical structure, flowing from the top down, with delegations assigned from higher levels to lower ones. Leaders are granted the authority to compel subordinates to obey orders through both coercion and persuasion. According to this theory, the right to issue commands, tied to the leader's official position, and the responsibility of subordinates to execute these commands help direct efforts and maintain discipline in the workplace.

– Theory of Practical (Informal) Authority: This authority is unique to successful leaders and originates from the acceptance of their leadership by subordinates. Proponents of this theory assert that the true source of a leader's official authority lies in its acceptance by subordinates. They maintain that a leader's power fundamentally relies on the subordinates' approval, placing less emphasis on the official authority that stems from the leader's formal position.

4- The Basic Theories of Authority by Weber and Crozier:

Max Weber and Michel Crozier introduce contrasting perspectives on leadership and authority, especially in the context of authoritarian leadership. While their theories are distinct, both offer valuable insights into the complexities of organizational dynamics and the nature of authority. To examine their core ideas, it is necessary to explore Weber's concept of bureaucratic authority and Crozier's focus on organizational dynamics and uncertainty.

4-1- Max Weber's Concept of Authority:

The German sociologist Max Weber is renowned for his theory on bureaucratic authority, which forms a pillar of his broader work on the rational-legal framework and the model of legitimate rational domination. Weber grounds authority in legal principles, explaining the relationship between the practice of legitimate rational authority in the modern state and the bureaucratic model of organization, distinguished by a hierarchical structure of administrative functions and general legal rules. Weber's theory of authority is grounded in the concept of the capacity to subject one group to the will of another through commands. The person in authority has the right to exercise this power, whether as a natural individual or a legal entity (such as a body or institution). Weber presented the concept of bureaucratic authority, defining it as a process including two parties: the ruler and the ruled. This dynamic exists only when the ruled comply with the commands of the ruler or authority figure. Weber describes authority as conditional, where one actor in a social relationship exercises control despite resistance. Typically, this authority is maintained through an administrative body or organization. His theory highlights the importance of hierarchy, rules, processes, procedures, and formal authority as key components of authoritarian leadership, operating within a rational-legal framework. Weber's theory of bureaucracy is founded on ideal types of legitimate authority, with both traditional and modern bureaucracies representing key manifestations of this type of power. Modern

bureaucracy aligns with rational-legal authority, while traditional bureaucracy corresponds to traditional authority. In his analyses, Weber studied the relationship between traditional and modern bureaucracies and the unique nature of authority, developing ideal models of legitimate power (Al-Waqdani, 2010, p. 9).

Weber determines three forms of authority-traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal-each ensuring obedience but corresponding to different phases of organizational development: Traditional authority is rooted in established customs and practices, relying on adherence to long-standing traditions. Charismatic authority, on the other hand, is grounded in the extraordinary personal qualities of a leader, deriving its legitimacy from the leader's charisma and vision. Lastly, rational-legal authority is based on established laws and formalized rules, emphasizing duty, responsibility, and a structured hierarchy. Each form of authority seeks to establish its legitimacy and reflects different organizational stages and societal development.

- Charismatic authority: This type of authority is grounded in a person's possession of certain traits that allow him to influence and control others. However, excessive reliance on this power can lead to fragmentation within society. Weber argues that to prevent this, it is essential to establish a stable and permanent system of authority by embedding the qualities of the charismatic leader into the societal framework. In other words, these qualities should become part of the routine and norms of social life.
- Traditional authority: Finds its legitimacy in established beliefs about the sanctity of, long-standing traditions and the status of those exercising authority under these traditions. We hers leadership is inherited or bestowed according to traditional rules. The ruler in such systems enjoys personal authority not based on rational rules but on sacred tradition, and their commands are legitimate only within the bounds of that tradition.
- Legal authority: Rational-legal authority derives its legitimacy from a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands. This form of authority forms the foundation of modern bureaucratic systems and is characterized by its impersonality and procedural regularity. In rational-legal systems, obedience is owed not to individuals but to legally established impersonal orders, with officials exercising authority only within legally circumscribed jurisdictions. Organizations where rules and procedures govern organizational functioning.

Table 1. representing the difference between the three types: Prepared by the researcher

Type	Basis	Legitimacy	Relationships
Traditional	Traditions and customs	Belief in the sanctity of traditions	Personal loyalty and respect for traditions
Rational	Laws and institutions	Belief in the fairness of laws	Clarity, organization, and adherence to the law
Charismatic	Leader's personality	Belief in the leader's exceptional abilities	Strong personal loyalty and willingness to sacrifice

4-1-1- Authority in the Bureaucratic System and the Role of Leadership According to Weber Max Weber's:

For Weber, bureaucracy is the ultimate expression of rational-legal authority, deriving its legitimacy from a belief in the legitimacy of the pattern of normative rules and the position an individual holds within the structure. Weber described it as the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency from a purely technical point of view.

Weber views legitimacy in autocratic leadership as dependent on the concept of traditional authority. This type of authority derives its legitimacy from traditions and customs, based on the belief in the sanctity of long-established customs and the legitimacy of authority within them, as well as the social status derived from those who hold power. In the autocratic context, the leader enjoys absolute authority.

Weber argues that the direct effect of traditional authority on society weakens the economic and rational activities of individuals because, due to the privileges enjoyed by rulers, individuals are reluctant to undertake economic, financial, or commercial initiatives for fear of clashing with the will of the rulers (Awada, 2013, p. 274). Furthermore, the bureaucratic structure within the organization forces employees to adopt model behaviors. This is due to the administration's urgent need to monitor employees and ensure that their actions align with the established plans. This compels employees to adopt various behaviors, some based solely on formalities, while others are driven by total compliance with these rules. Other behaviors may manifest as rebellion or isolation.

For employees who focus excessively on formalities and the conformity that arises within the organization due to the accumulation of laws and rules, they may abandon the initial goals set by the organization because of their strong attachment to these rules. Merton referred to this phenomenon as "goal displacement," describing how an organization's efforts to control workers and encourage model behaviors necessary for achieving its objectives can ultimately lead to a transition in workers' goals (Chaouech, 2021, p. 379).

The system of rules and organization provides a framework for distributing authority from upper management to each element of the organization. Full authority is divided into smaller parts, each assigned to a responsible individual. Authority is distributed to give the required orders to perform these duties in a stable and precisely defined manner through rules concerning coercive and material means, which can be directed by the officials. The position of the responsible individual in the bureaucracy is determined by rules and rational knowledge.

The term bureaucracy is distinguished by the division of labor, the establishment of specific rules and standards, as well as a pattern of impersonal relationships. According to sociologist Richard Hall, the features of bureaucracy emphasized by Max Weber can be understood as dimensions that, relying on the level at which they appear within the organization, refer to the degree of organizational bureaucracy. According to Hall, these dimensions are (Laiana, 2017, p. 30):

– Clear Division of Labor: Work is divided into a set of secondary tasks that are repetitive and clearly defined.
– Clear Hierarchy of Authority: Functions and positions are organized hierarchically, with each subordinate under the authority of a superior.

- Formal Selection: All members of the organizational structure are chosen based on technical abilities, through their background, academic trajectory, or official performance evaluations.
- Impersonality in Interactions: The system and monitoring should be applied in an organized manner, allowing for the separation of personal matters from professional ones.
- Merit-Based Career Progression: Managers are professional agents, not owners of the units they manage. They receive a fixed wage and advance within the institution based on merit.
- Separation of Management from Ownership: Decisions are made grounded in objective criteria and performance standards, rather than personal ownership interests.

Weber's methodological objective was focused on analyzing the behavior of officials to ensure that they fit within a predictable framework. Thus, Weberian Authority seeks to suppress uncertainty to guarantee precision and consistency.

4-2- Power Dynamics According to Michel Crozier:

On the other hand, Michel Crozier introduces a contrasting perspective by focusing on the dynamics of organizations and the role of uncertainty in power relationships. Crozier asserts that power does not solely stem from formal structures but also from an actor's ability to control areas of uncertainty—those undefined spaces within the formal framework of the system (Al-Azhari, 2023, p. 582). In contrast to Weber, who highlights official authority, Crozier emphasizes the significance of informal networks, resistance, and strategic alliances in forming organizational dynamics.

Crozier's theory is grounded in the belief that organizations are complex systems where power is continuously negotiable and changing. He suggests that individuals and groups within organizations possess power not only because of their formal positions but also due to their ability to exploit areas of ambiguity and uncertainty. These actors employ this to gain more power in order to safeguard their interests and influence the organization and other parties (Chaouech, 2021, p. 382). He asserts that rather than eliminating human discretion, the creation of strict rules in bureaucracies leads to the concentration of discretionary power in the hands of actors who have the ability or skills to control the remaining sources of uncertainty.

According to Crozier, controlling all sources of uncertainty in complex organizations is impossible. Thus, bureaucratic rules, rather than fulfilling rationality, effectively redistribute discretionary power to the remaining areas of uncertainty within the system. He sees the actor as facing, simultaneously, at all levels, the rational and utilitarian demands necessary to achieve their goals. The actor's power relies on the unpredictability of their behavior towards their partner. As long as the actor's needs themselves create situations of ambiguity, this grants individuals facing authority the ability to influence those impacted by the outcomes of their choices.

On this basis, power relationships are ongoing negotiations where each actor seeks to increase the margin of unpredictability in their behavior to reduce the zone of uncertainty concerning the actions of others. Actors will struggle to increase their share of freedom, promote their negotiating power, and force their superiors to offer more for their cooperation. Similarly, they will apply pressure to impose new rules and continue to push for personal gains. At the same time, superiors behave in

the same way, striving to fulfill goals and strengthen their power through negotiation while combating to maintain their own freedom of action.

Crozier's focus on ambiguity, uncertainty, and informal networks challenges the rigid structures of Weber's bureaucratic model. He asserts that true power lies in the ability to manage uncertainty, and control over this area grants authority. The actor who has the most control over uncertainty, due to their competence and network of relationships, is able to predict occurrences and thus holds the greatest amount of power (Kheira, 2022, p. 33). As a result, power takes on various features: it is a relationship of exchange and negotiation, a utilitarian and reciprocal relationship, mainly linked to the ability to manipulate and predict. Power is relational, as there is no authority outside of our relationships with others. Actors hold power because they control areas of uncertainty arising from the use of organizational standards. The actor exercises power over individuals because they control the areas of uncertainty to which those individuals are subject. Since monopolies are rare, everyone attempts to exert influence grounded in the areas of uncertainty they control. From this comes the complexity and contradictions in perspectives when it comes to justification or rationalization, as everyone wants others to guide them, provided they remain free.

In his research on bureaucracy and his analysis of the French social system, Crozier clarified that Weber's model overlooked power, conflict, and organizational change. Crozier explained the nature of social relationships to provide a relative picture of the strategies employed by actors, based on which they interact to safeguard their interests. Within the organization, the individual is seen as a component for rational management, meaning that society develops through a specific goal-oriented rational strategy, leaving the individual a margin of freedom despite the pressures (Sahraoui, 2022, p. 224). He views organizational power as depending on the actions and strategic behaviors adopted by actors at several levels within the organization. This results in a duality between the authority to enforce the law and technical working authority. Each party possesses limited rationality and attempts to create a personal strategy to fulfill their objectives, often conflicting with the goals of the organization. The party relies on available resources and legal loopholes in obscure ways. Thus, each entity within the organizational structure has unique goals, traits, and resources, leading to the formulation of unpredictable and obscure strategies to prevent others from discovering or predicting their behavior while pursuing their objectives. He argues that the behavior and attitudes of actors and groups within the organization cannot be fully explained without reference to the power relationships between them, and that power should be seen as a fundamental component in teamwork and organization. Understanding these relationships is significant for enhancing the organization's performance.

4-2-1- Sources of Power According to Michel Crozier:

Crozier attributes the acquisition of power to a set of sources or resources that allow any individual within an organizational system to possess power if they control these sources. He determines them as follows:
- Competence and Job Specialization: Over time, with the acquisition of professional experience, individuals working within an organization develop certain skills, gaining a margin of

negotiation flexibility with the organization and colleagues, especially when the work is difficult to replace. This ability to negotiate and maneuver is regarded as a form of informal organizational power, acquired through the actors' ability to invest their experience and technical knowledge in areas of uncertainty and ambiguity that their work nature offers.

– Control Over Relationships in the Environment: This is embedded in the daily relational networks of organizational life. This source is viewed as the most important and stable. The power to control relationships and how they are introduced to the organization is a critical necessity for designing strategic management within the organization. An actor who leverages relationships acquired from another organization reaches strategically significant outcomes.

– Communication and Information: The saying "He who has the information has the power" is key here. Obtaining and controlling information in the process of negotiation and bargaining is a significant advantage. It enables the individual to construct a defensive or offensive strategy. In order to perform their task effectively, an individual needs information possessed by others and on which they rely. Communication can be either internal or external.

4-2-2- How Power is Formed According to Michel Crozier:

Strategic analysis in Crozier's theory is grounded in numerous interconnected concepts that form the notion of power relationships:

– Stakes: This concept introduces the situation in which an actor, whether an individual or a group, feels that something is at risk and encounters the possibility of gain or loss in fulfilling his objectives within the organization. It can be regarded as a set of goals distinguished by change and instability, which prompts the actor, either independently or as part of a working group, to craft a strategy towards others—whether individuals, groups, or formal authorities. This strategic approach includes anticipating both expected and unexpected reactions from others and dealing with them, as well as leveraging appropriate timing and rationality based on available resources to secure the stake. However, the actor may face unexpected obstacles within the organization that force them to abandon some objectives and discover new ones (Bekhouche Oussama, 2024, p. 150).

– Actor: The actor employs a specific strategy sought at maximizing personal benefits (whether as an individual or a group). This strategy is not always explicitly clear to the actor, as it may be shaped by several factors and hidden objectives.

– Uncertainty Area: This refers to the inability to predict or control events that impact the operations of the organization. It is the source from which the actor derives power over others. Every organizational situation, no matter its nature, includes a component of doubt and uncertainty. By controlling this area, the actor gains power. The actor who controls it, through a network of communication relationships and professional competence, can predict occurrences and thus hold the greatest source of power. Mastery over this area of uncertainty grants the actor autonomy and the ability to conceal their tactics.

– Power: According to Crozier, power does not originate from the hierarchical position occupied by the actor. Rather, it is a system that defines the relationships between actors and management.

Power is the ability to influence and is grounded in an exchange relationship that is negotiated to increase the margin of unpredictability in the actor's behavior by others (Khribech, 2011, p. 583).

– System of Concrete Action: This is a social construct that includes the relationships and actions of individuals who participate in it through mechanisms and manipulations to fulfill a balance between changing structures and maintaining the stability of the social construct. The main purpose of the system of concrete action is to maintain the continuity of the system or organization. The system for actors within the organization is determined by the totality of alliances, conflicts, and negotiations, which result from the strategies of the actors (Hamama, 2023, p. 251).

4-2-3- Divergent Conceptions of Power and Authority:

The fundamental distinction lies in their conceptualization of power. Weber distinguishes between power as the ability to impose one's will despite resistance, and authority as legitimate power that is accepted voluntarily .His analytical focus remains squarely on authority—the legitimized forms of power. Crozier, in contrast, collapses this distinction by demonstrating how illegitimate power strategies permeate legitimate authority structures .For Crozier, power is not about legitimacy but about practical influence-who actually gets whom to do what through organizational dependencies.

This divergence leads to different understandings of organizational dynamics. Weber's bureaucracy functions according to its formal rules-a predictable machine operating with technical efficiency. Crozier's bureaucracy is a strategic playing field where formal rules both constrain and enable power games .Where Weber sees rule-following officials, Crozier finds rule-manipulating strategists. These perspectives represent not truth versus falsehood but different levels of analysis: Weber examines the organizational superstructure, while Crozier investigates its infrastructural workings.

Crozier identifies several inherent dysfunctional tendencies within bureaucratic organizations that persist despite-and often because of-their formal structures. Contrary to Weber's emphasis on bureaucratic efficiency and predictability, Crozier demonstrates how strict adherence to bureaucratic principles generates perverse effects that undermine organizational effectiveness. One central dysfunction is the isolation of individuals within hierarchical strata, resulting from impersonal rules that protect officials from direct authority but simultaneously prevent meaningful communication between different levels of the organization - This isolation creates what Crozier terms "vicious circles of bureaucracy".

5- General conclusion:

According to Weber, bureaucracy is an ideal model for fulfilling efficiency. By establishing clear lines of authority and formal procedures, organizations can operate in a more predictable manner. Since employees' roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, this leads to increased productivity. However, while Weber highlights the significance of structure and order, excessive

bureaucracy can result in rigidity. Critics of Weber's theory assert that it may lead to resistance to change, making the system inflexible and incapable of adapting to new challenges.

Weber's model of authority and bureaucracy, grounded in a rational-legal framework, contrasts with Crozier's approach, which focuses on the role of uncertainty in power dynamics. Michel Crozier argues that power is not solely contained within formal structures. He claims that power is often less about who holds a position and more about how actors manage their roles within the organization. The ability to navigate uncertainty is a key source of power. Actors who can skillfully maneuver through organizational complexities often hold significant influence, form alliances, create informal networks, and participate in negotiations.

Crozier highlights the significance of informal relationships and alliances within the organization, asserting that power is conditioned by social interactions between individuals, not just their positions within the hierarchy. He also emphasizes the importance of adaptability and negotiation in exercising power.

Both Weber and Crozier share a common understanding of power by examining its nature and influence on social behavior. Both recognized that resources play a significant role in determining the level of power that individuals and groups hold. Moreover, both acknowledged that power is not static but continuously evolves in response to changing circumstances.

In terms of authority, Weber determines three main types: legal, traditional, and charismatic. He sees power primarily as a tool for control and dominance. Conversely, Crozier views power as emerging from social relationships and interactions between individuals, focusing on areas of uncertainty. He perceives power as a strategic tool employed by individuals to fulfill their goals.

6- Conclusion:

In conclusion, Weber's core theory highlights the significance of the hierarchical structure of formal authority and rules within organizational frameworks. His vision of bureaucratic leadership is distinguished by a clear chain of command, where authority flows from the top down, ensuring efficiency and predictability in decision-making. Rules and regulations serve as the backbone of authority, creating an organized framework in which actors understand their roles and responsibilities. This bureaucratic model is particularly effective in organizations that require stability and control, especially in large organizations or government institutions.

On the other hand, Michel Crozier provides a contrasting perspective that deepens our understanding of power dynamics within organizations. His analysis emphasizes the role of informal networks and the uncertainty inherent in organizational environments. Crozier asserts that true power often does not reside in formal authority but in individuals' ability to navigate and manage uncertainties.

Despite their differences, both Weber and Crozier agree that power is not merely a matter of position but also involves relational aspects of leadership. Authority is multifaceted, and understanding how power functions necessitates an appreciation of both formal structures and informal networks. This dual perspective enables leaders to navigate their organizations' complexities and respond more effectively to challenges.

The foundational theories introduced by Max Weber and Michel Crozier provide a rich and nuanced understanding of leadership and authority. Weber's bureaucratic model highlights the significance of formal structures and rational-legal authority, emphasizing the importance of hierarchy and formal rules in fulfilling efficiency. Meanwhile, Crozier's focus on organizational dynamics underscores the role of uncertainty and informal networks in shaping power dynamics. By examining these contrasting perspectives, we gain a deeper insight into the complexities of autocratic (authoritarian) leadership and the diverse factors that influence power within organizations. This analysis offers a foundation for further exploration of Weber and Crozier's ideas and their implications for contemporary leadership practices.

- References:

Abdul Kader Khribech. (2001). Strategic Analysis According to Michel Crozier. Damascus University Journal.

Abdullah Masfer Al-Waqdani. (2010). Reformulating Max Weber's Theory on Bureaucracy. King Abdulaziz University Journal of Arts and Humanities, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Agha Rafiq Helmi. (2003). The role of managerial leadership in development and administrative growth. The Fourth Annual Conference on Creative Leadership for the Development and Growth of Institutions in the Arab World. Damascus.

Al-Azhari Ben Issa. (2023). An Analytical Reading of the Concept of Power in Organizational Thinking. Al-Sawra Journal of Human and Social Studies. Volume 9, Issue 3.

Alili Kheira. (2022). The Impact of Exercising Power on Job Satisfaction and Job Discipline in Algerian Public Administration – Tlemcen Wilaya. A Thesis Presented for the Doctorate in Science Degree – Department: Management Sciences, Specialization: Human Resource Management.

Bekhouche Oussama, Badraoui Soufiane. (2024). Organizational Communication and Workgroups According to the Strategic Analysis Theory. The Journal of El-Ryssala for Media Studies. Volume 08, Issue 01.

Chaouech Hamid. (2021). Weber's Bureaucratic Organization in the Core of Organizational Sociology. Human Sciences Journal, Volume 32, Issue 4.

Hanan Ali Aouada. (2013). Power according to Max Weber. Professor Journal, issued by the College of Education Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, University of Baghdad, Issue 206, Volume 1.

Laiana Carvalho Dos Santos. (2017). O Fenômeno Burocrático em Max Weber e Michel Crozier. Federal University of Amazonas - UFAM Institute of Human Sciences and Letters (ICHL), Postgraduate Program in Sociology (PPGS).

Mohamed Sorour Hariri. (2016). Rules of Psychoanalysis and Psychological and Behavioral Therapy. Dar Al-Minhali.

Muhammad Asrar-ul-Haq, Sadie Anwar. (2018). The many faces of leadership: Proposing a research agenda through a review of literature. Future Business Journal.

Saadi Mohammedi. (2021). Models of Contemporary Management. Dar Al-Yazouri Scientific Publishing and Distribution.

Sahraoui Hamama, Ben Ramadane Samia. (2022). Strategic action of the actor within the system: A strategic analysis approach by Michel Crozier. Journal of Social Studies and Research. Volume 10, Issue 1.

Sahraoui Hamama. (2023). Strategic Action of the Technical Engineer in Bureaucratic Organization: A Field Study at the Gas Cylinder Company. Journal of Research in Human and Social Sciences. Volume 14, Issue 2.

Samar Khalaf Allah Al-Zanati. (2024). Trump and Biden: Analyzing Journalistic Discourse. Arab Publishing and Distribution.

Vasileva Nadezhada, Angelova. (2021). The impact of leadership style on employee motivation in the automotive industry. Journal of Business and Retail Management Research (JBRMR).

Veliu, L., Mimoza, M., Visar, D., & Liridon, J. (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employee performance. Vadyba Journal of Management.

Zhen Wang, Yuanliu L. (2019). Authoritarian leadership and task performance: The effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on the leader. Frontiers of Business Research in China.