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This chapter presents the desirable characteristics of the human resource director. Starting from the base that human resources director needs a great responsibility in the decision making, a series of necessary characteristics that facilitate their work are established. Among them is justified the need to have great humility, technical knowledge, initiatives, knowledge of their employees and extensive human training, command capacity and exercise true leadership. All of them contribute to the improvement by the manager of the company's human capital and therefore of its business competitiveness.

1. **Introduction**

The success of organizations over their competitors is primarily achieved when the managers who direct them choose superior decisions, specifically when these are taken rapidly and when the managers who direct them make superior decisions, and specifically when these are taken rapidly and when the degree of decision implementation is extensive [1]. Therefore, the role that the company director plays, in the present period, constitutes one of the factors that most greatly impacts on the competitiveness of the firm.

To achieve this, the manager must have the skills to identify and solve problems, to collect and evaluate information in the process of delegating responsibilities, and to take responsibility for their own tasks, this also includes choosing what actions to carry out and practicing consistency with the rest of any activities implemented [2].

In this chapter, we have focused on the qualities of the human resources director, considering that such a figure has direct dealings with the rest of the workforce and therefore constitutes the greatest factor for transmitting knowledge and values that strengthen group identification with the company and favor the upward progression of the organization.

First, we analyze the functions and responsibilities that human resources directors perform in order to establish what virtues we consider essential for improving the implementation of those responsibilities. Second, we establish other typically needed skills and qualities, including technical training and initiative, the director’s knowledge of the employees and human capital formation, the capacity to command a workforce, and charismatic elements involving the exercise of authority, personal and professional ethics, and the exercise of practical and effective (true) leadership.

1. **Roles and Responsibilities of the Human Resources Director**

We must initially highlight the importance of exercising a profession. The personal behavior of an individual who has a sense of responsibility differs vastly from that of a person who lacks this quality. For this reason, if we wish to comprehend the scope of a director’s responsibility, we must first perform a meticulous analysis of the director’s functions.

Responsibility derives from the Latin “respondere" or "the ability of the human being to respond to the acts he performs and the consequences of those acts in their ethical content". In this sense, we can see the relationship between responsibility and freedom. Each person must take responsibility for the actions they undertake and freely chosen decisions. We must not ignore that, because the professional work of a manager includes governance over the actions of other people, this role incurs a greater responsibility. The director is more responsible for the actions that he orders others to put into practice precisely because the subordinates have less freedom (to choose not to do the action). Responsibility therefore falls directly on the decision-taker.

What does the Human Resources Director require? It is evident, in this case, which we are referring to the management of "people" who make up an organization that has adopted the concrete form of a company. Therefore, the management processes practiced are part of the overall management of the company, expressing and specifying in this way the specific tasks that each member of the organization must perform in order to achieve the goals of the company. Therefore, to “direct” is to “decide” (with regard both to the technical and the humane within the organization), but it is also to “educate” (in the sense of “drawing out” new knowledge or practices from people and "driving, guiding, accompanying" their further development). Directing, then, differs fundamentally from "manipulating." To draw out the qualities that another has hidden inside, the director has to see them and has to discover them first as it is something that is normally veiled and hidden for even the bearer of the qualities.

The first etymological meaning of educating, "educere", signifies drawing out a wealth (of understanding) that a person already carries within themselves, allowing it to externalize not because it is forced out but more through the application of maieutics. This that art and process (characteristic of the Socratic Method) of drawing out an interlocutor’s truths through a midwifery of questioning, a method that makes apparent to another knowledge that they had not yet recognized or formulated. This is, figuratively speaking, like the educator who teaches reading not by granting the ability to the student but encouraging the development of the skill of reading. Or similarly, to learn to swim is not exactly or only taking theoretical swimming lessons without application but requires the learner also to practice it in the water. In these same ways, the director educates by first knowing (intuitively or through objective tests for personnel selection previously made) that an individual has the desired or needed qualities and then offering adequate possibilities for the person to develop (practice) those skills.

The second meaning of the verb educate is "I will lead," which means to guide, to accompany, to lead as a concrete way of directing, and/or to change the behavior of that person in order to improve them—all of which implies that these goals are based on human values for improving coexistence and work in the business organization. It is, therefore, crucial to act and behave in a manner that is extremely respectful of the freedom of others, regarding their decisions, executions, and responsibilities. In contrast, to be demanding implies obliging, forcing or coercing another that would lead effectively to dictatorship and the corresponding paths of submission, reaction, subversion, or rebellion, and thus never leads to the organizational maturation of the other. Instead, any sense of being “demanding” must involve and identify with practices of tolerance and patience, and with the maintenance of decisions that also know how to adapt to each case, person, and circumstance, given that the rate and timing of learning and personal maturation differs from person to person. What is called for is to educate while respecting individual freedoms, which implies that the director provide the right instructions at the right time such that the subordinate, with that information and interpersonal communication in mind, chooses, decides and takes responsibility for the act as well. Moreover, as the employee decides and is free in choosing to do so, if they decide to take the correct decision, then they share in the responsibility such that credit is shifted toward them as well. Similarly, the decision-taker has responsibility to make decent decisions, as they are the one as well who grants the possibility of making mistakes and then rectifying and learning from those mistake. Educating in and for freedom consists precisely of such a process: to trust in the other and to promote personal development. The one who accompanies the decision-taker not only exposes the basis of the behavior sought but also constitutes the content of human values in play. These behaviors require that the decision-taker not act out of fear or the hope merely to look good. Rather, the director forthrightly proposes and explains the reasons and rationales for decisions—something that a manipulator would never do.

Therefore, we can clearly see that directing people is not like running machines by following an "instruction manual." Decisions are proposed, not imposed, such that the desire to act on the part of others is respected. Therefore, the management of people can be considered one of the most sublime and rewarding tasks, yet also the most difficult to perform because, —although the company seeks to maximize economic objectives that are built on a value of unity amongst employees oriented towards tasks given by management—trying to coordinate the different actions and to distribute certain tasks to different people such that this process leads to enrichment and synergy, instead of confrontation, disparity, dispersion is difficult. Sometimes, while the skills that employees possess may have no bearing on what others possess, the total pool (of skills) amongst all employees is already at the disposal of the director; as such, the director need not possess certain skills. This is the great advantage of human groups that under appropriate management produces synergies within the framework of the business organization. Therefore, the solutions provided by management must be usable not only for the current situation in the present, but also for any specific problem as contextualized by its respective companies’ situation, including the labor force of the firm at the moment—this, because these are the people who can improve the company and use whatever limited physical capital the company possesses for useful applications.

From what we have previously stated, it becomes clear that if the Human Resources director must take decisions for the here and for the now, being able to "educate" their workers in the broadest sense of the term requires that the director has a personality rich in human values and, at the same time, a balanced and harmonious personality as it is not possible to teach what is not known and, above all, what is not practiced. If we ponder what qualities we wish to find in a good director, we may discover what human values he should have, what he can have and what, in fact, he already has. This reflection is what we intend to develop in the following work, adding that such qualities are essential to achieve the objectives and goals that we have proposed in the firm.

1. **Fundamental Virtues of the Human Resources Director**

Most likely, if we carry out a consultation among those who have to work with the director to inform us with regards to the aspects that they would like to see practiced, it is possible that we would find affirmations such as the following: he does not impose his points of view, he always listens to others, accepts that another may be right or have a better opinion than his own, positively receives the suggestions of others, is open to what others can bring to the table in order to learn from them, accepts that he can be mistaken like any other person, we feel understood by him, he has a dialoguing mood, he is not arrogant and many others opinions that we could note. However, in the end, they always lead to the same statement: the director must be a humble person if we wish to develop decent relations, since humility is to recognize the truth and the reality of events or deeds (such that the humble recognizes his error, while the resentful rejects the facts), to distinguish the valuable from what is not, without making sense of people or pre-judgments about the goodness or courage of something or someone [3].

This human value, which implies a whole attitude and spirit, is essential and basic if we want to develop a dialogue with others because, although not everything is negotiable, one can and should discuss everything, listen to others and accept and recognize what is good in others and give us freely, recognizing in this way that we are neither the only nor the best in everything, something that is vital to avoid falling into arrogance or sufficiency. This is how mutual trust is built, the basis of all economic activity and of all coexistence and authority, because by it we can grant credibility to the other.

This virtue is the fundamental one that the director must practice, no matter how much it surprises us, if we wish things to work well within the organization. On it is based all of the human behavior in the company that allows the way of the unity of the people, the approaches and, therefore, of the actions in team duly coordinated.

Humility is based on two great human virtues: justice and sincerity. Justice requires different treatment to be given to those that, in themselves, are different, but this different treatment must be weighted so that unequal treatment is reasonably different and does not give rise to clear discriminations that generate hurtful inequalities. On more than one occasion, when human beings speak of justice and we ask that justice to be done, we are proposing, almost without realizing, a request for revenge, which is something quite different but that nests and springs many times from our hearts. On the other hand, sincerity consists of knowing how to tell the truth that the other can understand and to phrase it to them in a way that helps them improve on a personal level. It has nothing to do with the arrogance or the rudeness of "climbing the scaffold" and, from above, "read the book to others" to "sink into misery." It is also not about saying "half-truths" but about exposing the truth with the form and content that the other is capable of grasping and utilizing towards the organization’s advantage. Therefore, it is not about telling the other the first thing that comes to mind but something that helps you clarify and improve phrased in a way that is comprehendible.

Humility is based, then, on justice as well as sincerity and, therefore, the humble person knows how to value his subordinates in which he can find truths greater than within himself, a position that is essential to be able to listen and learn from others: to be open to the truth of another, to the outsider, to the goodness of others ... even if that person is of another political, religious, cultural or ethnic group than my own. The humble never falls into arrogance or self-sufficiency. The humble always generates mutual trust because he offers what he is, specifically, he offers himself to the other and welcomes all that is good within the other. His position of justice and sincerity makes his proposals credible because he knows how to always adapt to the level of the listener, the one he receives, and furthermore to not downplay the other but instead to do more, to help him improve, knowing that we can all learn from others besides bringing to the table what we know and are. The humble knows very well that "if you cheat me, you do not cheat on me but you deceive yourself" because the biggest loser with that action is not me but you: the most important thing is not that I believe you know or you can do it, but that you know it and know how to do it as that is the fundamental issue: what you are, not what I think and I believe about you.

1. **Technical Training and the Person with Initiatives.**

We refer here to the appropriate training as a variable dependent on the company that you choose to manage. We hope, then, that the manager is a person prepared and intelligent such that they are not a braggart or presumptuous. Their preparation, experience, culture and knowledge is not used to "make less" of others but instead they use these qualities to behave as a humble person who knows how to “catch up” with each of their subordinates, instead of demanding that they "go up" "Up to his position to follow him and understand him: because" it is the one above who should and can catch up with the one below and not demand the one below to grow up to reach his own in order to understand him ". Furthermore, this applies to both the physical stature and the intellectual stature or human experience found in each of us. The excellent director knows how to clearly distinguish between erudition and wisdom, thus he is aware that, in many cases, erudition prevents access to wisdom: it penetrates the essence of people and things, to value situations appropriately. The superior director does not presume of what he knows, yet instead he communicates it to others when necessary and shares it with those who need it since, acting in this manner, he will never lose credibility: neither as a person nor for the good of his company.

On the other hand, the Human Resources director must be innovative, which goes beyond having ingenious ideas: the process of innovation involves knowing how to adapt to each worker what is intended to be achieved globally, since, it is impossible to apply the same standards to different people. It is essential that the initiatives taken by the director do not block those that others are able to take, and instead, the ideal goal is to stimulate them. For example, if in a situation I pose a question with regards to what happens to others and, given the difficulty of the case, they find few initiatives after reflecting on it, and I then formulate a large number of possible and realistic proposals: what will they perform in the future, is to refuse to think if something happens to them and they will prefer to " take advantage of the opportunity" of what I offer later. With this I have not managed to encourage and strive to have personal initiatives but, on the contrary, I am encouraging them with my way of proceeding to adopt a passive stance and to be carried away by my future proposals [4]. That is to say, the issue is not about making my proposals succeed but about provoking situations that allow others to have initiatives that propose to the group (maieutic process) so that "you learn and commit yourself, such that you do not have the feeling that others compromise your ideas".

The director must also be open to receiving the proposals of others, knowing how to communicate their own ideas and motivating their workers, to which they must convey enthusiasm and encouragement, which is not exclusively based on words but fundamentally associated with their position, attitude as well as their adequate and humane treatment, which implies practicing a position of active pedagogy as we have previously indicated.

1. **Knowledge of your Employees and Extensive Human Training.**

We shift our focus away from theoretical psychology and towards practical psychology, which may be considered more tangible and intuitive, in order to understand how to relate to subordinates and to obtain the most out of their qualities such that they feel useful and valuable to the extent that they also recognize your successes.

Additionally, the Human Resources director must comprehend, through his intuition and experience in dealing with others, what qualities and potential may be found in his subordinates that are not yet practiced and which do not exist but are likely to be acquired, ergo allowing us to express with great clarity how we can consider an authentic integral human development. To achieve this, rather than giving lectures and instructions, it is preferable that specific tasks are assigned, directed, supervised and oriented in each case, manifesting to the worker that our interest refers to him as a person much more so than the task he performs or the results that he may obtain. In this way, by achieving them, the development of these values and qualities is achieved as a result of their personal effort, which leads them to feel protagonist of their own lives, ergo causing them grow in self-esteem and thus, being aware of how everything has come about, is born in the worker an attitude forged in recognition, gratitude, trust and credibility towards his superiors with whom he does not feel indebted but instead grateful to them because they have trusted him. Therefore, from now on he will trust and go to his superiors on his own initiative. It is more likely that an employee believes, introduces and applies new ideas for the benefit of the organization when the relationship with their managers is positive [5].

Obviously, this form of learning, which incorporates little theory and much practice, often requires that the management of the company make risky decisions which must be cautiously and carefully evaluated before applying them. This confronts us with a way of resolving conflicts: some must be resolved immediately, confronting the person with the truth of facts and situations, while others require a process of a medium or longer term, which forms and prepares that person and then allows him the opportunity to perform such tasks.

Human formation is essential for the achievement of what we are proposing. Furthermore, human formation cannot merely be defined as culture, but is instead, above all, a spirit that is acquired incrementally and involves cultivating a personality rich in human values, both quantitatively as well as qualitatively, which at the same time must be balanced, ergo leading us to recognize that we are facing a mature person.

Such a person shows in his life a position that is coherent (what may be claimed as reasonable) and consequent (what he says is what he does) for what goes beyond the intellectually trained, who knows how to combine tolerance or flexibility in his actions with firmness. Both human virtues are equally important and necessary, yet they fulfill different missions. Flexibility is necessary because, otherwise, we would be applying the same criteria to all people and circumstances and we must know how to adapt the decision made in each case. And the firmness is equally necessary to never lose sight of the objective that we intend to achieve and that will continue to be maintained: precisely, flexibility aims to make it possible to achieve it and never lose sight of it diffused between changing circumstances. Therefore, flexibility without firmness leads to chaos and disorientation, however, firmness without tolerance ceases to be firmness and transforms into stubbornness, which is curiously the position of the insecure, who do not want to lend their hand to twist nor want to their plans to vary so much, as then they feel lost and unable to elaborate new ones or to adapt the ones he already had and, for that reason, they react aggressively to defend what they had and not to modify it, thus manifesting their fear and uncertainty towards the new and unknown along with their inability to adapt to changing situations, such that this is not firmness.

It should be highlighted in all of this that the human being, by his own condition, is limited, insecure, imperfect and makes mistakes. Therefore, this must be assumed with gallantry that human error will never be a problem if one knows it, accepts it, recognizes it, knows how to coexist joyfully with its condition as a creature and, simultaneously, strives to surpass himself without confusing perfection with perfectionism, as this becomes the problem of the perfectionist and the solution is to accept that "the best can be the enemy of the good”. Thus, we must count on imperfection and admit as realistic the limitations of ourselves and others to move towards what is possible today, in the here and now, with the people that we have and with the available means, enjoying the achievements we achieve instead of lamenting that which we have not yet achieved.

Note that, regardless what is usually thought, an insecure person always tries to apologize, which is to blame others or what surrounds them, instead of recognizing their own mistakes or errors: it is a false pose of sufficiency, of false perfection that has its roots in pride regardless of how painful it is to recognize this. The perfectionist finds it difficult to accept facts and reality, therefore he seeks explanations and rationalizations to apologize. The problem is that the excess of insecurity not only makes it difficult to become humble but leads to intransigence and dogmatism, developing fundamentalist and intolerant positions "for the good of others". This is so because we are dealing with people who "hold on to the norm" as "sure of perfection" and, instead of being sympathetic to their own limitations and those of others to "learn to live with others in a real world", they demand perfection from others according to their own opinion and criteria, so that others adapt to what they understand as the ideal world. We therefore realize that, when encountering an insecure position, these factors leads to intolerance, to dogmatism and to radicalism: of the right, of the left, of Islamic fundamentalism or of any other extremist ideology because, in as mentioned and in summary, it is the world, it is the others who are wrong and they have to adapt to the extremist and his criteria, which are the only ones that are true, correct and valid. The problem is that this person demands that others respect their freedom but he does not respect the freedom of others and wants to impose his point of view.

1. **Ability to Command**

The ability to command is manifested in the way of organizing the company and in decision-making, which implies the exercise of authority, something that is distinct from the exercise of power. We must bear in mind that authority is proposed, and one becomes creditor, while power is imposed. Therefore, authority is something that arises in the informal organization of the company (what exists but is not designed or formulated in writing) while the power appears in the formal organization through the hierarchical design of the company, which grants power to each member of the group according to the position held by the employee.

The proof that you have authority is that you do not have to appeal to the power you have in order to have a specific action executed. Therefore, the authority already acquired and that others recognize in a director will increase with correct or fair use of power that is had, which will generate mutual trust and credibility in the intentions of the boss.

In order to practice authority, first of all it is necessary to practice true communication and to make an effort on the part of all, since it is necessary to develop an interior position that welcomes with enthusiasm the proposals that made to the director since, as the executer of orders may do so automatically or unconsciously, even reluctantly, etc., if in all cases the employee does not obey, it is because they lack the internal position of acceptance that underlies every human act: to obey is not to execute mechanically an action or to submit to a person, but instead it consists of the realization of a human act, which by definition is free and voluntary, in affective tune with another person to whom they recognize authority in, of which they trust, in which I trust and to which I entrust myself. Only when a person knows (from his intuition or from his personal experience) that his own good, evaluated through "rationality plus the ability to execute or achieve it," is not indifferent to the other person who sends me, which It will be fair, considered and prudent in what it asks of me, it can be said that they have found the basis to recognize authority and accept "a priori" a superior’s decision, which is to say: accept it before knowing what that decision can be. Obedience constitutes, in this way, the definitive proof of my trust in the other. Therefore, practicing obedience is not easy, nor is having authority.

Mutual trust also plays an important role. Having the human certainty that at least the established pacts will be fulfilled is crucial. Without remaining exclusively in the evaluation of the results because, if I only contemplate this, I must admit that I dedicate myself exclusively to assigning tasks to obtain results which is the only thing I look for. This, which is what we call functional operational trust, is clearly insufficient to base interpersonal relationships on it and, if applied to someone, the most reliable employees in this sense are machines. Functional operational trust is security in one's own power to control the behavior of the other. How is this achieved? Through "affective block" and personal deprogramming and through learning of directed behaviors that take place in a closed environment, free of other influences. If we isolate young children from their natural environment and subject them to a "behavior learning" in which actions that coincide with our wishes are rewarded and the initiatives they take are severely punished, over time we generate unhappy automata that feel the desire to be loved but reject it because they "fear" it based on their own experience. Every manifestation of their personal interests and affections has been brutally punished.

From what we have just explained, it follows that, in order for me to grant the other a high degree of credibility, I will have to base myself on my own experiences: trust in the other will be based on the rationality of his decisions (which implies the proper design and assessment of the same) together with the ability or virtuosity to expose and propose it, so that he who receives such a proposal is able to execute it for personal improvement and not for human deterioration. For this it is required that I have developed a trust in the intentions of the other and not only in their professional or technical skills, which, overall I trust and, therefore, I trust him because I am already convinced, by my own experience, that he seeks my good: this is interpersonal trust, which has to be mutual, that is, structural. It is the confidence that the patient places in the doctor: he trusts in his operative virtues (professional knowledge) and in his moral virtues (prudence, justice, strength and temperance and others derived from them) which leads him to have interpersonal trust and confidence. “Getting in their hands” is willing to do what I ask before knowing what it is, as I trust their intentions and I know that they work towards my best interests. Also of note is that we must not forget that people are the same at home, in organizations, with friends, with customers, etc. although sometimes we reflect relatively different images.

From all this it is deduced that the person who makes himself heard by what he is, by his way of being, by his way of acting (testimony), by his worth and personal prestige, has authority; his interest, dedication and effort to defend and promote the good of other colleagues and subordinates, for his respect and defense of the values and rights of others, even when this costs him and complicates his own life. From whom it proceeds, we say that he has "moral authority" and, therefore, attracts the attention and interest of others, whether or not they share their points of view, because these are always taken into account, although sometimes they are followed and they respect by assuming them, what we call obedient posture (which is not submission), while others fight giving rise to disobedience.

When one speaks of crisis of authority, the serious difficulties in the exercise of it are revealed and we can ask ourselves about the origin of this crisis: is it due to lack of knowledge regarding it? Lack of energy due to fear or laziness? Influence of the environment? Perhaps because of all of this, given that there are limitations that come from within the person, for to exercise authority in a non-arbitrary way it is necessary to strive to overcome personal limitations, especially passivity and ignorance, such that one does not want to complicate life by sending or wondering what to do. There may also be lack of energy, perseverance, serenity, human or transcendent criteria may be lacking ... To get rid of these obstacles it is necessary to practice the human virtues, assuming the constant need to overcome one's defects with permanent effort, demanding from oneself and others what one wants to demand. And we must overcome, also, the inconsistencies manifested, sometimes, in that we acquire information about something important and then we do not practice it while, at other times, the crisis comes from the arbitrary exercise of authority when we act not for the needs of improvement of others, and instead depending on one's own tastes, whims or personal manias, which in turn triggers the rebelliousness of the other. There are also limitations that come externally or derived from environmental pressures, "what is now trending", the lack of training and human maturity that do not assume the content or consequences that imply values such as austerity, effort, the spirit of service, sobriety. Also, there are, likewise, environmental pressures that are directly precisely against the exercise of authority in various social levels that consider that "everything new is good and the old is bad", thus fostering attitudes of irresponsibility, disloyalty, and arbitrariness. We argue this because in every organization there are always some goals (= the values and objectives that are sought) together with some means (= norms and customs). Someone must take care that these ends are achieved and that those norms and customs are lived, such that, that someone is the one who holds the authority.

However, exercising authority correctly and effectively is a personal challenge.

How do I gain or lose prestige in front of others? First, by my way of behaving: good humor, naturalness, serenity, and optimism are all necessary. Secondly, by my way of acting: my way of working, effort, ability to rectify and others which may be considered. In third place, by the way of relating to others that manifests itself in loyalty.

We will later discuss how authority is acquired and how it is exercised, lost and recovered, but we must be aware that it is not sufficient to exercise authority. Instead, it is necessary to teach others to obey because obedience is the essential counterpart of authority: the education of obedience is part of the education of freedom and is the main basis of support for the exercise of authority. Furthermore, obedience is taught by example, specifically by the attitude towards life. He who obeys must know the reason for his obedience, precisely because obeying does not consist in its mere execution nor of a mandate or an action. The motives may be extensively diverse: from a necessary regulation of operation to a transcendent purpose, however, we will always find that teaching obedience means teaching to serve others in small things and doing such an action for love. Learning to obey, in a paralleling fashion as learning to be free, is a long and arduous process. This learning must be considered in the wide field of participation since the authority of the superior consists on, among other things, directing the participation of the subordinates to building towards a common cause.

The entire process requires exigency and sacrifices, yet we know that people live safely and more happily in an environment of demanding and clear objectives, as such an environment demands more from the one that loves or cares more: the simple path is to allow one to create and to do. For this, due importance must be given to personal effort, demanding from each person an amount of output in accordance with their possibilities. Not everyone is equal in every ability, yet, inequality does not equate to inferiority, and thus we may refer to inequality as the diversity of skills. On the other hand, it is necessary to know how to reinforce the prestige of others without causing harm, belittling or criticizing them destructively. Also, since the success of authority is more dependent on how one governs instead of over what one governs, it is necessary to order what can reasonably be demanded, avoiding promises that will not be fulfilled or sanctions or threats that are not executed afterwards. It is therefore important to strive continually towards setting a good example so that the subordinate sees that what we ask is also what we strive to practice daily: what is done is always much more important than what is said.

Similarly, we must show the subordinates that dependence can make a person freer, where freedom is understood as what it is: capacity for self-determination oriented to assume an individual’s own responsibility. Therefore, an individual does not lose freedom if he depends on something good and he seeks it, while that individual loses freedom if he depends on or becomes enslaved by something which has negative impacts on him. Freedom is not the same as liberation as understood by one who evades and lacks commitment.

As mentioned, the entire process takes time, as you cannot educate someone from a distance; attentiveness is necessary because things cannot be achieved through screaming and slapping; joy is crucial because we need it to sustain life as somber faces and frowns cannot transmit knowledge; and faith in who can correct our deficiencies. However, we must be willing to win and, at times, lose: human beings are free, thus we can move away from what we propose and can also return to what we state. You must trust and have patience because exercising authority is a difficult task, thus it is naive to think that it can be achieved without believing in the other and in who (WHO) can expand our own limitations.

For all this, we see that whoever has authority is heard, loved and respected such that the binomial authority-obedience relationship arises. However, it is possible to have authority and not have power (and vice versa), which is a source of conflict in the human group and leads to confrontation between the formal organization (power) and the informal (authority): the one that can impose himself does not enjoy our trust, and whoever has that confidence cannot make decisions for the group.

The one who obeys in some way adopts a position in which, freely and voluntarily, he wants what the other wants, trusting that what the leader wants is good for himself and ergo trusting the leader, while the one who disobeys apparently rejects the proposal that has been made to him, yet, as we said, not only rejects what his superior says, but also rejects his superior on a personal level, with its implications and what such an act represents. This inner rebellion, which expresses the subordinate’s rejection of the other, is sometimes produced because the leader’s behavior and performance exposes the repeated failures that the subordinate has committed, such that this bothers the subordinate, especially when these failures are intentional on the subordinate’s part. But this rebellion against the leader can also occur because his behavior lacks credibility and confidence in the eyes of the subordinate, either because of the leader’s human nature or because of their professional incompetence, so that the employee does not contribute his spontaneous collaboration to the leader’s proposals.

The term obedience comes from the Latin "ob-audience" which means to listen (he who asks for an audience is in essence asking to be heard), and it must be pointed out that the one who obeys does not submit but respects and assumes what the leader has said in a responsible and prudent way, to the extent that he trusts and confides in the one who has authority, ergo he takes into consideration the proposal that has been made to him and he accepts it within himself with enthusiasm. This is to say: he believes the other, trusts in the other and places trust in the other. We are not before a subjection of our way of being to that of another, to their tastes or whims, but instead, we are before a conscious, free and voluntary human act of the subordinate, based on knowledge and personal decision. It is not about a mercantile negotiation in which one group wonders if an action interests him, but instead it is the individual who wants it: nobody compels him or imposes a decision on him. Therefore, the act of obedience is not unreflective or irrational and is instead based on the individual wanting to obey and decide as a person. Who obeys is willing to make an effort to understand, through their own experience, that what they propose is for their good and that of the community, a vital position that leads to a cooperative spirit aimed at facilitating advancement, far from the mere act of fulfilling or executing to avoid a penalty (= I fulfill and I lie).

This occurrence comes about because those who obey rely on the intentions of others much more than on their technical abilities (which are also necessary), which leads the individual to be sure in the knowledge that if the other is wrong, they will rectify their mistake and, before firmly taking a decision or stance, the other will inform himself as best as possible. Therefore, the individual who obeys is not afraid to ask because, he does not question in order to oppose, but instead does so to clarify, as he wishes to assume his commitment responsibly. Power generates "submission" (formal organization) while authority generates "obedience" (informal organization). Thus, as previously explained, obedience is the definitive proof of trust. Therefore, an individual trusts someone when he believes that their actions are just, where an action is not simply defined as just due to its consequences being just but instead because it is based on the virtue of justice, in the same way that a person is not moral or immoral for actions performed (because they can be have the right intentions and err involuntary) but is such because they are ethical or unethical due to their intentions, and thus they perform such actions that are virtuous or perverse because the ethical person that is mistaken recognizes and rectifies the bad, ergo he rejoices internally even if he disguises it. Disagreeing with another’s ideas does not imply rejecting the other as a person or taking such an event as a "pretext" to act as one pleases.

* 1. **How Authority is acquired**

Authority is the ability to effectively appeal to transcendent reasons and is based on the free acceptance of orders by those who obey, who recognize the ”leadership" quality in the manager. This quality of a director depends on the degree of "potestas" that he needs so that his mandates are obeyed. If he lacks authority, he needs a high degree of "potestas" for his subordinates to follow his orders, but if he enjoys great authority, his orders will be obeyed without any kind of coercion.

The exemplariness of a Manager is a necessary condition to achieve authority, as a result of one person having authority over another forms the basis of the latter relying on the intentions of the former when evaluating them positively (i.e. the other person has my best interests in mind), although trust in the professional capacities of the executive is also necessary, as it constitutes the sufficient or complementary condition of the previous one, the first being much more important than the second one.

It becomes a difficult task to develop this type of relationship in practice and even more difficult to live it intensely. In effect, we are accustomed to thanking another person for the proposals he makes once they are known and, even more so, once we have verified the results and consequences they have caused for us, all of which resembles a commercial relationship. However, deep interpersonal trust causes an especially distinct reaction: because an individual knows that the other trusts him and truly appreciates him, it is that individual who starts by thanking the other for the answer that is given to him or the proposal that is given to the individual before he has asked his question or filed a request, before he knows the answer, and that individual knows that this is the best gift that the other may bestow upon him.

Authority, understood as a sign of recognition, may be expressed as in the following table:

As indicated by Aristotle, authority is acquired through personal credibility, honesty and one’s way of acting. Personal credibility therefore constitutes, from the Aristotelian point of view, the fundamental element on which authority is based: the person in whom we believe is valued, respected, and inspires us with confidence not only because of his professional training but above all due to his personal nature, since it is more common to fear a competent person with unethical intentions than an incompetent person full of good intentions. Furthermore, this confidence in the personal nature of the boss is a consequence of his personal kindness, which is the most effective means of persuasion.

The importance that this conveys for the company, in reference to the management of employees and the productivity of the tasks carried out, is fundamental mentioned by Huete [6]. In fact, in a labor contract, certain rules can be agreed on with regards to schedules, functions to perform, remuneration, etc., yet you cannot agree that an employee does his work in a spirit of service, with joy, responsibility, sense of duty, desire to please the recipients of his work or desire to learn and become more efficient in his performance of tasks, as an example. The previously mentioned issues, which are of the utmost importance in the world of personal and professional services and which constitute around 95% of total economic activity, are situated in a world where the worker always has the last word, where, "if he feels like it" or not, he in fact decides to do or to not do so many other tasks throughout his working hours and in the course of his life, said issues being not only limited to the professional, but also the personal.

This type of behavior, which we refer to as spontaneous in order to differentiate it from the normative or regulated behavior, plays an essential role of the first magnitude in the achievement of high productivity as commonly understood, without causing detriment to the normative behavior that provides method, rationality and order but that should not monopolize the behavior of people. It is a matter of knowing how to harmonize and combine the goodwill of spontaneous behavior with the application of rules and methods so that the worker, feeling recognized and valued as a person, freely and voluntarily decides to join the project of the company because he wishes to lend his collaboration. It is not, therefore, that the company "traps" a worker for their projects, but it is instead that the offer made by the company is perceived as coinciding with what the employee seeks and desires as a worker and, ergo, the employee freely decides to contribute to this project to the best of his abilities, with which productivity increases rapidly.

In this business concept, it is assumed that spontaneous behavior favors the company when analyzing cases in which the aforementioned spontaneous actions are expected go against business interests. The first of these possibilities requires that, beginning with the basis of trust, supervision is understood as the opportunity that is given to us to learn and improve as individuals and as professionals, which leads to an increase in mutual trust. On the contrary, when the second hypothesis is adopted, not only does the situation deteriorate day by day due to the absence of an active position that encourages and supports spontaneous behavior and integrates it into the progress of the business organization, but rather, mistrust is institutionalized by creating a dangerous divide between good (supervisors) and bad (supervised), which the system itself augments by granting the first multiple privileges and depriving the latter of the necessary attention for their professional and personal development.

The conclusion reached is that productivity is not exclusively increased with norms and procedures that impose order and rationality, but also, and especially, with the free will of the collaborators in the areas of decision-making in which they are sovereign as, for example , the situation where each person ends up wanting to demonstrate initiative in the task, is educated in the deal, has a spirit of service, acts with joy, works with responsibility, wants to please the client, shows willingness to learn, behaves with diligence, wants to set a good example, makes an appropriate use of resources, has order in their work material, etc. It is thus evident that in this spontaneous behavior of workers lies the key to intense productivity.

This trust in the other, the origin of the authority-obedience relationship, develops and arises when there is credibility. Thus credibility, in turn, is the result of an integral, mature and generous character linked to professional competence. Both things require time and coherence: trust is not something that can be imposed on others nor can it be bought or "invested" in. It diminishes when credibility is wreaked and when the ultimate intentions of the people with whom one works or maintains a professional relationship is placed in doubt. Therefore, trust takes a long period of time to reach, yet it can be lost in an instant. Ergo, this credibility has two main aspects: credibility in people and credibility in the management systems that we discuss further.

With regards to the credibility of people, Covey has popularized it in his works by pointing out that integrity is nourished by six financial products that affect the accounting balance of the same, as we describe below:

* Listen and understand. When a person feels understood there has been a profound communication. Communication requires people who know how to listen. This type of communication involves a certain emotional connection. When a person feels understood, he is provided with sustenance from a psychological point of view.
* Take care of the details. One detail may convey interest and concern for the other person. Sometimes, small details can have a great impact on the people who receive them.
* Keep promises. The promises made to another person create an expectation that, if not fulfilled, degenerates into frustration. Likewise, when a person fulfills what he has promised, he generates a remarkable sense of confidence and security. Promising and not fulfilling is a character flaw that causes many distortions in interpersonal relationships. It implies, in the person who does such an action, a search for immediate gratifications (by promising, he receives a positive feedback from the person to whom he promises something) without doing the work (fulfilling the promise). Obviously, this little scam is not viable. Over time, not only is immediate gratification lost, but also a part of the ability to be a trusted person.
* Clarify expectations about the role to be played and the objectives to be met. The opposite always leads to many misunderstandings. When a person knows what is expected of them, they are filled with security and confidence. In this situation, they are much more inclined to take the initiative and feel ownership of the work they do.
* Act with integrity. This principle implies actions such as loyalty to the absent person (not criticizing other collaborators when they are not present), behaving in accordance to the principles that govern the direct coexistence between people (not making concessions for the gallery) and avoiding discrimination of the weakest (to not recreate with the weaknesses of the clumsy). The lack of integrity, although it may initially begin as “fun” and even be laughed at by the rest of the group, ends up becoming an outlet in the current account of mutual trust.
* Apologize when mistakes have occurred. It is an evident and critical proof of a good character trait in a person. Knowing how to rectify and attending to new approaches without mixing personal pride provides a more attractive image of the person who does it. The opposite implies living under a certain regime of arbitrariness, which always makes people shrink from the point of view of their potential.

We may indicate, finally, that the achievement of trust influences not only the credibility of the people but also the management systems used in the company. Which, when acted upon, achieve efficiency and send signals to their members that end up transforming into incentives or stimuli for the behavior of the human team. In this sense, the collective evaluation systems that the members of the group perform anonymously and whose results are made public periodically have been successful.

The honesty of the people who make up the organization is another element that encourages the emergence and development of authority. Furthermore, honesty is the result of three great human virtues, namely:

Justice, which consists of giving to each what they deserve. Therefore, a different treatment to those that are different is necessary such that, at the same time, this will have to be weighted so as not to make the differences a reason for discrimination.

Truthfulness, which involves telling the truth to the other so that he can understand it in order to achieve what is best for him. Therefore, this factor is about communicating the truth in accordance to prudence, not in order to satisfy the curiosity of others or to transmit the unnecessary information that manages to confuse and discourage the other by causing their disorientation or provoking the collapse of their state of mind from our condescension. Obviously, this way of "using and manipulating" the content of the truth to gain personal advantage and achieve personal convenience constitutes the corruption of power and leads to the instantaneous loss of authority that is impossible to recover in the future.

Responsibility, which means that a person commits himself and keeps his word on what was promised: they have learned, from the position of superior, of what the subordinate has told them, while the others in the group know what he has asked of the superior and everyone can see how the manager takes concrete and effective measures (most important of all) in relation to such events. It would therefore be especially negative that, knowing that the others have knowledge of what happened, for them to contemplate how the manager continually abandons his functions.

How the manager proceeds and behaves is another way of acquiring authority, since, as the one who commands and the one who obeys are on a different plane, they must still act as if they were on an equal level in such a way that the one who commands does not appeal to his authority or power and the one who obeys is not considered to be in a lower plane but cooperates as one such that everyone feels comfortable because the other's intentions are trusted by their own experience. The necessary condition for this interpersonal mutual trust to be possible is that the manager act rationally in search of the good of others and not out of sentimentality. The sufficient condition is that the other acts in the same way with respect to the manager, that is to say: behaves as if he knew with certainty (and does not know and cannot know) that the manager acts rationally in looking out for the subordinate’s best interests, specifically before executing an action or taking a decision and seriously considering the repercussions that it will have for him and for others.

Obviously, this degree of trust or interpersonal credibility requires real experiments in which one subject interacts with another. Furthermore, in these cases, the critical issue is not "to be successful", and it is not "to have achieved the desired result" since what is debated in these interpersonal relationships is the growth of mutual credibility as well as trust and therefore, the fundamental issue is to have been able to carry out the experiment and to have risked for each party, which may be considered an important cost. Therefore, when someone trusts the manager, the important thing is not the economic result that is achieved, which can confirm or disappoint their expectations, but the fact that the other has decided to trust the manager, assuming previously the risks and costs that it carries with it: that the manager can defraud him and betray him or simply fail him in one instance as the manager is, after all, human, and he makes mistakes and has limitations and defects. In this sense, the exercise of authority is very similar to the process that is followed when educating others: in both cases, it becomes a requirement that those who practice it act with sobriety. Therefore, the manager must see everything, correct little and disguise a lot, providing the latter part in a skillful and discreet way that optimizes the opportunities for human development and improvement, for which the active pedagogy then develops from learning through concrete tasks becomes very useful, entrusted to that end and duly supervised. It is thus possible to develop "essential" qualities and human values on which behaviors are based, through this "learning provoked by situations" that we have created.

Consequently, the essential factor is that someone has previously decided to trust another, with all of the resulting consequences. The manager may accept or reject the challenges or tests provided to him by the other as the questions becomes; how does the manager know that someone is his friend or appreciates him? The answer is simply giving the other the opportunity to do so and accepting as valid the tests they give the manager in their way of behaving with him. Indeed, it is possible that he betrays the trust placed in him by the manager, but if the manager does not accept such proof of friendship and affection, he will never have the possibility of knowing. In this situation, there is no mathematical certainty such that we are left with the certainty of interpersonal trust in the good intentions of others, based on repeated real interpersonal experiences in which we put at stake the past credibility to confirm and increase it. Therefore, this trust requires an extensive amount of time to be reached but can be lost in an instant because, when the manager places trust in another, what he does is that he confides in the other and trusts what that other does as well as what he is, that is, the manager trusts in him. This is not exempt from personal difficulties because human nature is of such a condition that we hesitate to entrust ourselves to that person from whom we have the most proof so as not to doubt him, because "it makes us dizzy" to really and truly "put ourselves in their hands” with everything we are and have.

In summary, this type of action makes the one who has authority lead the other towards the truth and the ethical so that, with his way of proceeding, he promotes his maturity and personal fulfillment. It is what we call a transforming leader that promotes awareness of the problem or the new situation we have in the other, offers the appropriate motivation for its execution and promotes and facilitates the overcoming of the problem and the development of the appropriate personal qualities.

* 1. **How Authority is exercised**

As previously indicated, the exercise of authority requires that the person in question "be an authority" and, in addition, "have authority". The latter will keep it as long as he is able to exercise authority correctly, so in this case it will continue to be recognized based on the manager’s competence and personal qualities. The correct exercise of authority is based on the fact that, having personal styles of exercising it, every person begins by thinking about what to send or proposing to the other and tries to be thoroughly informed about that issue as well as, depending on all of this, makes a decision where his failure will never be blamed on others and his success will never include him as the sole protagonist. At this point, it is then necessary to communicate to the recipient the order or proposal that has been made (knowing that an order plus a countermand is a disorder) to, finally, take care of enforcing what has been said: to positively sanction the correct compliance of the order and to do so negatively if the order has been breached. It should be noted here that it is essential to carry out the express approval of what has been correctly executed, thus there are those who place all the emphasis on recriminating what has been done wrong and do not recognize what has been done well, and such individuals argue that whoever proceeds in this way "has fulfilled his duty" and we should not contribute to his pride. This position is clearly wrong, because it is a much worse and more serious issue when a person is discouraged and falls into pessimism and discouragement. The incorrect argument can be mentioned as, in other words, that the fact that, for now, the person has a small amount of encouragement yet, with enthusiasm, he moves forward: this second "problem" is much easier to solve than the first, because we all experience our limitations at some point in life and we see the realities of life such that, as God always takes into account, human beings occasionally fail while nature never does so.

The prestige or loss of prestige before the subordinates of those who exercise authority is modified according to the manager’s behavior or personal attitude with which he acts, the way in which the manager relates to others and the way in which the subordinates perform their work or essential duties, which forms the available means to encourage personal initiative in others and to develop trust through personal experiences. What is evident is that both authoritarianism and permissiveness always provoke the disobedience of others.

* 1. **How Authority is Lost**

Authority can be lost by one of the following paths:

* The unjust use of power or "corruption of power" when it is used to obtain personal advantages and benefits at the expense of others. Aristotle himself indicated that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, because it is very easy to exploit for one’s self the advantages and prerogatives that power puts within our reach. The unjust use of power (nepotism, for example) entails an automatic loss of power where recovery of power is nearly impossible.
* To not use power when it should be used, which is known as abandonment of functions. Those who have power do not use it to guarantee a minimum of discipline, respect, order, etc. in the coexistence between the people of a group in essence provoke anger and rejection towards their person on the part of those who wish to act with a responsible, coherent position and realize that this not only is not facilitated but, in practice, it is prevented on the part of a superior who is inhibited and wants to defend himself in the neutral and uncommitted position of his decisions which, in fact, are not neutral and tolerate or protect very specific behaviors, which implies in fact a "very committed" position so that everything remains unchanged. Therefore, if this situation starts to become relatively frequent, it leads to the first problem: the unjust use of power, which is no longer a mistake but instead, a frequent result: favoritism towards the privileged, which thus maintains the manager’s position, and the damage that is caused to others, especially to the excluded, marginalized and vilified.
* Useless use of power, which means establishing too many complications in the regulation of tasks and functions, or, in other words, creating unnecessary complications. In summary, the useless use of power manifests a position of "awkwardness" on the part of whoever exercises it.
  1. **How Authority is recovered.**

The lost authority is not, necessarily, forever gone because it can be recovered once again. There are four essential elements that must be practiced in this case. In the first place it is necessary to recognize the mistakes made without trying to disfigure them towards any extreme. This requires a great dose of humility, which is the human virtue that leads us to recognize and accept the truth of the facts. Secondly, we must rectify the decisions for the future with will, determination and strength, in order to ensure that such events of the past will not be repeated for the future. However, everything said above does not go beyond proclaiming a declaration of good intentions, which accomplishes a minimal amount if we do not decide to repair the damage caused by our past performances and practice justice: it is of little use to acknowledge having stolen and to commit one’s self to not repeat the same error. Finally, to recover the credibility and trust of others, it is not enough to simply follow the aforementioned steps outlined above, which are a necessary but insufficient condition. A manager must show the other that he really loves and appreciates him with works, gestures and words, without underestimating any of these aspects because the measure of all of this is put in order to restore the subordinate’s confidence. Because love is demonstrated with actions and not words, it should not be put only into works but also in words and not only in words but also in works. One thing cannot and should not exclude the other.

1. **Personal and Professional Ethics of the Manager**

The main function of the manager is to make decisions, but these decisions always affect people, whether workers, customers, shareholders, suppliers, as well as others. For this reason, every decision always has an ethical component that we must never forget.

The manager must be responsible for his own actions before others but also before himself, such that he will not make decisions without considering the repercussions of these for others. The manager should also be aware that all positions assume responsibility, thus he cannot fall into the error of assuming that doing nothing exempts him from responsibility, since not doing anything also means a decision that is taken freely and that he is therefore responsible for.

At this point we can ask ourselves the following question; what are we responsible for? In order to answer this, we can cite several positions:

* Maximalist posture. This position defends that everyone is responsible for all social problems and comes to this conclusion because the responsibility that falls on everyone ends up being the responsibility of no one.
* Minimalist posture. Here it is argued that each one is solely responsible for the immediate and intended consequences of the individual. Yet one must be careful because, if this theory is followed, is it, for example, the responsibility of a weapons manufacturer only that his product works well and that deadlines are met?

For this, you have to have two things quite clear; first of all, the responsibility is always based on an individual, thus we cannot blame the organization or society for a certain action; secondly, that the negative consequences of an action, when foreseeable and avoidable, are voluntary and therefore the individual is responsible for them. Therefore, whenever the negative consequences of an action can be eliminated or diminished with reasonable means and not done, the individual is directly responsible for that action.

We have already made the distinction between personal ethics and professional ethics, emphasizing the importance that the latter acquires as it affects a greater number of people. The fundamental objective in decision making is to develop the human virtues on the part of the manager since, in this way, he will behave ethically. However, we have to be aware that a manager will behave in this way only and exclusively when their personal behavior is also ethical. It is difficult to behave with employees in an ethical way and not with one’s own children, thus we argue that ethics must be practiced in one’s personal life if that person is to fulfill the ethical standards expected of them in a workplace environment.

Finally, all managers must ask themselves a series of questions for reflection:

* What are we responsible for?
* To what extent do we not look for responsibilities? Or do we elude them?
* Can we fall into an excess of responsibility?
* What consequences would this have for the manager and for others?

We leave these questions open for study in specific cases.

1. **Does a Real Leader Operate in this Way?**

The director therefore practices true leadership through authority, communication, and interest in the improvement of others that he hears and wants. We may summarize this as follows; the manager makes it come true through his personal mood, as we must grow more in humanity to be able to feel at ease with those around us. In this sense, the leader is very clear about what he should propose to others because what is good for them is what they need and what suits them, regardless of whether they like it or not. Also, the manager operates in this manner because he knows very well what the fullness of the human being consists of and will decide to promote professional fulfillment, which is the most directly visible in the company; personal fulfillment, which encompasses all other facets of the human being in its physical, intellectual and moral segments, which have a clear influence on the professional dimension and, finally, even if he himself is not a believer, knows how to promote and facilitate the other in a scope of religious plenitude as something that clothes, links and integrates all of the above and not as viewing the other as an addition unit of labor than could easily be disposed of.

Ultimately, the leader draws more from what he proposes and what he does than from what he says: he does not defeat but instead convinces employees by giving those employees the opportunity excel above his previous self (convince) not through reasons but by his own experience, since the human being does things, as we mentioned, with reasons but not for reasons, with motives but not for motives. The leader knows that, if there are human values, there are behaviors, but if there are only pre-established behaviors, we cannot assure that there are values that remain into the future. That is why the leader surpasses himself daily through serving others and through his way of being and acting, which is not learned in books but, instead, in real life, alongside others and based on personal effort: firm in what he wants and flexible at the time of obtaining it. The leader, fundamentally, is based on this personal effort and, properly speaking, not born but is built from his own peculiarities, which are exhibited uniquely by each human being, while their potentialities and qualities, that are fostered, are enriched based on overcoming personal challenges. For example, this occurs in an excellent athlete or an Olympic champion. Therefore, there will never be two equal leaders because each one will be formed from what he is and from his own experiences that never coincide with those of another person.

The leader is not a magical figure but is present in each one of the people who, having others at their side, develop with them this human spirit and put at their disposal the best of their person to contribute to the development in fullness of the other. The leader "is not the one who takes power over others without knowing why”, but is an excellent friend although that may often go unnoticed or his treatment may seem very demanding, as he will always be demanding of himself and in defense of the rights of others. Personal differences do not lead, then, to confrontation, but instead to complementation and collaboration for the enrichment of the group with what each one is and what each contributes, so that we can learn greatly from the other by seeing their peculiarities. This is how two very different people can encourage mutual personal enrichment of each other as what occurs, for example, in the marriage between a man and a woman, sharing what they are and what they have.

1. **Conclusions**

From the above it is clear that, in a company, not all are called to make decisions, and leadership itself is not the most important hierarchical position that is occupied because it is important to command as well as to obey and develop diverse tasks, yet it is also true that all are called to be leaders through the exercise of communication, authority, humility and motivation, thus, when all of this is missing, we do not have a company, we do not have an organization, and we do not have a human group. The leader thus promotes an atmosphere of acceptance, of himself and of other people's acceptance, of understanding, of pleasant treatment that makes possible an attractive work climate, a product of unity, which is to say: "it makes attractive what is necessary (the unit) so that we can all make the vocation (work) a vacation. "

Finally, this always translates into greater profitability, not as an objective but as a consequence. Happiness and joy are then presented as the result of how things are made, with joy being a manifestation of happiness. We promote, in this way, the organization and the development of free human persons (educated in freedom and for freedom) who are happy and we do it on the basis of recreational-ambitious relationships aimed at fostering the interpersonal love of friendship, cooperation, collaboration and team spirit freely and voluntarily accepted that lead to personal satisfaction and the fullness of human life, as we experience the joy of working with that team of people in which we feel accepted and in which each one is integrated with hope, thanking the manager for being well received by others, who have wanted to trust the manager and who offer him their friendship and support. That is why we say that "it is not the manager who makes an opinion about you, but you are the one who you insists on your way of proceeding in that the manager has a certain opinion about you", for better or for worse.

In fact, why does someone decide to change? Simply put, by how he is treated. If we look, therefore, beyond the mere economic results that are possible, and we begin by loving the other, we become capable of understanding and comprehending him. It is this personal experience that the manager experiences before the one who loves him, the one that leads him to re-know and accept his past without disguising it and without fears, being then willing to change his life because he has also changed his position: he is not on the defensive, to try to excuse or justify himself, but he does not fear to re-know and accepts his past and, because another loves him, he looks for another future for himself because he wants it as well and he decides it: nobody decides for him nor is anything imposed on him. He is the one who choses it freely and voluntarily.

It is understood that the leader achieves all of this through the implementation of human values.
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