

What kind of leader is a manager?

Aurelia Dumitru¹, Alina Georgiana Motoi², Andrei Bogdan Budică³

¹PhD Candidate, University of Craiova, Romania

²PhD Candidate, University of Craiova, Romania

³Teaching Assistant, PhD, University of Craiova, Romania

Abstract

This study aims to clarify the difference between leader and manager in the environment of economic and communication specific tourism field. Used method is one of meta-analytic nature; it consists of primarily configuration of set up of two epistemic nuclei and in analyzing them parallelly. A first nucleus is that of leader-leadership relationship and the second nucleus is formed of manager-management relationship; significative joints of this two nuclei are comparatively analyzed. Common or similar features differentiating features are brought into convergence to create two clear portraits, one for leader and one for manager. The leader and the manager must accomplish two types of tasks: the one concerned with problem solving (tasks' fulfillment) and social functions (of group creation and maintenance. The leader is firstly oriented on group creation and maintenance and secondly on tasks' fulfillment. The manager is firstly oriented on problem solving and secondly on social functions. The comparative analysis of the leaders and managers stresses the fact that not all the managers are leaders and not all the leaders are also managers. The most efficient long term managers are also leaders. Managers make sure the tasks have been carried out, whereas the leaders focus on the people that carry out the tasks.

Keywords: problem solving, social functions, leader, manager, leadership, management

JEL: Z32, M41

1. Introduction. Leader and leadership

The notion of leadership is polysemantic. It cannot be rendered by a single word. In the dictionaries, we find it as: a) leadership, command; b) management, behaviour; c) administration.

In some papers, the notion of leadership is rendered by: a) leadership (Certo, 2003); b) the capacity of leading (Bennis & Nanus, 2004); c) the science of leading (Maxwell, 1999); d) the capacity and/or the process of leading (Johns, 2006).

Leadership continues to be understood and put into practice in different ways. The most representative definitions given to this term make reference to: the art of influencing people by persuasion or personal example; the main dynamic force that motivates and coordinates the organization in order to carry out the established goals; the ability to inspire trust and support, necessary to achieve the planned goals; the interpersonal influence based on the direct, sincere communication necessary to achieve the planned goals.

The leadership represents a leader's capacity and art to collaborate with a group of individuals with a view to achieving a goal, carry out tasks or missions on the basis of their emotional and operational involvement. The leadership has two meanings: a practical activity or the process of influencing and guiding people by noncoercive methods; group of persons whose role is to influence people. Consequently, leadership can be considered an attribute of a hierarchical position within the organization, a characteristic of a person or group of persons, their mobilization and training for a certain aim, a kind of behaviour. Being a process concerned with the influence of the activities carried out by the members of a group, leadership involves: other persons (subordinates) that accept to be guided, the leader's attitude, an unequal distribution of the power between the leader and the subordinates, favourable to the leader; the ability to use the different forms of power to influence the subordinates in their behaviour, or during the activity they develop. The complex issues concerned with the leadership have represented a subject of interest for several decades, the specialists being interested in finding out who are those that have the capacity to imprint their own visions onto the organizations and to influence its important activities, whether the leaders' qualities are innate qualities or can be developed and improved.

At present, there are many approaches of the concept of leadership (Bass, 1991; Bente, 2010; Tocan, 2012). The first approach focuses on the

leaders's behaviour. The lider must fulfill tasks and accomplish social functions. A leader that complies with both categories of functions is a professional leader. The leaders that tend to carry out problem solving tasks will concentrate on a more severe supervision of their subordinates. Tasks' fulfillment is more important for them than the subordinates' satisfaction for the efforts made. The leaders focused on the accomplishment of the social functions will try to motivate more than to control. The second one is the approach by means of the features specific to the leaders. Some of the characteristics specific to the leaders are: self - confidence, intelligence, initiative, self - trust. Recent studies have emphasized, by the comparison between the traits of the efficient leaders and those of the less efficient leaders, the fact that an efficient leadership implies intelligence, initiative and self - trust. The universalist approach considers that there is one single style of leading, namelt the best one, whatever the conditions. According to the situational approach, the leadership styles differ according to the circumstances. The situational factors that can influence the adoption of a certain leadership style are determined by the degree of complexity specific to the tasks, by the group's attitude towards the common objectives and towards the leader, by the leader's power to sanction (Brabete & Dragan, 2009; Grabara, Kolcun & Kot, 2014).

According to the contextual approach, an efficient leadership is influenced by the leaders' personality, past experience and and their perspectives, as well as by their superiors' perspectives and behaviour. The leaders usually tend to conform to their superiors. The specialty literature contains a variety of leadership styles: the existence of two fundamental factors, namely: consideration (positive attitude towards people, esteem and respect) and the capacity to clearly formulate the planned objectives and the proper means); the leadership styles according to the decision practices considered to be instrumental for the overall profile of the leader. More precisely, he must be authoritarian, democratic and permissive (Zlate, 2004). This theory has been revised by R. Likert (1961) who suggests four leadership styles: authoritarian-oppressive, authoritarian-objective, democratic-consultative and democratic-participative. As to the leader's performances, two different approaches have taken shape.

The studies on leadership have focused on four main approaches: great man theory; the situational approach; the approach of the charismatic leader; the behavioural approach. Great man theory represents an approach to leadership based on the presupposition according to which some people were born to lead, or that leaders appear in some favourable historical

moments, when the events make possible their appointment to leading positions (Vladutescu, Budica, Dumitru & Stanescu, 2015). According to the situational approach, unlike the great man theory, the requirements of a current issue, (situation) determine who will lead. By putting the two approaches together, we can notice that the leader is that person endowed with qualities that allow him to make use of a certain situation. The approach concerned with the charismatic leader is similar to the great man theory. It relies on the idea according to which certain people are endowed with certain special attributes – selected by the intervention of Divinity – so that the others follow him. In our modern times, the concept of charisma is related to such personality traits as: charm, intuition, enthusiasm, energy and intelligence and less to the divine grace. The behavioural approach has been often used in the study of leadership, starting from the attempt to observe: what do the efficient leaders do; what positions they hold, what kind of tasks they carry out in order to achieve their goals; the way they motivate the others. Thus, the emphasis is not laid on the personal traits anymore, but on the behaviour adopted by the leaders while performing certain activities, actions or positions. The advantage of this approach is the fact that they that the innate characteristics are considered irrelevant, being nevertheless important noticeable behaviours. Consequently, if we can identify that kind of behaviour that provides an efficient leadership, then this can be learnt. When it comes to the innate qualities, those people that are endowed with them will be selected, training becoming irrelevant. The leader represents a person that exercises his power or a big influence on different social groups, such as (societies, nations, communities, organizations, smaller groups, etc.). The leader is that person that has the main role within a group and the biggest influence as to the mobilization and focalisation of the efforts made the group's members to achieve the common goals. The leader is that person that effective guides others persons.

In sociology, we make the distinction between the formal leader (appointed, institutional, official), the person institutionally appointed to a leading position, (the institutional leader) and informal leader, (spontaneous, unofficial), more precisely the person that exercises the biggest influence within the group (the unofficial leader). To achieve high performances and provide a climate generating satisfactions, the formal leader must coincide with the informal one. Today, a good management of organizations is not enough anymore. Leaders are needed at all the hierarchical levels, in order to improve the organizational culture and and make them more competitive. The leader is considered to be the person that obtains remarkable, efficient

results in any field of activity, no matter the obstacles he might meet. The leaders must be endowed with a series of characteristic qualities: reputation and antecedents regarding the former successes; be familiar with the group and the field of activity (the internal and external environment, technologies, key personalities, stimuli that motivate each individual); personal qualities, (honesty, integrity); abilities and competencies, (the capacity of analysis, of clear reasoning, strategic and multidimensional reasoning, the ability to build good relations with the employees, mobility towards the others, the comprehension of human nature); behaviour in the society and in the field of activity; a powerful motivation to turn into a leader (Zorlenţan et al., 1998, p. 82). Some of these qualities are trainable.

2. Leader versus Manager

According to the specialty literature, there are three typical situations as to the way of using the notions of leadership and management. The first one tends to identify the two notions. Some authors use randomly the two notions, resorting to one or the other, according to the circumstances, the context, but without intending to make the difference between them (Negrea, 2015; Voinea, 2015). The second situation is different from the first one. It consists in the clear distinction between the two notions. In M. Zlate's opinion, the main difference between leadership and management consists in the fact that the notion of leadership is more often associated with the cognitive, imaginative, anticipatory aspect, whereas the second one is associated with the actional aspect.

The third typical situation related to the distinction between leadership and management is an intermediary situation and it intervenes between the first two extremes. It determines a part - whole relation between the two notions. Most of the authors consider leadership to be a part of management, its essential, fundamental part actually. The origin of this point of view is to be found in Henri Fayol's paper, according to whom leadership represents only one of the management's components. M. Zlate considers that none of the situations mentioned above is satisfactory. The first one, (the overlap between the two notions) leads to the elimination of any differences between them, which cannot be accepted, all the more so as a simple analysis of the two notions demonstrates the existence of several differences. The second situation, (the opposition between the two terms) brings about artificial differences, "forces" reality to fall into the category of a series of pre established, logical schemes (Zlate, 2004). The distinction between the two notions could represent at the most an academic, theoretical interest.

Any distinction contributes to the observation of the specific elements of the analyzed phenomena, provided that these distinctions are not absolute or bring about obsessional and reductionist ways of thinking. The third situation, (the relation part-whole) is mainly as inconclusive as the others. It deals with the partial overlap between the contents of the two notions, which leads to the loss of specificity of one of them. Leadership loses its specificity when it is considered as a part of management and vice versa. The best and accepted solution would be to put forward some relations of partial coincidence of the two notions' meanings. This would mean that both leadership and management, the leaders and managers have, each of them specific elements that guarantee their individuality and relative autonomy, but also a series of common elements, which facilitates their mutual interaction (Calota, 2014; Rosca, 2015). First of all, both the leaders and the managers have almost the same roles (forecasting, organization, implementation, coordination, training, control), but differently. For example, the role of forecasting is accomplished by the leaders on the basis of certain broad perspectives and visions and by the managers on the basis of relatively limited perspectives. The leaders forecast in the long term, whereas the managers do the same thing in the short term. Secondly, both the leaders and the managers may be endowed with almost the same qualities and abilities, (conceptual, human, technical), but in different proportions. As to the leaders, the personality traits are predominant, some of them having a more evident hereditary support (Tohătan, 2008; Vasile & Grabara, 2014; Liu, 2015). As far as the managers are concerned, the operational skills and abilities prevail. These are learnt and developed by means of the learning processes. The appropriation of the qualities, characteristics and competencies of the two categories, (leaders and managers) is achieved differently, according to the characteristic of the circumstances and situations the respective individuals experience (Basic, 2015; Holmström, Lindberg & Jansson, 2015; Ionescu, 2015). For example, a leader's qualities are put into practice especially in those situations that involve major and rapid changes, whereas the managerial responsibilities and competencies are practised in the everyday situations people confront. The mutual emphasis of the competencies and traits, their stabilization or destabilization are only possible if a person is endowed with the qualities of both leaders and managers. Tending somehow towards a certain behavioural uniformity determined by the need for safety and the need to be successful, unless he acts as a leader, the manager will be ever more bureaucratic and less creative. Thus, we can identify three typical situations:

- ideal – when the same person should be able to carry out completely and at the best the functions of leadership, but also those of the manager;
- real – when a person is mainly concerned with leadership activities, or has the qualities of a leader rather than those specific to a manager, or vice versa. In this case, we are talking about leaders that are to a certain extent managers and of managers that are to a certain degree leaders too;
- when a person is only leader, while another is only manager, what matters is their quality or power, as well as their way of association.

The researches made on the relations between the leaders and the managers underline a series of important aspects (Bennis, 1984):

- The manager administers; the leader innovates.
- The manager stands for a copy; the leader stands for the original.
- The manager maintains; the leader develops.
- The manager lays emphasis on systems and structures; the leader focuses on people.
- The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust.
- The manager takes a common sense view of things in the short term; the leader has a long range perspective.
- The manager asks how and when?; the leader asks what and why?
- The manager focuses on the final result; the leader concentrates on the horizontal result.
- The manager imitates; the leader initiates.
- The manager accepts the status-quo; the leader generates it.
- The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing.
- The manager is trained, he learns by training; the leader learns by education.

American researchers J. MacGregor Burns (2003), A. Zaleznik (1977), J. Kotter (2013), B. Johansen, R. Johansen, J. R. Ryan (2011), W. G. Bennis (2009) and J. W. Gardner (2000), who have concluded that the manager is the administrator that makes the company function, while the leader is the one that brings together and motivates the people in order to achieve certain goals. On the other hand Meryem Le Saget (2003) considers that there are five aspects that define the roles between the managers and leaders:

- The manager anticipates and plans, the shapes an inspiring vision, (and often this vision will be «co-created» together with the partners in question).
- The manager establishes the budgets, evaluates the investments and the expenses, the leader designs a long term strategy and shows flexibility when it comes to the budget; he anticipates the opportunities and the weak

points, doing everything possible to distinguish the unpredictable and envision transformation scenarios, in order to be able to react and adapt to certain situations that had not been included in the budget.

- The manager organizes, the leader leads, adapts to each situation, shows opportunism similar to the chameleon, focuses on the long term vision.
- The manager controls, the leader lays the emphasis on quality and self-control.
- The manager estimates and adjusts the deviations, the leader evaluates the vision and adapts the status of the organization and of its products, due to a permanent effort to anticipate and keep the market under observation (Le Saget, 2003).

Actional nuances: head-manager-leader (Rotaru, 2006): The head: solves the problems he could not/did not know how to prevent. The manager: solves the problems before they appear. The leader: makes problem solving an efficient process, (solves all problems efficiently). The head: wants his orders to be correctly performed. The manager: wants his orders to be understood by the others. The leader: becomes aware of the received orders. The head: orders and leads. The manager: manages and leads. The leader: brings the employees together with a view to achieving a certain goal. The head: is a very determined person. The manager: is authoritarian. The leader: is kind, amicable. The head: inspires fear. The manager: demands respect. The leader: shows enthusiasm. The head: orders. The manager: manages. The leader: innovates. The head: maintains the structure. The manager: develops the structure. The leader: improves the structure. The head: focuses on the status. The manager: focuses on the role. The leader: focuses on people. The head: orders and controls. The manager: guides and checks. The leader: motivates and inspires.

3. Conclusion

The profession of leader (manager) in the tourism companies involves the usage of a system of complex relations with those that carry out the tasks, on the basis of rules and principles that can be checked, controlled and even measured/evaluated (Jamrozy, Backman & Backman, 1996; Weaver & Oppermann, 2000; Shoemaker, Lewis & Yesawich, 2007; Mazilu, Avram & Ispas, 2010; Testa & Sipe, 2012). Consequently, the head/the manager must have, apart from the necessary qualities, aptitudes and proper behaviour the capacity of creating the conditions for the efficient use of all the resources, with a view to pertinent decision-making. Leadership is

fundamentally different from management. The efficient leader aims at situations that need a change. He “does what he has to do” and acts according to its personal influence. He has a powerful “vision,” being often capable of “motivating” the others. A manager must develop his leadership attitudes, he must train to become a leader. Consequently, he must have a clear vision: shape new ideas, based on facts, clearly render a vision of change, incorporate the others’ ideas into the vision, identify the impact of his own ideas on the organizational capabilities. In the second place, the manager must have a motivation, namely to convey passion and conviction together with the presentation of his ideas, include and encourage the others’ participation. Thirdly, a manager must borrow from the energy specific to the leader: he must notice and remove the obstacles, convince the others of the immediate necessities, include the innovations into the mode of working, focus on efficiency.

References

- Basic, G. (2015). Coherent Triads: Observed Successful Collaboration in Youth Care. In CIL 2015, International Conference of Humanities and Social Sciences-Creativity, Imaginary, Language, Craiova, Romania, May 15-16, 2015. (pp. 91-105).
- Bass, B. M. (1991). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. Basic Books.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (2004). *Leaders*. HarperBusiness Essentials.
- Bente, C. (2010). Leadership-ulin cadrul organizatiilor publice. *Revista de Administratie Publica si Politici Sociale*, 1(4), 49.
- Brabete, V., & Drăgan, C. (2009). Particular aspects of the process of financial communication from the perspective of exigencies regarding the quality assurance of accounting products. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 9(2), 189-196.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness* (Vol. 213). Grove Press.
- Calota, T. O. (2014). Opinions On The Impact Of Management Decision On Performance In Tourism. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 9(3), 33.
- Certo, S. C. (2003). *Modern management: adding digital focus* (Vol. 1). Prentice Hall.
- Gardner, J. W. (2000). The nature of leadership. *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership*, 3-12.
- Grabara, J., Kolcun, M., & Kot, S. (2014). The role of information systems in transport logistics. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(2).

Holmström, S., Lindberg, E., & Jansson, J. (2015). Entrepreneurial Education Embedded in Sport Psychology: A Swedish Case Study. *Journal of Education and Training*, 3(1), 126-138.

Ionescu, A. (2015). Neutralité neutrosophique et expressivité dans le style journalistique. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 10, 58.

Jamrozy, U., Backman, S. J., & Backman, K. F. (1996). Involvement and opinion leadership in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 908-924.

Johansen, B., Johansen, R., & Ryan, J. R. (2011). *Leaders make the future: Ten new leadership skills for an uncertain world*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 386-408.

Kotter, J. (2013). Management is (still) not leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 9.

Le Saget, M. (2013). *Le manager intuitif-3ème édition: Vers l'entreprise collaborative*. Dunod.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Liu, S. H. (2015). Effects of Self-Perceptions on Self-Learning among Teacher Education Students. *International Education Studies*, 8(10), 63.

Maxwell, J. C. (1999). *Twenty one indispensable qualities of a leader*. Thomas Nelson Inc.

Mazilu, M., Avram, M., & Ispas, R. (2010). The Romanian Tourism During the Economic Crisis- Where To. In *Proceedings of the 5th WSEAS International Conference on Economy and Transformation Management (Vol. 1)*.

Negrea, X. (2015). Public Interest, Procedural and Discursive Limitations. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1), 33-41.

Rosca, V. (2015). Linking Human Resources with Internal Marketing in Football Management. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 16(3), 372.

Rotaru, N. (2006). *PSI – Management*. București: Editura ANI.

Shoemaker, S., Lewis, R., & Yesawich, P. C. (2007). Marketing leadership in hospitality and tourism: Strategies and tactics for competitive advantage. *Marketing*, 3(4), 5.

Testa, M. R., & Sipe, L. (2012). Service-leadership competencies for hospitality and tourism management. *International journal of hospitality management*, 31(3), 648-658.

Tocan, M. C. (2012). *Managementul organizatiei*. Bucharest: Mustang Publishing House.

Tohătan, A. (2008). Caracteristici ale managerului-leader sub incidența globalizării. *Studia Universitatis Vasile Goldiș, Arad-Seria Științe Economice*, (1-3), 244-250.

Vasile, E., & Grabara, I. (2014). Agricultural exploitation from the perspective of Romania's integration into the European Union. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(2).

Vladutescu, S., Budica, I., Dumitru, A., & Stanescu, G. C. (2015). Functions and Forms of Managerial Communication. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 12(2), 191-201.

Voinea, D. V. (2015). The journalists' obligation of protecting the victims of sexual assault. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1), 101-106.

Weaver, D., & Oppermann, M. (2000). *Tourism management*. John Wiley and Sons.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders. *Harvard business review*, 55, 67-78.

Zlate, M. (2004). *Leadership și management*. Iași: Polirom.

Zorlențan, T., Burdus, E., & Caprarescu, G. (1998). *Managementul organizatiei*. Bucuresti: Editura Economica.