

Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)

Volume 2
Number 1 *Journal of Business & Leadership*

Article 16

1-1-2006

Continuing Confusion -Are Managers and Leaders Different?

David Curtis
Governors State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Curtis, David (2006) "Continuing Confusion -Are Managers and Leaders Different?," *Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)*: Vol. 2: No. 1, Article 16.

DOI: 10.58809/IGID9458

Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl/vol2/iss1/16>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-Reviewed Journals at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012) by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

CONTINUING CONFUSION - ARE MANAGERS AND LEADERS DIFFERENT?

David Curtis, Governors State University

This paper revisits the debate about whether managers and leaders are different. It notes the assertion that managers do things right and leaders do the right thing. The paper, then, examines the discussions provided in the leadership literature, and the experiences described by successful executives to test the validity of the previously described claim. Also, this paper provides an alternative view that managing and leading are not as different as commonly asserted.

INTRODUCTION

During the fourteen years I have taught management courses, every textbook I have used has drawn distinctions between managers and leaders. Each included the word "management" prominently in the title and dealt with a wide range of management issues and concerns. All claimed, either in their preface or introduction, that today's students are the leaders and managers of tomorrow and that the texts were preparing them to take on those responsibilities – they were providing useful information for future managers. Each also had a particular section of one or more chapters focused specifically upon leading and leadership. In those chapters, leadership was treated as somehow different from management, and leading was seen as different from managing. Each textbook seemed to treat leadership as not only different from management, but also implied that management was somehow less noble or even inferior. While never stated explicitly, each seemed to adopt Warren Bennis' assertion that, "Managers do things right and leaders do the right thing". (Bennis, p. 39)

The distinction between management and leadership is one of more than passing academic curiosity. It is a fundamental consideration in the study of both management and leadership and is especially important to those who teach in those fields. Further, it is particularly important to the students who are influenced by the literature and what instructors have to say about managing and leading. Management and business students seek degrees primarily to become managers in a variety of different organizations. While many of them may aspire to very high level executive positions, those most often associated with "leadership", the reality is that the great majority will finish their careers in mid-level "management" positions. In preparation for that future the students attend our classes to learn about managers and managing. Faculty, responsible for teaching the students, take their lead from textbooks and academic literature and teach that managing and leading are

different and that there are "management and managing tasks" and that there are separate "leadership and leading tasks", and within the same organization there might be both managers and leaders who could be different individuals.

The assertion here is that the textbook writers and leadership researchers all too often confuse the theoretical and idealized constructs of "manager" and "leader" with their actual personification. In much the same way as Weber (1947) conceptualizes an "ideal bureaucracy" that does not exist in reality, one may certainly draw conceptual distinctions between managers and leaders as a way to illustrate "ideal types". However, when one implies, or even states, that such ideal types exist in reality, (Zaleznik, 1977& Daft, 2002), then such efforts are more confusing than helpful.

A problem of a different sort is that while the literature is replete with assertions that managing and leading are different, that same literature, in fact, often describes them as being essentially the same. When the distinctions blur and overlap, the confusion increases and complicates the discussion about the differences between managers and leaders. Additionally, numerous books and articles by management practitioners also support the view that outside the world of "idealized types", there is no difference between managing and leading.

The terms manager/management and leader/leadership are found in all dictionaries, and while each concept is described with different words, or with the same words arranged somewhat differently, one must pay very careful attention to discern the differences. In the past leader and leadership have applied more often to the military and political arenas while manager and management have been used primarily in other organizational settings.

The earliest writers dealing with organizations used the terms manager, management or administrator much more frequently than leader or leadership. For example, Taylor (1911) wrote on "Principles of Scientific Management"; Fayol (1916) titled his work "Industrial

and General Administration". The number of journals dealing with leadership and management also indicate over time the relative interest in each concept. A review of Ulrich (2004) shows a total of 149 journals dealing with the topic of leadership and it lists 3597 journals dealing with different aspects of management. However, in comparing the number of journals in existence before and after 1977, it is interesting to note that of the 149 publications on leadership, eight of every ten were created after 1977. For management journals on the other hand, fewer than three of ten were created after 1977. These numbers show a heightened interest in leadership since 1977.

The increased interest in leadership, especially as contrasted with management, was likely due, in part, to the publication of Zelnick's "Managers and Leaders – Are They Different?" (Zaleznik, 1977). Harvard Business Review reprinted the article in 2004 with an introduction that said, "...the piece [as published in 1977] caused an uproar in the business schools, [and] the study of leadership hasn't been the same since". (HBR 2004, p. 74)

This study was motivated in great part by Zaleznik and examines three types of literature that deal with leading and managing - (1) widely used management textbooks, (2) textbooks and scholarly articles focusing primarily on leadership, and (3) the views of practitioners who have held high level positions in business and industry. I will provide numerous examples to show that while textbook writers and leadership scholars purport to draw clear distinctions between managing and leading, they do not. I will further show that executive practitioners often blur the difference between managing and leading or, more likely, make no distinction at all. Definitional distinctions can be useful tools, but once made, they should be used in a consistent fashion. It is not helpful to give particular meanings to "manager and managing" and "leader and leading" if those meanings are not used consistently or are defined in such a way that they become interchangeable. I will show that many of the distinctions are the result of semantic or definitional gymnastics, or that they are defined so extremely as to make their meanings caricatures of reality.

I am on firm ground in concluding that the discussion of the difference between managers and leaders be ultimately grounded in reality. No less a management scholar than Peter Drucker argues the importance of reality when discussing management paradigms, "Basic assumptions about reality are the paradigms of a social science such as management...those assumptions largely

determine what the discipline - scholars, writers, teachers, practitioners – assume to be REALITY" (sic) (Drucker 1999, p. 3)

I deal here with management and leadership only within civilian organizational settings, and have also excluded elected officials. However, while government organizations are not specifically considered, the findings should generally apply to them as well.

METHODOLOGY

The study examines seven management textbooks, Bateman and Snell (2006), Dubrin (2006), Hellriegel et al (2002), Lussier (2006), Robbins and Coulter (2005), Schermerhorn (2006), and Williams (2006), all of which, except Williams, are at least in their fifth edition, indicating they have been used by numerous faculty over several years. I included Williams because of its recent vintage to examine whether newer textbooks handled the subjects differently. The texts were selected because of the length of time they have been used and their availability to this researcher. No textbooks were reviewed and then "rejected" because they did not fit with a preconceived thesis.

The selection of textbooks and scholarly articles on leadership was more problematic and challenging. How does one select a manageable number of books and articles from the literally thousands available? Here, I relied on current textbooks recommended by publishers for leadership courses, and other works are among those often cited in the literature as "classics". In addition to books, there were thousands of scholarly articles from which to choose, and, again, I selected a number of classics plus several publications which are often cited or which were particularly relevant. There is no claim that the selection is exhaustive, only that it is an illustrative sample.

There have been thousands of successful business and management practitioners, but only a very small number have written about their experiences. Of those who have, relatively few have dealt explicitly with management, and even fewer with leadership. In selecting the monographs, I obtained "best seller" lists from the Wall Street Journal and New York Times and used the databases of Barnes and Noble and Borders. Those efforts yielded the most recent books by practitioners, though not all were useful. I conducted further searches of library holdings and of several large library databases including ABI Inform, Proquest, Business Source Elite, and Academic Search Premier. As a result of those efforts, I located additional books and articles by other practitioners who had written

about managing, leading, or both. Again, while the sample is not exhaustive, it is illustrative.

ILLUMINATING THE CONFUSION: THREE KINDS OF LITERATURE

Management Textbooks

All seven selected textbooks state in the early pages that the four functions of management are planning, organizing, leading and controlling. Each is also organized around those four functions, and selected chapters expand upon them. While the chapters themselves are variously named and the "real world" examples are different, the seven textbooks are striking similar in what they present and how they present it.

The seven texts also define "managing", "manager", or the "managing function" in essentially the same way:

- It is "...the process of working with people and resources to accomplish organizational goals." (Bateman and Snell, p. 16)
- Managers are "...people in organizations who directly support and help activate the work efforts and performance and accomplishments of others." (Schermerhorn, p. 15)
- "A manager is someone who works with and through other people by coordinating their work activities in order to accomplish organizational goals." (Robbins and Coulter, p. 5)
- "...management is the process of using organizational resources to achieve organizational objectives..." (Dubrin, p. 2)
- Managing is, "The process of obtaining and organizing resources and achieving goals through other people". (Hellriegel et al, p. 25)
- "...management is the process of using organizational resources to achieve organizational objectives..." (Lussier, p. 6)
- "Management is getting things done through others". (Williams, p. 4)

The seven definitions differ from one another only in their exact verbiage, but certainly not in the essence of what they say. It seems reasonable to conclude that the writers of the textbooks view managers and managing in essentially the same fashion.

Each of the seven texts also describes "leading", and devotes a major section to the subject of leading or leadership, with multiple chapters on different aspects of leadership such as motivation, teamwork, communicating, and dynamics. The specific subject of

our consideration is whether and how the textbooks distinguish between managing and leading, and if the distinction is made, is it clear, persuasive and useful not only to other scholars but also to their primary audience, our students?

Bateman and Snell say, "...a leader is one who influences others to attain goals" (p. 374). One must read the text very closely to find a distinction between their "leadership" and their "management". Schermerhorn sounds very similar, "Leadership is the process of inspiring others to work hard to accomplish important tasks" (p. 323). Dubrin sounds like an echo, leadership is "...the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organizational goals" (p. 334). The others say much the same, "Leadership involves influencing others to strive to achieve one or more goals" Hellriegel (p. 404); "Leadership...is the process of influencing a group toward the achievement of goals" (Robbins, p. 422); "...process of influencing employees to work toward the achievement of organizational objectives" (Lussier, p. 604); and "...leadership is the process of influencing others to achieve group or organizational goals" (Williams, p. 416).

Hence we find that the definitions or descriptions of managers and managing are essentially the same in all seven textbooks. Further, we see that the definitions of leaders and leading are also very similar. However, the question for this study is whether the seven actually make useful distinctions between managers and leaders. The textbook authors do not make clear that they are proposing ideal types. The problem with their definitions and distinctions between "leaders" and "managers" is that they imply, and sometimes assert, that those ideal types are distinct and that they exist in the real world.

Literature on Leadership

The previous section focused on widely-used management textbooks and how they describe and differentiate between managing and leading. This section examines how articles, textbooks, and monographs, focusing more clearly on leadership, describe those same relationships. Zaleznik (1977) is a good place to begin. As noted earlier, he titled his article, "Managers and Leaders: Are they Different?", and it had a significant impact on the thinking of many academics. Zaleznik is trained as a psychotherapist, and he fundamentally adopts a psychotherapeutic point of view that "...managers and leaders are very different kinds of people. They differ in motivation, in personal history, and in how they think and

act” (Emphasis added) (p. 75). Zaleznik then follows with, “Managers tend to adopt impersonal, if not passive, attitudes toward goals. Managerial goals arise out of necessities rather than desires... [while] ...Leaders adopt a personal and active attitude toward goals” (p. 75). In continuing with his psychological analysis of the differences between managers and leaders, Zaleznik proposes:

- “For those who become managers, a survival instinct dominates the need for risk, and from that instinct comes an ability to tolerate mundane practical work” (p. 77)
- “Managers prefer to work with people; they avoid solitary activity because it makes them anxious” (p. 77)
- “...managers may lack empathy or the capacity to sense intuitively the thoughts and feelings of those around them” (p. 78)
- [leaders] who describe another person as “deeply affected” with “intense desire”, “crestfallen...would seem to have an inner perceptiveness that they can use in their relationships with others” (p. 78)
- “A manager’s sense of self-worth is enhanced by perpetuating and strengthening existing institutions. Leaders...feel separate from their environment. They may work in organizations, but they never belong to them (p. 79)
- “Leaders are like artists and other gifted people who often struggle with neuroses...” (p. 79)

The entire article is written in this vein, and the conclusion drawn is that the differences between managers and leaders are in great part psychological and even hard-wired. More modern writers seldom make such

claims. Zaleznik clearly confuses the “ideal type” of manager and leader by the stark differences he posits and by the assertion that they actually exist as real in individual managers and leaders. His article is relevant because of its historical importance, and if the Harvard Business Review observation is correct, perhaps the views held today about the differences between managers and leaders can be traced back to Zaleznik.

Daft, in his widely used and frequently cited work defines leadership as “...an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes and outcomes that reflect their shared purposes” (Daft, 2002, p.5). He devotes several pages to the proposition that leading is different from managing, which he describes as planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. The astute reader will note that he substitutes the term “directing” for the term “leading” usually found in management texts. He provides an exhibit, which draws on the work of Kotter (1996), Rost (1933), and Dumaine (1993) to compare management and leadership.

Daft’s distinctions can be helpful in illuminating the concepts of management and leadership as ideal types. The problem arises when one confuses the functions he proposes with persons. While it is possible to envision a manager or leader who fits neatly into one side or the other of his dichotomy, it would be highly unlikely to actually find many such individuals holding responsible organizational positions. His distinctions are useful in the world of concepts, but are too stark and absolute to be useful in the world of reality. What leader in an organizational setting cannot be concerned with both vision and the financial bottom line? While the leader should be concerned with helping others grow, she also must devote attention to control, and surely must produce and sell as well as motivate.

Comparing Management and Leadership (Daft p.16)

	Management	Leadership
Direction	Planning and budgeting: Eye on the bottom line	Creating vision and strategy: Eye on the horizon
Alignment	Organizing, staffing Directing, and Controlling: Create boundaries	Creating shared culture and values, and helping others grow: Reduce boundaries
Relationships	Focus on objects – producing and selling based on position power: Acting as boss	Focus on people - inspire, motivate based on personal power: Acting as coach, facilitator
Personal Qualities	Emotional distance, expert mind, Talking Conformity: Insight into organization	Emotional connections (heart), open mind (mindfulness), listening (communications), and nonconformity (courage): Insight into self integrity
Outcomes	Maintains stability	Creates change

Hughes et al (2002) enumerate nine definitions of leadership developed by researchers over 75 years (p. 7):

- The creative and directive force of morale (Munson, 1981)

- The process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner (Bennis, 1959)
- The presence of a particular influence relationship between two or more persons (Hollander and Julian, 1969)

- Directing and coordinating the work of group members (Fiedler, 1967)
- An interpersonal relation in which others comply because they want to, not because they have to (Merton, 1969)
- Transforming followers, creating visions of the goals that may be attained, and articulating for the followers the ways to attain those goals (Bass, 1985; Tichy and Devanna, 1986)
- The process of influencing an organized group toward accomplishing its goals (Roach and Behling, 1984)
- Actions that focus resources to create desirable opportunities (Campbell, 1991)
- The leader's job is to create conditions for the team to be effective (Ginnett, 1996)

The discerning reader will note that the nine definitions of leadership correspond very closely and at times almost exactly, with the definitions of management in the management textbooks. Hughes et al then state their own definition of leadership as, "the process of influencing an organized group toward accomplishing its goals" (p. 8). Their own definition of leadership, too, is essentially the same as those in the management textbooks given to both leadership and management. One must ask again, do Hughes et al actually make a distinction between leadership and management?

Other leadership texts provide similar definitions. Howell and Costley (2006) state that, "Leadership is a process used by an individual to influence group members toward the achievement of group goals in which the group members view the influence as legitimate" (p. 4). Manning and Curtis (2003) posit that, "Leadership is social influence...leaders influence the behavior of others (p. 2). Kotter (1990) acknowledges that leadership and management are different and distinctive, yet complementary, and that "...both are necessary for success" (p. 85). In essence, he believes that management is about coping with complexity while leadership is about coping with change. One certainly may draw such a distinction, but as noted earlier in this paper, does he mean that individuals must be either managers or leaders? Or is it possible that the same individual might perform managerial functions at certain times and leadership functions at others? Kotter is not clear. Nahavandi writes, "A leader is defined as any person who influences individuals and groups within an organization, helps them in the establishment of goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals..." (Nahavandi, 2003, p. 4). Kouzes and Posner add, "...leaders mobilize others to

want to get extraordinary things done in organizations" (Kouzes and Posner 2003, p. xvii).

Warren Bennis is certainly one of the most important and seminal thinkers on organizations, managing and leading. Throughout his writing he draws distinctions between managers and leaders and enumerates differences between them, which he says are "enormous and crucial" (Bennis, 2003):

- The manager administers; the leader innovates
- The manager is a copy; the leader is an original.
- The manager maintains; the leader develops.
- The manager focuses on systems and structure; the leader focuses on people.
- The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust.
- The manager has a short-range view; the leader has a long-range perspective.
- The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why.
- The manager has his or her eye always on the bottom line; the leader's eye is on the horizon.
- The manager imitates; the leader originates.
- The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it.
- The manager is the classic good soldier; the leader is his or her own person.
- The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing. (emphasis added)
- (Bennis 39)

Bennis' distinctions, like those of Daft (2002) can be helpful so long as the differences are seen as describing "ideal types". However, that is not the impression one might conclude from his contrasts. His extreme and polar differences in characteristics seem to obscure more than they illuminate. The "managers" described above are more like caricatures of reality than descriptions of managers in the real organizational world. There is no subtlety, no nuance, no recognition that a continuum in the characteristics might exist. As described by Bennis, managers are more like robotic bureaucrats than they are the able and competent individuals who guide organizations throughout the world. Yes, Bennis draws distinctions between managers and leaders, but are those distinctions plausible?

Practitioners

Textbook writers provide aspiring managers and leaders with information about what it means to manage

and lead. Academics who study leadership attempt to understand the dynamics of leadership, and some give guidance to aspiring or practicing leaders. Practitioners, on the other hand, actually do what textbook writers and leadership scholars write about. Some, though very few, practitioners write about their experiences and insights, and one need not read too many examples of the practitioners' works before it is clear that most use the terms manager, leader, and executive almost interchangeably. Some attempt to define certain leadership characteristics, but subsequently merge the qualities of leadership into their discussion of managers and executives such that the terms, as actually used, are indistinguishable. While time and space limit the number of possible examples, the following are illustrative.

Jack Welch, the former chairman of G.E., and on most lists of successful executives, notes the following (2005):

- "One day you become a leader. On Monday you're doing what comes naturally, enjoying your job...Then on Tuesday you are management (p. 61)
- "When you are a leader, your job is to have all the questions...When I was first made a manager...I would make a pest of myself with a round of phone calls asking the salespeople or plant managers to explain everything I didn't understand." (emphasis added) (p. 74)
- "Leaders celebrate. What is it about celebrating that makes managers so nervous?" (emphasis added) (p. 78)
- "These kinds of questions have pushed me to make sense of my own leadership experiences...I managed businesses..." (emphasis added) (p. 62)
- [I have asked questions that ranged from] "...managing talented but difficult people...to leading in uncertain times." (emphasis added) (p. 2)
- "This not the last you will hear of leadership [in this book]. Virtually every chapter touches on the subject from crisis management to..." (emphasis added) (p. 62)

Welch clearly mixes the terms, does not seem to differentiate, and by his very language equates leading and managing.

Lee Iacocca (1984) writes extensively of managers and executives, but mentions "leader" only once and "leadership", never. Neither term is in the index. The single time this writer could find the term "leader" was when Iacocca said:

A good business leader can't operate that way.

It's perfectly natural to want all the facts and to hold out for the research that guarantees a particular program will work...That's fine in theory, but real life just doesn't work that way...There are times when the best manager [must just act] (emphasis added) (p.54).

There is little doubt that Iacocca was a leader, as the term is used by both the textbook writers and other academics, but he couches almost all his own actions in the language of managing. For Iacocca a most important question was, what are your plans, priorities and hopes?" (p.50). This is clearly a vision, hence leadership, question. A second question of equal importance to him was, "How do you intend to go about achieving them?" (p. 50). The achievement part is "execution", a management function and skill. However, in Iacocca's view, vision and execution must reside in the same person and are inseparable. Iacocca further blends the management and leadership functions when he says, "In addition to being decision-makers, managers also have to be motivators." Decision-making is generally viewed as a management skill and motivation is seen as a leadership function. Hence, if neither vision nor execution or decision-making and motivating can exist independently of one another, one may conclude that he sees managing and leading as the same.

Larry Bossidy, former CEO of Allied Signal and recognized as one of the nation's top CEOs by Executive Magazine provides a list of: The leader's seven essential behaviors. That list has several behaviors not noted elsewhere, but given that Bossidy (2002) calls the list the leader's essential functions, it is instructive to note that his list also includes aspects of what have been described by others noted here as the behaviors of either managers or leaders. Bossidy combines them (p. 57):

- Know your people and your business
- Insist on realism
- Set clear goals and priorities
- Follow-through
- Reward the doers
- Expand peoples' capabilities
- Know yourself

Bossidy's book, *Execution*, is a term that most academic writers attribute to managing rather than to leading. However, Bossidy says, "Many people regard execution as detail work that's beneath the dignity of a business leader. That's wrong. To the contrary, it's a leader's most important job" (emphasis added) (p. 1).

Bossidy, it seems, is the third practitioner examined who mixes the concepts of managing and leading.

Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., the former CEO of IBM, is another practitioner who is not helpful in making a distinction between managers and leaders. His book: Who says elephants can't dance (2002), includes a chapter called "Creating the leadership team". He says, "Building a management team is something you have to do business by business, person by person, day by day" (emphasis added) (p. 74). Here again, Gerstner seems to be making no distinction between a leadership team and a management team, and by extension, no difference between managers and leaders.

The terms "leader" or "leadership" are not found in Sam Walton's, *Made in America* (Walton, 1993) or Alfred P. Sloane Jr.'s *My years with General Motors* (Sloane, 1963). They discuss managers and executives, but not leaders. Yet surely both believed that persons within the companies exercised what others have called "leadership functions."

Donald Petersen served as President and Chairman of Ford, and he includes in his book a section called "Building leadership" (Peterson, 1991). "There was a lot of serious discussion and debate in these meetings over the leadership question...[we] made an effort to identify the unusual individuals who showed the potential to attain the very highest levels of management" (emphasis added) (p. 141). Throughout the book, Petersen refers to himself as a manager.

Gerald Greenwald had 40 years of executive experience, including vice-chairman of Chrysler and chairman and CEO of United Airlines. He also blurs, or even eliminates the distinction between leaders and managers when he says, "A CEO's obligation is to create the condition that encourages...getting people to work well together...what worked for me will work for [other] managers too" (pg. 13).

The Harvard Business Review published a series of over 30 paperbacks dealing with a wide range of topics "...designed to bring today's managers and professionals the fundamental information they need to stay competitive..." (2001, ii). One of the paperbacks, "What Makes a Leader" included several articles written by business practitioners that impute the same meanings to manager, leader, and executive. They do not make distinctions. (Davenport and Beck, Ciampa and Watkins, Schmidt in Fryer, 2001).

As noted earlier, only time and space prevent the inclusion of more examples in which practitioners, in discussing what they did and do, use the terms manager, leader, and executive interchangeably.

Alternative View

A major problem in the study of the distinctions between managers and leaders is the absence of a more nuanced and realistic view of the terms. Rather than seeing management and leadership as discrete idealized types, a more accurate portrayal is that they are closely related and integrated - they are symbiotic. Adjectives can be quite useful in understanding and clarifying the relationship between the two functions. It should be recognized that successful managers also have several leadership characteristics, and the more leadership qualities the manager has, the more successful she will probably be in the organization. Surely the able/competent/successful manager will simultaneously keep an eye on both producing and motivating; she will organize and staff as well as create a shared culture and values; she will focus both on producing and motivating; she will maintain stability when and where needed, and will create change as necessary. The able manager-leader will be flexible and adaptable and will adjust tactics and strategies as the situations require.

While it may be possible to imagine a manager, though not a very successful one, as having few leadership characteristics, one is challenged to envision a successful leader within an organization who has few, if any, managerial skills. Leadership is more than orating, or making people feel good, or describing a vision. A leader must have the managerial skills to move beyond the mere speech; employees who "feel good" must then be organized to utilize those feelings to accomplish organizational goals; and a vision without action to achieve the vision accomplishes very little. Certainly, a leader in the real world must be concerned about accomplishing the vision.

While conceptual distinctions can be drawn between managerial characteristics and leadership characteristics, such distinctions are not particularly useful if one does not realize that they are ideal types and that in reality they must be combined and integrated to create the effective manager, leader, executive. The practitioners seem to have it right, even though they do not express the idea directly. Implicitly they recognize that success within the organization means merging managerial and leadership skills. Only through a combination of those skills does the manager or leader become whole. Figure 1 depicts the Alternative View.

CONCLUSION

Many writers of management textbooks and researchers who focus primarily upon leadership issues

claim that they make distinctions between managers and leaders and between managing and leading. However, upon closer inspection, those claims lose their persuasiveness in one of two ways. Either they define the terms in ways that make them almost identical, or they propose such idealized and extreme differences that the meanings no longer relate to reality. Certainly there are management skills and leadership talents, and they can be conceptually different. The problem, though, is that the textbooks and leadership researchers all too often do not acknowledge that they are describing ideal types, and imply or even state that managers and leaders may be different individuals. The practitioners, on the other hand, describe the "real world" as one in which the terms "managing" and "leading" and "manager" and "leader" are used interchangeably.

The Alternative View proposed here is very similar to that of the practitioners, and recognizes that leadership is an added dimension of management and that the two talents almost always reside in the same individuals. Managers without leadership skills or leaders without management skills are almost unknown, and the few individuals possessing only one set of skills without the other, would not rise very high within actual organizations.

While we may, and should, create and examine conceptual distinctions and propose ideal types, those Platonic ideals should not be confused with reality. In the real world of organizations, those who succeed combine both management and leadership skills. In that world, there is little confusion. Managers and leaders are the same.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B. 1985. **Leadership and performance beyond expectation**. New York: Free Press.
- Bateman, T., & Snell, S. 2006. **Management: Leading and collaborating in a competitive world**. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Bennis, W. 1959. Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problem of authority. **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 4: 259-272.
- Bennis, W. 2003. **On becoming a leader**. New York: Basic Books.
- Bossidy, L., & Charon, R. 2002. **Execution**. New York: Crown Business Publications.
- Branson, R. 1998. **Losing my virginity**. New York: Three Rivers Press
- Campbell, D. 1991. **Campbell leadership index manual**. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Daft, R. 2002. **The leadership experience**. Mason, Ohio: Thomson Southwestern.
- Drucker, P. 1999. **Management challenges for the 21st century**. New York: Harper Harper Collins
- Dubrin, A. 2006. **Essentials of management**. Mason, Ohio: Thomson Southwestern.
- Dumaine, B. 1993. The new non-manager managers. **Fortune**, 127: 80-84
- Ciampa, D., & Watkins, M. 1998. **The Successor's Dilemma. Harvard Business Review on what makes a leader**. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Company.
- Davenport, T., & Beck, J. 1998. **Getting the attention you need. Harvard Business review on what makes a leader**. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Company.
- Fayol, H. 1916. **Industrial and general administration**. Paris: Dunod.
- Fiedler, F. 1967. **A theory of leadership effectiveness**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gerstner, L. 2002. **Who says elephants can't dance?** New York: Harper Collins.
- Ginnett, R. 1996. **Team effectiveness leadership model: Identifying leverage points for Change**. Proceedings of the 1996 National Leadership Conference. Maryland.
- Greenwald, G. 2001. **Lessons from the heart of American business**. New York: Warner Books.
- Harvard Business Review 2004. **Best of HBR: Managers and leaders - Are they different?** Zaleznik, A. Reprint from HBR, 1977.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S., & Slocum, J. 2002. **Management: A competency-based approach**. Cincinnati: Southwestern.

- Hollander, E., & Julian, J. 1969. Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership Processes. **Psychological Bulletin**, 71: 387-91.
- Howell, J., Costley, D. 2006. **Understanding behaviors for effective Leadership**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. 2002. **Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience**. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Iacocca, L. 1984. **Iacocca, an autobiography**. New York: Bantam Books.
- Ketter, J. 1996. **Leading change**. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. 2003. **The leadership challenge**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lussier, R. 2003. **Management fundamentals**. Mason, Ohio: Thomson Southwestern.
- Manning, G., & Kent, C. 2003. **The art of leadership**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merton, R. 1969. The social nature of leadership. **American Journal of Nursing**, 69: 2614-18.
- Munson, C. 1981. Style & structure in supervision. **Journal of Education for Social Work**, 17: 65-72.
- Nahavandi, A. 2003. **The art and science of leadership**. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Petersen, D., Hillkirk, J. 1991. **A better idea: Redefining the way Americans work**. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Roach, C., & Behling, O. 1984. **Functionalism: A basis for an alternative approach to the study of leadership**. In J. Hunt, (Ed.), **Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership**. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon.
- Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. 2005. **Management**. Upper Saddle River: John Wiley and Sons.
- Rost, J. 1993. **Leadership for the twenty-first century**. Westport: Praeger
- Schermerhorn, J. 2006. **Management**. Hoboken: John Wiley.
- Schmidt, E. 1998. **Interviewed in Leading through rough times: An interview with Novell's Eric Schmidt**. Harvard Business School on What Makes a Leader. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Sloane, A. 1963. **My years with General Motors**. New York: Doubleday.
- Taylor, F. 1911. **Principles of scientific management**. New York: Harper.
- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. 1986. **The transformational leader**. New York: John Wiley.
- Ulrich's International Publications Directory**. 2004. New York: Bonker.
- Walton, S. with Huey, J. 1993. **Sam Walton: Made in America**. New York: Doubleday.
- Weber, M. 1947. **The theory of social and economic organizations**. New York: Free Press.
- Welch, J., & Welch, S. 2005. **Winning**. New York: Harper Collins.
- Williams, C. 2006. **Effective Management**. Mason, OH: Thomson Southwestern.
- Zaleznik, A. 2004. Managers and leaders - Are they different? **Harvard Business Review**, 1: 74-81.

David Curtis is a professor of management at Governors State University. He received his Ph.D. in policy analysis and higher education from Stanford University. His research interests are leadership and collective bargaining. He is co-author of Policy making and effective leadership, and has published in Change, Journal of the Association for Institutional Research, and Journal of Higher Education.

Appendix 1:
Alternative View of the Relationship between Management and Leadership

