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Abstract

There is a very pronounced tendency to confuse leadership with management. Also, the leader-manager issue is intensively discussed and researched. Specialty literature highlights the presence of five typical situations regarding the use of the leadership and management concepts, which are: superposition, contraposition, partial similarities between the spheres of these two concepts, leadership - part of management, management - part of leadership. We come with the premise for a new approach: whatever it will be named - management of the future or leadership, manager-leader or leader, the organization of the future will need a visionary, intuitive, authentic leader, with rigor and method, a good organizer and very well trained professionally.
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1. Introduction

There were times when people used words like leadership and management as synonyms, those two words being used interchangeably, both in theory and in practice. But now, most people realize that there is a significant difference between those two concepts. Management is the process through which the practical application of the program and the objectives of the organization are ensured, and leadership, in contrast, aims to bring perspective ideas and to motivate people (Maxwell, 2005, p. 10). On one hand, management is applied primarily to objects, it creates stability rules, the manager prepares and trains, tending to the need for security and bureaucracy; on the other hand, leadership applies mainly to people, it inspires change, and the leaders tend to see their goals realized. A balance between leadership - management and between manager-leader is therefore needed. A good management - leadership can transform organizations and can have a positive impact on people's lives and a good manager-leader brings benefits, but requires more effort.

Regarding the stage in which the leadership in Romania is placed, the future looks promising, studies () show that with openness towards Western values, leadership begins to be perceived as a reality in Romanian companies or in business meetings, this topic being discussed more often. Ionescu Gh., Cazan, E., (2012, p. 32) states that "many emerging trends and approaches to treat organizations [...] require new thinking of the people who are employed. We have entered in an era where the best managers are known best for the help and support that they produce than for subsequent surveillance and issue commands [...] increasingly more, even the title of manager is replaced in flowcharts with leader, coordinator or coach."

2. Leader versus manager - etymology, definition, similarities and differences

The etymological root of the word "manager" is the word of Latin origin manus, which means hand. This sense is divided, etymologically speaking into the following words:
- maneggiare, in Italian, with the meaning of handle;
- to manage, in English, meaning to keep a horse under control, to manage;
- manège, in French, with the meaning of coaching and training a horse in riding schools;

The word manager refers to the one who practices management, under this name being included all the leading boards.

The etymological root of anglo-saxon words: lead (which has several meanings: to lead; to straighten; to determine; to guide; to conduct; to show the way; to accompany), leader and leadership is the word laed having the meaning of path or way. A remarkable significance belongs to the verb laeden which means to travel.

Therefore, we note that, since the beginning, the leader is the one who shows the way to those with whom he is travelling being part of group and also leader of the group. This etymological origin of the term laed suggests a much more ample and durable orientation than to teach the "horse" how to behave.
The leader, by definition is a person who: directs the activities of a group through a common goal (Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E., 1957), he mobilizes institutional, political, psychological or other nature resources, he stimulates, engages and satisfies the motives or the needs of followers (Burns, J. M. (1978, pp. 18); he defines and successfully transforms the reality of others (Smircich, and L. Morgan, G. (1982); he believes that success in life is represented by the continuous involvement in the search of a worthy ideal which is done for the good of others rather than for personal benefit (Denis Waitley, 1983); leaders do the right thing and managers are people who do the things how they should be done - both roles are profoundly essential, but deeply different (Peters, T., Austin, N., 1985); he builds a lasting excellence through a paradoxical blend of personal modesty and professional will (Jim Collins, 2007); he is a combination of know-how and personal attributes, which is better than others in a given situation (Ram Charan, 2008); he blends the innate qualities with those acquired through training (Ioan - Constantin Petca, 2009); he is able to influence others to contribute in the measure of their ability to achieve his vision (Sam Ervin, 2011).

The manager, instead, is defined as a person who: adopts decisions and initiates actions that influence the decisional and operational behavior of others; integrates the work of other people (Robins, 2002 quoted by Dănaiață, et. al. 2006); he is responsible for the work performance of one or more persons engaged in the organization (Zaleznik, A., 2008); he is the most expensive resource of a company, but also the most important, because thanks to the managerial system the objectives of the organizations are achieved (Drucker, 1954, p.109), but the same author argues that sometimes the manager has too many responsibilities, which require teamwork, and the one who will direct and guide the team without taking into account the hierarchy of the group, but based on his knowledge will be a leader.

From the definitions provided we can say that leaders are people who train and develop more conceptual skills (to see the organization as a whole, to know the place of each department, vision and strategic thinking, etc.) and human abilities (empathetic, charismatic, with a great communication skills and skills for understanding and influencing people and human groups). At the same time, we note that management makes more leads and develops technical skills (to understand specific tasks, to know the working methods and techniques, etc.). We do not mean that any manager with good knowledge becomes a leader we mean that we need people with vision, who know how to use their expertise knowledge in their work with people.

A first conclusion would be that leaders are those who interact and assume responsibilities and are able to develop qualities specific both to leadership and management.

3. Management versus leadership- premise for a new approach

Numerous studies regarding to leadership conducted by Warren Bennis - called the dean of leadership, John Adair - one of the founding fathers of leadership contemporary John Maxwell - considered a notorious contemporary leadership, are probably the most often cited. To complete these, the specialty literature (Zlate, Bennis W, Zaleznik, Fillipp de Woot, T. Peters & N. Austin, Baillesteanu) reveals the presence of five typical situations regarding the use of the concept of leadership and management. They are: overlapping, contraposition, partial similarities of the spheres of the two concepts, leadership - part of the management, management - part of leadership.

As a result, some specialists consider that manager and leader are synonym terms and use them interchangeably. For example, Armstrong (2006) declares that to be an outstanding manager, you have to be an exceptional leader. Others, however, clearly define the two terms: Zaleznik (1977) highlights the first differences between the concepts, then Kotter (1990) states the complementarity of the two concepts, and more recently Yulka & Lepsinger (2005), Ford (2006), Northouse (2007), Carroll & Lester (2008), Bennis (2009) study the interdependence of the two concepts.

The current management leadership called in Peter Drucker's vision is centered on the following principles:

- it refers to humans;
- it is closely linked to culture;
- in companies, leadership requires the commitment of achieving the objectives and compliance with common values. (...) This consists in analyzing, fixing and exemplifying these objectives, values and causes.
- it must provide each employee and company the capacity of growth, of development, as changes of needs and perspectives appear
- the enterprise must rely on communication and individual responsibility
- the performance must become an integral part of the company and management: it must be measured - or at least estimated - and must be constantly improved;
- the results of the company only exist outside of it: inside of it there are only costs.

We observe that all the principles listed focus on people, so we can say that in any system of people management there is a sine qua non condition for sustainability and competitiveness. Summarizing, we can say that the fundamental difference between a leader and a manager is the ability of the first one to determine a voluntary participation of collaborators, while the manager may resort to coercion. Of course a leader is not only the person from
the top of the peak - any person who leads a group, regardless of hierarchy can be a leader. Or not. The current manager must be a leader or become one.

In the Romanian specialty literature a frequency of these approaches can be noticed, the subject being discussed less in books and more in educational materials used in educational institutions. We enumerate here studies realized by: Mihu et al., 2003; Zlate, 2004; Popa, 2005; Ilieș et. AL., 2008; Bâleșteanu & Burz 2008.

Our point of view on these concepts is based on the assertion made by Gosling and Mintzberg (2003), namely: "Separation of management from leadership is dangerous. Just as management without leadership encourages a style of driving without inspiration, also, leadership without management generates a disconnected style of leadership."

We believe that the opposition leader versus manager is no longer valid in reality - more important is the professional quality of the person from the top of the hierarchy, whether you call him a leader, manager, chief, ruler. Therefore, we tend more towards modern definitions of the leader, such as those set by George Bâleșteanu, Jim Collins and Ram Charan.: a leader should be defined and judged from a single perspective: the ability to make his organization have performant results including the years after his departure!

The roles of manager and leader are dual: any person can become both: manager when his activity has as a characteristic reference point the management of complexity and leader when his effort focuses on promoting and implementing the change (model Kotter). Managerial skills and the art of leadership are largely distinct; their exercise requires both the accumulation of specific knowledge (through learning), but also a lot of practical experience.

We share the view that there are informal leaders who are not managers. They are important to the organization. However, we believe that the organization that does not promote managers who have leadership qualities is "defective" and that business is not sustainable. The manager is a true leader when: he educates and retains valuable people from the company, is willing to create a climate in which others can follow and become the leaders of tomorrow. Starting from the title, we believe that the leader must be complementary as manager. An ideal situation would be that in which the same person can realize fully and maximal both the leadership functions, as well as those of management (difficult situation, if not impossible to put into practice), maximum leadership effectiveness is achieved when the leader fulfills the status of manager or the manager has the necessary qualities of a leader.

Our proposal: the ideal situation would be a balance between manager and leader, this would be a rare situation, but not impossible. Thus, the kind of person who analyzes carefully before taking a decision is also capable to take the initiative of the group in order to get things done. He is interested both in quantity and quality. He values his friends and shows flexibility when needed having the strength to say that an idea is good, even if it doesn't belong to him.

4. The leader - a continuum of the manager

The controversy leader-manager can be studied taking into account the four systems by R. Likert who considers that there is a continuum between management styles (figure no.1). He has examined different types of organizations and leadership styles, and he asserts that to achieve maximum profitability, good labor relations and high productivity, every organization must make optimum use of their human assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System I</th>
<th>System II</th>
<th>System III</th>
<th>System IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exploitive - authoritative</td>
<td>benevolent - authoritative</td>
<td>consultative- authoritative</td>
<td>participative-group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. no. 1. The four systems of Likert**

(Source: Luț D. M., 2010, Managementul resurselor umane, Editura Eurostampa, Timișoara, p.183)

According to the figure above between System I - profoundly authoritarian and System IV – participative, a benevolent or paternal bond with the subordinates System II benevolent authoritative and System III authoritative consultative is created. To support the research that states that the manager and leader are different regarding the style of work with subordinates the two extreme management styles are compared: authoritarian and participatory. System II (style authoritarian benevolent) corresponds to the managers who want to do things their own way, but do it with kindness and System III, the most common one of Likert is adopted by consultative leaders (leaders consult with subordinates, but keep ultimate control and the right to make final decisions). The fourth system, management style 9.9 (Blake and Mouton) and Y theory have some common features. All emphasize the participatory side of those in positions of leadership being ideal styles with the highest efficiency. They are characteristic of true leaders who are trying to work with people, to involve them in decisions and activities of the organization, helping them to develop their work.
The exploitive - authoritative system, where decisions are imposed on subordinates, where motivation is characterized by threats, where high levels of management have great responsibilities but lower levels have virtually none, where there is very little communication and no joint teamwork.

The benevolent - authoritative system is the one where leadership is by a condescending form of master-servant trust, where motivation is mainly by rewards, where managerial personnel feel responsibility but lower levels do not, where there is little communication and relatively little teamwork.

The consultative - authoritative, where leadership is by superiors who have substantial but not complete trust in their subordinates, where motivation is by rewards and some involvement, where a high proportion of personnel, especially those at the higher levels feel responsibility for achieving organization goals, where there is some communication (both vertical and horizontal) and a substantial amount of cooperative teamwork. This fourth system is the one which is the ideal for the profit oriented and human-concerned organization, and Likert says (The Human Organization, Mcgraw Hill, 1967) that all organizations should adopt this system. Clearly, the changes involved may be painful and long-winded, but it is necessary if one is to achieve the maximum rewards for.

5. The leadership in Romania

In their study "Management in Eastern Europe," British economists Vincent Edwards and Peter Lawrence argue that managers in Romania adopt a style of leading based on the concept of "strong hand", considered the most suitable for the company's stability. We believe that the autocratic style can produce, indeed, stability, but is it also the guarantor of success? American Jim Bagnola considers that, on the contrary, it may be a long-term loser.

Until recent years, Romania has adopted the hierarchical style, but this way of leading is about to change, due to the openness towards Western values, believes the American trainer. "Lately, I met many managers who adopted a Romanian middle style, situated between the two extremes (hierarchical and egalitarian style). Why? Because in 1989 they moved from communism to democracy. They have adopted English as a second, third or even fourth language. Like the Dutch, they speak not only excellent English, but also know many other languages", says the specialist. Thus, the specialist proposes a new style of leadership for Romanian managers starting from next three challenges: a true leader is followed by followers, a leader must have the ability to build interpersonal relationships, leadership is a partnership between leader and followers. The style proposed by the specialist leans towards egalitarian style, but may contain elements of several styles listed above. Following "the strong hand" of leadership is not a solution, but rather is a quick way to remain without employees. So sometimes the leader has to be a follower himself, sometimes a leader, sometimes a manager.

Thus, we can conclude that the manager is considered, in general, the one who makes the organization work, while the leader is the one who brings others together and provides a motivation to lead people into a certain direction. But if we take into account that one of the functions of management is that of leading and motivation, we can conclude that management would include, in fact, leadership. But if we also analyze the political sphere, where many political leaders who know how to influence the masses are not good managers, we realize that leadership is a broader sphere than just being a part of management. In our opinion, leadership and management are two different concepts that define different and autonomous areas, but they interact with each other having a space or a series of more common elements. Starting from the title, we believe that the leader should exist complementary as manager. An optimal situation would be one in which the same person should conduct both functions of leadership and management: integral and maximal (difficult situation, often impossible to put into practice), maximum efficiency is achieved when leadership meets the leader and manager status or the manager has the necessary qualities of a leader. Thus, on the one hand, people who are managers, but also have the abilities, traits, skills of a leader, they are forming the desired and required category in companies and, on the other hand, leaders who have skills and competencies of manager are the same necessary and wanted.
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