

The Difference between Leadership and Management:

A Comparative Analysis

By

Liz Cass

Abstract

This paper will be about the differences between leadership and management. Whether they are similar, widely different, and how the two can be used effectively or ineffectively. I will show how leadership can be used to mentor young individuals or adults, and how management would be used when mentoring or leading is not advisable. I will show how you can have leadership without management, and management with the benefit of leadership, and that you can use both. Leadership is the ability to set a new direction for a group of people; the leader is the one to lead from the front at all times and accept responsibility when the group goes astray. An effective leader motivates their personnel and ensures the job is accomplished the proper way and on time. Management maintains the group and the ideals once they have been put into place. I will be showing where these two have a place in not only the workplace, but can be used in every day life. Leadership is not just about taking the lead and perhaps being looked at as the number one person on the team; leadership is also about accepting responsibility for those mistakes made and accepting the reprimands and moving on without taking it out on the team. Leadership has a more personal touch with their personnel and perhaps mentoring an individual if necessary. Management doesn't always have the personal touch that leadership does with a team or group of people. Management is about making sure the job gets done right and on time and perhaps the firing and hiring of personnel.

Leadership

What is Leadership? Leadership is defined as "Causing others to want to do what you are doing in order to accomplish the work of the organization" (Leadership, 2004). Effective leadership should be both rewarding and rewarded. The word want in the definition is the key work to effective leadership. This word, by design, takes out such leadership practices as being mean, uncompromising, overbearing, self-centered, stubborn, quarrelsome, or protecting the status quo. It means if you are management-centered rather than customer-centered, you will not make help people to want you as a leader. Why? Because those you are in charge of will never come to a point of wanting what you are doing as a leader when those negative leadership characteristics are present.

When you learn how to do a job now matter where you work, leadership is usually not part of what you learn. And as it turns out, you usually end up leading by gut instincts, watching how others are doing it, and most cases trial and error. When that happens, you usually hesitate a lot, and you fall a lot. Even worse, you usually end up hurting those you are leading. Trial and error is not the way for any professional to learn how to be an effective leader. The toll on those leading and those lead are very inconsiderate

and negative and results in being ineffective. There are some things you must know if you are to be an effective leader. First, you must know yourself and know what you are about. In order for you to be an effective leader, you must be confident in yourself and your ability to lead. If those under you feel you hesitate, they may not feel confident to follow. Second, you must know your people, inside and out. You must know what makes them tick – what sets them apart from the others, what are their qualities, what makes them work. Third, you must know your job and the jobs of those you are leading. Nothing must come as a surprise to you. You should be able to step in anyone's position should the need arise. Fourth, you must know the laws and principles as they relate to leading yourself, leading others, and causing them to want your leadership.

Leadership

Styles

According to the US Army Handbook (1973), there are three (3) major leadership styles. Effective leaders use all three, making one the dominant one, and ineffective leaders stick to one style. The Authoritarian style is used when leaders want to tell their workers what needs to be done and how to do it without any feedback or advice from the workers. Leaders can use style this in the situation where you have all the information needed to complete the task, you are short on time, and your workers are properly motivated. Some tend to think of this style as an excuse for yelling, using demeaning language, and leading by threats and abusing their power. This is not an example of the authoritarian style, rather an abusive, unprofessional style called simply bossing people around. It has no place in a leader's demeanor. The authoritative style should only be used rarely and not on a regular basis.

The Participative style is more democratic in nature which involves the leader including one or more employees in the decision making process – asking them for their advice and feedback. However, the leader has the final decision making authority. Using this style is not considered a sign of weakness, but rather a sign of strength and confidence that the employees will respect. This style is used when the leader has part of the information, and the workers have others. Remember that the leader is not expected to know everything. Leaders must use people that are knowledgeable and skillful. Using this style is of mutual benefit – it allows the workers to be part of the team and help the leaders make better decisions.

The third style is described as delegative. This style shows the leader allowing the workers to make the decisions. But the leader is still accountable for the decisions that are made. This style can be used when the employees are able to analyze the situation and decide what needs to be done and how to do it. Leaders cannot do everything – an effective leader must set priorities and delegate certain tasks. This is not a style to be used so that leaders can blame others when things go wrong. Instead, this is a style to be used when a leader can fully trust and has confidence in the people below them. Delegating work to others can be done, but it must be done sensibly.

Leadership vs Management

Even though I am studying Leadership in Criminal Justice, leadership and managerial styles can and will work the same no matter the workplace setting. You, as a leader or manager, will want to tweak it a bit to best fit your situation and workers. In an article written for the National Institute of Justice it talks about the four (4) different supervisory styles and which one is actually the best one to use for overall effectiveness. It also shows the average age of the supervisors, amount of knowledge of the job, amount of training they have gone through and what they found to be best per policemen as far as supervisory procedures and mentoring. The article says that for younger patrolmen a different type of supervisory style is needed that wouldn't be used on someone that had been on the force for a while. The four styles talked about are listed as traditional, innovative, supportive, and active. (Police Supervisory Styles, 2003)

While traditional supervisors like the traditional, they are not adverse to change as long as it follows along the same like as how they are used to managing. They like seeing numbers because numbers means productivity and results. They like hardcopy paperwork but with the way the economy and the environment are today, and everyone wanting to go paperless the traditional are having a hard time letting go of the familiar. They are more likely to manage vice lead and because of their gruff nature and strict adherence to rules and regulations they are also more likely to reprimand their workers than praise them for job well done.

The article goes on to talk about the rest of the styles, how well it may or may not work with their subordinates and the pros and cons of each style Today's leader needs to have an active presence with their subordinates. They need to lead by example and this not only helps the workers but it also helps the leaders and managers keep their skills sharp. How can you expect to effectively lead or manage a group of individuals if you have no idea what they are doing? Delegating jobs and authority is fine but you have to be wise about it, and still be willing to accept responsibility for all outcomes, good or bad. Accept responsibility where there is blame to be placed, and tell the workers "job well done" when the higher levels are happy. They also need to be willing to step in and fill the gaps when someone is out sick or they just need an extra body to do the job. Managers lose sight of the big picture when all they do is hand out assignments (if necessary) and not check back. This is how ineffective managers get caught up with the finger-pointing and blame naming. Effective leaders and managers need to step up or pass the job to someone else.

Can leadership be taught? Or is it something someone is born with it? Luckily they are made or we would fall short in that category. Leadership is not a gift of genetics but a combination of knowledge, personality and habit – all of which we learn from our parents, siblings, schoolwork, teachers, friends and other experiences in our lives. Leaders have moral courage, strong wills and a concept of responsibility. They have a great deal of confidence, self-discipline and the ability to let others participate in the decision-making process. Most of us have the potential to be a leader in some point in

our lives whether it be family, church or neighborhood. Even if we are not an appointed leader all the time, but on the occasion we are able to stick our necks out and provide leadership we inherently do. (Leadership, Edward Tully)

In order for us to have effective leaders in this world we would have to have leadership teachers or people that can teach effective leadership skills. The military knows that in order to instill good core values in a person and to teach them to think and work as a team and not an individual then they can achieve anything. The fact that we are lead to understand that leadership can be taught also means that someone wants to learn how to be a leader and that individuals believe that leadership training can help them become leaders. In the Center for Creative Leadership, they operate on the belief that developing leaders relates to the “whole person.” Meaning the Center believes that to develop your leadership skills and realize their full potential as a leader one must first come to terms with character, ego, and upbringing. While the “human dimension” (people who have the human touch) of leadership certainly seems to associate strongly with effective leaders, this kind of information comes to many people as not really applicable to their job requirements. (Gunn, 2000)

Management

A manager, by definition, is someone that directs what is already in place. They do not lead, they do not mentor. They are there to see that everything runs smoothly, that the work is done correctly and on time. How is this different from leading? For starters, leaders make people want to follow them. Management controls or directs people and resources in a group according to values or guidelines that have already been in place. (Leadership and Management, 2008) Managers aren't interested in being leaders. They are not interested in their subordinate's personal or professional lives. Management controls what is in place to maintain the status quo. The traditional term of manager or management talks about a set of activities and the people involved in four general areas, including planning, organizing, leading and coordinating activities. While people think that the way managers have been doing their job is outdated; they should be more hands on, more facilitating, more focus on leadership skills. Some feel that is isn't so much a change in the managerial functions but rather it is “re-emphasizing certain aspects of management”. (Management and Leadership, 2009)

Management Styles

A manager is somebody who is in charge of managing the effectiveness of a business or a team of people. Management styles can cover many possibilities, and as a result various management styles has been discussed for centuries as they are ever changing. Even as our ancestors were trying to make fire, there would have been one individual telling the others how to strike their flint effectively and then wondering how they could get this out to their neighbors. Management styles have without a doubt been written about since man first started making images on cave walls. Truly successful managers know that different situations and different individual personality styles

require different management styles. Even sports coaches know that in order for their team to win a major championship will require a different type of motivation than one that is fighting to survive being cut from their division.

Effective managers adjust their management styles to suit the circumstances that they encounter, and if possible anticipate them before they actually happen – be proactive and not reactive. However, some people are unable to manage that way and find themselves stuck in one style and possibly managed by their supposed subordinates. There are two styles of management that go to the extreme. These styles are called authoritarian management and participative management. The authoritarian management style is viewed as a set of rules that go to their system and the absolute expectation of obedience to their authority. An excellent example of a well established authoritarian management style is the military chain of command structure, where decisions come from the top down, with each layer of command being clearly defined and passing on orders and insisting on and getting absolute acceptance of those instructions. Outside of that military structure, any manager who takes absolute control of a workplace situation, without input to their team's thoughts and ideas would be exhibiting the authoritarian management style.

The participative management style exists in a place where the workers will allow themselves to be organized, but are willing to accept responsibility for what they do or don't do, and are actively engaged in process improvement, goal setting and performance monitoring. The role of the manager is to facilitate rather than instruct the work of the employees and the employees will participate in the decision making process with their superiors. (Management, 2008)

So the question remains: is leading different from managing? The answer is yes; leading is different than the planning, organizing and coordinating of management because leading is focused on persuading people while the other functions are focused on the resources needed to make the operation work in addition to the people. But that difference is not enough to argue that leading is different than managing any more than one can say that planning is different than managing or organizing is different than managing. To make this statement that leading is different than managing can perhaps The statement that leading is different than managing and the ways that these assertions are made — can tend to make people think that the actions of planning, organizing and coordinating are somehow less important than leading. The claim to this can also convince others that they are better or more gifted leaders who can ignore the simple activities of planning, organizing and coordinating. Managing is just as important as leading – provided everyone concerned remember the common focus is the mission at hand. Leadership combined with management manages to utilize both positive energies and with it sets a new direction and manages the assets to achieve it.

To be an effective manager one needs to maintain quality of work to accommodate your customers. Those in the company should also share the same vision, with all employees understanding the features and aspects with the same understanding. The

mission of the company should always focus on constant improvement and effective job performance. You can properly manage this aspect by creating measurable and proven points that will guide your employees and will help maintain your management skills. Some of the efforts included in your company should promote originality and ingenuity. Thinking out of the box is important to maintain and improve quality so your products and service stay competitive in the market.

You need to generate a dependable system that you and your employees can look to especially during new situations and stressful conditions. Everyone in the company should be given sufficient training on stress management and time management so that they can finish the company task in a productive way. The system needs to be good enough to generate competition among suppliers to enhance performance. You can get good management skills training from both experience and by taking formal classes. You will also find web sites offering lectures and online courses which could be free or for a nominal fee. You get to choose the lessons you want to take, as well as the significant points you may want to take for more coverage. There are probably a few campuses where you can attend in person too. You can use your own business or company for comparison and learn how to run it more efficiently.

Check and see how your system works with the existing demands of the market and if you can properly perform your job to ensure that all employees are functioning to their full potential. Good management skills should continue to improve over time, so always make it a point to update your knowledge and information. Talk to other professionals in the field, especially those who are in the same industry. Discuss the different systems and approaches you are using to expand and perfect the business to new heights. (Management Skills, 2009)

Conclusion

As we work our way through life, each of us on our own career path to greatness, we on occasion will be both a leader and a manager. Some people are better leaders than managers, some vice versa. There is no right choice in life about which we should be. As time goes on, society and the environment will actually choose for us. Some jobs call for excellent leadership, and some call for management. It is up to us to be the best we can no matter which one we pick. Do not be in a position of mediocrity; if you choose to be a leader, then be the best you can. Should you choose a life of middle or upper management, excel there. But you choose either one and only do half the job you are not only cheating yourself but your subordinates. People in our society look up to those in positions of power, leadership, and management and should those individuals in those positions of power not do the job properly then they are letting society down. Elected officials were put there for a reason; and for them to not come through on their campaign promises or do their best they can for their constituents then we are all getting short changed.

Leadership is about doing the right thing all the time without regard to personal gain. No matter the cost. I think American's for the most part have forgotten what true leadership is all about. They prefer to be managers – and not very good ones at that. They are so willing to pass the buck and put the blame on someone else then they are the ones in the position to do the right thing and they chose not to. If our founding fathers were here to day I wonder how they would feel about those we have in office. Our elected officials have forgotten the true definition of leadership. They are actually performing like managers – maintaining the status quo until their time is up. But true leaders like George Washing and Abraham Lincoln knew their true calling in shaping our nation into greatness. And so far our “leaders” are acting more like managers and making us the laughing stock of other countries.

Being a manager is a fine thing. As long as those that choose that route remember they are managers and still have a responsibility to provide their subordinates with a small amount of insight as to what the job entails. Managers still have a responsibility to ensure the job gets done right and on time, regardless if they delegated or not. Delegation is fine but one must remember where the buck stops – with the manager or management team. A poor manager also reflects badly on their bosses. If this person is such a poor manager why is he still in management? What are the higher ups thinking? They must not have much pride in what they do or in their profession to let someone as ineffectual as this manager still holding a position of power with the ability to reside over the subordinate's performance evaluations. Effective managers need to be more informed than their workers. They must have professional and organizational knowledge, they must know what their bosses above them want and the mission for the business. They must be able to handle complex situations whereas leadership needs to be able to handle change.

Some people do not realize when they take these jobs as management that a lot is to be expected of them. Should they fall short of the job they were hired to do, they will not be respected or taken seriously by their subordinates or bosses. And those managers who are micromanaged by their bosses have a tendency to feel frustrated by the fact that they are not allowed to do their job and may either leave for better opportunities or stay because there aren't any. Leaders need to also recognize their manager's positions within the firm and let them do what they do best. A good leader will be well aware of what their managers can and cannot do, and what they are doing. Good Leadership has an ear to the ground at all times and nothing should get by them, just as a good manager should never be surprised by what their subordinates are up to. Good leadership and good management can go hand in hand to effectively get the job done, get done right, and keep the stockholders in the black.

References

Acquiring Good Management Skills, October 2009

<http://www.easymanagementskills.com>

Basic Skills in Management and Leadership, 2009
Free Management Library
<http://www.managementhelp.org>

“Can Leadership be Taught?”
Gunn, Bob, Strategic Finance, December 2001
<http://www.allbusiness.com/finance>

Leadership and Management, 2008
Team Technology
<http://www.teamtechnology.co.uk>

Leadership Styles, August 2008
Performance, Learning, Leadership, & Knowledge Site, US Army Handbook, 1973
<http://www.nwlink.com>

Level Three Leadership: Getting Below the Surface, 4th Edition
Clawson, James G., 2009

Management Styles, 2008
<http://www.managementstyle.net>
On Leadership
Zeeb, Ron, The Heritage Institute

Responsibility, Leadership, Public Trust – Tough Words
Tully, Edward

Police Supervisory Styles, June 2003
U.S. Dept of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>

“What is Leadership?”
Proactive Leadership in the 21st Century, 2004
<http://www.leadershiphelp.com>