Barth's distinction is that there are two types of people: those who divide people into two types and those who don't.¹ This distinction is an appropriate one for the study of leadership, a field which consists of many dichotomies. Distinctions are made between leaders and subordinates, and appointed leaders and emergent leaders; between leadership and supervision, and management and leadership; and between leaders who are autocratic or democratic, boss-centered or subordinate-centered, and social-emotional or task-oriented.

The purpose of this paper is to focus on one of these distinctions: management as opposed to leadership. The literature on management indicates that only one aspect of management is concerned with leadership, and the leadership literature indicates little that is concerned with management. However, a review of literature on what managers actually do shows that aspects of management and leadership intertwine in the job of the supervisor. In focusing on the manager/leader distinction I will be concentrating on individuals who are appointed managers or leaders in a formal organization. This eliminates concern with emergent (informal) leaders and nonorganizational settings.

**MANAGEMENT**

In answer to the question, "What does a manager do?" the management literature is likely to contain some form of the acronym POSDCORB, which stands for:

Planning, that is, working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;
Organizing, that is, the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated for the defined objective;
Staffing, that is, the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;
Directing, that is, the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instruction, and serving as leader of their enterprise;
Coordinating, that is, the all-important duty of interrelating the various parts of the work;
Reporting, that is, keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and subordinates informed through records, research, and inspection; and
Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting, and control.²

This description, or variations of it, has appeared in the management literature since the early 1900s and represents what managers should do. POSDCORB is based on managers’ reflections about their jobs, and on attitude questionnaires administered and analyzed by scholars. Interestingly, only one of these seven aspects of a manager’s job mentions leadership: the directing function includes decision-making, giving orders and overall leadership of the organization. A quick reading of the management literature gives the impression that leadership is a small component in the overall task of management. This traditional view of the manager’s job draws heavily on measuring the end result in appraising performance. There is a tendency to add up wins and losses and assume that the manager is responsible for everything. This has led to the analogy of the manager as a symphony orchestra conductor, standing aloof on his platform while controlling the performance of the orchestra members.³ Later in this paper I will stress the differences between what the literature says a manager should do and what managers actually do, and the difficulty in separating leadership actions from other aspects of managing. First, however, we need to take a brief look at the leadership literature.

LEADERSHIP

Leadership has traditionally been viewed as a subpart of managing and usually is defined in terms of influence. In a review of leadership research covering the period 1902-67, Stogdill found that almost all definitions suggest that leadership is an influence process.⁴ A large body of research has concentrated on this influence process as it applies to face-to-face interactions between superiors and subordinates.
This research has been concerned with how superiors influence subordinates. For example, one study focused on the sources of power available to the leader in influencing followers. In a review of this power-influence process, Cartwright cites the following scheme developed by French and Raven:

Reward power is based on P's* belief that O has the ability to mediate rewards for him. . . .
Coercive power is based on P's belief that O has the ability to mediate punishments for him. . . .
Referent power is based on P's identification with O. . . .
Legitimate power is based on internalized values in P which dictate that O has a right to influence P and that P has an obligation to accept that influence. . . .
Expert power is based on P's belief that O has some special knowledge or expertness. 5

The more sources of power leaders have at their disposal, the more potential they have for influencing subordinates.

It is apparent that some of these sources of power stem from abilities and traits of the leader (i.e., expert and referent) and others from the situation in which the leader operates (i.e., does he or she possess the authority to hire, fire, give raises, etc.). Approaches to leadership based on the above scheme address the issue in terms of individual abilities and traits versus situational factors. Psychologists and sociologists have developed both trait theories and contingency theories of leadership. The trait theories attempt to identify personal characteristics of effective leaders that could be used in screening candidates for leadership positions. The contingency theories attempt to specify the conditions under which certain leader styles or behaviors are most effective. 6 Leadership research relies on a variety of methods, but laboratory studies focusing on specific aspects of leader behavior (i.e., how often an individual talks) and attitude surveys of leaders and their subordinates are the most common. Other papers in these proceedings will elaborate on alternate approaches to leadership study.

Leadership literature also treats leader effectiveness. The assumption has been made (though it has not been well tested) that by identifying personal traits associated with effectiveness and increasing our understanding of situational factors that influence effectiveness, an individual's leadership performance can be improved. In summary, leadership research has focused primarily on the face-to-face influence process between superior and subordinates and has attempted to identify personal and situational characteristics that enhance leader effectiveness.

* P denotes the agent subjected to influence and O denotes the agent exerting influence.
THE MANAGEMENT/LEADERSHIP DISTINCTION

I take the position of a person, to use Barth’s distinction, that does not divide people into two types, and consequently argue that the manager/leader distinction is an artificial one that stands in the way of understanding the true nature of effective management, leadership or supervision. A cursory review of management literature indicates that leadership is only one aspect of the manager’s job, and includes directing, making decisions and giving orders. In other words, leadership is directly influencing the individuals who comprise the organization. Leadership literature indicates that this influencing occurs in face-to-face interactions between leaders and followers. I suggest that, first, motivating and influencing others can and does occur in other than face-to-face superior/subordinate situations, and second, people tend to view a boss’s job as a whole and typically do not distinguish between managerial and leadership aspects.

Each of the management functions has aspects that serve to influence individuals in the organization and thus overlaps the power-influence concept of leadership. Organizing, for example, involves work subdivisions and formal structure. In recent years considerable research has been done on job design and its impact on the performance and satisfaction of the individual performing that job. The organizational structure can also influence performance of individuals. For example, Sayles suggests that: “The intragroup contacts between subordinates in a given managerial unit should be self-maintaining. That is, if the organization structure is correctly designed to facilitate the reintegration of division of jobs, subordinates act largely on the basis of stimuli provided by fellow subordinates.” (Italics added.)

Each of the leadership sources of power-influence has aspects that are part of the manager’s job in other than the leader/follower relationship. Managers have to influence peers (other managers at the same level in the organization) as well as their bosses. The ability to help (reward) or not to help (punish) a peer can have an impact on the manager’s performance in coordinating, staffing and reporting. Therefore, the many sources of power and influence that a leader can use with subordinates can also be used with peers and superiors in carrying out the management functions.

This suggests that the manager/leader dichotomy becomes blurred in practice. A person tends to be viewed as effective or ineffective in performing the job. It is very seldom that someone is said to be a good manager but a poor leader. In a study of chief executive officers, Mintzberg concluded that: “Leadership permeates all activities; its importance would be underestimated if it were judged in terms of the proportion of
a manager’s activities that are strictly related to leadership. . . . In virtually everything he does, the manager’s actions are screened by subordinates searching for leadership clues."³⁹

In summary, how a manager/leader designs jobs, organizes the structure of her or his unit, and influences peers and superiors has an impact on the individuals in that unit. To attempt to relate some of this impact to leadership and some to management is difficult and may not be useful in an attempt to increase understanding of our jobs.

NATURE OF A MANAGER’S JOB

In order to determine the skills and abilities necessary for effective job performance of managers, it is helpful to review what is known about the nature of a manager’s work and the task demands placed on managers. The previous review of traditional management functions was based primarily upon survey research and interview methods of study. During the past several years, researchers have been reexamining these traditional assumptions by actually observing managers on the job or by having managers keep detailed diaries of their activities. Several characteristics of managerial work emerge from the results of these studies¹⁰ that are helpful in identifying important managerial skills.

Managers are busy and work long hours. A manager’s work week is typically between fifty and ninety hours. Those managers who work longer hours tend to be in higher-ranking positions in their organizations. Little free time is available and because of the open-ended nature of their jobs, they have a tendency to take work home.

Activities performed by managers are characterized by brevity, variety and fragmentation. Studies of activity rates (in which a new activity is recorded every time the manager changes the medium of his or her work, i.e., from meetings to telephone calls, tours, desk work, etc.) show as many as 500 activities per day for a foreman, and as few as 30 per day for a chief executive.

A foreman’s activities range in length from a few seconds to two minutes. Higher-level managers average about nine minutes per activity. There is great variety in the activities performed and the trivial are interspersed with the important, requiring the manager to shift moods quickly and frequently. Interruptions and unplanned contacts are commonplace. Studies of top-level managers indicate that fifty to seventy such interruptions a day are not unusual. As a result, managers spend very little time alone. Studies indicate that executives average between one-half and one and one-half hours a day working alone, but this time is divided into brief periods of ten to fifteen minutes each. One study showed that an executive remained undisturbed at his desk for twenty-three minutes or more only twelve times in thirty-five days.
Verbal and written contacts are the manager’s work. There are five discrete types of activity in which a manager engages: mail (or other paperwork), telephone, unscheduled or informal meetings, scheduled meetings, and inspection tours or visits.

Mail and paperwork take 22-36 percent of a manager’s time. The manager generates much less mail than he or she receives and most of it is in response to incoming mail. The telephone is used for brief conversations and while it consumes a small proportion of a manager’s time, it enables a manager to handle a large number of individual contacts. One study found that 36 percent of a manager’s contacts were via the telephone. The scheduled meeting consumes more time than any other managerial activity — up to 60 percent. These meetings permit contacts of long duration with large groups of people. The manager’s work is primarily oral. Studies indicate that 75-90 percent of a higher-level manager’s time is spent in oral communication.

Information is a basic ingredient and contacts are all-important. There is strong support for the notion that the manager’s major function is gathering information, and this activity may consume between 25 and 50 percent of the manager’s time. In considering the process of getting information and passing it on to others, the total time spent on this activity exceeds 50 percent. Managers spend only 5-14 percent of their time making decisions and giving orders.

The manager has been likened to the neck of an hourglass, standing between his unit and a network of contacts. These contacts include superiors, peers and others who serve to inform the manager. Evidence indicates that as a person moves up the management hierarchy, the amount of time spent with individuals outside the manager’s work group increases to one-half of his or her total working time. The majority of contacts outside the work group are with peers. Managers typically spend only 10-25 percent of their time with superiors.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING

At least two implications for management training can be drawn from the characteristics of a manager’s job. The first concerns time management. Does a manager control the job or does the job control the manager? Current findings leave this issue unresolved. Some researchers believe that brevity, fragmentation and unplanned interruptions are the result of a flow of activities beyond the manager’s control. They maintain that the manager has no choice but to respond to this flow. Others believe that managers thrive on and encourage interruptions and frequent changes of activities that lead to inefficient use of time, and argue that managers can do a better job of controlling how their time is spent. Given the large number of hours managers spend on the job and the open-ended nature of their work, training in time management should be of value.
The second implication concerns the amount of time managers spend in scheduled meetings. Studies show that managers may spend up to 60 percent of their time meeting regularly with other members of their organization. This suggests two potential training topics. First, training in the timing of meetings may be of value. Personal experiences tell us that many meetings are unnecessary. Often information can be obtained and issues resolved without formal meetings. Second, training in how to run a meeting may be useful. If considerable time is to be spent in meetings, effective leadership to improve the functioning of the group would be helpful.

In summary, improvement in at least three skill areas would be beneficial to a manager: training in time management, in the timing of meetings, and in effective management of meetings. Following are guides to this training taken from literature in the administrative sciences.

**Time Management**

An effective, straightforward approach to time management which can be done on an individual basis is keeping a diary. By keeping a diary of activities for a week or more, a manager can get immediate and direct feedback on how time is being spent. The diary should include type, duration and content of each activity and should be easy to fill out. It can provide information for answering such questions as:

1. Am I giving adequate attention to current activities, to reviewing the past and to planning for the future?
2. Am I dividing my time correctly between different aspects of my job? Is there, perhaps, one part of my job on which I spend too much time?
3. Have I allowed for the effects of changes which have taken place in the content of my job, my objective and in the organization of my work?
4. Am I doing work I ought to have delegated?
5. Who are the people I ought to be seeing? Am I spending too much or too little time with any of them?
6. Do I organize my working day and week according to priorities, or do I tend to deal with each problem as it turns up, without stopping to think whether there is something more important that I should be working on?
7. Am I able to complete a task or am I constantly interrupted? If the latter, are these interruptions an essential part of my work?11
As the studies of managers reviewed earlier in this paper indicate, much of a manager’s time may not be controlled by the manager. This is all the more reason for a manager to look at how time is spent so that time within the manager’s control can be used effectively.

When to Have a Meeting

In their approach to managerial decision-making, Victor Vroom and Philip Yetton provide a rational basis for answering the question, “Should I have a meeting?”12 Their approach is based on the assumption that managers want to: (1) make good decisions, (2) have acceptance of their decision and a commitment to carry out the decision on the part of subordinates, and (3) minimize the time it takes to make a decision.

Below is the Vroom and Yetton model illustrating a structured approach to determining which type of decision-making method is most appropriate for a particular situation. Obviously, not all formal meetings a manager attends are solely for the purpose of problem-solving or decision-making. However, this model provides descriptions of a range of approaches to information-gathering as well as decision-making, and a set of diagnostic questions to guide the manager in deciding whether to have a meeting or make individual contacts with others in his or her unit. These following five approaches vary from autocratic to participative and represent a wide range of management styles.

(AI)* You solve the problem or make the decision yourself, using information available to you at that time.

(AII) You obtain the necessary information from your subordinates, then decide on the solution to the problem yourself. You may or may not tell your subordinates what the problem is in getting the information from them. The role played by your subordinates in making the decision is clearly one of providing the necessary information to you, rather than generating or evaluating alternative solutions.

(CI) You share the problem with relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together as a group. Then you make the decision which may or may not reflect your subordinates’ influence.

(CII) You share the problem with your subordinates as a group, collectively obtaining their ideas and suggestions. Then you make the decision which may or may not reflect your subordinates’ influence.

* The first letter of the symbol signifies the basic approach. A stands for autocratic, C for consultative, G for group. The roman numerals I and II represent individual and group approaches, respectively.
(GII) You share a problem with your subordinates as a group. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution. Your role is much like that of chairman. You do not try to influence the group to adopt your solution and you are willing to accept and implement any solution which has the support of the entire group.¹³

Vroom and Yetton present seven diagnostic questions and a flow-chart (see Figure 1) to aid the manager in deciding which of the five decision-making styles is the most effective approach. To use the flow-chart, begin at the left side and ask the question in column A. If the answer is "no," proceed to column D. If the answer is "yes," move to column B, and so on. When a particular branch terminates the recommended management style is found.

How to Run a Meeting

Research indicates that there are two goals of group problem-solving: (1) achievement of a specific group task, and (2) maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. Leadership of the group is described in terms of task orientation and social-emotional orientation.¹⁴ An extensive review of the literature on group leadership shows that:

1. task-oriented leadership is necessary for effective performance in all working groups;
2. acceptance of task-oriented leadership requires that the leader allow others to respond by giving feedback, making objections and questioning the leader;
3. social-emotional leadership orientation is required in addition to task-oriented leadership when groups are not engaged in satisfying or ego-involving tasks;
4. groups requiring both kinds of leadership behavior will be more effective when these behaviors are performed by one person rather than divided among two or more persons; and
5. when formally appointed leaders fail to perform behaviors required for group success, an informal leader will emerge and perform the necessary behaviors, provided that success is desired by the group members.¹⁵

These findings suggest that effective group functioning calls for some form of participative leadership on the part of the formal leader.

Maier suggests that effectiveness of meetings can be increased when leaders are trained to engage in the following leader behaviors: (1) sharing of information with members; (2) preventing dominant personalities
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from having undue influence; (3) soliciting opinions, facts and feelings from reticent members; (4) assisting members in communicating with each other; (5) protecting deviant opinions from being rejected without fair evaluation; (6) minimizing blame-oriented statements; (7) redirecting unfocused discussion back to the problems; (8) encouraging alternative solutions; (9) delaying the evaluation of alternatives until all have been presented; and (10) guiding the process of the selection of the best alternative.\footnote{16} It is evident from this list of behaviors that a participative leader does not abdicate the role of leadership. The role of the participative leader is one of obtaining relevant information, expertise and commitment to implementation of the chosen solution.

**SUMMARY**

This paper began with a brief review of the traditional views of management and leadership and suggested that a distinction between them was not helpful in understanding the task of motivating, supervising or managing subordinates. Management and leadership roles are so intertwined in practice that only an understanding of the nature of the manager's task demands can provide clues to the skills necessary for effective management/leadership. A review of findings about the nature of a manager's job suggests at least three skill areas that managers should master: (1) management of time, (2) timing of meetings, and (3) how to run a meeting. Specific findings from research in these areas along with guidelines for training were provided.
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