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Abstract: Despite abundance of the literature, there is still much ambiguity regarding the distinction between management and leadership. The purpose of the article is to examine the main paradigms and their evolution over time, in order to establish sets of skills and specific activities for managers and leaders. A critical analysis of the management and leadership literature is realized, from Plato to the present day. The article contributes to a better understanding of the differences and the commonalities between leadership and management, offering to managers new solutions on how to approach the activities which they perform.
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1. Meanings of “management” and “leadership” terms

Leading people was a fundamental concern since ancient times. Great philosophers have addressed this problem of mankind, dedicating lots of volumes to this issue. But, over the ages, thinking about management and leadership has evolved so much, acquiring new values and meanings in the last hundred years. Although the art of leading people was perennial object of study, and management and leadership literature is more than rich, or perhaps because of such reasons, things are still not very clear. Distinction between management and leadership is still generating ambiguity, all of these in times when management has an extremely important role.

Distinction between management and leadership is now accepted by many authors in this field. However, there are still many controversies on the two concepts, especially because, semantically, they do not differentiate very clearly,
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even in English, who re-created and imposed them. It is therefore necessary to
analyse the historical, linguistic and content of the two terms in order to identify
the manager's and the leader's tasks.

Initially, the modern literature treated the management from the perspective of
what today we mean by “general management” of the company, with the focus of
specific tasks needed to be fulfilled to ensure business success. Since 1916, Fayol\(^1\)
classified these tasks into five main categories: planning, organization, command,
coordination and control, each in turn comprising a number of specific activities.

The terms of “manager” and “leadership” have been used for a long time
alternatively by designating the person who is responsible for the performance of
organization. Subsequently, control and coordination have been identified as
responsibilities of leadership, which was still regarded as a primary task of
general management\(^2\). Now, management tasks are the same.

Differentiation between the two concepts appears in studies made by Zaleznik\(^3\)
and Burns\(^4\). They separated leadership from management, which was presented as
an insipid activity, unimaginative, mostly tactical, and incapable to guarantee
alone the success of the company. Leadership instead was a highly praised
concept, essential to business success, so favoured than management\(^5\). Currently,
many authors support the differentiation between management and leadership,
even if the base of this distinction is not very clear\(^6\). However, a trend in which
the authors deal with management and leadership as an integrated whole still
exist, following the conception of those who founded the management literature,
such as Barnard, Fayol and Follett.

In management and leadership literature it appears that both terms concern the
overall success of the company. However, some authors have noticed a
discrepancy between the significance of the two concepts and their assigned role
in obtaining performance in organizations. At the same time, many debates were
held constantly, regarding the role and significance of management and
leadership, but not conclusively and widely accepted in finding an answer for this
issue. It is one of them more important than the other, and if so, to what extent?
Are these two concepts mutually exclusive or complementary? Here are questions
that still seek an answer. The interest is particularly higher in the current global
crisis conditions, in which any information relating to the role and place of
management and leadership is extremely important among both researchers and
practitioners.
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\(^3\) Zaleznik Abraham, *Managers and leaders: are they different?*, Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1977


Management and leadership existed and they were practiced in all the organizing forms of humanity, from the earliest times. However, documented knowledge about leadership and management is relatively new\(^7\). Miriam Grace shows that the root word of “leadership” comes from Greek and Latin and dates before the year 800, while the root word of management comes from French and management is much more recent date, appearing around 1598\(^8\). Grace says that the concept of management of people had appeared in texts in 1809, 30 years before the word “leadership”. In the twentieth century, the two concepts have been associated with the discipline of management and leadership. Grace claims that in the beginning “lead” meant to “cause or go along with oneself, to bring a person or animal to a place”. There is a distinction between “leading” and “execution” and this difference appears even in Plato’s writings, who said that knowing what to do and doing are different things.

In linguistic terms, the word “leadership” implies, in according with Grace, a hierarchical position and includes the relationship between leader and subordinates, so that among the term’s meaning was included the concepts of influence or domination. A similar view had authors such as Bernard\(^9\), Zaleznik\(^10\), Bennis and Nanus\(^11\), Kotter\(^12\), Novicevic\(^13\), which described leaders as superior persons related to people in subordinate positions. Since 1933, Follett defined leadership as a personal quality that can be exercised by many people, not just top executives\(^14\). She continued saying that the higher the person is in the hierarchy, the more quality is required, especially in terms of the “total situation”. According to Follett, the total situation includes fragmented facts, present and potential, aims, purposes, people, experiences and desires, from which the leader has to find a unifying whole, seeing the relations between all the different parts. It is known that the higher the person is in the hierarchy, the more abilities are required, because there is a wide range of facts from which he must extract the relationships. At the same time, Follett stresses the changing nature of these abilities, as dictated by the situation, to ensure the success of the company.

The term of “manager” was initially used in association with a person who handles horses\(^15\). Later, it appear in the texts relating to the British Houses of
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Parliament, describing “a member of a committee appointed by one house to confer with a similar committee in the other house”, illustrating a change of meaning. In modern times, a number of authors such as Taylor (1911), Church and Alfred (1912), Sheldon (1923), Babbage (1832), Barnard (1938), Follett (1925, 1933), Drucker (1955), Simon (1962), O’Connor (2000), Humphreys and Einstein (2003), Ghosh (2005), Wren (2005) argued that management requires special skills to cope people who have their own will\textsuperscript{16}. And people should be treated as individuals who can contribute to the welfare of the organization, instead of try to lead them by fear, as businessmen did in the pre-Renaissance period.

Although the academic attempts to give as much information as possible to practitioners about management and leadership, many leaders and managers still prefer to rely more on personal experience than scientific knowledge\textsuperscript{17}, that once again expresses the mislead or the ambiguity experienced by the managers and leaders in front of the avalanche of theories and approaches in this field. Currently, the terms “leadership” and “management” are often used alternative, as authors as Fayol (1916), Follett (1925), Barnard (1938), Kent (2001, 2005), Novicevic (2005), Wren (2005) did\textsuperscript{18}. As well, Grace argues, in agreement these authors that in organizations the “management” and “leadership” are basically the same thing. Although there are a lot of studies and approaches arguing that leadership and management are identical terms, several authors also relevant in this area have expressed different views on the distinction between the two concepts, among them reminding Zaleznik\textsuperscript{19}, Burns\textsuperscript{20} and Kotter\textsuperscript{21}.

John R. Darling and Raimo Nurmi\textsuperscript{22} analysed the two concepts in terms of meanings, in order to clarify and deeper understanding them. In English, the word “management” suggests usually aspects of efficiency, planning, paper work, procedures, regulations, control and consistency. On the other hand, “leadership” is associated with aspects of vision, creativity and risk-taking. This distinction is shared by several authors who consider that, while the performance in management involves activities related to control, the leadership is based on a choice of values and thus it is a value-laden activity\textsuperscript{23}.

Both concepts “management” and “management” passed through major semantic changes and have made a career mainly in the twentieth century with

\textsuperscript{16} Nienaber Hester, Conceptualisation of Management and Leadership, Management Decision, 48(5), 2010
\textsuperscript{17} Rousseau Denise M., Is there such a thing as evidence-based management?, Academy of Management Review, 31(2), 2006
\textsuperscript{19} Zaleznik Abraham, Managers and leaders: are they different?, Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1977
\textsuperscript{20} Burns James M., Leadership, Harper and Row, New York, 1978
\textsuperscript{22} Darling John R., Nurmi Raimo W., Key contemporary paradigms of management and leadership, European Business Review, 21(3), 2009
English-language literature. Since there are many difficulties in other languages translation, explaining the original meaning and the evolution of both words throughout the time can help clarify the differences between them. English word “management” has Latin origin. The root is “manus” (hand). With the transformation of Latin into Italian, “maneggiare” generally had a training horses meaning. Shakespeare also used this word in two ways: the first is horse training, and the second is trickery and deceitful contrivance. After the industrial revolution and especially in America the term “management” began have been used with today generally accepted meaning. On the other hand, “leadership” comes from the old German language. Its root is the verb “Ladan”, meaning to travel or to go forward. Therefore, the original meaning of the word leader is showing the way with traveling, going in front of a convoy of people.

It have to be mentioned also the Latin terms that have been used in similar ways over time, such as: “ducere”/“Dux”/“ductus” (meaning the manage/manager/management), words remained in human memory related to Mussolini, who named himself “Il Duce”; “gestion” which has correspondent in most of modern Latin languages, and having the closest meaning by “management”; “dirigere” (to direct); and “administre” (the original meaning were to serve). Also German language has a notable contribution in the evolution of management and leadership concepts, mentioning terms like “Leitung”/“Leiter” and “Führung”/“Führer”, corresponding to the management and leadership. “Leitung” seems to be much more bureaucratic and less frequently used, while “Führung” is more charismatic, closer to the leadership, but also used less frequently because of its association with Hitler. In German there are many words used especially in business language, but they are not precisely identical with the consecrated terms of management and leadership.

Every language has its own terms to describe the concepts of management and leadership, but certainly not all of them can illustrate the universal distinction between management and leadership. Therefore, this issue is still far from being clarified. There are many cultural differences and national approaches of the two concepts. Leadership is quintessentially an American concept and an American phenomenon; it is not such a major issue even in the UK. Since the Western Europe countries have in parallel their own terms for management and leadership, which are not necessarily identical, those words have been used interchangeably.
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with the terms imported from English, without manifesting the overseas leadership fever. This explaining incursion should not be regarded not only as an exercise, but as an intercession to highlight the overall direction and thinking differences that accompanied over time the concepts of leadership and management. It is an attempt to eliminate misunderstandings about them, because a proper understanding of these concepts can help today's managers and leaders to know better what is their role’s requiring and what is expected from them.

2. Models and paradigms of management and leadership in literature

2.1. Ancient foundations of leadership thinking

At an assessment of leadership studies by previous authors, it can be seen that reporting to the classic writings is minor. Nevertheless, it is generally accepted by many researchers that all Western thinking is based on administrative principles described by the ancient thinkers. Plato's influence on Western thinking is enormous. There are many contemporary philosophers and academics who often claim that philosophy after Plato is just remarks on Plato’s work. Thus, the roots of Western administrative thinking are found in Plato’s and Aristotle’s writings. Although some of them had lost the relevance in time, these two philosophers will always remain extremely important as thinkers and as sources of ideas.

According to Takala, Plato was the first thinker who presented systematically a political and administrative model, in order to establish the life in the ideal state (polis). The purpose (telos) of such a state is to educate people to be “good”. Thus, the state has rather a moral function in people's lives. In Plato’s conception, the state is like the human body, in which different parties complement each other and act in harmony. Saying this, Plato himself is an early pre-modern functionalist of organizational theory. What is missing in Plato’s theory is the approach of the organizational conflicts.

In Polis (The Republic), Plato states that politicians should act as leaders of the new ideal state, because they really have the knowledge (“episteme”) about what is “the Form of Good” and which are goals of the state. They also have the ability to rule in accordance with these goals. But in a later dialogue, Politikos (The Politics), Plato does not speak any more about the forms in which the ideal state must be ruled. Instead, he believes that “the art of leading people” (leadership) can be reached and based on scientific principles. This art is like the art of navigation, which can be learned. Political science, which is more than an individual art,
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dealing with the creating laws by “weaving these individual arts in a unified whole”. But a just politician, who knows political science and has also fortitude, is rare. Therefore, it is better that the laws stand over the politicians and they must act according to law.

In *The Republic*, Plato develops his conception on the leader’s tasks in an ideal state. At least two tasks can be assumed as belonging to the leader. The first one is to control the implementation of the education and the second is to control the propagation of thoughts. The functions of these state’s controllers are very significant, so that the controllers must be philosophers. In Plato's view, leaders are not ordinary human beings, but they belong to the world of the gods. Therefore, Plato sets the border between the rulers and the ruled people, conferring mystical abilities to the leaders, which are likened to the old magicians.

One of the most important tasks on a leader’s agenda is to take care of social categories education. The means used to rule the state can be rough or doubtful. Plato supports even the method of “management by lying”; he says: “State leaders must be able to tell lies when it is necessary, thus betraying his enemies, but also their own citizens. But nobody else should do that.” Therefore, the state should be governed by philosophers, who know with certainty the moral principles which should underpin the social order. According to Plato, the ruler-philosopher must lead people relying on four main virtues: prudence, courage, temperance and justice. Unfortunately, Plato had to accept that this ruler-philosopher might prove to be an unattainable ideal.

If in *The Republic* the Greek philosopher was concerned to emphasize the need for philosophical leadership, in *Valtiomies* (*The Statesman*) he treated this ideal from the perspectives of an ordinary life and recognized that it is very difficult to reach such a philosophical leadership. *The Statesman* highlights the leader's personal skills that are necessary to take care of the State. He may have a special talent in this respect, but he can also learn these skills to lead according to his own vision, without to prejudice the rules and laws, and binding on citizens. A true leader must have charismatic traits and also must be able to apply them in practice in his daily activities.

Leadership theme is addressed by Plato in his old age dialogue *Lait* (*The Laws*). Here, as in *The Republic*, he attaches great importance to education. Education is seen as the cornerstone of the State – as education into virtue, which is basically understood in terms of educating our desires. The full virtue includes undoubtedly the wisdom, but its ultimate requirement is that we want the right
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things\textsuperscript{35}. The Laws highlights a concept of leadership that emphasizes the meaning of the laws and the common rules, in addition to personal power of the leader. He must listen and act according to a set of laws created by a common government organ. This exercise will prevent the abuses of power by leaders.

In Plato’s speech, we can find some areas which are close to some modern debates about leadership: charisma in leadership, leadership as a heroic act, leadership symbols, justice in managerial work; equilibrium versus conflict in organizations, truth manipulation in leadership, etc.\textsuperscript{36}

2.2. Modern leadership models

Both managers and leaders, occupy positions in organizations that involve a number of responsibilities. Therefore, they need certain skills to fulfil these responsibilities, as well as doctors, lawyers, engineers, artists, or any other people engaged in different jobs, which they are qualified for. Nevertheless, leadership requires more than a set of competencies. A good leader needs personal skills, such as to have a vision, to perform, communicate and influence people from organizations. Therefore, leaders need leadership skills. Management is based on a status in the hierarchy, while leadership is based on the personal recognition and acceptance from other people. Both can exist together, but not necessarily. However, the ability to combine both in a managerial leadership role is an important issue in the development and success of the organization\textsuperscript{37}.

We can often read in the literature about numerous examples of companies that have made large and sophisticated strategic documents and long-term plans, which ended in failure at the operational stage. This is because people forget quickly plans and strategies, if they ever really known it. Thus, in last decades, the managers, the consultants, the authors and the trainers in management became aware that the planning and implementation efforts are not two different things; they must overlap thinking and organizing. Therefore, the leadership became a top management preoccupation. Also, the concept of strategic leadership occurred. Strategic leadership is not just delegating implementation strategy from the top to the base, but, more importantly, collecting strategic impulses that manifest inside the organization and in contact with customers\textsuperscript{38}.

Leadership is rooted in American history, in myths and legends about powerful and charismatic American figures who were able to make the world a better place through the power of their will, through their talent and charisma. American democracy values individual freedom and liberty. Many achievements
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in America were based on such a heroic people\textsuperscript{39}. Authors who have written about American history emphasize the leadership, the individual initiatives and entrepreneurship.

On the other hand, the Europeans, who have experienced several dictatorships, were more reluctant to support and praise the concept of leadership. Therefore, in Europe, democracy is seen as a mean to prevent too much power concentrated in the hands of one single person. In this regard, democracy is thereby based on resentment against holders of power\textsuperscript{40}. Authors who wrote about European history valued the cultural achievements, based on Church and national states. When European business people, consultants and teachers talk about leadership in admiration of the American doctrines, they do not always realize that actually try to implement an idea in a culture and national ethos that differs from the origins of the leadership\textsuperscript{41}.

2.3. The managerial leadership paradigm

In modern operating models, management can be compared to leadership in the next general terms\textsuperscript{42}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administer</td>
<td>Innovate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>develop, promote change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>inspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short-term oriented</td>
<td>long-term oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask \textit{how} and \textit{when}</td>
<td>ask \textit{what} and \textit{why}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imitate</td>
<td>originate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept the status quo</td>
<td>challenge the status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do things right</td>
<td>do right things</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences generally reflect fundamentally different personality types. Therefore, managers and leaders can be considered as belonging to different categories of people. Some people are, by their nature, managers, and other are leaders. We cannot say that some are better than others, but they are just different.

The differences between these kinds of people can be quite useful, as long as organizations require the both sets of functional responsibilities to be well exercised, in order to be successful. A person attempting to be recognized by his expertise in both paradigms must cultivate attributes that are not inherently found in the basic structure of his own personality. Management and leadership complement each other and the both are vital to performance and success of the
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organization. Management and leadership can be considered as two overlapping functions. Typically, most of successful people in organizations are able to perform equally well in both positions\(^{43}\).

It is important to make the distinction between management and leadership, to completely understand why both paradigms are important for the organizational success\(^{44}\). First, in order to appoint the right people for specific jobs, it is useful to make recruitment based on skills and competencies required by the respective jobs. Second, organizations need both managers and leaders performance, because there is an agreement that managers alone cannot achieve the necessary changes in organizations and therefore they must be supported by strong leaders. Successful organizational transformation has been found to be 70-90% leadership and 10-30% management\(^{45}\).

As well, it was said many times that in organizations occurs probably too much management\(^{46}\) and too little leadership\(^{47}\). There is a rich literature that supports leadership, which is presented as being great and admirable, much better than the less visible management. The question that inevitably arises is whether they can be always and everywhere find enough such exceptional leaders. Therefore, building a model including both management and leadership as managerial leadership is the key of organizational success, in an era of evolutionary and revolutionary changes\(^{48}\).

According to literature, the role of management is to promote stability and to allow the organization to go smoothly, while the leadership role is to promote adaptation or useful changes. People in managerial positions may be involved both in management or leadership activities, or may focus on certain activities instead of others. In essence, both management and leadership are necessary to meet organizational goals and objectives. However, if managers do not assume both responsibilities, assuming this managerial leadership paradigm, then they should ensure that someone else dealing with passed over activities\(^{49}\).

The bases of management can be learned, but the study itself cannot make a good manager. The practice has an important role, their own and others' experiences and mistakes constituting the basic ingredients in the formation of successful managers. On the other hand, developing leadership skills is a more complicated issue. It is difficult but not impossible for a person to become a leader through formal education. However, a highly academically qualification in
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leadership do not guarantee anyone to become a leader. Instead, leadership skills can be a great compensation for a poor formal education, as illustrated in the cases of famous leaders such as Hitler and Stalin\textsuperscript{50}.

3. Activities/tasks specific for the two organizational roles: manager and leader

After reviewed the main meanings of “management” and “leadership” terms and also the most important paradigms of the two of them, it has to be highlighted the activities that must be fulfilled exercised by the people who meet both of organizational roles. In this regard, the literature is also abundant in theories and approaches, but there are some basic activities and tasks that are considering organizations, environment and people who work there.

The whole range of activities that managers and leaders engage to fulfil the two organizational roles have as a starting point the proper functioning of organizations, their survival and performances’ growth, which depends on the strengths and weaknesses of organizations, on present or future opportunities and threats. All of these constitute the basis of management decisions, the main attribute of leaders and managers from everywhere\textsuperscript{51}.

Some activities/tasks were found in common by a lot of authors who have addressed this issue. Some of them assigned it to management, other to leadership, and others to both roles. In Table 1, the activities/tasks are listed in the first column; the second and the third columns specify whether they were assigned to management or to leadership.

Activities/tasks of the management/leadership illustrate the integrated nature of the two organizational roles. According to Table 1, all the tasks/activities fall within management boundaries. Leadership tasks overlap those of management. Moreover, unlike management, leadership does not have separate tasks which fall within its exclusive boundaries\textsuperscript{52}. Exceptions could be the decision-making responsibility related to organizational change, trust building, staff motivation and mission, vision, purpose and strategy firm building, which are considered by some authors just leadership tasks, but views are not unanimous in this regard. Therefore, in Table 1 these activities are integrated also into the management. Concluding, managerial leadership paradigm seems to be a solution for the successful integration of the two organizational roles.
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In these circumstances, we may ask ourselves if management and leadership concepts are really different. It seems management is, in its nature, more comprehensive than leadership, as originally stated the leadership literature pioneers.\textsuperscript{53} Even taking into account the integrated nature of the tasks/activities of leadership/management, as it was shown in the table, the two concepts still have no content separately. This explains to some extent why the ambiguity and difficulty in making a clear distinction between leadership and management still occur, among academics and practitioners.

\textsuperscript{53}Nienaber Hester, \textit{Conceptualisation of Management and Leadership}, Management Decision, 48(5), 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/tasks</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting the direction by setting the vision, mission, purpose and strategy of the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility for the operations, survival and growth of the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction and strategy communication</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting priorities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting the products/services that are subject to the business</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and mobilizing employees to meet goals</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and maintaining a proper framework to ensure the organization performance</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting the clients/beneficiaries values</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring a positive perception of the clients/beneficiaries regarding the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and improving the ability to create added value</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding internal and external environment in which the organization operates</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up and maintaining information database, necessary for establishing the needs of the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting, evaluating and using information</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and maintaining an internal environment in which employees can achieve maximum of their potential</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting, selecting and improving employees</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate delegation of responsibility/authority to employees, so that they can fulfil roles within the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building trust within the organization, taking into account the emotional aspects</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing employees access to the knowledge, skills, means, resources and processes necessary for the proper function of the organization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking decision about the changes the organization needs to make to its proper function, survival and performance growth</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision/anticipating the future</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusion

Management and leadership literature is divided regarding the conceptualization of these terms. The foundations of the distinction between management and leadership are not totally clear, since both roles are designed considering a common goal – organizational success. Etymological and semantic analysis performed supports clarifying the two concepts by demonstrating their original meanings and their evolution over time from a different national culture to another, from a continent to another.

Also, the main models and paradigms of management and leadership have been presented in addition to linguistic analysis, as in-depth understanding of both concepts may create preconditions to eliminate the persisting confusions or ambiguities regarding the distinction between management and leadership. The starting point was the Plato's leadership paradigm, seen as the art of leading people, to illustrate the fact that modern management literature has its roots in ancient Greek philosophy, particularly Platonic dialogues. The concepts of management and leadership passed through significant changes over time, since the industrial revolution and especially in the twentieth century. Management paradigm is generally identified by a position in the organization that requires functional responsibilities associated with planning, organizing, decision and control. In contrast, leadership paradigm is based on personal ability to have a charismatic vision, to lead and influence people around, to be recognized by them within the organization. These paradigms of management and leadership evolved practically from a broad base of understanding and beyond language boundaries.

The distinction between managers and leaders seem to be based on different types of personality. Moreover, organizations need them both. Therefore, persons who may to perform both roles, natively or following a formal learning, function as managerial leaders.

In terms of activities and specific tasks, the synthesis of the literature shows that management and leadership are interconnected in a hard to explain way. All tasks identified fall within both management and leadership boundaries. Management has several tasks that do not belong to leadership, while the leadership has no separate tasks. Moreover, at a detailed examination, these tasks can be categorized into: planning, organization, command, coordination and control, as they were originally identified by Fayol in the beginning of the twentieth century\(^\text{54}\).
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