

simply obedience to the position the individual occupies. Obedience, although it may be grudging, will often be extended to the position because of the authority of the position itself. However, willing obedience will be extended consistently only by those employees who have accepted the supervisor's leadership.

Acceptance by one's followers cannot be mandated; it must be earned. Without this acceptance, a supervisor is a manager in title only and a leader not at all.

WORD PLAY: LEADERSHIP VERSUS MANAGEMENT

Leadership attracted much attention and acquired newer shades of meaning in the total quality management (TQM) movement. As empowerment is "in" and delegation attracts little concern, so is leadership "in" at present. Many concerned with the quality movement speak of the need for "not management, but leadership."

With this highly positive connotation placed on the word leadership, we are left with an eroded connotation of management, conveying the impression that somehow mere management does not measure up to leadership. However, management and leadership remain two words that are generally synonymous and freely interchangeable in many uses.

As suggested previously, someone can be a manager—or supervisor, director, coordinator, administrator, chief executive officer, or whatever—in title without being a true leader. However, this in no way renders management as a whole anything less than, nor anything significantly different from, leadership. There is poor management and there is good management; there is poor leadership and there is good leadership. One can be a manager in title without being a leader, but in terms of function one cannot manage without leading and cannot lead without managing. Good leadership and good management go together, as do poor leadership and poor management.

We frequently hear management described as both art and science. We might say the same about leadership, but we are usually ready to consider leadership more as art. Leadership is more likely to inspire thoughts of the human element, whereas management conjures up images of "techniques" and "tools." Whether we are speaking of management or leadership, however, we are dealing with the process of accomplishing goals through the efforts of people. Only so much of this process can be quantified and reduced to rules and techniques; the remainder will come from the heart and the gut. Whether it is called leadership or management, it is this unquantifiable, frequently elusive "soft" side that puts the word "good" or another adjective in front of management or leadership. And leadership and management cannot be justly compared without the use of qualifying adjectives.

CAN YOU LEAD "BY THE BOOK"?

If we accept the contention that good leadership (or good management) is both art and science, we can perhaps reason that leading or managing "by the book" is only partially possible. However, one of the errors commonly committed by struggling leaders is overreliance on what we might refer to as cookie-cutter management. Cookie-cutter management is what occurs when we

title as necessary your actions

any manager see, with r of orders: e results of nagers see "me" and in es.

responsibility and authority or the decision the decision considerably rs. To trust ill responsibility

if that the tell them es find the at the rear e crew and facilitator, the entire of the mas-

abilities that rat include egity, and c qualitative cannot find you cannot have these

is certainly erring of a on, a great e anything

acceptance leader, not

Think of what occurs when you roll out a batch of cookie dough and apply a cookie cutter. You obtain a desired shape, but you also get leftover material. Even if you roll out the leftover dough and cut another time or two, you are still left with a remaining lump of dough that fails to fit the required shape.

management.

Cookie-cutter management is especially prevalent in management litera-

Consider, for example, the “excellence” movement inspired by *In Search of*

these concepts into "excellence programs." Much the same happened years

We have likewise been offered cookie-cutter approaches in the forms of qual-

The good news about cookie cutters is that they all include concepts of poten-

contribution cannot be dictated by procedure; these qualities are among the elements that fuel the art of leadership. If they are not there in sufficient quantity to inspire people to follow willingly, the best that can ever be obtained from the latest cookie-cutter approach is a brief burst of success—perhaps real, perhaps only perceived—to be washed away in a returning tide of cynicism. You cannot lead or manage by the book; the book provides only the science, but the art springs from the capabilities and actions of the individual manager.

AN EMPLOYEE'S VIEW

Not all the employees in a department will view the supervisor in the same light or develop the same impression of the supervisor as a leader. Each of your employees will experience your leadership "style" in bits and pieces that add up to a total impression. As long as you are convinced you are doing the best job you know how to do, there is little to be gained from worrying about the opinions your employees hold of you. However, it pays to remember that your view of yourself as a leader is rarely the same as the view of you that your employees hold. What you see as your strengths may not be seen as strong points by your employees. Conversely, what your employees see as your strong points may not even have occurred to you as significant characteristics of your style. There are several aspects of supervisory performance that are likely to influence your employees' assessment of you. Your employees may not use the same terms we use to describe these aspects of performance, and neither may they use labels such as "autocratic," "authoritarian," or "participative." However, the view your employees form of you is usually related to the way you come across in regard to some or all of the following:

- Do you communicate openly, sharing all necessary or helpful information with the employee group? Openness to communication is associated more with consultative or participative leadership, and a closed communication posture is associated more with autocratic leadership.
- Do you display awareness of people's problems and needs? The participative leader tends more toward awareness of individual problems whereas the autocratic leader often appears unaware or even uncaring.
- Do you display trust and confidence in employees? The autocratic leader displays little trust or confidence, relying mostly on close supervision. The true participative leader is able to extend trust and confidence.
- What means do you use to motivate employees? The autocratic leader frequently relies on fear and punishment to move people forward. The participative leader motivates through involvement and reward whenever possible.
- Do you provide support to employees? The employees of the autocratic leader often find they stand alone when things go wrong and they need the supervisor's backing. Support for employees and their decisions and actions is a hallmark of the participative leader.
- Do you request input on job problems? The autocratic leader tends to go it alone, but the consultative or participative leader is generally open to input from the work group.

r kinds of man-
gh and apply a
lover material.
or two, you are
quired shape.
to some form of
to the desired
material that
l purposes lost
ply "formula"
tend at times
ipes for doing
ever, manage-
essed by pro-
into certain
ement litera-
approaches to
n and become
engagements,
y In Search of
' enlightening
ment, the con-
created many
proceduralize
ppened years
MBO concept
ter F. Drucker
asty and com-
ebooks that it
against allow-
) picked up on
is of time and
forms of qual-
M. There also
me as succes-
month or to be
epts of poten-
he cookie cut-
ecause by its
de. Also, none
d characteris-
sight, pride,
nd potential