

Between Management and Leadership—A Comparative Study with Reference to (Sheikh Zayed AL Nahyan and Nelson Mandela)

Dalia Mohamed Mostafa Mabrouk^{1,2}

¹Faculty of Arts & Humanities, Suez Canal University, Ismailia, Egypt

²Abu Dhabi Police Headquarter, Abu Dhabi, UAE

Email: dmabrouk2009@hotmail.com

How to cite this paper: Mabrouk, D.M.M. (2018) Between Management and Leadership—A Comparative Study with Reference to (Sheikh Zayed AL Nahyan and Nelson Mandela). *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 6, 35-47.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2018.69003>

Received: August 6, 2018

Accepted: August 31, 2018

Published: September 3, 2018

Copyright © 2018 by author and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

In this paper, I am reflecting on Abraham Zaleznik's paper "managers and leaders: are they different?" He was a prominent Harvard business school professor who attacked management style for depending only on rationality and achieving goals. He believed that managers and leaders are totally different persons. He described managers as inscrutable, detached and manipulative. Plus, while managers are interested in control and how things are done, leaders are more concerned with ideas and innovation. I try to probe into various questions related to both management and leadership to approach a clearer opinion for these inquires: do managers and leaders really have completely different personalities? Or are they both competing for the same target of getting work done through people? Is management upgradable with more knowledge and hard work? Are leaders more empathetic than managers? What makes managers inscrutable and manipulative? Is this innate or acquired? In which way leaders are different? Seems a huge task but I will tackle this issue by conducting a comparative study among two prominent figures as Sheikh Zayed Al Nahyan and Nelson Mandela. I will trace some points of similarities and differentiations based on the timeless lessons from their life stories that will endure for years to come. Both were gifted visionary individuals who exercised full range of cognitive, emotional and behavioral abilities to bring about profound change in their countries.

Keywords

Management, Leadership, Professional Development Cycle, Abraham Zaleznick, Zayed AL Nahyan, Nelson Mandela

1. Introduction

I have noticed throughout my reading in this specific topic that a determined distinction between managers and leaders is being prolifically conducted. One of those examples is what Zaleznick pointed out in his research “managers and leaders; are they different?” that “managerial leadership unfortunately does not necessarily ensure imagination, creativity, or ethical behavior in guiding the destinies of corporate enterprises” [1]. Furthermore, suggestion as, “Where managers act to limit choices, leaders develop fresh approaches to long-standing problems and open issues to new options.” [2] is repeated in different contexts with close meaning such as, “A leader is a person who pushes employees to do their best and knows how to set an appropriate pace and tempo for the rest of the group. Managers, on the other hand, are required by their job description to establish control over employees which, in turn, help them develop their own assets to bring out their best. Thus, managers have to understand their subordinates well to do their job effectively.” [3] Then the same concept goes far to continue in this way “Managers, however, are not required to assess and analyze failures. Their job description emphasizes asking the questions “how” and “when,” which usually helps them make sure that plans are properly executed. They tend to accept the status quo exactly the way it is and do not attempt a change.” [4] Again magnification of leadership over management is elaborated in this context “One responsibility of a manager is controlling a group in order to accomplish a certain goal. Leadership, on the other hand, is the ability of an individual to motivate, influence, and enable other employees to make a contribution toward the success of an organization. Inspiration and influence separate leaders from managers—not control and power.” [5]

2. Discussion

There are people who often mistake leadership and management as the same thing and others who regard the two as completely different islands in which leadership is overrated. The concept that leaders have people that follow them, while managers have people who simply work for them cannot be reliable enough to judge things fairly. In consideration to the idea that “Leadership requires getting people to comprehend and believe in the vision set for the company and to work on achieving these goals, while management is more about administering and making sure the day-to-day activities are happening as they should.” [6]. It presupposes that managers are born with limited potentials that incapacitate them from competing with leaders which is unfair and couldn't be taken for granted, yet it's not even scientifically approved. On the other hand, there are group of people who see that leadership and management must go hand in hand. I, through this paper, try to verify that they are necessarily linked and complementary to one another within certain scope. Without a clear grasping of their nature, any effort to separate the two within an organization is likely to cause more problems than it solves. Again this idea of overestimating leader-

ship over management goes far and is replicated in several texts as follows, “Leadership is about inspiring and management is about planning... Leaders have a tendency to praise success and drive people, whereas managers work to find faults.” [7]. While I have always thought that for any institution or country to be successful, it needs management that can plan, organize and coordinate its people, and also in a dire need to leadership for inspiring and motivating them to perform to the best of their ability.

It’s like one is being stimulated to understand what both sides have to do, and to reach a clearer vision, we need to comprehend the essence of the difference between them. This is a matter of definition—understanding how the roles are different if they really are and how they might overlap. Managers’ work, on the other hand, is being insinuatedly underestimated on doing his core business of setting, measuring and achieving goals by controlling situations to reach or exceed their objectives. Here I am bound to take real examples of history leaders in an attempt to discover whether being a great leader is innate trait and managers, on the other hand, whatever diligent and hard-working, will be always in the same typical zone of administrative tasks.

Debate has long surrounded the topic of whether managers differ from leaders and vice versa. Based on this concept, some companies try to train employees to be both, while some consider them distinctly different. However, in reality, the answer remains elusive because managers and leaders are both the same and different and that’s what we will verify here. This takes us to try to connect both theory with practice through tracing the professional legacy of two well known world leaders due to some similarities and differentiations in their journey of fame.

Northouse [8] wrote that leadership and management are similar in many ways. Both involve influencing, achieving goals, and working with people. However, while they may share some similarities, there are distinct and important differences. Northouse said that the study of leadership goes as far back as the times of Aristotle, while the concept of management came about “around the turn of the 20th century with the advent of our industrialized society” [9]. Here, I am a bit doubtful about the notion that management and leadership are similar because if they are similar why then we should regenerate it in a less effective creativeless frame titled “management” while we have a stronger version of leadership? Plus, Northouse supposes that both management and leadership are going parallel to each other which needs to be probed as well. What really matter is not the emergence of leadership since Aristotle’s time, but the characteristics he highlighted that any leader should possess in order to successfully lead others. Aristotle in his book (*In the Nichomeachan Ethics and Rhetoric*) mentioned that the amount of experience one has is the first important characteristic in leadership “one who has experience is qualified to judge” [10] Successful people have learned from both positive and negative experiences and having certain years of experience in the related field is a must requirement for any managing vacancy.

So, this characteristic is clearly a basic requirement to management and a matter of course to leadership. Accordingly, we couldn't consider them as parallel or different, but one most probably leads to the other in a cycle of professional evolvement and under certain conditions.

Mintzberg [11] defined a manager and a leader as one and the same. Mintzberg considered a manager "the person in charge of the organization or one of its subunits" [12]. In his HBR article which originally appeared in Harvard Business Review in [13], he referred to CEOs as managers. Managers include "foremen, factory supervisors, staff managers, field sales managers, hospital administrators, presidents of companies and nations..." [14]. Mintzberg maintained that managers are vested with authority over an organizational unit and from this authority comes status, which then leads to interpersonal relations and access to information. And, it is information that allows a manager to make decisions and develop strategies.

Another connection is raised to the scholars and the interested in this topic assuming that "Leaders manage and managers lead, but the two activities are not synonymous... management functions can potentially provide leadership; leadership activities can contribute to managing. Nevertheless, some managers do not lead, and some leaders do not manage" [15]. This is more confusing than the opinion discussed above by Micheal Nelson because it signifies the relationship between management and leadership as two-way path which is completely intertwined. By stating that leadership is management and vice versa, it crashes a pile of studies and papers stuffed in attempts trying to differentiate both as well as failed to quench thousands' hunger to embody the topic in their dissertations or professionally benefit in their work fields. The fact that managers should know how to plan, organize, and arrange systems of administration and control doesn't exempt leaders from these tasks' skills, on the contrary, it burdens them with more tasks to acquire and master.

In an attempt to try to probe the link between a leader and a manager, here is a simple example; a good leader of a software company may not be someone technically proficient in guiding a software developer through a complex job. That job belongs to a competent manager. And, a good manager may be good at managing the day-to-day tasks in his work field, but lacks the vision required of a great leader to strategically guide an organization. Through this example, we can infer that the evolvement from a manager to a leader is an incremental process that clarifies the cycle of professional development where a manager could develop into a leader if he determines to through acquiring knowledge and deep insight.

Another notion of overlap between leadership and management is what Northouse [16] said: "Although there are clear differences between management and leadership, the two construct overlap. When managers are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership, and, on the other hand, when leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and

controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals toward goal attainment.” [17] when grasping the idea carefully, it’s plausible that leaders can and should know how to handle all the managerial work as they are supposed to have surpassed this level to a higher one, while not all managers are able to lead; the idea that the majority are debating about and spending much time and effort contemplating about its dimensions. So, due to the obvious proliferation of theories that are boasting leaders due to their exceptional mental capabilities over managers who are trapped in red tape work within their limited capabilities have to be thoroughly verified through an attempt of connecting theory with reality. That’s why I try here to take examples of world leaders from various cultural background, though they shared gradually stepping up the road of leadership through a path of hindrances and hardships.

The first figure under study here is Nelson Mandela, or “Madiba,” as he was affectionately known, is arguably the most famous African icon. He became his country’s first black president after spending 28 years in jail and is held up as one of the greatest leaders the world has ever seen. Like Zayed Al Nahyan, Mandela was a man who gave so much for his people, even his harshest critics agree he was irrefutably an extraordinary man. But, what made him stand out as a leader from numerous other statesmen around the world? Why is he immortalized while many of his contemporaries, even some who arguably achieved more, have slipped into the dustbin of history? After studying both Mandela and Al Nahyan rigorously, we traced several reasons and circumstances in their lives that polished their personalities. First, Self-sacrifice—Nelson Mandela spent 28 years of his precious life in prison on Robben Island, hammering on rocks in the scorching heat during the day, only to retire to a tiny eight-by-seven-foot concrete cell with only a straw mat to sleep on. When he was offered freedom in 1985, he refused, saying: “I cannot and will not give any undertaking, at a time when I and you, the people, are not free. Your freedom and mine cannot be separated!” [18] Second, compassion; normally the human nature finds difficulty in forgiving and forgetting injustice. Amazingly, Nelson Mandela forgave his greatest adversary, the Apartheid government, which not only caused tremendous suffering to himself and his family but also to his countrymen. He could have demanded the heads of those who murdered thousands of innocent indigenous South Africans, but he chose the higher route instead. Setting up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, he left a legacy of forgiveness and reconciliation, not only for his people but also for the world. He never stops educating himself and learning while in prison, he was able to cleverly manage himself not only by throwing himself into the routine of daily exercise, but he also read smuggled books as much as he could. A lover of learning, although he was restricted from access to political books he liked, he ordered books on gardening and horticulture, eventually cultivating food that fed not only his fellow prisoners but also prison officials. Based on business theories, we can regard him as a

good manager as he continued his legal education while in prison, often giving legal advice to both prisoners and prison staff. Then he crossed this phase into a more sophisticated level of professional enlightenment. This enlightenment was fueled by his zest for learning and teaching which was so great that Robben Island became known as “Nelson Mandela University.” Another important dimension in his character is being ethical. In today’s increasingly competitive world, people care less about how you acquire money, power, and wealth, just as long as you amass them. Mandela, on the other hand, put people and honor before worldly gain. This coincides with Zayed’s vision of the most sustainable investment in the human capital. At a time when most African presidents were corruptly amassing fortunes during their tenures, Mandela’s estate was roughly just US \$2.9 million. And, he not only left money for his family but for his staff as well.

Through this comparative study, I noticed a huge similarity between the life journey of Nelson Mandela and Zayed Al Nahyan as both not only were born in the same year [19], but also were remarkable unifiers; while Mandela believed in “United we stand, divided we fall.” Zayed repeated “Al Beit Metwahad” which means “We are and must be unified” which is the basic mindset of any good manager to keep his people focused on one goal. When Mandela took power, he sought to bring whites, blacks, and other minorities together. Some expected him to favor blacks, particularly those from his own tribe, but because of his vision for a rainbow nation, South Africa is currently benefiting from its rich diversity economically, intellectually, and culturally. Both focused their lives on the needs of others, not their own, listening to those which society had ignored and cast away. They served the poor and the rich; they served the educated and the illiterate. As there is no one Mandela did not care for, Zayed as well extended his helping hand not only to his people but also to majority of nations. Both saw everyone as their brothers and sisters, regardless their nationalities, gender or religion. While rulers all over the world were busy empowering themselves and their friends, Mandela and Zayed were busy empowering their people. Furthermore, both Mandela and Zayed were full of humanitarian nature; The media put Mandela on a pedestal, classifying him as an infallible saint—an incorrigible angel who could do no wrong. He became a man of mythical proportions to many in Africa and all over the world. The reality, however, was far from it; Mandela himself never denied his humanity, given to the same weaknesses as everyone else. His first marriage broke down, and so did his second; he was unable to balance between personal life and political concerns, which is being a leader in the home and in the nation. He also failed to raise the kind of children befitting a man of his nobility. He said in an interview, “My first task when I came out was to destroy that myth that I was something other than an ordinary human being.” [20] In the end, although disappointing, people were still drawn to him. In fact, his humanity made him even more appealing.

On the other hand, taking into consideration other world figures that have

been also controversial as Henry Kissinger, we will discover new dimensions to both management and leadership. Applying Henry Kessinger's famous statement about leadership on Nelson Mandela, which is "The task of the leader is to get his people from where they are to where they have not been", we know that When Nelson Mandela was a young man, white and black people in South Africa lived separate lives under a system called apartheid. White people, who were small part of the population, were in charge of the country. It was illegal for black people to use the same schools, hospitals, and even beaches as white people. Conditions in whites-only schools and hospitals were much better. Black people were also denied basic rights—like being allowed to vote in elections. But Nelson Mandela believed that everybody should be treated equally. So, he was able to set about trying to bring people of different races together.

It evokes curiosity to discover the essence of Kissinger's statecraft and how he developed from management into leadership simply because we need to verify Abraham Zaleznick's assumption that "leaders are more empathetic than managers." [21] I really found him a rich soil to investigate through his career whether he was really an idealist or not, worthy of the continued praise that gets heaped on him in Washington and international circles? Is he best characterized as America's greatest statesman, capable of making smart sacrifices for the greater good? Or has he been a careless and callous leader, responsible for perpetuating war and great crimes against humanity to the detriment of U.S. national security?

What has been mentioned about Henry Kissinger by some critics is really controversial "He manipulated colleagues and nations. He faked the beginning of a nuclear war in order to advance some perverse personal game theory. Though he was regarded as main reason of initializing war by some of his critics, he was a man of ideas at the center of an American strategy that ultimately benefited the world in some grand sense.

Obviously, both Zayed and Mandela were not only good managers, but good leaders as well. So, in order to comprehensively test Zaleznick's assumption of the leader being more empathetic than the manager, which doesn't contradict the fact of being a creative leader, might shake old patterns and relationships across the globe. So, we couldn't accept this as a standard. Inside Washington Kissinger was one of the two or three most skillful bureaucratic warriors of modern times; his most consistent trait was to amass as much power and control as possible in his own office and person. On the whole, being a vastly overrated as a statesman stresses his managerial and leadership capabilities. On the other hand, depending on his career history, we couldn't regard him as a completely good leader who is driven by kind intentions and motives.

Unlike Kissinger, both Zayed and Mandela believed in the idea of unification and aggregation of power to achieve the aspired goals targeting the maximum benefit for all. Kissinger, on the other hand, believed in the philosophy of subjectivism that "every man in a certain sense creates his picture of the world."

Following much of Kant's philosophy, He stressed the notion that humans create their truth and come to understand their purpose through actions.

Moving to review the history of Shaikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan who was an honorable man that gained widespread respect and reverence, as he became a great leader, relying on his unshakable faith and legendary intuition. He contributed a lot to Emirati community, Arab, Muslim and others. Plus, due to his relentless efforts and his international affairs that helped to transform a desert into a vibrant country. Like Mandela, he stood for justice, generosity and the culture of life. Remembered as "the man who turned the desert green", the humble Shaikh Zayed focused developing his country and his people in a way that far exceeded his time. His Faith and vision for the future was supported with strong will to face all the hardships that he encountered.

Above all else, and long before the discovery of oil, Shaikh Zayed valued human capital. What interested him most were human advancements, the very quality he shares with Mandela. It's worth mentioning that this truly impressive man believed that opportunities bestowed on the UAE should be maintained and developed.

As Nelson Mandela turned his prison into a learning center and acquiring the trust of his fellows to consult and enlighten them, also Shaikh Zayed excelled some skills, as his potentials in solving conflicts among his people in a satisfactory way. That's why he was able to earn the trust of everyone's else. Shaikh Zayed worked hard to set a plan to unite the main emirates under one nation in which he succeeded.

In spite of the hardships, not only has the federation survived and prospered, it also exceeded everyone's expectation to reach levels of stability and prosperity, in large part due to Shaikh Zayed's policies that, in coordination with those of the late Shaikh Rashid Bin Saeed Al Maktoum of Dubai, and their cousins.

Shaikh Zayed was elected president of the UAE in 1971 for a five-year term, a great responsibility set on his broad shoulders for six consecutive elections, the last one being in 2001. Immensely skilled, Shaikh Zayed utilized his managerial authority effectively to maintain good relations with other nations in the region and abroad. Throughout his life time, he skillfully knew how to protect the UAE's national interests, conceding when necessary but never compromising on the country's territorial integrity or the stability of its institutions. Another point in his character that helped him well to step forward from managerial arena into leadership zone is that Shaikh Zayed was moved by an absolute sense of justice as he understood that internal reconciliation required sharing the country's wealth with those less fortunate.

For three decades, the smart president continuously invested in the UAE, which witnessed the creation of major institutions ranging from ministries of finance, planning, defense, communications, internal and foreign affairs, as well as health and education. Shaikh Zayed managerial skills again clarified in well financing large-scale construction of public housing facilities, schools and hos-

pitals, where few existed both in Abu Dhabi and throughout other emirates. Sheikh Zayed succeeded in upgrading the capital city into an international facility, along with a modern seaport, highways, roads and bridges linking the island to the mainland. The end result was an advanced country, with elegant fittings, modern infrastructure all immersed in lush gardens. Inspired by this founding father, Emirati officials in Dubai, Sharjah, Ras Al Khaimah, Ajman, Umm Al Quwain and Fujairah, all embarked on grandiose economic schemes that changed the face of the country. While many toiled to introduce these dramatic modifications, Shaikh Zayed, who has skillfully stepped into leadership arena after a really long path of learning and hard work, inspired most, and acted as the paradigm worthy of emulation.

It must be stressed that Shaikh Zayed's politics of humanity and generosity were unrivalled. He even yielded parity to Dubai, even if Abu Dhabi could have prospered standing alone, for his commitment to the federation which was unprecedented.

Gradually Zayed developed a sophisticated level of leadership as his generosity had duplicated on several dimensions. For example Shaikh Zayed emulated the Shaikhdom's paradigm after studying best practices from the region and abroad. On the other hand, he was also interested in directing part of his attention to less fortunate Muslim countries in Asia and Africa. On top of that, his greatest concerns focused on real threats as he carried out several mediation efforts especially with certain Arab Republic in 1990.

Similar to what Mandela did to spread forgiveness among the whites and the blacks of his nation, Much like his support for the core Arab concern, Shaikh Zayed displayed an immensely tolerance towards Christians, Hindus and people of other faiths, aware that the presence of a very large expatriate community in the UAE necessitated flexibility. Furthermore, faith was not simply a matter of convenience but also of conviction, as Shaikh Zayed distinguished Abu Dhabi from neighbouring societies, with full freedom of religion. In fact, it was this quality that earned Shaikh Zayed global respect. Remarkably, Shaikh Zayed espoused a moderate Muslim conservatism, as he himself rejected extremism. Although he supported Muslim centres of learning that promoted religious education, Shaikh Zayed rejected excessive judgments rendered by the Sharia courts and, using his presidential powers granted by the UAE Constitution, regularly set aside decisions that were considered to be tough.

The smart dimension that reflects a wise leader was displayed in Shaikh Zayed's wish to bridge the gaps among other disputed countries through peaceful methods, cognizant that diplomatic initiatives were preferable to confrontation, especially among neighboring countries.

Shaikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan was a globally respected elder Arab statesman who was actively engaged in a range of issues and concerns. International observers noted that Shaikh Zayed was a man in a hurry, anxious to introduce basic reforms to his country, willing to challenge all difficulties as well as carry

burden in order to improve the condition of the average Emirati.

Another point of similarity between Shaikh Zayed and Mandela is that unlike many who rolled in wealth, they lived a relatively modest life, always attuned to basic traditions and values. It's worth mentioning that the true legacy of Shaikh Zayed was not just in channelling wealth and investing in building a modern country. It was in bringing the federation to life under extremely difficult circumstances and against great odds.

As mentioned above both Zayed and Mandela were born in the same year 1918 by the end of the First World War. Shaikh Zayed received a traditional education, which meant exposure to the Quran and to a limited window of Arab literature. Early on, as he grew up in Al Ain Oasis, he demonstrated a keen interest in tribal affairs, which helped him develop a sharp awareness of his own family's key position in the area. "With the discovery of oil in Abu Dhabi in 1958, Shaikh Zayed quickly appreciated the rare opportunity, as he decided to harness and unleash this new source of power." [22] He skillfully negotiated the creation of the UAE and quickly 'invested' in an unprecedented infrastructure where little existed before. An unparalleled generosity, which rarely found, distinguished Shaikh Zayed who handed out oil revenues to his people with the aim to improve their living conditions. Shaikh Zayed was appointed president of the federation in 1971 in various fields as health, education and other facilities. A faithful man, both Zayed and Mandela believed in basic freedom for all, regardless their color, religion or gender. They believed every human has his own capabilities that would help in building his or her country.

3. Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this research, it can be concluded that what Abraham proposed in his paper needs reconsideration as the methodology conducted herein proved a little deviation. The two figures under study evolved into a "cycle of professional development". In other words, they are real examples that there is nothing like classification of leaders and managers, but most likely there are managers who got inspired to upgrade themselves, consciously or unconsciously, pushing themselves into a higher sphere. They simply won't be satisfied with mediocre level of knowledge and strive to train and educate themselves to be professionally illegible for their tasks. The evolution from management into leadership is most likely intangible, though has its clear symptoms; It's not a prescribed standard to be met, on the contrary, it's being sensed by the reaction of the followers, the scope of impact on the surroundings and the success in driving change.

Another point we come across while probing into management and leadership in the comparison between the two figures is the necessity to destroy the concept associated with manager to have a negative connotation as well as leader to have a positive connotation. We get assured that as there are good managers and bad managers, there are as well good leaders and bad leaders. Based on our research,

we discovered that both Nelson Mandela and Zayed Al Nahyan have been recognized as good leaders who sacrificed their lives striving for the prosperity, freedom and welfare of their nations; on the other hand, we might find a leader who is a clever strategist with extraordinary words mouth as Henry Kissinger, but who could be seen by many as vicious and manipulative.

Apparently, a leader, after proving his managerial capabilities, is elevated to another level where he is able to inspire and engage his people in turning his vision into reality. This higher level may empower the leader, rather than the manager, to see individuals not as a particular set of skills, but they think beyond what they do and activate them to be part of something much bigger.

Another perspective clarified here is that management really matters and it's a prerequisite to reaching the skills of leadership. Managing requires getting work done. It requires management of people and day-to-day organization of logistics, communication, workflow and tasks. It is making sure that things run smoothly and work together to create a functional whole.

Some of those who master management tools become diligent and believe in life learning commitment can evolve naturally into leadership sphere where they can easily inspire, have a mission, envision a future and be able to communicate it in a way that motivates other people to believe *and participate in it*. Now it makes sense and we can justify the idea that leaders have followers, while Managers technically, don't.

But it's not really a question of whether a manager leads or a leader manages. More, it comes down to a matter of execution. In other words, a manager comes up to his position for several reasons, one of which might be his professional capability. So, the manager could be good or bad depending on his performance in meeting his job requirements. And likewise, a leader may be good or bad depending on his intentions in leading others.

In this study, we found Zayed Al Nahyan and Nelson Mandela earned the reputation of skillful leaders who got global respect for their long life struggle to secure their people's rights. Both played a fundamental role in defusing and resolving regional disputes and, more important, promoted moderation.

We deduct here that "Leadership is path-finding; management is path-following. Leaders do the right things; managers do things right. Leaders develop; managers maintain. Leaders ask what and why; managers ask how and when. Leaders originate; managers imitate [23].

Finally, what Zaleznick proposed in his paper proved inaccurate when it comes to practice and reality. Nelson Mandela helped to change South Africa into a fairer place. Zayed Al Nahyan will be remembered around the world for his message of peace and unity, while Henry Kessinger shaped the modern history of diplomacy. Those three leaders evolved from the management territory into the leadership arena through hard work, taking risks and facing challenges. Hopefully, this paper stimulates other researchers to probe into the dilemma of strong professional development which comes to nothing if the individual's

talents are negligible. Also more research about organization psychology needs to be conducted for the smooth landing from management into leadership.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Aristotle, Ross, W.D. and Brown, L. (2009) *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [2] Aristotle, Ross, W.D. and Brown, L. (2009) *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [3] Aristotle and Leadership. (2015) Dr. Michael Nelson. University of the Cumberland .
- [4] Aristotle and Roberts, W. R. (2004) *Rhetoric*. Dover Publications, Mineola, NY.
- [5] Avery, G.C. (2005) *Understanding Leadership*. Sage Publications, London.
- [6] Hersey, P. and Blanchard, P. (1969) The Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, **23**, 26-34.
- [7] Bass, B.M. (1990) *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. 3rd Edition, The Free Press, New York.
- [8] Bass, B.M. (2008) *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. 4th Edition, Free Press, New York.
- [9] Bass, B.M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. Free Press, New York.
- [10] Bennis, W. (1994) *On Becoming a Leader* (Rev. ed.). Perseus Books, Reading, MA.
- [11] Bryman, A. (1996) Leadership in Organizations. In: Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R., Eds., *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage, London, 276-292.
- [12] Conger, J.A. (1989) *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- [13] Hitchens, C. (2001) *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*. Verso, London.
- [14] Katz, R.L. (1955) Skills of an Effective Administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, **33**, 33-42.
- [15] Mandela, N. (1994) Book Review: Long Walk to Freedom by Nelson Mandela. Little, Brown, and Company.
- [16] Northouse, P.G. (2013) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 6th Edition, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [17] Niall Ferguson's Henry Kissinger, 1923 to 1968: The Idealist (2015). Penguin Random House LLC.
- [18] Kirkpatrick, S. and Locke, E. (1991) Leadership: Do Traits Matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, May, 48-60.
- [19] Likert, R. (1967) *New Patterns of Management*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [20] McCaffery, P. (2004) *The Higher Education Manager's Handbook: Effective Leadership and Management in Universities and Colleges*. Routledge Farmer, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203463758>
- [21] Mintzberg, H. (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work*. Harper and Row, New York.

- [22] Northouse, P.G. (2007) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 4th Edition, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [23] Rashed, N.A. (2003) *Sheikh Zayed Life and Times: Through the Lens of Noor Ali Rashid*. Motivate Publishing, Abu Dhabi.