

# THE CONFIGURATION OF THE ROMANIAN CONCEPTS ENTREPRENEUR AND MANAGER IN FRONT OF THE EUROPEANIZATION

Holban (Oncioiu) Ionica

*Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Iasi and ASE Bucharest, Constanta, str. Brizei, nr. 5A, bl. FB7A, ap. 1,  
Tel. 0744 – 322911, Email nelly@cta.ro*

## *Summary*

*In the context of the new type of economy, as a result of the European integration and of the striking necessity to increase the adjustment's capacity of the Romanian enterprises to the exigencies of the social-economical environment, one of the problems which must be solved is, without doubt, the transition from the model of the good manager, executor of the received tasks from the superior hierarchical levels and directed especially to the administration of the current problems- widely, product of the totalitarian system- to the model of the dynamic and prospective manager, with capacity to observe and to anticipate the changes, to plan the actions which must be undertaken to realize them or to come across them, but also to stimulate and to activate the others members of the organization with power of decision..*

*Key words: entrepreneur, manager, european integration.*

Taking into consideration the behavior in the existent business practices on the unique European market, the entrepreneur is different in many aspects from the manager. We can say that all the entrepreneurs are managers, meaning that they should control their own business, but not all the managers are also entrepreneurs. This happens because the big companies became very structured, with strict rules, necessary to control some entities of such dimension. The little companies have not these problems.

A business of success represents the transformation of the work, of the imagination, of the risk and of the entrepreneur's capital in profit. Firstly, the businesses are formed in our imagination and then, these are transposed in the real world, which is more complex, and presupposes the projection of all the factors in order to realize the business's profitableness.

If a manager is responsible only for an aspect related to a specific function, the entrepreneur is responsible for the entire business.

The entrepreneur differs from the manager also from the point of view of the behavior in all the activity's spheres of the business. He has the exploitation tendency of the existent opportunities in his business' environment, without being constrained by the resources availability.

To be entrepreneur supposes a distinct prevision sense, a certain attitude regarding the carried up activity and also the unique responsibilities.

As far as the *strategic orientation* is concerned, it is a business dimension which tackles the factors which leads to the company's strategy elaboration. This orientation is determined by the opportunity's fructification manner, and it should be assumed by the Romanian managers.

The entrepreneur has the exploitation tendency of the existent opportunities in his business' environment, without being constrained by the resources' availability.

Even he recognizes the necessity of opportunities' fructification; firstly, the manager focuses on the utilization manner of the available resources and those he can control.

This dimension points out one of the main characteristic of the entrepreneur- the creativity, innovator spirit.

Consequently, the Romanian manager will be efficient when he has a strategic vision regarding the phenomena and the processes which develop inside and outside the company and he is preoccupied by its future, manifests a great receptivity in front of the new and interest for the authentic, professional and moral values, he has the realistic evaluation capacity of the situation in which the company is, but he has also the capacity to stimulate the employees' confidence and their attachment for the company.

In other words, the manager is efficient when he proves a strategic vocation and an enterprising spirit, based on initiative, competitiveness and risk's accepting, but also on information, intuition and talent.

To be a good strategist, a company manager has to stimulate himself to develop his talents and to improve his abilities in the following directions:

- the thought's originality, expressed by the capacity to interpret the external world's evolution;
- sensibility, to realize the collaborators, consummators' expectations;
- the capacity of selection, respectively to memorize the most important events, the "key" opportunities and the main dangers;
- the capacity to adapt to change, respectively to think in a constructive manner, using the transformation and anticipating the situations' modification that can supervene;
- concentration and perseverance to achieve a purpose, improving the vision on a long period.

Certainly, the reunion of all these qualities depends on the personality and the characteristics of the manager, but firstly on his professionalism level, on his availability to acquire new knowledge and managerial abilities, to develop a strategic thinking, all these representing demands and exigencies very important to which the managers has to answer to assure a realistic perspective orientation of the companies and an efficient administration of their activity.

I also consider that in situations of incertitude and rapid mutations of the business environment from Romania, is impossible to surprise everything (technological breaches, the new competitors' entrances, the clients' pressures, state' interventions etc.) through formal analysis techniques, and the strategic "rationality" is not sufficient. To this is attached the difficulty to come on the unique European market.

It has to be duplicated, so it has been shown by the experience of the countries members of the EU, by the managers' intuition and creativeness, by their imagination and vision regarding the evolution of a phenomenon or of another and of the company that they administrate.

These qualities represent the binder that maintains the organization cohesion, helps it to formulate itself and to implement coherent strategies, to increase its flexibility and to adept successfully to change.

Another element that differentiates the entrepreneur by the manager is the opportunity's fructification, its exploitation degree.

The entrepreneur wants to profit rapidly of the appeared opportunity, on a short period of time, in a manner almost revolutionary. For this, it is considered that the entrepreneurs may assume exaggerate risks.

The manager engages himself in opportunities, on a long period of time, in a rhythm slower, progressive, but which can seem stationary.

The resources engagement distinguishes the two subjects of the economical activity. The entrepreneur engages himself in a multi-stage process of using the resources, with a reduced implication degree to each stage. They try to maximize the produced value, through the minimization of the resources volume implied, certainly, with the price to assume a bigger risk. The managers focus on the uni-stage utilization of the resources, with a great implication degree and only after a detailed evaluation.

Another factor which produces differences between the entrepreneurs and managers makes reference to the resources' control. The entrepreneur is the adept of the habitudes, talent and others' ideas use. He tries to use these resources in a proper manner.

In exchange, the manager wants to own the property and the resources' control or to employ the personnel necessary to realize the tasks. Firstly, he is interested in the efficient utilization of the resources that he possesses. With respect to the management structure, between the Romanian entrepreneurs and managers and those from EU, exist important differences.

The entrepreneur wants to know directly each domain of the business. The fact that he rents the necessary resources and he doesn't use the own employees, determines the development of an informal management structure.

On the other hand, the manager considers the management relations more formal, defining the specific rights and obligations assigned by the tasks' delegation.

This arises directly from the use of the resources and of the own employees. Some authors tried to make the distinction between entrepreneurs and managers, suggesting that it is impossible that a good entrepreneur to be also a good manager.

The entrepreneur is seen as an egocentric person, and, consequently, inefficient to manage. Nevertheless, although the managerial tasks are very different from those entrepreneurial, the managerial talent is essential.

The reward system is a new factor through which the entrepreneur differs from the manager. The entrepreneur focuses especially on the value creation and realization. Those who invested money in the business' setting up, they will want to recuperate them as quick as possible. As a result of the conception based on the value creation, the entrepreneurial companies tend to substantiate on performances the reward system- there, where the performance is closely connected to the value. The manager focuses less on the value maximization and distribution.

He takes into consideration, when he takes decisions, especially the protection of his position and the job's security. Firstly, the reward system is based on the individual responsibilities and on the performances referring to the objectives' realization, regarding the short-time profits. The rewards have the mission to stimulate the increase of the responsibility levels.

With the XX century, the entrepreneur became a synonym or at least associated with the free enterprise and capitalism. He is recognized as being an agent of the changing. The entrepreneur is a creative person, with innovator ideas of business, which contribute to the enterprise's increase and profitability.

The entrepreneurs are also those who are not necessary inventors or innovators, but persons who initiate a business, taking risks that normally, others don't take the liberty, with the object to realize the profit.

Some authors affirmed that the entrepreneurs are some adventurers, taking into the consideration the fact that they assume some risks that others wouldn't. For this reason, the risk is an important element in the entrepreneurial process.

Nevertheless, I think that the existent perception is wrong, because the majority of the entrepreneurs prepares and plans their actions. So, the entrepreneur doesn't search deliberately the risk and doesn't assume it inefficiently, but he doesn't have restraints when it is about risks that can be avoided. According to the economist Peter Drucker, the persons who need certitude, is less probable to be good entrepreneurs.

In all the entrepreneurial activities the decisions must to be taken for a purpose, and the essence of any decision is the incertitude. Conformable to the mentioned author, I consider that the incertitude, the doubt, the lack of persuasion lead to managerial failures and block the way towards excellence.

The incertitude and the doubt are the greatest enemies of the failures. The lack of persuasion presupposes the lack of a motivation, powerfully anchored in the belief to succeed in the prompt realization, at time and qualitative of the activities, objectives, and the appliance of new methodologies in the products' realization.

The Romanian entrepreneur can not manifest the necessary will to assure himself the success, only having the firm conviction that he will be successful in what he enterprises, always advances in the direction of his beliefs. He will realize only what he thinks he is capable to do.

There exists an extraordinary power in the conviction that you can realize what you proposed. Who has the bigger self confidence is released by the incertitude of his situation, even if this is insecure and it eliminates any incertitude for the future.

In other words, who is protected by his belief releases many of his fears and cares which can defeat those who don't have a sufficient belief in what they could realize. He can use freely his qualities, using them completely, at their entire value. Nobody can use entirely his qualities, when he lets him being surrounded by the troubles, incertitude, fear or hesitation.

Relating to the situation of the Romanian entrepreneurs, at the present, especially in the context of the European integration, I consider that they should learn that in a Market economy there is not only profit, but profit and loss, there is not only gain, but risk and gain, you should have a company's strategy, and to be entrepreneur supposes art, economical knowledge, intuition and style adequately to the circumstances of the ambient environment of the business. Therefore, the Romanian entrepreneur should have knowledge from each activity domain to built a successful activity, but in my opinion, for a business to be successful it should begin with the identification of the combination mode of the production's factors available: to identify the goods and services request and offer, to introduce the business on the respective market in function of the economical arguments, to calculate the breakeven, the managerial productiveness of the production's factors.

The decision to put in application a business in a Romanian economy anchored to the European integration's requests has to be taken with the entire comprehension of the implied risks and to find the solutions how to remove them. This thing relates the Romanian entrepreneur's intuition and flair.

In conclusion, the enterprise contains also a part of management. But the enterprise and the management aren't synonyms.

The enterprise presupposes a specific management, with its own concepts, purposes and methods.

The enterprise is based on the risk's administration, and not on its minimization, on the orientation towards opportunities, and not towards resources, on action, and not on the analysis, on an informal structure, flexible of management, and not on a formal one.

These characteristics derive from the specific features of the entrepreneur.

### **Bibliography references**

1. Berrien K., 2005 – A General Systems Approach to Organization, College Publishing Company, Chicago.
2. Drucker Peter, 2004 – Managementul viitorului, Editura Asab, București.
3. Henry P., 1991 – Creative Management, Glenwiev Scott, Foresman.
4. K. Kalseth, 1998 – Re-inventing Information Management: Bridging the Gap between Information, Needs and Knowledge Source, FID Bulletin, nr. 48.