

Beyond Max Weber: Emotional Intelligence and Public Leadership

Robert Kramer, PhD
Assistant Professor of Public Administration
School of Public Affairs
American University
Washington, DC, USA
kramer@american.edu

"We're always talking about efficiency, productivity, restructuring and accountability. And to the ordinary citizen this means little. What the citizens want to hear is honesty, service ... You have to communicate with people at an emotion level -- the issues that are confronting them as ordinary citizens" (Delegate to OECD Symposium, cited in Lau, 2000, p.59).

All governance is people governance. All public service is people service. It's all people. Relationships are the DNA of governance. Without people who can develop trusting relationships with other people there is no governance. Governance is more than the machinery of public administration and more than impartial cost-benefit analysis. At the 1996 OECD Ministerial Symposium on the Future of Public Services, governance was defined entirely in terms of relationships. Governance, concluded the OECD ministers, "encompasses *the set of relationships* between governments and citizens, acting as both individuals and as part of or through institutions, e.g., political parties, productive enterprises, special interest groups and the media" (Lau, 2000, p. 112). Relationships are at the heart of governance. To the extent that public administration mirrors the hearts and minds of people, it is governance. To the extent that public administration is disconnected from people, it is not governance. Public administrators are much more simply human than otherwise. Like the rest of us, public administrators are people, too.

1.0. Relationships are the DNA of Governance

If relationships are the DNA of governance, I want to pose a question that is rarely asked in schools of public administration in Central and Eastern Europe: what, exactly, would be the value *for governance* of public administrators who can build relationships of mutual understanding and trust with:

- people who are peers in their own ministries?
- people who are peers in other ministries?
- people who are political superiors?
- people who are lower-level civil servants?
- people who are heads of parliamentary committees?
- people in business firms?
- people in special interest groups?
- people in media?
- people who are academicians?
- people who are NATO and European Union officials?
- people in the civic sector, non-profits and NGOs?
- people who are ordinary citizens?

Trust is a precious commodity. It is virtually impossible for any human being to build trusting relationships with so many people at once. So, let's pose a more modest question: What, I wonder, would be the value of public administrators who can build relationships of mutual understanding and trust *merely with people who are peers in their own ministries?*

Public administrators all over the world hold on, with amazing rigidity, to "turf," "stovepipes" or "silos." In my 25 years of experience in the U.S. government, including a

stint on vice-president Al Gore's task force to reinvent government, I often saw the harmful effects on American governance of this problem. Even after September 11, Governor Tom Ridge, who was appointed by President Bush to coordinate "homeland security" for the United States, cannot gain the cooperation of people in the two dozen Federal agencies whose mission is connected to homeland security. There are many reasons for the insidious durability of "silos," one of which I will touch upon later in this paper, when I explore the unexamined assumptions of Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy. But, in the simplest sense, what a metaphor like "silo" signifies in CEE and NIS governments is that -- even in the same ministry, even in the same department of the same ministry, even on the same floor of the same department of the same ministry -- public administrators *do not see a need to build relationships with each other*. If they do not see a need to cooperate with each other in the same ministry, if they do not see a need to build relationships of trust with the people they work with on a daily basis, why on earth would they see any need to cooperate with people in other ministries? Or with political superiors? Or with EU officials? Or with media? Or with citizens? *Or with anyone?*

I suspect that these questions are so rarely asked in schools of public administration because of the tendency toward isolation and "silos" in academic departments themselves. Few professors see any need to cooperate with colleagues. But, even with their devotion to individualism, professors usually respect the intellectual merit of the major disciplines of the field of public administration. The discipline of economics, for example, is highly valued for its intellectual rigor. So, if you have not yet fully understood the implications of my original question, let me now rephrase it, but this time strictly in economic terms: What would be the value for governance of public administrators who see the need for building stocks of social capital in administrative space? Mutual respect is a prerequisite for building understanding and trust in the space between people. In the public sphere, "administrative space" is merely the name that political scientists give to the "space between people" -- the space that economists have shown can be filled with "social capital."

2.0. Social Capital

What, exactly is social capital? For CEE states, especially those about to enter the EU, building social capital may be even more valuable than investing merely in physical, financial and human capital. Physical capital comprises the machinery, tools and technology of production. Financial capital refers to money. The people who produce goods and services are human capital. Social capital refers to the bonds of mutual respect and care among members of a collective. Social capital allows for reducing the transaction costs of economic exchange (Wiegel, 1997).

Human capital is invested in people. Social capital is invested in *relationships* among people. When public administrators invest in social capital, government earns a big return on investment. Public administrators earn currency in the form of increased trust in governance:

We can think of it as money in the “relationship bank.” As we work with people over time, deposits are made. We learn when someone gives us their word that we can count on it or that when they make commitment, these commitments are kept. We learn through working with them that we can count on them for straight talk and reliable action. When we have worked with someone over time and they have built up a trust account with us, if they are suddenly less than candid or they do not meet a commitment, we are likely to give them the benefit of the doubt. However, there is a point at which the balance in the relationship bank becomes depleted and trust changes to mistrust. That is the point at which people begin to disengage from the relationship (Axelrod, 2000, p. 168).

When public administrators fail to invest in social capital, they lose legitimacy, add to cynicism, and reduce the willingness of citizens, businesses and interest groups to bear the costs of painful reforms.

Without large investments in social capital, the tens of billions of dollars of World Bank and other local taxpayer monies allocated to modernize the economies of CEE and NIS states are liable to be wasted, deepening the chasm of mistrust and cynicism, fostering more corruption and increasing citizen apathy. The currency of social capital is trust (Rose, 1996; Fukuyama, 1995). The “cash value” of this currency is real. As trust in government continues to plummet, CEE and NIS states will need a new Marshall Plan to increase investment in social capital even more than they need infusions of World Bank and other financial capital.

Economists have compiled 30 years of multivariate statistical analysis to demonstrate that earnings from social capital help lift trust in governance (Putnam, 1999). Likewise, psychologists have compiled 30 years of multivariate statistical analysis to demonstrate that the level of social capital in any human system is dependent on its collective level of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1997). The higher the level of group emotional intelligence, the higher the level of social capital. Would it be too far-fetched, therefore, to conclude that “social capital” is nothing more than an abstract name that the discipline of economics gives to what neuroscientists call “emotional intelligence”?

3.0. The Intelligence of Emotions

What, exactly, is emotional intelligence? Doesn't IQ cover all we acknowledge and mean by the word intelligence? According to Douglas Hofstadter (1980, p. 26), Pulitzer-prize winning author of the brilliant book *Godel, Escher, Bach*, intelligence can be defined in terms of the following eight abilities:

1. To respond to situations very flexibly.
2. To take advantage of the right time and right place.
3. To make sense of ambiguous or contradictory messages.
4. To recognize the importance of different elements of a situation.
5. To find similarities between situations despite differences that may separate them.
6. To draw distinctions between situations despite similarities that may link them.

7. To synthesize new concepts by taking old concepts and combining them in new ways.
8. To develop ideas that are novel.

Are emotions “intelligent”? Evidence from evolutionary biology and neuroscience is overwhelming that emotions are, in fact, highly intelligent, and that they have primacy over IQ for building group intelligence and social capital:

In meetings and other group settings where people come together to collaborate, there is a strong sense of group IQ, the sum total of intellectual knowledge and skills in the room. However it turns out that the single most important element in group intelligence is not the average, or highest, IQ, but emotional intelligence. *A single participant who is low in emotional intelligence can lower the collective IQ of the entire group.* Chris Argyris, from Harvard, asks. “How can a group where everyone has an individual IQ of 130 together and collectively end up with an IQ of 60?” (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997, p. xxxiv)

IQ alone cannot build group intelligence. IQ has no heartbeat. Emotional intelligence, on the other hand, focuses like a laser beam what is important to us. Without the signals communicated by emotions, life would be drab, colorless and meaningless. I would care no more what happens to me or to you than does a machine. I would be interested in nothing. Without emotions we could not attach meaning to the word “interest” in the term “public interest.” Organized society could not function without emotional intelligence. Without emotions we could not attach meaning to the word “organized” in the term “organized society.” Emotions can certainly be harmful to governance, especially the emotions of hatred, greed, vengeance and lust. “There has never been any doubt that, under certain circumstances, emotion can disrupt reason,” says Antonio Damasio, professor of neurology at the Medical School of the University of Iowa. “yet research shows that reduction in emotion may constitute an equally important source of irrational behavior” (*ibid.*, p. xxxiii).

Without the intelligent guidance of emotions, human beings cannot respond to situations very flexibly, take advantage of the right time and right place, make sense of ambiguous or contradictory messages, recognize the importance of different elements of a situation, find similarities between situations despite differences that may separate them, draw distinctions between situations despite similarities that may link them, synthesize new concepts by taking old concepts and combining in new ways, or develop ideas that are novel. Without the guidance of emotions we cannot be intelligent. Without the guidance of emotions we cannot be rational.

Emotional intelligence is registered through *deep listening* -- listening to oneself and listening to others (Kramer 1995, 1999). People who are high in emotional intelligence know how to listen to their emotions and regulate their intensity so they are not hijacked by them. Emotionally intelligent people know how to keep disruptive emotions in check. Emotionally intelligent people sense the effect their emotions have on others. Emotionally intelligent people can laugh at themselves. Emotionally intelligent people know how to deploy their strengths and compensate for their weaknesses. Emotionally

intelligence people listen to other people's emotions and can empathize with them. Emotionally intelligent people act ethically and build trust through integrity and reliability. Emotionally intelligent people admit their own mistakes and learn from them. Emotionally intelligent people are comfortable with new ideas and new information. Emotionally intelligent people are skilled at listening to a group's emotional currents and discerning the power relationships. Emotionally intelligent people can negotiate and resolve disagreements. Emotionally intelligent people listen to other people and know how to communicate effectively (Goleman 1997).

Emotionally intelligent behavior is a prerequisite for building bridges of mutual understanding and trust in the space between people -- in "administrative space." To promote effective and efficient governance, large stocks of social capital are needed to fill the gaps of mistrust in every ministry, in every department, in every office, and in every nook and cranny in administrative space.

4.0. Leading by Listening

To build stocks of social capital, one of the most important skills a public administrator needs is the ability to listen -- to self and others. The Chinese characters that make up the verb "to listen" tell us something significant about this skill. Chinese characters are really picturegrams. "When in stillness," reads this picturegram, "a king listens with the heart.



The ear is worth ten eyes." In order to be a good king, one must listen with ears, eyes, and heart, giving undivided attention to the people. In the philosophy of Taoism, a king is defined as a servant-leader who is a mindful listener. In a sense, the Chinese pictogram suggests an ancient wisdom: "leadership" is a metaphor for being integrated, focused, and centered, a metaphor for emotional and intellectual balance in all aspects of life. Leadership is connecting mindfully

and feelingly to what moves in one's soul -- and makes one come alive -- and to what moves in the souls of others and makes them come alive. Public service leadership is soulwork.

Traditionally, leadership has been seen as a mysterious, lofty quality granted only to a few privileged people, and if one is not born with that quality, one cannot acquire it. Not so. Leadership is a composite of listening and speaking skills that can be learned, developed, and exercised by anyone in working with others to carry out a task. An outstanding public servant, according to the Chinese pictogram, is a leader who:

- Listens to the whole message -- not only the words, but the "music": the tone of voice, the facial expressions, the gestures, the emotions and the silences between the words.
- Allows the speaker to feel fully valued and deeply respected.
- Is able to sustain concentration, focus intently and recall the speaker's message -- the words, emotions and the "music" -- many days later.

- ❑ Listens to one's own thoughts and emotions as he or she speaks -- carefully choosing words and non-verbal ways of expression (the "music") that match one's intended meaning.

As the last point suggests, leading is about speaking persuasively just as much as it is about listening deeply. By tapping emotional energies, leaders move themselves and others to committed action. Leaders know how to draw out enthusiasm in others not merely compliance. Authenticity -- *listening to oneself* -- is the most important prerequisite for public service.

Public service leaders know their deepest convictions, are true to them, and act with empathic understanding and positive regard for others' differences, without demanding that everyone else feel, think or act the same way that they do (Kramer, 1995). Public service leaders listen deeply as a way to find common ground for action and results. Public service leaders hold their ground and stay connected. Public service leaders are ethical. Public service leaders who have the capacity to listen deeply to themselves and others know five things. They:

- ❑ Know, deep down, what their values are and what other peoples' values are;
- ❑ Know how to communicate what they need in order to get cooperation from peers, political superiors and others;
- ❑ Know how to build coalitions to support the needs of peers, political superiors and others;
- ❑ Know how to say no to illegal or unethical acts of government;
- ❑ Know how to build social capital.

5.0. Do Public Administrators Have a Right to Lead?

Public administrators are accountable to political superiors. Doesn't this imply that they are responsible solely for following mandates granted from those who are elected to represent the "will of the people"? Public administrators are followers not leaders. Public administrators follow laws and regulations. Public administrators follow the will of elected chief executives and elected legislators. Public administrators follow the election returns. Public administrators are cogs in the machinery of government. Public administrators are mechanical transmission belts. Public administrators merely transmit the emotional energy imparted to them from above, making no additional contribution to the total effort. What they see, hear and feel is irrelevant to implementing the "will of the people." Only elected political officials have the right to lead. Public administrators are not the equivalent of Chinese kings. What right, you might ask, do unelected public administrators have to lead? Wouldn't this open the door to administrative tyranny and arbitrariness? Is it ethical for public administrators to see themselves as "leaders" in governance? According to Harvard professor Robert Behn (1998), leadership is not merely a right of public administrators. It is a necessity:

Leadership from [public administrators] is necessary because without leadership public organizations will never mobilize themselves to accomplish their mandated

purposes. Leadership from [public administrators] is necessary because the elected chief executive can provide leadership for only a few of the many agencies and programs for which he or she is responsible. Leadership from [public administrators] is necessary because the legislative branch of government gives public agencies missions that are vague and conflicting and often fails to provide enough resources to pursue seriously all of these missions. Leadership from [public administrators] is necessary because a narrow interest can easily capture a public agency and redirect government programs for their own gain. Leadership from [public administrators] is necessary because the citizenry often lacks the knowledge and information (or will) necessary to perform its responsibilities. (p. 209)

Because neither chief executives nor legislators are perfect, governance cannot exist without public administrators who are also leaders. Because chief executives and legislators are fallible humans, who often give inconsistent or incomplete directions, public administrators must help them lead. Elected officials represent the will of the people. But public administrators in democracies may be even more representative of ordinary citizens than elected officials (Krislov and Rosenbloom, 1981). When elected officials attempt illegal or unethical acts only public administrators can block the implementation of these acts. All governance is people governance. Elected chief executives and legislators are much more simply human than otherwise. Like the rest of us, they are people, too. If leadership is manifested in relations between people, then, in economic terms, the most important contribution of public administrators to governance may be to work purposefully and ethically with elected officials to *increase stocks of social capital in administrative space*. Only leaders who know how to listen deeply -- to themselves and others -- have the capacity to increase social capital.

6.0. Leadership is a Relationship Not a Position in a Hierarchy

Leadership is more than a formal position in a hierarchy. It often starts as a formal position, but it is always more, much more, than merely a position. Leadership is an encounter -- a listening relationship -- between human beings. Leadership is a *relationship* not an individual (Kramer, 1995).

While traditional conceptions of leadership tend to be dominated by images of a single person such as a president, prime minister, Member of Parliament, or business CEO speaking to the masses and directing them from “on high,” leadership has little to do with domination. Although people can be threatened or rewarded to do what others want them to do, that is not leadership. Leadership does not occur when people obey commands or comply based primarily on threats or promises of reward. Leadership does not occur when people respond to a situation based primarily on direction by someone else. Leadership does not occur merely when you get other people to do what you want them to do.

Today leadership in democracies is no longer seen as a single person who occupies a position at the top of a hierarchy and issues commands. Leadership is not an attribute of a position. Leadership is not an attribute of status, either in business or government. We

must not confuse leadership with the top-ranking person in a hierarchy. Many a “No. 1” in politics or public administration could not lead a squad of ducks across the street. Likewise, we should not confuse leadership with power. Military dictators like Saddam Hussein wield power. The al-Quaida terrorist who lays a knife on the neck of an airline pilot has power. Leadership is more than power. Leadership is also more than legitimate authority. The police officer who issues you a speeding ticket has legitimate authority, as does the Motor Vehicles Bureau clerk who tests your vision before granting you a license to drive. “Corporations and government agencies everywhere have executives who imagine that their place on the organization chart has given them a body of followers,” writes John Gardner (1990), a former U.S. cabinet secretary. “And of course it has not. They have been given subordinates. Whether the subordinates become followers depends on whether the executives act like leaders” (p. 3).

7. 0. Followers Can Be Leaders and Leaders Can Be Followers

“The only definition of a leader,” according to Peter Drucker (1999), “is someone who has followers” (p. xii). In other words, without willing, active, and committed followers, there are no leaders. Since leadership is a relationship of deep listening, any person in the “administrative space” of governance can “take the lead” and any person can “follow the lead.” These roles are not fixed. They can alternate. We shift frequently in ordinary group relationships from one role to the other without even thinking about it. In my Sunday morning prayer circle I can be a leader. In my Sunday night bowling club I can be a follower. A new view of “followers,” first articulated by Joseph Rost (1991, p. 109), is now emerging in the context of governance relationships:

- ❑ *One person does not make a relationship.* If leadership is a relationship, then it is not possible for leadership to equal a single person.
- ❑ *Only active people are followers.* Only people who engage with others in the leadership relationship should be called followers. Passive people have chosen not to participate in a relationship. Passive people are not followers. Passive people are non-players. Passive people have chosen to withdraw their social capital from public life and invest it in their private life.
- ❑ *Followers can be transformed into leaders and leaders into followers.* Sometimes we choose to lead and other times we choose to follow. People are not stuck in the same role all the time. In one meeting on Monday morning I can be a leader, and in another meeting on Monday afternoon I can be a follower. Few people have interest in leading 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. In public life, some people choose to be followers much of the time and some people choose never to participate in any leadership relationships.
- ❑ *Followers are not doing followership, they are doing leadership.* Both leaders and followers co-create one relationship that is “leadership.” If a leader’s influence is based more on persuasion than on authority, position or status, then followers actively and deliberately choose when, where, why and how they allow

themselves to be influenced. Followers and leaders continually influence each other. If they did not influence each other, they would not be in leadership relationship.

Public leadership, therefore, is a relationship between leaders and followers who develop mutual understanding and trust by repeated experiences of deep listening. People who participate in this relationship are the stakeholders in governance.

Stakeholders are the DNA of governance. These stakeholders have different names. Depending on the situation, time and place, we may call these stakeholders “leaders,” “followers,” “elected officials,” “public administrators,” “government employees,” “constituents,” “citizens,” “customers,” “interest groups,” “NGOs,” “academicians,” “media” or any other name for a human being that designates an active and willing partner in governance.

8.0. “360-degree” Leadership

By definition leadership is about leading change. To maintain the status quo there is no need for leadership. There can be no reform of CEE governance without the emergence of many people who are willing to be leaders. A handful of officials at the top of a hierarchy in the Prime Minister’s office or the Parliament is not enough. To implement reform of governance, elected political leaders are necessary but not sufficient. Career public administrators must also lead. In a report entitled “Developing Public Service Leaders for the Future,” the July 2000 *HRM Working Party Meeting* in Paris concluded that:

... leadership plays an important role in the implementation of reform because it involves two of the most important aspects of reform: *change* and *people*. Leadership is manifested in relations between people. Good leaders inspire people. Changing organizations is really about changing people’s behavior, so organizations undergoing reform need leadership. Leaders, spread throughout an organization, can help diffuse and maintain the new values necessary for public sector reform. (OECD, 2000, p. 3)

Just as governance is a relationship, so, too, is leadership. *Leadership is not a single person*. In CEE states, “The relationship between citizens and their public administration is a central issue of strategic importance to improving governance,” writes Joanne Caddy, administrator of SIGMA’s Public Administration Development Strategies Unit. “Better channels of communication and greater citizen engagement increase both the effectiveness and legitimacy of public administration -- and hence its capacity to deliver results” (Caddy, 1999, p. 1). All public service is people service. It’s all people and relationships. For governance to mean anything, it must mirror the souls of people.

Actions such as constructing better channels of communication and inspiring greater citizen engagement call for more than just public administrators. They call for *public leaders*. More precisely, they call for public administrators who know how to lead by

listening – which means they know how to touch the souls of people, their own souls and those of others. They know how to listen to their own heartbeat and to the heartbeat of others.

Few public administrators in CEE states possess the leadership skills necessary to serve in senior civil service positions. In almost all CEE states, mid-level communist bureaucrats have been retained because there are no readily available alternatives. Many of the best public administrators have left government for the private sector. Under communism, civil servants listened to the Party but not to the broader population of stakeholders they were supposed to serve. As a result, since 1989, citizens of CEE states have become increasingly disillusioned with the rhetoric of “democracy” and “free markets.” Both elected and career officials often appear to be deaf to the everyday concerns of ordinary citizens. This is a failure in leadership and a failure in listening. As a result, many CEE states are creating a massive deficit in social capital.

This has untold economic consequences. A deficit in social capital means that the allocation of financial capital will be inefficient, wasteful and unproductive. A recent survey of more than 3,000 CEE companies by the World Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) reveals that bribery and corruption are widespread in the region. “A small group of firms exercises influence over state policies that affect the activities of many firms across the economy,” according to the EBRD survey (*The Wall Street Journal Europe*, November 9, 1999, p. 2). In many CEE and NIS states, trust in government has plummeted to pre-1989 levels (Rose, 1996). As former U.S. vice-president Al Gore observed in Washington, DC, at the January 1999 *International Conference on Reinventing Government*, “Ensuring the integrity and efficiency of government will strengthen democracy and help it accelerate, instead of suffocate, the entrepreneurial initiative of its private sector” (U.S. Department of State web site). Investing in social capital is good business -- it is an investment in good governance and, even more, a prerequisite for efficient allocation of financial capital.

If social unrest in CEE states is to be forestalled, participation in policy-making, especially as it relates to meeting the requirements of EU accession, needs to be expanded to the widest possible spectrum of public administrators, citizens, business firms, professional associations, NGOs and interest groups.

In the long run, ensuring widespread collaboration by all stakeholders in the EU accession process will allow for big savings in the regulatory apparatus of government, given that successful implementation of the *acquis* laws and regulations across Central and Eastern Europe relies heavily on voluntary compliance by citizens and businesses. Even in the short run, coercion is neither practical nor effective.

Promoting democratic governance in CEE states demands developing a cadre of public administrators who can “lead by listening” to stakeholders. This involves what can only be described as “360 degree leadership” -- public administrators with high enough levels of emotional intelligence to:

- Lead up -- build social capital with political superiors and elected officials;
- Lead down -- build social capital with lower-level staff;
- Lead across -- build social capital with peers;
- Lead out -- build social capital with stakeholders outside their ministry -- MPs, interest groups, NGOs, EU officials, academics, media, citizens etc.

9.0. Max Weber and Beyond

Currently, the vast majority of public administrators in CEE states lack the understanding and behavioral skills necessary to build social capital. Even those public administrators who are excellent administrators of laws and regulations lack the leadership skills to bring their citizens into a more mutually beneficial partnership with government officials.

Why, one wonders, is it so hard for public administrators to know when to *administer* and when to *lead*? Why is it so hard for public administrators to know when -- in the daily process of working with their political superiors, staff, peers, interest groups, MPs, media, NGOs, EU officials or ordinary citizens -- it is necessary for them to behave as *leaders* and when to behave as *administrators*? Why is it so hard for high-level civil servants to see that, to administer laws and regulations, to implement public policy, to build trust in governance, they must learn how to blend, on a day-to-day basis, the law-based knowledge of an *administrator* with the equally vital listening skills of a *leader*? Why is it so hard for high-level civil servants to see that they must, in fact, combine both the skills of an administrator and the skills of a leader in *one and the same person*? Neither the responsibilities of administration nor those of leadership can be ignored, yet most public administrators, in CEE states and elsewhere, focus narrowly only on their administrative roles. Why? To be honest, I'm not sure but I have a hunch.

A major reason may be the continuing acceptance, by scholars and public administrators alike, of certain unexamined assumptions of Max Weber's model of bureaucracy. Based on my long experience in the U.S. Government, where I met few senior public administrators who were genuinely interested in or capable of "taking the lead" in governance, I have come to suspect that the unexamined assumptions of the Weberian model of "man as machine" contributes, to a large extent, to the absence of a leadership mindset in career civil servants.

According to Weber (1922), bureaucracy compares with other organizations exactly as does a machine: "The more perfectly the bureaucracy is dehumanized, the more completely it succeed in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and purely personal, irrational and emotional elements which escape calculation" (p. 15). Weber's model of human nature assumes that efficiency and effectiveness are harmed if human emotions influence the rational actions of public administrators. *Emotions are not intelligent*. Emotions are opposed to reason. Emotions are irrational. Emotions are unproductive. Emotions are subjective. Emotions should never guide administrative actions. The purpose of bureaucratic hierarchies, division of labor, classification of positions, standard operating procedures and pay grades is *to legislate against intrusive and irrational emotions*. To end nepotism, prevent capricious or subjective

administration, and promote equal justice under law emotions must be eradicated. For reason to rule, public administrators are to become souls on ice.

10.0. Souls on Ice

In the classic formulation of Max Weber (1922), public administrators must be without affection or enthusiasm – *ohne Zorn und Eingenommenheit*:

Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. This is the feature of it which makes it specifically rational ... The dominance of a spirit of formalistic impersonality, "*Sine ira et studio*," without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm .. This is the spirit in which an official conducts his office ... Otherwise the door would be open to arbitrariness. (pp. 15-16).

Weber's lifelong project was to conquer the world of administration for rationality (Diggins, 1996). Excellent administration is "control on the basis of knowledge." *Administration, therefore, is about control.* Excellent administration is about limiting discretion. Excellent administration is about preventing arbitrariness and tyranny. For this reason, public officials do not establish relationships to persons. Governance is impersonal. Relationships are positively harmful for excellent administration. Once the boxes on the organizational chart are drawn, once the responsibilities of positions are delineated, once the irrationality of human emotion is eliminated, the organization will be a smooth running, lean and efficient machine, easily able to follow orders and implement public policy. Public organizations must be cool arenas for dispassionate reason, clear-headed analysis. Administration without people is the most efficient and effective governance. Administration without people, by definition, is excellent administration. Unless public administrators eradicate emotions that interfere with decision-making:

1. They cannot respond to situations very flexibly.
2. They cannot take advantage of the right time and right place.
3. They cannot make sense of ambiguous or contradictory messages.
4. They cannot recognize the importance of different elements of a situation.
5. They cannot find similarities between situations despite differences that may separate them.
6. They cannot draw distinctions between situations despite similarities that may link them.
7. They cannot synthesize new concepts by taking old concepts and combining them in new ways.
8. They cannot develop ideas that are novel.

Under the guidance of emotions public administrators cannot be intelligent. Under the guidance of emotions public administrators cannot be rational.

This is a prescription, of course, for transforming people into machines. But machines cannot build the trusting relationships needed to govern. Only people can govern. Yet, for

those immersed in the culture of bureaucracy, the prescription against relationship virtually mandates that the daily actions of public administrators -- namely, encounters with political superiors, staff, peers, interest groups, media, members of parliaments, NGOs, or ordinary citizens -- all relationships with all stakeholders be conducted *Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm* as Victor Thomson once suggested in the title of a 1975 book.

At the time impersonal public administration was proposed, it was a necessary and essential corrective for nepotism. Standardized rules and procedures were revolutionary breakthroughs in administrative thinking and retain value as a safeguard against corruption even today. We must never let down our guard against administrative or political tyranny. The separation of executive, legislative and judicial powers, with each power being able to check and balance the others, is the best antidote to tyranny. However, I do not think that an assumption of “man as machine” is compatible with late 20th century discoveries in evolutionary biology and neuroscience. The classical bureaucratic assumption of “man as a machine” is, on the contrary, perhaps the single biggest contributor to the “occupational psychosis,” (John Dewey), “professional deformation”(Thorstein Veblen) and “bureaupathology” (Robert Merton) so often observed in the behavior of high-level civil servants, not just in CEE states, but all over the world, including the U.S. Government.

The assumption of “man as machine” has induced in public administrators a state of unconscious incompetence and trained incapacity for leadership, according to the sociologist Phillip Selznick (1976):

Mechanical metaphors – the organization as a “smooth running machine” – suggest an overemphasis on neat organization and on efficient techniques of administration. It is probable that these emphases induce in the administrator a trained incapacity to observe the inter-relationship of policy and administration, with the result that the really critical experience of organizational leadership is largely overlooked. (p. 3)

In his famous 1937 Brownlow Commission Report, Luther Gulick argued that efficiency must be built into the structure of government just as it is built into a “piece of machinery.” Following Weber’s assumption about the harmful effect of emotion, public administrators, asserted Gulick, are supposed to be smooth running machines – transmission belts -- for carrying out the will of the people as expressed by elected officials. In 1976 Gulick, one of the most influential framers of orthodox American public administration, examined and, for the first time, regretted his assumptions four decades earlier about the merits of a mechanistic, de-humanized and emotionless model of administration:

There is good reason for dropping the idea that government is a *machine*. We should never have abandoned the notion that any team of people working together for a purpose is an “organism” not a machine ... If we think of government as an organism, a living organism, we have a totally different and more accurate and constructive understanding of a government organization. [Public administrators] are no longer cogs, they are suborgans ... They do not merely transmit the energy

imparted to them from above, they each make an added contribution to the total effort, influenced by what they see, feel and are doing” (cited in Gawthorp, 2002, p. 85).

So why does it remain so hard for high-level civil servants to see that that they must blend, on a day-to-day basis, the essential skills of an efficient *administrator* with the equally vital skills of a *leader*? I can't be certain, but I suspect that it is a problem of unexamined assumptions. It is extremely painful and anxiety-provoking to examine deeply ingrained tried-and-true assumptions. But isn't examining assumptions the very definition of learning? The unexamined life, as Aristotle said somewhere, is not worth living.

11.0. Excellent Management is Not Leadership

Let me now turn to a related problem. We have just learned how extraordinarily difficult it is to see the difference between *administration* and *leadership*. The question I want now to explore is what, exactly, is the difference between *management* and *leadership*? While related, management and leadership are not the same -- even in the private sector -- and must be sharply distinguished. I believe that excellent managerial skills are necessary but not sufficient for CEE public administrators. For good governance, leadership skills are also required. Only leading by listening, in my experience, can increase social capital. We know that excellent administration alone is not capable of increasing social capital. I want now to show that excellent management *also* is not capable of increasing social capital. But why? Why is management a misleading path if we are concerned about developing the governance skills of public administrators?

Is excellent management *necessary* for public administration? – absolutely yes. Is excellent management *sufficient* for building social capital? – absolutely not.

The word “manage” derives from the Italian word, *maneggiare* -- which means “the handling of horses.” In American sign language, the sign for “manage” is to hold the reins of a horse. *Like administration, management is essentially about control.* Management is about restraining energies. Management is about limiting discretion. In public administration, control and restraint -- especially in the expenditure of taxes collected from citizens and businesses -- is a prerequisite to demonstrate accountability to elected officials, Parliaments and citizens. In a democracy, law-based public administration is essential. Therefore, control of financial resources is absolutely necessary for public managers. *All public administrators must also be good managers.* All public servants -- whether they are elected politicians, appointed political executives or career civil servants -- must take an oath to protect monies in the public treasury from being spent illegally, imprudently or unethically. The behavior of all public managers -- elected, appointed or otherwise -- must be monitored and “controlled.” It is impossible to argue this truth away even by the strenuous advocates of the entrepreneurial philosophy of New Public Management.

Leadership, however, is not about control. For decades, many scholars have assumed that leadership is excellent management (Rost, 1991). This is wrong. Leadership is not about restraining energies. Just the opposite. Leaders move themselves and others to committed action. The word “lead” derives from Old English, *leden*, which means “to go before as a guide; to take a journey.” The word “motivate” derives from the Latin, *motere*, which means “to move.” The word “emotion” also derives from *motere*, to move. By drawing on emotional energies, leaders take us on a journey. Leadership = emotion. Leaders begin initiatives. Leaders challenge the process. Leaders inspire a shared vision. Leaders enable others to act. Leaders model the way. Leaders encourage the heart (Kouzes and Posner, 1997). Leadership is not about control. *Leadership is about releasing human energies.* Leaders lead by tapping their emotional intelligence and the emotional intelligence of others (Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2002). Leadership is about influencing stakeholders in society to work together to achieve higher, more ethical goals.

According to the Pulitzer-prize winning political scientist James McGregor Burns, who founded the field of leadership studies, the leader’s fundamental act is to lead “people to be aware or conscious of what they feel to be their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can move to purposeful action” (1978, p. 44). In other words, leaders listen so deeply to the emotional messages of their constituents that, sometimes, they have the capacity to register needs not even fully conscious to their constituents.

Leadership is the major contributor to social capital. Leadership, says Burns, “raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of *both leader and led*, and thus has a transforming effect on both” (p. 20). Building social capital, therefore, depends on leaders not managers.

To be an excellent manager or administrator, one does not need to tap the emotional energies and creative will of subordinates, citizens, business firms, interest groups and other stakeholders in society. Moving others to committed action is not a necessary skill for managers. Building social capital is not in the position description of any manager. Listening to others is not what they do best. Highly motivated or inspired behavior may even be counter-productive. According to Harvard professor John Kotter (cited in Behn, 1998, p. 212):

For some of the same reasons that control is so central to management, highly motivated or inspired behavior is almost irrelevant. Managerial processes must be as close as possible to fail-safe and risk-free. That means they cannot be dependent on the unusual or hard to obtain. The whole purpose of systems and structures is to help normal people who behave in normal ways complete routine jobs successfully, day after day.

Completing routine jobs successfully – delivering social security payments on time; implementing computer systems for E-government, filling potholes; keeping nuclear power plants safe -- is a worthy task. Excellent management is the exercise of control.

The focus is to strengthen or correct what already exists in the organization. Excellent managers look for exceptions and fix them. Building social capital, or raising people to higher ethical standards of behavior, plays no role in excellent management. Managing budgets means “controlling public monies to prevent financial waste.” Managing information technology means “controlling what kinds of information computers release.” Managing nuclear power plants means “controlling accidents.” People, however, cannot be managed. They can only be led.

12.0. A Cure for Occupational Psychosis

While we still appreciate Weber’s genius as the premier sociologist of his generation, his model of “man as a machine” has had unintentionally perverse effects on modern, post-industrial public administration and in navigating the permanent white water of change. “Man as machine” continues to serve as a major barrier to building trust in 21st century government. The fall of communism, if nothing else, demonstrates that rigid, inhumane Kafkaesque bureaucracy is not superior to other forms of organization. Moreover, it is not even true that “impersonality” is the best guide to rational decision-making. Charles Darwin showed as early as the 19th century that emotions were adaptive in the evolution of human beings, but there is no evidence in Weber’s writings that he understood the implications of Darwin’s revolution in biological science (Weber 1978). “Many emotions are products of evolutionary wisdom, which probably has more intelligence than all human minds together,” according to Joseph Ledoux (1996, p. 36), professor of science in the Center for Neural Science at New York University. Neuroscientific discoveries in the last decade show that rationality and emotions are not separate compartments in the brain. Rather they are inextricably woven into all cognition.

Recent work in psychology by scholars such as Martin Seligman, Richard Lazarus, Anthony Ortony, and Keith Oatley, and research in neuroscience by Joseph Ledoux and Anthony Damasio show conclusively that emotions are a form of intelligent awareness. Emotions are intelligent. Emotions are what make us human. Emotions tell us what is valuable and important to us and to others. They signal the meaning of events. Emotions are just as “cognitive” as other perceptions. They serve as essential guides for humans to make rational choices. Emotions are a form of thinking as well as a form of feeling. All thinking is infused with the intelligence of emotions. Without the guidance of emotions, one becomes irrational, detached from reality. Is not this detachment from reality the very definition of “occupational psychosis” (John Dewey), “professional deformation” (Thorstein Veblen), “trained incapacity” (Philip Selznick), and “bureaupathology” (Robert Merton)?

We now have conclusive biological evidence that *decision-making is neurologically impossible without being informed by emotions*. Contrary to the classical model, decision-making is arbitrary when it is *not* infused with the intelligence of emotions. Empirical research by organizational scholars on three continents shows that “emotional intelligence” is the very marker that distinguishes routine management from outstanding leadership and the marker that distinguishes dead organizations from living organizations (Ashkanansy, Hartel, Zerbe, 2000).

Neuroscientific research shows some stunning differences between the classical bureaucratic assessment of emotions and current scientific understanding (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997, pp. xxxii-xxxiii):

Bureaucracy on emotions

Make us inefficient
 Sign of weakness
 Interfere with good judgement
 Distract us
 Obstruct, or slow down, reasoning
 Arbitrary and tyrannical
 Weaken neutrality
 Inhibit the flow of objective data
 Complicate planning
 Undermine management

Modern neuroscience on emotions

Make us effective
 Sign of strength
 Essential to good judgement
 Motivate us
 Enhance, or speed up, reasoning
 Build trust and connection
 Activate ethical values
 Provide vital information and feedback
 Spark creativity and innovation
 Enhance leadership

For public administrators, management and leadership skills are not mutually exclusive (Kovriga, 1998). We should not make the mistake of stigmatizing management and glorifying leadership. They are complementary. Managers lead and leaders manage; however, the two functions reflect different -- at times overlapping -- sets of skills. *Both are essential*. Public administrators need to expand their repertoire of skills to include both functions, without minimizing one at the expense of the other. “What is needed are both managers and leaders (ideally, both in the same body),” according to a recent panel of the U.S. National Academy of Public Administration (1997) “with the need for leaders growing immensely as predictability and order give way to change and ambiguity”(p. 5). A genuinely democratic and ethical civil society in CEE and NIS states demands the development of a cadre of public administrators skilled in leadership not just administration and management. *Civil servants at times administer laws, at times manage budgets, and at other times lead people and change*. Civil servants are not just administrators and they are not just managers. They are also leaders who have a responsibility to share democratic values, represent a broad range of social groups, and view themselves as accountable to much broader constituencies than before.

“We need a government,” writes Peter Drucker, the father of modern management, “which knows how to govern and does so. Not a government which ‘administers,’ but a government which truly governs” (cited in Potucek, 1999, p. 28). All governance is people governance. All public service is people service. It’s all people.

Bibliography

- Ashkanansy, N. M., Hartel, C.E., Zerbe, W. J. (2000). *Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory and Practice*. Westport: Quorum Books, 2000).
- Axelrod, R. H. (2000). *Terms of Engagement: Changing the Way We Change Organizations*. San Francisco: Berret-Koehler Publishers).
- Behn, R. (1998). "What Right Do Public Managers Have to Lead?", *Public Administration Review*, May/June, Volume 58, No. 3, pp. 209-224.
- Burns, J.M. (1977). *Leadership* (New York: Harper and Row).
- Caddy, J. (1999). *Public Management Forum*, OECD, May/June.
- Cooper, R. K. and Sawaf, S. (1997). *Executive IQ: Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organizations* (New York: Perigee).
- Diggins, J. (1996). *Max Weber: Politics and the Spirit of Tragedy*. New York: Basic Books).
- Drucker, P. (1996), "Foreword," in Hesslebein, F, Goldsmith, M, Beckhard, R. *The Leader of the Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), pp. xi-xv.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: The Free Press).
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On Leadership* (New York: The Free Press)
- Gawthrop. L. (2002). "Public Service as the Parable of Democracy." In Jun, J. S., ed., *Rethinking Administrative Theory: The Challenge of the New Century* (Westport: Praeger), pp. 77-92).
- Goleman, D. (1997). *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (New York: Bantam, 1997).
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., McKee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press).
- Hofstadter, D. (1980). *Godel, Escher, Bach* (New York: Ballantine Books)
- Kovriga, A. (1998), "The Challenge of Central and Eastern European Local Executive Development: A Working Group Initiative, pp. 383-390. In Jabes, J., ed., *Public Administration and Social Policies in Central and Eastern Europe. Sixth Annual Conference Held in Prague, Czech Republic* (NISPACEe).

- Krislov, S. and Rosenbloom, D. H. (1981). *Representative Bureacracy and the American Political System* (New York: Praeger).
- Kramer, R (1995) "Carl Rogers Meets Otto Rank: The Discovery of Relationship." A chapter in *In Search of Meaning: Managing for the Health of Our Organizations, Our Communities, and the Natural World*. In Pauchant, T., ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), pp. 197-223.
- Kramer, R. (1999). "Weaving the Public into Public Administration," *Public Administration Review*, January/February, Volume 59, No. 1, pp. 89-92.
- LeDoux, J. (1998). *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life* (New York: Touchstone).
- Lau, E. (2000). *Government of the Future*. (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development).
- OECD (2000). "Developing Public Service Leaders for the Future" (*HRM Working Party Meeting*, Paris, July 3-4, 2000).
- Potucek, M. (1999). *Not Only the Market: The Role of the Market, Government and Civic Sector in the Development of Postcommunist Societies*. Budapest: Central European University Press).
- Putnam, R. (1999). *Bowling Alone* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Rose, R. (1996). "Trust and Distrust in an Hour-Glass Society," pp. 19-32, in Jabes, J., ed., *Developing Organizations and Changing Attitudes: Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe. Fourth Annual Conference Held in Tirana, Albania* (NISPAcee).
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. (Wesport: Praeger).
- Selznick, P. (1976). *Leadership in Administration* (Berkley: University of California Press).
- U.S. National Academy of Public Administration (1997). *Managing Succession and Developing Leadership: Growing the Next Generation of Public Service Leaders* (Washington: NAPA).
- Weber, M. (1922) "Legitimate Authority and Bureacracy" in Boone, L. E. and Bowen, D. D., eds., (1987). *The Great Writings in Management and Organizational Behavior*. Boston: Irwin), pp. 5-19.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Weber: Selections in Translation*, Runciman, W. G., ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Wiegel, W. (1997) "On the Improvement of the Relationship Between Citizens and Government Authorities - The Reduction of Transaction Costs, pp. 129-143 in Jabes, J., ed., *Professionalism of Public Servants in Central and Eastern Europe, Fifth Annual Conference Held in Talin, Estonia* (NISPAcee)