

EMPOWERMENT: A MODEL FOR MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Dr. Graydon Dawson,
Courseware Product Assurance
Simms Industries, Inc.
Subcontractor to
McDonnell Douglas Training Systems'
C-17 Aircrew Training System
Norman, Oklahoma
[405] 366-5526

ABSTRACT

Empowerment is a critical component of a Total Quality Management (TQM) system. Total Quality Management training that has been the most successful include a paradigm-shifting set of experiences for the managers in training which are, in turn, transferred to the job resulting in a highly effective and empowered work force. How many managers in your organization have a working paradigm that is consistent with the principles of TQM? What is your organization doing with and for the other managers who's paradigms are not working? Effective TQM training addresses, head-on, the managerial habits (paradigms) that are counter-productive to effective TQM. An effective model of management accountability will include performance standards - the characteristics of a paradigm in harmony with the principles of TQM, and a measurement tool for measuring whether a manager's paradigm is moving (shifting) towards empowering their work force. Conclusions from one year of tracking and reporting manager's empowerment behaviors, at McDonnell Douglas' C-17 Aircrew Training System Courseware Development site in Norman, Oklahoma, will be drawn. Successful and unsuccessful empowerment strategies used by Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award winners and non-winners will also be reviewed.

INTRODUCTION

More and more organizations are allocating resources for the development and implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM) training. The reason is that organizations which have been highly successful in the market place (i.e., Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award winners) have exhibited a commitment and practice of empowering their work force. Arguably, trying to copy organizations that have won the Baldrige award may be the wrong motivation for implementing TQM. More and more organizations are getting more press/attention because of their emphasis on TQM training. Unfortunately, far too much of TQM training is nothing more than a quick fix and the outcomes are short-lived, short-term and cosmetic.

Empowerment is a critical component of effective TQM implementation. Management's role in empowering the work force is to provide leadership in, and the necessary resources for, establishing organizational structures (models) of responsibility, accountability, and authority. Unless management has established organizational structures that include: 1) performance standards for empowerment, 2) training, 3) how to measure performance against standards, 4) how to use diagnostic/prescriptive feedback, and 5) the rewards for attaining performance standards and the

consequences of not, organizations will never realize the fruits that successful organizations are realizing through their TQM implementation.

The purpose of this presentation is to demonstrate that TQM training programs that have been the most successful establish management structures of accountability and include a paradigm-shifting (*) set of experiences for the managers in training which are, in turn, transferred to the job resulting in a highly effective and empowered work force. The characteristics of a paradigm in harmony with the principles of TQM will be defined and a measurement tool will be reviewed for measuring whether a manager's paradigm is moving (shifting) towards empowering their work force. Conclusions from one year of tracking and reporting manager's empowerment behaviors will be drawn and we will also examine both successful and unsuccessful empowerment strategies used by Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award winners and non-winners.

THE COMPONENTS OF A PARADIGM IN HARMONY WITH TQM

Adams and Kinchen (1990) define Total Quality Management as "a customer-driven operating philosophy committed to excellence in products, services and

relationships through total participation in the constant improvement of all processes." [1] Adams and Kinchen, have spent the last ten years implementing TQM within both large and small organizations and have drawn some significant conclusions (lessons learned).

Although successful TQM implementation is as unique to each organization and management system as personal development is to us as individuals, one common feature that Adams and Kinchen's research has born out is that "everything happens, or doesn't happen, on the basis of relationship." [1] TQM training that focuses on how to cultivate an effective relationship between a manager/supervisor and his/her people provides the glue which is critical to holding the various components of TQM together. Quality Circles, Participative Management, Pep Talks, Statistical Process Control, Suggestion Systems, Flattened Organization, or Team Building activities have all proven to be quick fixes unless they are built on a foundation of a strong and effective relationship between manager and employee.

A study conducted by Harbridge House (1984), a Boston consulting firm, identified ten managerial habits which profile this foundational relationship between manager and employee:

- 1) Provides clear direction, 2) Encourages open communication, 3) Coaches and supports people, 4) Provides objective recognition, 5) Establishes ongoing controls, 6) Selects the right people to staff the organization, 7) Understands the financial implications of decisions, 8) Encourages innovation and new ideas, 9) Gives subordinates clear-cut decisions when they are needed, and 10) Consistently demonstrates a high level of integrity. [2]

As Adams and Kinchen (1990) point out, "successful TQM implementation involves changing very long-standing and deeply entrenched organizational and managerial habits. The implications of these changes are shifts in power, authority, communication patterns, performance evaluations and the basis for promotions, just to name a few." [1] All the grassroots enthusiasm in the world is not enough to effect lasting change without a fundamental change in people who hold positions of status and power (managers and supervisors). And let's face it, most of what we experience in the form of management training today simply does not take on these difficult areas of training because it shakes the very foundations and assumptions about human motivation in the work place upon which most corporate cultures and structures are built.

Stephen R. Covey (1989), author of the inspiring national best seller The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, discusses the power and importance of paradigm shifts to effective interpersonal relations. Each of us have an operating paradigm - a psychological

map, a personal frame of reference, the way we see the world - not in terms of our visual sense of sight, but in terms of our perceiving, understanding and interpreting relationships. All the influences in our lives all have made their silent unconscious impact on us and have helped shape our frame of reference, our paradigms, our maps. Furthermore, our paradigms, correct or incorrect, are the source of our attitudes and behaviors and, ultimately, our relationships with others. And frankly, as Covey purports, most of us who are managers need a paradigm-shifting experience in order to be more effective in relationships. [3]

To help us see more clearly what Covey means by a paradigm-shifting experience, he cites a number of examples. The first is the story about a man who was reading a book on a New York subway train. Several other passengers were passing the time reading their daily newspapers when a young father with three children boarded the subway car. While the young father sat staring at the floor, his three children wreaked havoc with the passengers, chasing each other back and forth, wrestling each other, knocking the newspapers out of the hands of the other passengers and, in general, upsetting everyone except the young father. Covey, who was himself observing this situation, couldn't help wondering how this young father could be so oblivious and insensitive to the chaos his children were creating. Covey thought surely this young father will notice what's happening and discipline his kids. But that never happened and most of the passengers' non-verbal behavior suggested that it was the father who needed to be disciplined. His patience wearing thin, Covey went over and sat next to the young father and pointed out that his children were out of control and asked if he could not see that? The young father looked up from the floor to see the faces of the passengers frowning and responded, "Oh, you're right. I guess I should do something about it. We just came from the hospital where their mother died about an hour ago. I don't know what to think, and I guess they don't know how to handle it either." Covey says, can you imagine what he felt at that moment? His paradigm shifted. Suddenly, he saw things differently, and because he saw differently, he thought differently, he felt differently, and he behaved differently. His irritation vanished. Everything changed in an instant.

A more glaring example of how one's paradigm determines how they see, and subsequently interact, with the world (so-to-speak) was the paradigm shift Ptolemy must have experienced. "For Ptolemy, the great Egyptian astronomer, the earth was the center of the universe. But Copernicus created a paradigm shift for the followers of Ptolemy, and a great deal of resistance and persecution as well, by placing the sun at the center. Suddenly, everything took on a different interpretation."

What is the substance of a paradigm shift that must take place in the hearts and minds of managers?

William C. Byham (1989) authored a simple, yet powerful book entitled Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment. [4] In Zapp! we see the daily transformation (paradigm shift) of a supervisor (Joe) as he learns that continuous improvement for the individual and the company is based on the relationship between himself and the employees who report to him. Joe learns that his basic assumptions about how to motivate his people (e.g., managerial habits) have been acquired by watching other managers. These habits, Joe learns, have created a working environment that seemingly builds mistrust and apathy among his work force.

Joe's initial paradigm manifests itself in taking responsibility away from his employees, taking away employee authority to make any decisions that affect the employees performance, and taking away the employee's identity, energy and power. However, Joe learns the value of having an effective role model when he observes another manager giving her employees responsibility, authority, identity, energy and power. Subsequently, his paradigm begins to shift. Joe learns that sharing these critical elements of human motivation with employees does not mean that he is abandoning any responsibility. Joe begins to question the role model he is providing for his employees and learns that the model his employees observe is largely responsible for the quality of the working climate.

The Harvard Business Review (1987) reports that 60 to 70% of the climate in which we work is credited to our manager. [5] The real tragedy acted out in most work places is that millions of people are allowing themselves to be treated with something less than human respect because they are afraid to risk objecting to it. Then, when they themselves become supervisors or managers of other people, they are often just as insensitive as their bosses. After all, they see that kind of behavior being rewarded all around them.

Joe, our supervisor in Zapp!, learns about a force which energizes his people, helping employees take ownership of their jobs so that they take personal interest in improving the performance of the organization. Joe learns about four categories of management behaviors (habits) which Zapp! his people: 1) Maintaining the self-esteem of his people, 2) Listening and Responding with empathy, 3) Asking for help in solving problems, and 4) Offering help without taking responsibility. Joe learns that these behaviors are his responsibility for initiating and maintaining. Furthermore, he learns that he must first empower individuals before he attempts to create empowered teams. That is, the individual employees' personal experience

with empowerment must be cultivated and understood before a team can be effectively formed and transformed. Zapp! builds a powerful case against most TQM training programs which fail to include a personal transformation - changing very long-standing and deeply entrenched organizational and managerial habits. How refreshing and uplifting it is to find a manager who, not only gives verbal ascent to TQM, but can back it up with very effective relationships with his/her people in establishing a working environment where anyone can question any system or process. TQM training which seeks to set up empowered teams within work groups without first getting the manager/supervisor to analyze their own interpersonal relationship (managerial habits) with their people offer little more than quick fixes.

Our character, basically, is a composite of our habits. Habits are behavior patterns and thought patterns which get repeated so frequently they become automatic, conditioned responses to behavioral triggers or situations in which we find ourselves. The conditioning of a lifetime affects every manager's perceptions, how they see things, their attitudes and the way they interact with other people. Is it possible that some managers are operating with an ineffective paradigm (not conducive to TQM precepts)?

Covey compares our paradigms to a road map and raises the question "how useful would a road map of Detroit be if we wanted to get to a specific location in central Chicago?" Can you relate to the frustration, the ineffectiveness of trying to reach our destination? We might work on our behavior by trying harder, being more diligent, double our speed, but our efforts, Covey says, would only succeed in getting us to the wrong place faster. Or, we might work on our attitude by thinking more positively. The point is, we would still be lost because the fundamental problem has nothing to do with our behavior or our attitude. It has everything to do with having the wrong map. Covey says that the power of a paradigm shift is the essential power of quantum change, whether that shift is an instantaneous or a slow and deliberate process. [3]

How many managers in your organization have a working paradigm that is consistent with TQM precepts? What is your organization doing with/for the manager whose paradigm is not working? Effective TQM training addresses, head-on, the managerial habits (paradigms) that are counter-productive to effective TQM with training, self-assessment and retraining. Ineffective TQM training avoids these issues.

Empowerment (training and practice) is not a quick fix or personality technique we put on like a coat in order to be more effective with people or be more liked by people. Covey goes on to say that the

requisite paradigm-shifting experience must first be a private victory, based on thorough self-analysis, before it can be a public victory. It is futile to try to improve relationships with others (quick fix techniques) before we improve ourselves. Doing what we have been doing over and over and over again but expecting different results from our work force is a definition of insanity. Most management training, however, does not address the private victory in the TQM equation.

Ralph Kilmann (1987), author of Beyond the Quick Fix, states that each organization has five leverage points (tracks) that can affect morale and performance: 1) the organization's culture, 2) the manager's skills for solving complex problems, 3) the group's approaches to decision making and action (team-building), 4) strategic choices and structural arrangements, and 5) the purpose and design of the reward system. More importantly, Kilmann states that these five tracks require months for planning and implementation and are sequential in their implementation, each building upon the preceding track. [6] For an organization to channel its resources/programs in any of these tracks without first having built upon the preceding track is to allocate/channel resources for quick fixes, according to Kilmann. Critical to building a strong TQM foundation is a thorough review and analysis of the organization's culture (guiding and operating values) with management trainees followed by the requisite management skills training to facilitate the new corporate culture.

One of the major areas in which a paradigm-shifting experience must take place is in a self-assessment of our assumptions concerning human motivation in the work place. Research by Herzberg (1987) has been replicated by numerous other studies with the same conclusions. [5] There seem to be two categories of human motivators. Furthermore, effective organizations/managers apply them in working with their people.

Herzberg calls the lower level motivators "maintenance factors" or those that must be present to maintain a minimal level of satisfaction (e.g., job security, salary, work conditions, company benefits and policies). However, higher levels of satisfaction can only be realized when the employees are provided opportunities (empowered) to use their intellect to improve the process. Without involvement, there is no commitment. Effective organizations and their managers are paying more attention to these higher level motivators by developing systematic programs or personal habits so that employees can experience achievement, recognition, advancement, be turned on by the work itself and experience personal growth that comes with increasing levels of

responsibility (i.e., Employee Motivation + Empowered Opportunity + Achievement + Rewards = Employee Commitment). The winners and non-winners of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award have realized these important keys to success.

The Juran Institute, Inc. (1991) has been close observers of the Baldrige Award winners and non-winners in terms of the things they did to achieve stunning quality results. For the winners and non-winners, quality results were a result of a combination of strategies employed and not one here and there. According to the Juran Institute, what did work was: 1) processes at the worker level were revised by the workers so as to put workers in a state of self-control, 2) the work force were provided opportunities to participate actively on quality improvement teams, and 3) test sites were established at which teams of workers were trained and empowered to become self-supervising. [7] In general, these organizations put into practice the concept that planning for quality should involve participation by those who will be impacted by the plan.

What did not work for the Baldrige winners and non-winners, according to the Juran Institute, was: 1) Massive meetings of employees, speeches, wall posters, pledge cards, slogans, and the colorful rest. Such spectacles lacked substance, and were commonly views as "here comes another one." Subsequently, the credibility of the sponsoring managers was reduced, 2) programs whose sole emphasis was on Statistical Process Control. Organizations which focused on training in tools, alone, generally were focusing on the useful many improvements while neglecting the vital few, 3) Quality Control Circles, 4) the Project-by-Project approach to improvements neglected the vital establishment of a corporate quality infrastructure which harness and focus all quality initiatives and resources, and 5) Increased inspection and testing. [7]

Many valuable lessons can be learned, and mistakes not duplicated, if managers would take the time to seek out research findings such as these. Unfortunately, according to McGregor (1960), most managers reject the findings of social science research. Instead they believe that their own experience is an adequate database on which to make decisions. [8]

Covey (1989) reminds us of Aesop's fable of the goose and the golden eggs - a story about a poor farmer who becomes fabulously wealthy when he discovers his pet goose (the production asset/capability) lays glittering golden eggs (production). However, with his increasing wealth, comes greed and impatience for more and he kills the goose to get all the eggs at once. He not only discovers no eggs, but the producing asset (the goose) is no longer capable of producing any more of the

prized golden eggs. Covey suggests that there are three kinds of assets in every enterprise - Physical assets, Financial assets and Human assets. Our poor farmer, and far too many managers, place all their eggs in one basket - Financial Assets (e.g., Quarterly Reports, decisions driven by production quotas). However, it is the human assets that have control over both the physical and financial assets. If managers operate from a paradigm that focuses on golden eggs and neglects the care and feeding of the goose, we will soon be without the asset that produces golden eggs. When managers fail to respect the Production/Production Capability (P/PC) balance in their use of physical and financial assets in organizations, they decrease organizational effectiveness. [3]

One of Edwards W. Demings' 14 points is to "give people an opportunity to take pride in their work." Deming says that managers in the U.S. do not utilize what they have available to them - the creative minds of their people. In fact, Deming says, when it comes to utilizing the intellect of its own work force, the United States is a third-world country. If management did a better job of utilizing their people, says Deming, they would get a higher level of employee commitment.

McGregor says, that "commitment is a function of the rewards associated with achievement." [8] No doubt you've heard it said that management gets the behaviors it rewards and the behaviors that are not rewarded, go away. Employee commitment is a function/outcome of: 1) providing employees opportunities which facilitate the higher level motivators and 2) providing a reward system that is tied to the higher level motivators. And management controls both of these factors in our equation - the giving of opportunities (empowering) and the rewards based on achievement. And the personal paradigms that far too many managers are operating with are bent towards controlling, repressing and intimidating their people.

A DEFINITION OF EMPOWERMENT

A foundation has now been laid on which a definition of empowerment can be built. Empowerment is the effective application of understanding, enabling, and encouraging our people for the constant improvement of all processes.

Understanding our people means, as manager, we must possess an operational knowledge of the research on human motivation in the work place. We build a much more solid foundation on which empowerment is defined, and measured, when we managers understand and apply what research tells us about the factors that enhance employee commitment, loyalty and interest in improving the job processes, products and services.

Enabling our people means we give our people opportunities to realize the higher-level motivators, take ownership of their jobs, operate within a team structure for the purpose of continuous innovation and improvement of all processes. Measurement systems (quality tools/techniques) provide a feedback system with indicators of how well our processes are performing to meet our internal and external customer requirements (satisfaction).

Encouraging our people means we maintain their self-esteem (e.g., When we create value for other people, they soon create value for us), we listen and respond with empathy, ask for help in solving problems, and offer help without taking back the responsibility and authority. Understanding, enabling and encouraging our people represents the heart of a customer-driven operating philosophy committed to excellence in products, services, and relationships through the total participation in the constant improvement of all processes.

WHY AREN'T LEADERS LEADING?

A Gallup Poll surveyed 401 CEOs of America's largest corporations. The results indicated the following: 1) Most CEOs know that American firms have a problem with quality, 2) Over 50% of the CEOs surveyed said that they did not accept responsibility for problems associated with quality, 3) Over 50% of the CEOs said that it is the employees' lack of skills, commitment and understanding of their work that makes it difficult to deliver a quality product or service, 4) 61.7% of the CEOs said that the lack of management attention to quality does not affect quality, and 5) 70% of the CEOs said the pressure for short-term profits did not have an impact on quality. [9]

William Roth reports that the long-term objective in investing in quality improvement is to steadily improve the corporation's bottom line through better planning, relevant training, the introduction of appropriate statistical measurement tools and better use of employee expertise (empowerment). Short-term objectives have been to enhance the company's image by publicizing its' new dedication to quality improvement. This is evident by senior managers who appear periodically to make well crafted speeches which often note that improved quality requires "cultural change and must become a way of life." The trick, as Roth reports, is to watch their feet as well as their mouths. Imaging is easier than doing. And because it is easier, senior management becomes more interested in creating the image of improved quality than in actually improving it. According to Roth, "Employees learn all too frequently, that upper level managers are indeed for improved quality and the necessary changes, but only so long as they themselves are not affected and only so

long as alterations in their own style of management (paradigm) are not necessary. They are currently involved in too many crises upon which the fortunes of the company depend to worry about changing the way they do things. If the top people don't set the example and play by the rules, no one else will. If the top people decide they are allowed to modify the rules to deal with the pressures of leadership others will quickly follow suit." [10]

Deming says that 94% of the quality problems in most organizations can be traced to problems in the organization's own systems and process, whereas, only 6% of the quality problems can be traced to a particular employee. Who owns the organization's systems and processes? Managers are the only one's given the authority to allocate/approve resources to make improvements/changes to the organizations processes/systems. How can the system/processes in an organization be improved/changed? Only through the intellect of the work force. And yet, how do managers in most organizations get ahead or climb the corporate ladder? By conforming to the system rather than by changing/improving the system. Do you get a sense of the dilemma most organizations face when trying to move past making verbal commitments to TQM to a legitimate operating philosophy that effectively empowers its work force?

The case presented thus far begs two questions, 1) What is an effective paradigm - one in harmony with the precepts of TQM? and 2) How can a manager determine (measure) whether his/her working paradigm is moving (shifting) towards empowering their work force?"

An effective paradigm reflects a balance between production (performance) and the production asset/capability (the care and feeding of our human assets). The guidelines for human conduct that are proven to have enduring, permanent value are fairness, integrity, honesty, trust, human dignity, a servant's attitude/practice, an urgency for quality, being personally responsible for cultivating the potential of our work force through training, retraining and nurturing opportunities to be empowered, patience with people and a tolerance for mistakes, and daily encouragement. These guidelines for human conduct (leadership behaviors) form the basis for a paradigm consistent with the precepts of TQM. How can we establish a structure for management accountability where these Empowerment standards of behavior can be measured (baselined), reported, and the results used for constructive purposes?

MEASURING AND REPORTING EMPOWERMENT BEHAVIORS

A familiar continuous improvement axiom says, "To improve anything, you have to have a baseline." That is, we cannot know whether or not we have improved

until we can compare where we are to where we were (baseline) or where we should/would like to be (some standard of performance). The Empowerment Indicator Survey which follows measures four categories (subscales) of management-employee relations which management is responsible for initiating and maintaining. This survey was developed by this author (after reading William C. Byham's Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment) and is currently being used with McDonnell Douglas Training Systems courseware development managers for the C-17 Aircrew Training System in Norman, Oklahoma.

After reading Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment, all employees complete the Empowerment Indicator Survey rating the supervisor or manager to whom they report. The Empowerment Indicator Survey is an indicator of: 1) The degree to which the delegated responsibility, accountability, and authority of empowerment is being realized by the people who report to the manager or supervisor being rated, and 2) The degree to which the responsibility, accountability, and authority for empowering people has been communicated and delegated down to the individual manager or supervisor.

The first time the survey is administered, a baseline can be established. Subsequent measurements will indicate the extent to which a manager's empowerment behaviors (his or her paradigm) are moving (shifting) in the direction of an effective TQM paradigm (i.e., shifting from a 1, 2 or 3 to a 4, 5 or 6 on the response scale). The results from individual managers can be compared to their own past measurement periods to determine if the paradigm shift is in a positive direction. The composite mean scores from all managers whose empowerment behaviors are being baselined provide another valuable benchmark on which to assess individual or organizational progress.

The Empowerment Indicator Survey results may indicate the extent to which an individual supervisor or manager is empowering his/her people; however, the reality is that the score may also indicate the extent to which a supervisor or manager has been empowered by their own manager. The responsibility, accountability, and authority for empowering the work force should be first modeled and then delegated top-down in an organization. Subsequently, there should be a correlation between a supervisor's empowerment behaviors and his/her manager's empowerment behaviors. To reflect both possibilities - that a score has the potential of being owned by both supervisor and manager, an "NA" (No Authority; The responsibility and authority has not been delegated down to my manager) on the response scale is scored as a zero (0).

Results from the Empowerment Indicator Survey are intended to serve as a tool/catalyst for open discussion among all levels of management and the work force. Therefore, individual supervisors and managers sit down with their people, share the results and seek advise about how they can continue to manifest this paradigm-shifting experience.

Results from tracking manager's empowerment behaviors for the past year at the C-17 MDTs-Norman site have yielded the following preliminary findings and conclusions: 1) Program mean scores increased each measurement period indicating an increase in the level of empowerment experienced by the work

force. Conclusion: Establishing a structure of management accountability that includes Empowerment standards of performance for empowering the work force, and a measurement system to provide managers periodic feedback relative to the direction and strength of their paradigm shift, will increase the level of empowerment experienced by the work force. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to conclude whether the reasons for increased empowerment scores were due to avoidance of low scores, increased awareness, or some other factors (e.g., Hawthorn effect). 2) Senior managers (rated by their direct reports - the middle managers) received the highest ratings (Mean = 4.74) of all managers or supervisors rated. Conclusion: Middle managers believe they are being empowered by senior managers and the paradigms of senior managers are shifting in a positive direction. 3) Middle managers (rated by first-line supervisors and their work force) received the lowest ratings (Mean = 3.79) of all managers or supervisors rated. Conclusion: While middle managers felt empowered by senior managers, first-line supervisors and the work force, in general, did not experience or enjoy a comparable level of empowerment. Middle managers, and to an extent first-line supervisors, appear to be a major inhibitor to the releasing/delegation of empowerment. 4) The items which were rated the lowest across all management levels were within the Maintain the Self Esteem subscale (particularly items 20 and 26). Conclusion: Management training in this area is recommended. 5) Overall empowerment mean scores for the organization increased when quality-productivity measurement systems were employed by the work force. Conclusion: Quality-productivity measurement systems appear to be an effective tool and catalyst which facilitates increased work force involvement in the constant improvement of processes and products. There are, however, other factors that could explain this increase.

CONCLUSION

The progress of a quality program is measured in years rather than months. Much of the progress achieved in the past eighteen months at the MDTs-Norman site

is centered around quality awareness, establishing a quality infrastructure, measurement systems, and new skills. The effective implementation of empowerment, and Total Quality management as well, will include a model for management accountability and will not neglect a paradigm-shifting set of experiences for the managers involved in training - with periodic self-assessment and retraining. Unfortunately, far too much of TQM training is not addressing this critical cultural change and are, instead, focusing resources on quick fix techniques and image building which only yields the veneer of success. The reality (i.e., the experience of the work force) is change that does not substantively change anything nor does it make anything better - only different.

EMPOWERMENT INDICATOR SURVEY (Manager's Form)

Directions:

After reading each question, use the following response scale and circle the number on the Answer Sheet that accurately describes the degree to which the following statements reflect your personal experience.

RESPONSE SCALE

1. Practically none; to a very small degree
2. Not very much; to a small degree
3. Moderately (on the low side)
4. Moderately (on the high side)
5. Very much; To a high degree
6. Extremely; To a very high degree

NA No Authority; The responsibility and authority has not been delegated down to my manager

Sample:

	Low	High
11. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities (being asked) to share your ideas.	1 2 3 4 5 6 NA	

EMPOWERMENT INDICATOR SURVEY (Manager's Form)

1. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities which facilitate within you feelings that your job belongs to you -vs- belongs to the company.
2. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications foster a working environment which provides opportunities for you to make things better and better.
3. The degree to which, time permitting, your manager provides opportunities which allow you to tackle problems normally not your job.
4. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities for taking on the challenges that affect your performance (-vs- not getting the opportunity or having the responsibility taken away).
5. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities which facilitate the understanding that your job really counts for something (-vs- doesn't really matter).
6. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities for you to discuss anything related to your job that is really important.
7. The degree to which you are asked by your manager to help solve problems or your opinions are sought.
8. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities to solve your own problems -vs- having someone else solve your problems for you (i.e., the degree to which you have ownership of solutions that affect your performance).
9. The degree to which your manager, or the system, lets you know how well you are doing (i.e., receive prompt, regular and meaningful feedback concerning your performance).
10. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications foster a working environment in which your teammates can be trusted.
11. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities for you (being asked) to share your ideas.
12. The degree to which your ideas, if deserving, receive credit or recognition.
13. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities for you to have some say in how things get done that affect you or your performance (-vs- someone else making those decisions for you).

14. The degree to which you feel your ideas, opinions, or contributions are listened to by your manager.

15. The degree to which your manager has encouraged your team to develop and manage your own quality-schedule performance/feedback system (-vs- having someone else managing the feedback system).

16. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications foster a working environment which enhances and reinforces the concept that your job is a part of who you are.

17. The degree to which your manager makes available adequate resources to do your job.

18. The degree to which information essential to your job/performance is shared by your manager.

19. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications provide opportunities for you, and your job, to perform an important role on your team (-vs- feeling like you or your job doesn't count).

20. The degree to which your manager says something constructive about your performance daily.

21. The degree to which you feel your manager is providing adequate direction.

22. The degree to which your manager helps everyone on your team understand how their individual or team's mission fits with the overall mission of the program.

23. The degree to which adequate support from your manager is provided to do your job without your manager taking that support or responsibility from you.

24. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities which give you the feeling that you are on the inside (e.g., shares information vital to the performance of your job, invites you to work some issues important to the team/organization).

25. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities for you to demonstrate responsibility, accountability, and authority (-vs- just doing whatever you are told).

26. The degree to which your manager shares your team's successes with the rest of the organization.

27. The degree to which your manager makes your team aware of how well they are doing.

28. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications facilitate the belief that your job is important and therefore, it is easy for you to connect your job to the organization's common purpose/mission.

29. The degree to which your manager provides opportunities which facilitate the belief that you can make a difference.

30. The degree to which your manager's actions, decisions, and communications foster a working environment which facilitate the desire among your teammates to really make things better and better.

31. The degree to which your manager has provided people on your team opportunities, responsibility, accountability, and the authority for taking on the challenges that affect your team's performance (-vs- having opportunities, responsibility, accountability, and the authority taken away).

32. The degree to which your manager has helped you understand how your individual and team's mission fits with the overall mission of the program/organization.

EMPOWERMENT SUMMARY

SUBSCALE	ITEM NO.	FUNCTIONAL AREA SCORE	PRODUCT'S MEAN SCORE	GAP	SUBSCALE	ITEM NO.	FUNCTIONAL AREA SCORE	PRODUCT'S MEAN SCORE	GAP
MAINTAIN	1				ASKS FOR HELP	3			
	5					7			
	9					11			
	15					13			
	29					18			
	22					24			
SELF-ESTEEM	26				IN SOLVING	4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	27					11		7.5	4.07
	28					15		1.2	4.05
	29					19		3.62	3.64
	32					21		4.49	4.15
	26					23		3.25	3.25
LISTENS AND RESPONDS WITH	2				PROBLEMS	15			
	6					19			
	10					21			
	14					23			
	17					25			
	30					31			
EMPATHY	1				OFFERS HELP	4			
	5					8			
	9					12			
	15					19			
	21					23			
	27					31			
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6				WITHOUT TAKING	4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6				RESPONSIBILITY	4			
	total.... / 6					8			
	total.... / 6					12			
	total.... / 6					15			
	total.... / 6					19			
	total.... / 6					23			
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6				COMPOSITE SCORE	4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03
	total.... / 6					11		7.5	4.07
SUBSCALE SCORE	total.... / 6					15		1.2	4.05
	total.... / 6					19		3.62	3.64
	total.... / 6					21		4.49	4.15
	total.... / 6					23		3.25	3.25
	total.... / 6					31			
	total.... / 6					4.22	3.69	4.27	4.03

[5] Herzberg, Frederick, "One more time: How do you motivate employees?" Harvard Business Review, September-October 1987, No. 87507.

[6] Kilmann, Ralph H., Beyond the Quick Fix, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1988.

[7] Juran, J.M., "Made in USA - A Quality Resurgence," The Journal for Quality and Participation. March 1991, pp. 6-8.

[8] McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1960, p. 6.

[9] Bram, James, "Gallup Poll shows CEOs passing Quality Buck." Quality Update, Philip Crosby Associates, Fall 1990, Winter Park, Florida.

[10] Roth, William, "Why aren't Leaders Leading?" The Journal for Quality and Participation. June 1991, p. 76-80.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Graydon Dawson is the Courseware Product Assurance manager for Simms Industries Inc. - a subcontractor to McDonnell Douglas Training Systems' C-17 Aircrew Training System in Norman, Oklahoma. Simms Industries provides scientific, engineering, training systems design and development, and management services to the Federal Government (DOD and DOE) and commercial enterprises. Graydon has spent 22 years in the field of education/training and development. Before initiating the quality improvement activities at McDonnell Douglas, Graydon served as a performance analyst and instructional systems design specialist conducting organizational and human performance studies for Electronic Data Systems Corporation (EDS), AT&T and General Motors Corporation. Graydon has also served as a full-time professor of Instructional Systems Design, Interactive Technologies and/or Division Chair for Texas Christian University, Oklahoma State University, Friends University and Southern Nazarene University (SNU). Besides working with McDonnell Douglas, Graydon is currently an adjunct professor for SNU teaching courses in Business Research/Applied Statistics, Principles of Management, and Systems Management for the Management of Human Resources (MHR) program. Graydon has presented over a dozen technical or research papers at national conventions and has published over 35 articles - the latest in The Journal for Quality and Participation (December 1991).