



Achieving Accountability Through Shared Values

Conversations with Rob Lebow

Master teacher, platform keynote speaker, author

Prepared by Carol Butler, AOK Archivist

Note: The asynchronous nature of online discussion groups can be confusing, as the reader often encounters several unrelated messages between one question and its reply. The Star Series discussions at AOK are a rich resource for those of us interested in knowledgework. In appreciation for all that our guest moderators and fellow AOKers do to make these discussions so interesting, I attempt here to create an archival record that feels more like a face-to-face conversation. All contributions to this Star Series conversation are reproduced below in their entirety, but the order has been modified to create a smoother narrative. – Carol Butler, AOK Archivist

More information about this and other Star Series discussions can be found at the AOK website (<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/stars.html>).

*About the Archives. A sentence or two from most messages has been highlighted in blue to make it easier to scan the document for a [quick overview of the entire conversation](#). Most messages contain 2 Subject lines. The first **subject line** was provided by an AOK editor, and appeared in the subject line of the message delivered to members; the last subject line was written by the person posting the message and appeared within the text of the message. Long signatures have been reduced to the **poster's name**.*

Date: Sun Jan 18, 2004 5:51 pm

Subject: ACCOUNTABILITY: Welcome Rob Lebow to the STAR Series

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: Please Welcome Rob Lebow (and Randy Spitzer) to the first STAR Series Dialogue for 2004.

STAR Series with Rob Lebow

It is again my pleasure to introduce Rob Lebow, master teacher, platform keynote speaker, author and co-author of three U.S. Bestsellers including "Accountability: Freedom and Responsibility without Control

<<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>>."

I am also pleased to announce that Randy Spitzer, the other co-author of "Accountability," plans on joining Rob for this Dialogue. Randy is a senior team member of an international research and training organization that serves companies in helping them create Freedom-Based environments. Their clients include FORD-Asia Pacific Operations, Pepsi Cola, ENGEN Oil of South Africa, US Food Service, Goodyear Tyre-Australia, IBM-Mid America Credit Union, ARAMCO Saudi Arabia, TRANE-HVAC, the US Government and literally hundreds of other operations.

Randy has been an educator for twenty-nine years in both the public school system and the corporate arena. Additionally, Randy is a Certified Financial Planner(tm) and an author of many articles on business related subjects.

Together, Rob and Randy deliver a powerful message to management about the essential elements of accountability: Beliefs about people - how people perform best; Leadership Approach - how goals are set and responsibilities are distributed ; Accountability Approach - how people are accountable; and finally, the Kinds of People Needed - how people behave.

They have not been focused specifically on knowledge management and their book only utters the word twice. Yet, their work easily converges with the views of KMers and provides another way of putting the value proposition to corporate and public decision-makers.

If you have not yet done your homework for this discussion, please go now to "Preparing for Conversations with Rob Lebow <<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/lebow.html>>, then come think with us for the next two weeks.

But first, help me welcome Rob Lebow to the STAR seat, and Randy Spitzer as co-pilot.

Date: Sun Jan 18, 2004 6:20 pm

Subject: Accountability: Giving Up Control

From: Jerry Ash

Hi Rob (and Randy).

I don't know if I've ever fully explained my enthusiasm for your book.

As I have engaged in the AOK KM Dialogues over the past three years, I have noticed that we often shy away from the biggest roadblock standing in the way of a trusting, energized workplace environment where tacit knowledge can be unleashed and leveraged into real value and competitive advantage; that roadblock -- management.

Some of us see the roadblock so formidable , myself included, that we have sometimes resorted to the belief that hierarchy will always exist and, therefore, there will always be

a parallel system of hierarchy and stealth KM at work -- one calling the shots and one accomplishing the goals in spite of them!

Your vision has given me new hope -- that yes there will always be hierarchy but it can adapt to the needs of a collaborative environment by changing corporate culture deeply rooted in the Industrial Age. But that means giving up control. I love the idea. But how realistic is it?

Date: Mon Jan 19, 2004 6:38 am

Subject: Accountability: Giving Up Control vs. Taking Control

From: Jack Vinson, Ph.D., Knowledge Jolt, Inc

Subject: RE: [AOK_K-Net] Accountability: Giving Up Control

Welcome aboard, Rob and Randy. And to all of AOK, Happy New Year!

Based on Jerry's initial comments -- the concern that "management" is the roadblock -- I wonder how pervasive this idea is. I've just read another book in the Accountability genre, Ticoll & Tapscott's Naked Corporation which basically says that corporations won't go the transparency route unless either the top leadership believes that it will add value to the organization or companies are forced to do it through legislation.

I also participate in another forum where people are asking a similar question: We have this Great Idea, but why do companies drop the ball after trying it for only a short while? Even companies where the Great Idea showed a benefit have reverted to their old ways of doing things. Several people groused about management, but I think the more apropos comments went the direction of human behavior. While the Great Idea might be helpful, it requires too big a change in behavior, and that change is not being reinforced. As a result, when there are changes in the organization / leadership, the Great Idea loses its momentum.

Can human organizations really not handle change? Or are we so unfamiliar with true change that we have difficulty communicating and implementing change in our human organizations. I suspect the latter. It is so much easier to go back to doing it the way it has always been done, particularly when all the supporting business mechanisms work better with the old way of doing things.

So, how to create lasting change, whether it is for Accountability, knowledge management or [insert your idea here]?

Jack

Date: Mon Jan 19, 2004 6:50 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Giving Up vs. Taking Control - Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: Some of us want/need the freedom to act

We've experienced some technical glitches which I hope I've worked out; and Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer should be in action tomorrow.

Meanwhile, I thought I would respond to Jack Vinson's concerns about human behavior.

I have been wrapping up the Conclusion of my book, *_Stars of the NEW ORDER_*. The Conclusion is a summary written in a blend of the collaborative words of 59 contributors featured in the book. One passage was largely inspired by STAR Moderator Carol Kinsey Goman. It goes like this:

"Human beings are social animals. Creative thinking and knowledge sharing comes naturally to us as children but it changes with our formal education process, where we begin to learn it is unwise to share what we know. For example, we learn only some children get good grades in art class, and so, they are the only ones deemed "artistic." These misconceptions are enhanced by organizations that place "creative" people in marketing, communications, PR and advertising and don't seek ideas from the whole. People in direct contact on a daily basis with customers and competitors probably have more strategic wisdom than the decision-makers back at the office.

"The common misconception has too often been that employees have limited or narrow capabilities, are untrustworthy or even disloyal. And yet, [no one's goal in life is to do a mediocre job at a company they hate. In fact, most want to do a terrific job on meaningful projects at a company they care about and with people they like. This is the potential power behind empowerment and trust.](#) We want to <some of us even need to> trust and have the freedom to act both independently and collaboratively.

"When reward systems and department funding are designed to create competition between employees, it's nurture vs. nature; and, most organizations have been inadvertently nurturing mistrust and knowledge hoarding for as long as they have had the Industrial Age mindset."

'Nuff said.

Jerry

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 3:27 pm

Subject: **Accountability: Re. Giving Up Control vs. Taking Control - Rob Lebow**

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Dropping the Ball a Common Occurrence

To: Jack Vinson and all

The notion of transparency is normally instigated from outside an organization. Either government or some other power-base. I agree with this premise.

Dropping the ball is a pretty common human occurrence. And changes in leadership doesn't help. Humans are wonderful adapters to change...that is why they have survived so long. [The idea or change has to be "sticky" enough to grab folks attention.](#) People don't ordinarily like change, but the like to change. Fashion, electronics...trends etc. are not modern phenomenon.

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Rob Lebow

Date: Mon Jan 19, 2004 2:33 pm

Subject: Accountability: Realistic? It's Been Done

From: Jack Ring, proprietor, Innovation Management

Subject: Welcome Rob and Randy

I am glad that you both are willing to interact. I have read the introductory material, Jerry's 'realistic' question and Jack Vinson's 'lasting change' viewpoint. Please consider the following 500 words and recommend what therapy I need, if any.

After learning, in GE, 45 years ago, the difference between responsibility (to person) vs. accountability (for result) I have observed that few people use these two concepts accordingly and exhibit astounding levels of creativity and fast footwork when faced with impending accountability. It appears as if only a small percentage of humans are comfortable being accountable. The fearful balance grudgingly submit themselves, Monday through Friday, to voluntary adult detention facilities where the wardens, being former inmates, know that 'anyone willing to work here cannot be trusted. Besides, the wardens do not want to set a precedent of accountabilities traceable to an individual. In fact, it was to avoid personal accountability that Ben Franklin invented the legal entity called a corporation in the first place.

Regardless of The Big Debate in the Sky about Free Will, it doesn't have to be this way. Phil Crosby, author of *Quality is Free* and *The Eternally Successful Organization*, figured out how to educe accountability in workgroups and individuals and founded Quality College, graduating thousands to date. Also did Dee Hock, architect of VISA Corp., and author of *Birth of the Chaordic Age*. His work is being carried on at www.chaordic.com. Sounds like your Shared Values Process does so, as well.

In the physical and information sciences the field of control theory makes the choices fairly clear -- Oversight, Embedded and Systemic (autonomic). The Agility Forum noted that a framework and module architecture enabled a more agile organization. See Rick Dove's *Response Ability; the Language, Structure and Culture of the Agile Enterprise*, Stafford Beer's icosahedron architecture is stronger but unable to bend in the winds of

political, economic and social change, thus too brittle. Even with appropriate framework, however, the modules (including humans) must be harmonized into a system. And, being indeterminant devices the human modules require continual, up close and personal adjustment.

This highlights the four kinds of organizational architectures for socio-technical systems; Structured, Process-oriented, Object-based and Chaordic. Dr. Lebow's transaction view seems mostly process-oriented but does have some object and chaordic tones. The danger is that it focuses on the Customer which may not adequately accommodate the other kinds of stakeholders.

It isn't about management. Time wounds all heels. Each individual, regardless of role, is the key. As Pogo observed, "We have met the enemy and they are us." Ironically, humans enjoy change and change in-joys humans. The big blockage is created by the way we go about attempting to control change. As Churchill said, "I love to learn. It is being taught to which I object."

Accountability and KM (better, KProduction and KUtilization) are closely interrelated. When accountable, a person wants to know goals, situation, options, likelihoods, techniques, etc. and, when appreciative of another's accountability is proactive in sharing. Further, each accountable person is interested in resolving what they know they don't know and even in discovering what they don't know they know. Being accountable also heightens the appreciation of "Freedom to" as contrasted to "Freedom from," thus the Personal Best at mastering the basics.

Getting there is quite realistic. It's been done many times. Even by managers. Perhaps not too often by "consultants" and those who presume to "teach."

Am I seeing clearly or not?

Cheers,

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 3:32 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Realistic? It's been done. - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject:

I agree, if accountability means "whom to blame, you'd only find Joan of Arc" stepping forward. And Mr. Jack Welch really went after folks...if you know what I mean? I like Phil Crosby. He is a friend of one of my co-authors, Bill Simon co- author of Lasting Change, my second book. The Shared Values Process is available to anyone who wants the details...just request it.

Humans if given the chance will respond intrinsically to all requests and challenges. They do not need adjustments. That is an extrinsic concept...and it is resented and not

sustainable in the long run. As for focusing on the customer...if you pull that off successfully everything is easy. If customers [internal or external] are served that includes all stakeholders, not just the guy paying the bills.

You are on the right track Jack Ring. [Creating Accountability all depends on our beliefs about who people are and what their capacity and intentions are. I believe people want to be great.](#) Let's keep talking.

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!
Rob Lebow

Date: Wed Jan 21, 2004 11:17 am

Subject: [Accountability: 'M' in 'KM' Stands for Mangement - Carl Frappaolo](#)

From: Carl Frappaolo, executive vice president, The Delphi Group, and previous STAR Series moderator

Subject: Re: [AOK_K-Net] Digest Number 297

Management is not responsible for a lack of knowledge sharing, an inability to enact change or anything else for that matter. Too often we look for the easy, universal source of weakness, and are too quick to point a finger.

If we have not learned anything else, we should have learned that knowledge management is NOT ABOUT THE SAME THINGS in every organization. KM is a very personal and situational matter. Sure, the management in one company may be a roadblock to KM, but in the next it can be the biggest supporter and catalyst to KM. I have seen some management teams that inspire their teams to be innovative and collaborators. These managers typically lead by example, and demonstrate through daily practice a cooperative and agile relationship with other fellow managers. I have also witnessed management teams that create silos or fiefdoms of power, who rarely open their world of control to the scrutiny and coordination of other managers.

[It is difficult for KM to endure when management sets the wrong example and creates roadblocks, \(although I have witnessed strong user cultures that operate KM in stealth mode\). But, we cannot say that management is therefore universally an impediment to KM.](#) A little bit of the right kind of leadership and structure is critical to KM. Remember the M in KM does stand for management after all. Would others agree? How about some stories where management has made a positive difference?

Carl

Date: Wed Jan 21, 2004 7:35 pm

Subject: [Accountability: Re. 'KM' Stands for Management - Mark McElroy](#)

From: Mark W. McElroy, President, KMCI, CEO, Macroinnovation Associates, LLC

Subject: If Management Isn't Responsible for Setting Conditions, Who Is?

Hi Carl:

Not sure I get your point. On the one hand you say that the 'M' in KM stands for management and you go on to cite some opposing cases where management's influence on KM has led to varying results; but you also seem to be saying that management is not responsible for a "lack of knowledge sharing" and so forth.

If management is not responsible for setting the conditions in which knowledge processing (innovation, sharing, integration, etc) occurs -- including its outcomes -- then who is? And if not management, why not management? And if management's active influence can be shown to have positive outcomes, why in the world shouldn't we take notice of that and adopt the view that management OUGHT to actively engaged in making such influences whenever it can?

Moreover, I disagree with your claim that KM "is not about the same things in every organization." At one level it is: it's about enhancing an organization's capacity to learn, innovate, solve problems, and adapt. Of course the specifics will vary, but the overall mission is the same.

Regards,

Mark

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 6:25 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Management Setting Conditions - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Move Argument to Freedom-based Metaphor

Carl, you are suggesting that human behavior effects KM. And he's right. Mark is suggesting that despite human factors managers should take a lead...and I believe he is right. Here is the question. Both colleagues - Mark and Carl hold good positions with the issue at a stalemate because they are thinking within a Control-Based metaphore. In a Freedom-Based metaphore it is never the individual manager who become responsible for promoting learning, innovation, creativity, sharing and integration, it's the culture itself. [Again, it is a village that raises a child...with the parents overseeing from a distance.]

What about focusing on how a culture -- not individuals -- could be responsible for these very socially positive activities. Not getting too political, but would you want "civil liberties" given over to our fearless Attorney General - John Ashcroft to facilitate and drive personal liberties and define the boundaries of what is good or bad? [And, I'm a card carrying Republican.] So, I'd recommend that both you gentlemen move from a Controlled environment that places all power in management and view this argument or discussion within the context of a Freedom-Based metaphor, the one we talk about in the

book Accountability: Freedom and Responsibility with Control

<<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html>>. That is more Jeffersonian than some of us are comfortable with...but KM is about individuals asserting their God given right to act and behave this way, without management's "permission!"

Finally, I would suggest that Mark McElroy is defining exactly what we have been literally installing in clients all over the world. It's called the Shared Values Process®/Operating System. It is based on Shared Values from 17 folks who were asked what was important to them from 40 countries around the world...2.4 million were Americans...the rest were from around the world. KM and Shared Values are very similar...If you want to find out more just go to Lebowco.com...lots of stuff...enough of the promoting stuff...

Again, place your comments in a Freedom-Based/Shared Values concept and it is always the individual who is responsible for their learning..as well as the culture that leaders create, or the context...In a Freedom-Based culture there are "NO" and I repeat "NO" managers! Period! By-the-way, we define a manager as someone who hired someone so badly that they are assigned to watch the poor devil. Again, there is no such thing as a manager in real life! Unless you talk to folks who are in prison!

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Rob

Date: Fri Jan 23, 2004 6:55 pm

Subject: Accountability: A Correction and a Gift from Rob Lebow - Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

In Rob's post to Carl Frappaolo (Re. Management Setting Conditions), Rob referred to a Shared Values Study involving (correction) 17 million folks who were asked what was important to them from 40 countries around the world.

Now he makes available to us at no cost, the results of that study. Use the following URL to download the PDF:

<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/lebow.html>

Jerry

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 3:21 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. 'M' in K'M' Stands for Mangement - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Shared Values Generates Responsibility

To Carl and all:

No group is responsible for all the woes of a particular situation - KM included. Expectations are always different. And, we are not mind readers. For example recently I had a run-in with an editor [actually today] who did not understand my schedule nor did I really understand his expectations. Well, you can imagine the havoc it caused until we continued to work together and discuss our boundaries. Remember, we all think and act as though we are the "center of the Universe." Well, we are not. So [introducing the Shared Values concept](#) could make the difference. I will list them for all of us...me included.

Here is the unique list:

1. Truthfulness shared without compromise.
2. Trust lavished on everyone.
3. Mentoring shared unselfishly in all directions.
4. Openness to new ideas regardless of their origin. Not on an individual's personal status.
5. Risk-taking for the organization's sake.
6. Giving credit where it is due and helping define and raise standards in all areas.
7. Honesty and ethics in all matters.
8. Selflessness that requires putting others first as an intrinsic responsibility.

Have a great day Carl...and thanks for your time.

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Rob

Date: Wed Jan 21, 2004 6:36 pm

Subject: Accountability: Software Only Managed by CoP - Kurt Rieger

From: Kurt Rieger ATP Management Design - Business Integration

Subject: Reply to Carl Frappaolo:

I am heading to Cairo for 7 month on Monday 26. The following is a short cut:

International guidelines for managing electronic safety related systems changed the "ball game," but these guidelines do NOT apply to every organisation. But many organisations

now make use of business critical software - so it may be "best practice" to manage all business software by the guidelines for safety critical software. If we accept this in principle then:

Business critical software systems can only be managed by a CoP - therefore it can be assumed that management is responsible for/accountable for realizing knowledge sharing within an organisation. However if we use the term management in its broadest interpretation, then managers are not responsible, but the Board of Directors is - so it's up to? It's that "thing" which I call [organisational leadership](#).

I am working on a simple presentation to demonstrate the "big picture" which I will submit later in this fortnight - it will be a word document with an embedded powerpoint presentation - so it will only work on MS Office 2000 and later.

Kind Regards
Kurt

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 6:12 pm

Subject: [Accountability: Re. Accountability Only Manged by CoP - Rob Lebow](#)

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Herald Learning as a Strategic Event

Kurt is correct in that leaders are responsible to create a level playing field. But that sounds too passive. [Leaders need to "herald learning as a strategic event." It is not a "program"...for this year or next...it is a way of life, just like quality, customer-service or innovation!](#) If you sign on to our company XYZ then get use to the fact that learning and knowledge that turns to experimentation, appropriate risk-taking, adventuring with staff members is ongoing...never ending...Rob

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 12:10 pm

Subject: [CULTURE: AOKers Know Culture](#)

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: Preparing for Conversations with Ourselves

So far, posts have debated whether cultural change begins with the organization, groups or individuals. Personally, I have come to believe no amount of stealth or guerrilla tactics will truly succeed in changing cultural roadblocks to knowledge sharing on the shop floor. Those tactics are designed to practice knowledge work in spite of the environment, not by changing it. [If an organization is to become a knowledge-friendly workplace, it will need leadership by genuine example from top level executives and middle managers. Convincing defensive workers to come out of their trenches will not be easy and cannot be done unless the "way we manage" precedes the "way we work."](#)

But that is just my personal opinion.

I did a search of the AOK Web site to see what some of you have already said about the roles of corporate and people cultures. There were 113 finds! First up was a white paper by AOKer Maribeth Achterberg, president of Verity Management Solutions, LLC of Greenbay Wisconsin: "How Culture Affects Information Sharing in an Organization:"

<<http://www.kwork.org/White%20Papers/cultural.html>>.

Hot linked anchors take you to several subjects including:

* What really Comprises Organizational Culture * Leadership Style * Employee Empowerment * Assessing Cultural Impact * Outcomes of Cultural * Strategies for Leveraging Culture

An article by David Gurteen at the Gurteen Knowledge Website is another great find:

<http://www.kwork.org/Library/govern.html>

A Brit, David is an AOK member and he's all set to be the STAR Series moderator for February. He starts his article with this:

"An isolated knowledge management programme looked after by a privileged few is a paradox in itself and will not survive for long. Only effective collaboration and communication which spans across the whole company structure will give knowledge management the boost it really needs." In order to enrich a company's current culture, David Gurteen believes that change must start with the individual. Every employee has a sphere of influence along with his or her own individual knowledge, and this is where he believes a knowledge sharing culture can begin.

Several past stars, including Hubert Saint-Onge and Debra Amidon, also gave us extensive insight into the impact of culture on knowledge and innovation:

<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/amidon.html> <http://www.kwork.org/Stars/saint-ong.html>

Please join those who have already begun this conversation by listening, learning and contributing to the Dialogue.

Thanks.

Jerry

Date: Thu Jan 22, 2004 6:41 pm

Subject: Accountability: Don't Call It Knowledge MANAGEMENT - Rob LeBow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Maribeth and David Have It Right, but Please Don't Call It Management

In response to Jerry's comment about getting folks out of their trenches...We don't work in trenches by choice. Just remove the "Manager role"...but keep these highly experienced folks and you'd be surprised how fast the trenches are turned into latrines!

Maribeth gets it right. [Culture or the context of the "game or rules...mostly unspoken" dictates sharing of information and to a larger extent our behavior](#) and culture. To me you have to simply stated the obvious...it's about our survival as an organization and as a culture - that's what a leader must articulate and understand. We simply grab the bull-by-the-horns and challenge the current thinking. Quiet approaches do not work. John Kennedy understood this in his opening speech on that cold January in 1961. "Let every nation know, whether friend or foe ..." Frankly, he understood the obvious. Mandela understood this in his liberation speech: Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not our darkness that most frightens us. We ask ourselves, who am I to be brilliant, gorgeous, talented and fabulous? Actually, who are you not to be? You are a child of God. Your playing small does not serve the world. There's nothing enlightened about shrinking so that other people won't feel insecure around you. We were born to make manifest the glory of God that is within us. It's not just in some of us; it's in everyone. And, as we let our own light shine brightly, we unconsciously give other people permission for their light to shine as well. As we're liberated from our fears, our presence has the power to liberate others. [He borrowed this from a talented American poet.]

David Gurteen also understands that the culture we speak of is a Freedom-Based environment, not an environment for the few -- something he calls isolated knowledge management. If those of you who read this and other statements from me over-philosophize I will try my darnedest to bring you and the discussion back to earth. Here is why. The people who need a KM/Shared Values environment are our customers...not the members of AOK. We have to speak their language, not ours! That is how you make your message sticky! By keeping it simple. And I find it somewhat uncomfortable that we put two words together that to me is crazy! I love the word knowledge...but why do you tack on the word management next to it? Here is why...the term management to a blue-collar worker is anti-people. Hey, perhaps none of you are at the lowest level of the totem pole, but most folks working for a living are. You know the folks who are two paychecks away from living in their car! Well tacking on the term management is a "warning" not "welcoming" word...Marketing 101...and we have all failed the course. Here is a case in point.

Subject: ZERO GRAVITY

When NASA first started sending up astronauts, they quickly discovered that ballpoint pens would not work in zero gravity. To combat this problem, NASA scientists spent a

decade and \$12 billion developing a pen that writes in zero gravity, upside down, on almost any surface including glass and at temperatures ranging from below freezing to over 300 C.

The Russians used a pencil!

As an after thought: Enjoy paying your taxes this year...we could cut our taxes in half if we could remove from our references the idea that we can control everything, even down to a pencil.

Let's keep talking...

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 8:40 am

Subject: **Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - Butler**

From: **Carol Butler, AOK archivist**

Subject: Surely management attitude is significant

I'm not sure I understand what Rob is saying. On the one hand he says management is not responsible for knowledge sharing in an organization, the "culture" is. But isn't management responsible for the culture?

It has seemed to me that a tenet of KM is that without management support everything becomes much more difficult.

Considering Rob's unique list, IMO all these things come from the top in any case. If upper management believes in unselfish mentoring most others will follow their lead. If upper management doesn't trust their employees enough to match responsibility to accountability, no one will be able to take pride in their work. If your boss is lying to his boss about the real cause of a problem/failure, you can expect most of your co-workers will adopt the same technique.

[It seems pretty pie-in-the-sky to talk about using a Freedom-based metaphor if the people in control of your paycheck are using the Control-based metaphor for the company.](#)

When I first visited Rob's website my initial thought was, "I'd like to know which companies buy into this notion, because I'd like to work for them." But my experience has been that finding companies without a Control-based metaphor governing the organization is not at all easy. What does that say?

Carol Butler

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 3:03 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Freedom-based Experiments; Some Last, Some Don't

Carol Butler wrote: "When I first visited Rob's website my initial thought was, "I'd like to know which companies buy into this notion, because I'd like to work for them." But my experience has been that finding companies without a Control-based metaphor governing the organization is not at all easy. What does that say?"

Carol -- I want to share our client list after 20 years (see below). Not all are still working in a Freedom-Based metaphor...far from it, because leadership has changed...just as you rightfully recognized. But, they have been exposed to the ideas of Shared Values. I thought you should see the list.

Client list <http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/clients.pdf>

Best Wishes

Rob

P.S. [If management are "huns" and most are not...Freedom-Based thinking and Shared Values can not survive just as you said.](#)

Date: Fri Jan 23, 2004 9:08 am

Subject: Accountability: 'Fingering' Who's Accountable - Paul Cripwell

From: Paul Cripwell, principal, J.P. Cripwell Associates, Canada

Subject: 'Fingering' Who's Accountable: Black Side of Tracking Systems

First to Jerry for persevering, and Rob for finally getting through. I saw the dreaded word "AOL" in the conversation and all is explained.

I never really understood how accountability could be such an issue. Personally I have no problem saying "Oops, that was my fault." Then carry on. Nothing bad has ever happened for admitting to a mistake or misunderstanding.

However my trip last year to Bangladesh brought accountability front and centre and now after reading the latest posts can finally see the problem. It was a situation regarding new software that tracked trains, wagons and shipments along a rail system. This system had been installed many years ago but was not lacking for funds personnel and consequently credibility. As with most computer systems it was capable of producing a plethora of valuable information to managers. It also had the ability to track where the information came from, who was accountable for what. BIG mistake. [What ended up happening was that managers refused to use the information, because then they would be accountable for finding out who was also accountable for any problems or mistakes in their organization.](#)

Now I can understand why this was seen as not a good thing.

Thanks Rob.

Cheers
Paul

Date: Fri Jan 23, 2004 9:17 am

Subject: Accountability: Management Not Universal Roadblock - Carl Frappaolo

From: Carl Frappaolo

Subject: Management Plays Important Role, But It Is Not the Only Influence

Hi Mark and all:

Thanks for the response. First, I agree. Sure KM at a high level is about the same thing (isn't everything if raised to a high enough level?) - but when it gets down to how do you make KM work in your organization (any organization), and whether management should be viewed as a critical roadblock, the similarity ends. Just as two children may require two different approaches to teaching in order to reach their maximum learning potential, so too does each organization need to assess its own individual issues and strengths.

My comments were in response to dialogue discussing how management could (or could not) be characterized as a roadblock to KM. Perhaps offering examples of each led to confusion. In short my response said - in some cases yes, but in other cases absolutely not. Management is not a universal roadblock, and I was looking for other management as a source of KM inspiration and leadership stories.

I am always concerned when discussions lean too strongly toward a single issue and "universal truth". Clearly, yes, management plays a very important role in KM. But, it is not the only influence and as such cannot be viewed as a universal roadblock or enabler for that matter.

So how about it - do any of you have management teams that are/were not roadblocks?

Carl

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 6:53 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - McElroy

From: Mark McElroy

Subject: Separating KM from KP (Knowledge Process)

Hi Carl and All:

I guess it's not clear to me whether you're talking about KM or KP (knowledge processing). Knowledge processing is the individual and social process in organizations that accounts for knowledge production, sharing, etc. KM is the management process that seeks to enhance all of that (knowledge processing). [So to raise questions about the degree to which management is enabling or blocking KM is to simply ask about the degree of commitment to KM in an organization. The strength of KM in an organization is equivalent to the degree of its managers' commitment to it.](#)

Why? Because KM IS management. It does not exist apart from it. It is a branch of management. We either have KM going on or we don't -- or we have varying degrees of it. But none of that is to shed any light at all on the question of how much knowledge processing is going on or what its quality may be. These are independent variables. In other words, we can have strong knowledge processing going on even in the utter absence of KM. Or we can have weak knowledge processing going on in the presence of strong KM.

Indeed, even when management's commitment to KM is the highest it can be, we can see poor performance in knowledge processing. How? By doing all of the wrong things in KM, despite the strong commitment to do good.

So are you asking about management influence in KM or KP? And if the former, are you suggesting that a high degree of management commitment to KM somehow necessarily translates into high-performance knowledge processing outcomes?

Regards,

Mark

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 2:49 pm

Subject: [Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - Lebow](#)

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: KM Done Poorly Though Well Intentioned?

Mark McElroy wrote:

"Knowledge processing is the individual and social process in organizations that accounts for knowledge production, sharing, etc. KM is the management process that seeks to enhance all of that (knowledge processing)."

I'd have to agree with Mark on this point. But [I'm not sure anyone would disagree if the sharing of KM is done poorly even if the intentions are good, what the outcome would be. But there is more to this than process issues.](#)

Rob

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 3:03 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Separating KM from KP - Vinson

From: Jack Vinson

Subject: KM & KP -- I've Finally Got It!

Interesting. For all the times I've heard this particular distinction between management and processing, I've only finally gotten it. Or it clicks with me today for some reason.

Management should be all about getting the most out of the people -- the people are doing the knowledge processing, not the management system. The management of this work needs to understand the nature of the processing - how do people go about their work - and then develop the strategies and tools that support them in their work. Applying a tool to a problem before understanding what people really need doesn't help anyone.

[Thanks to Fred Nikols, whose recent reference to his papers on Knowledge Work at <http://home.att.net/~nickols/articles.htm> helped me to "see" these distinctions.]

Jack

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 11:40 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Separating KM from KP

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Management is about creating the right conditions

Jack, I just read your posting. If you were in my office "I could kiss you!" Yes, yes, yes, it is all about people intrinsically getting why knowledge and sharing that knowledge in constructive way is important ... because it's the right thing to do is what it is all about. And, management is about creating those conditions without driving the sharing -- which could turn into yet another "boring and resent laden" event. Process must be defined by people on the front-lines. Experiments and constructive discussions -- not quotas -- need to be had. Study work. Understand why it sometimes goes amiss ... then correcting the TransAction Block is what work is about. Remember, a Lexus is built in 2.5 days using this approach. A Series 7 BMW takes 2 weeks because it is in a top-down environment. Check out the resale on both! Again, thanks < Jack...

Best Wishes

Rob Lebow

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 6:47 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - Jack Ring

From: Jack Ring

Subject: The "New Something New;" KM Came Naturally

I see it much like Carl does.

I claim that knowledge production and utilization has been happening for decades and that people have bothered to simplify it, integrate it, automate it, socialize it, etc. with various degrees of success and with various degrees of applause or resistance from people both above and below them in the cell blocks of their Voluntary Adult Detention Facilities. My view irritates the witchdoctors who would have you believe that KM is something new, in fact, already the New Something New, but such angst is only a report on how poorly they scored in history class.

1980 I was assigned as Director, Market Requirements and Planning in the (mainframe) computer division of Honeywell. Staff of 18, then inherited the six person Competitive Analysis shop. The CA shop was quite good at comparing competitors based on pundit data but did not have much data from on the street. The MR&P group consisted of five shops that were a mirror image of the R&D organization rather than the customer topology. All were a little dazed regarding their role and relevance.

We prepared a context diagram, a system functional flow block diagram, a document structure tree and related all that to either a cyclic or event-driven schedule. Then, after thoroughly briefing the staff, each was asked to identify their locus of contribution as well as their 'customers' and 'suppliers.' We emphasized the information pool (library) and newsletter. Soon the shop was humming. People were finding interesting information and tagging it for at least two cohorts. The field sales force was recruited into part time participation as 'war correspondents' and the tempo of the whole group rose markedly. One year later we were over-achieving, doing the necessary work with about half the staff and able to start two new ventures with the other half. We required no directives from management but gave them plenty of opportunity to applaud. One of our rather unique outcomes was a techno-economic model of the computer market and industry that indicated the winners and losers seven years in advance. Seven years later it had proved remarkably prescient. The most thrilling outcome was that the people openly enjoyed themselves at work.

Cheers,
Jack

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 2:49 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. New Something New - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Position Story in Control/Freedom-Based Context

My response to Jack would be: [when you open a workplace to transparency ... things happen](#). But, I would very much like him to position this experience within the Control-Based and Freedom-Based context. That would be interesting to hear!

Rob Lebow

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 11:47 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Separating KM & KP - Ring

From: Jack Ring

If you are going to agree, please explain how processing and management can be differentiated in an individual or allocated mutually exclusively to two or more individuals. Seems to me these are two convenient concepts that just don't exist in the real world.

Jack

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 3:00 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Separating KM & KP - Vinson

From: Jack Vinson

Subject: KP & KM go on within everyone; but know the difference.

Great observation, Jack Ring. Knowledge processing and knowledge managing go on within everyone. [The idea of making the distinction is so that one can think about what it means to "do work" and what it means to "manage" that work.](#) The processing is involved with skill and knowledge and ability to accomplish a set of activities. Managing is about creating the environment and mechanisms that enable the best work. The distinction helps me consider what my efforts are geared towards.

And, of course, the "process" of managing can be managed as well -- not necessarily hierarchically. Organizations constantly attempt new ways of doing things that are geared toward making work better for everyone in the organization.

Jack Vinson

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 3:05 am

Subject: Accountability: Re: Management or Processing?

From: Dirk Scheuring, Founder/Chair, Xyco Text Animation Services, Germany

Subject: How do you separate processing and management within an individual?

Jack Ring wrote:

<snip> "please explain how processing and management can be differentiated in an individual or allocated mutually exclusively to two or more individuals."

Sure looks difficult to me, as long as I place Processing and Management on the same ontological level I help myself by assigning Processing to a higher level, and specializing between Management (manages/controls a process) and Leadership (drives a process) below that. From my observation, the recent financial scandals (in the US, in Italy, in Germany) were all caused by the fact that Leadership (which has to own the Freedom attribute so it can change things) also, by usurpation, owned the Control attribute, and so managed to bypass the Law (for a time). The force that drives a process should not be allowed to also manage it, since driving needs Freedom, and managing needs Control. If I separate Management from Leadership, and Control from Freedom, things, to me, seem to get much clearer.

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 11:50 am

Subject: Accountability: Separating KM from KP - Ring

From: Jack Ring

If 'management' means human beings how do you stop them from processing knowledge on how to be better managers of knowledge processors?

Jack

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 8:05 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Separating KM from KP

From: Mark McElroy

Subject: Managers are rightly engaged in KP

Jack:

You asked:

"If 'management' means human beings how do you stop them from processing knowledge on how to be better managers of knowledge processors?"

The answer is you don't. Managers, too, are subject to knowledge processing, only at the level of KM. No need to stop them at all.

Mark

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 7:02 am

Subject: **Accountability: Role of Managers in an Open Enterprise - Mark McElroy**

From: **Mark McElroy**

Subject: Managing Business Process (BP) but Not Knowledge Process (KP)

Hello Rob:

Your ideas are similar to a model my colleague, Joe Firestone, and I call 'The Open Enterprise' (see our book by that title on www.kmci.org). I think where we may part company, though, is in the issue of whether or not there are any managers. You say that in a "Freedom-based culture" there are no managers. For you this seems to be a positive thing insofar as having impact on learning is concerned.

In 'The Open Enterprise' (OE) model, we point to a third way, so to speak. We accomplish this by making the all-important distinction between knowledge processing and business processing. The former refers to learning-related behaviors in organizations, the latter to commerce-related behaviors (e.g., performing operational business processes, or day-to-day work).

In the OE model, we retain the conventional command and control role of management in business processing, but we reject it in knowledge processing. In other words, **we reject command and control of learning-related behaviors, even as we accept and reaffirm management's legitimate role of directing the business processing activities of employees.** Thus, in the OE, employees 'follow orders,' but they are also free to disagree and debate (openly) opinions held by managers, conclusions reached by them, policies they make, their strategies, etc.

So I do not agree that in order to have openness in learning we need to rid ourselves of management. There is a third way, and the OE is it.

Regards,

Mark

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 3:02 pm

Subject: **Accountability: Role of Managers in OE Model - Lebow**

From: **Rob Lebow**

Subject: Managers Become 'Wise Counsels'

Hi Mark...this is where I would differ (from your text): "In the OE model, we retain the conventional command and control role of management in business processing, but we reject it in knowledge processing."

Here is why we don't believe your thinking will work. **We believe managers become Wise Counsels in our view. They are leaders and teachers who coach, counsel and**

support, but they do not own operational decisions nor do they follow-up or measure. KM must be all encompassing. I have included a chart (see below) that you will appreciate. It outlines where learning is most comfortable. Please review. By the way, did you read Randy and my latest book Accountability <http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>? It would help in this discussion. Well, enjoy the chart.

Creating great customer transactions
http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/customer_transaction.html

Rob

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 12:02 pm
Subject: **Accountability: Role of Mangers in OE Model - McElroy**
From: **Mark McElroy**
Subject: RE: [AOK_K-Net] Digest Number 303

Rob:

Not sure I understand your point. You said "Here is why we don't believe your thinking will work." But then you go on to explain your thinking, without critiquing mine as promised.

You then say "KM must be all encompassing." What does that have to do with the degree of management control we're discussing?

I must also say that I find your chart difficult to fathom. Maybe you could paraphrase its message for us. I will also not have a chance to read your book. Maybe you could summarize the key points it makes relative to this discussion.

Regards,

Mark

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 2:27 am
Subject: **Accountability: Re. Separating KM and KP - Lebow**
From: **Rob Lebow**
Subject: Transactions Owned by an Individual or Team

Hi Mark.

My point was that knowledge processing and bus. processing need to be the same as far as the customer receives a full and capable transaction. Randy and I believe this is done with a new structure that we call the TransAction Zone. The TransAction Zone is a zone

where each transaction is owned by an individual or a team. Learning is shared within each TransAction Zone, which can be a large store-wide environment or a small team environment.

All experiences good or bad are posted if they are significant. No blaming or finger pointing ... just learning and improving the "flow of the business." Studying how a business gets better at reducing mistakes, without blame, not quotas is the key. That is what we meant. We have experienced patient folks become Wise Counsels who have both technical and people skills. You need to read our book, because we are very opposed to this line in your response of Jan. 25:

"In the OE model, we retain the conventional command and control role of management in business processing, but we reject it in knowledge processing."

Mark, [we reject the idea of command and control as inefficient, counterproductive and antiquated](#). Sorry, but you will need to read the book. Jerry published an interview to introduce us several weeks ago. Without reading the book, this interview might add to this discussion and answer some of these differences we seem to have. One more point. I'd caution against separating learning and conducting business. It was Dr. Deming who suggested that: "Every mistake is an opportunity to learn. It is in his words a pearl of an opportunity. As for the chart ... it is what it is. You might want to call me: 425.828.3509 in Seattle Metro area ... West Coast. Perhaps I can take you through it. It would be my pleasure. Rooting for you ...

Rob

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 8:29 am

Subject: [Accountability: A Clear Definition of 'Accountability?' - Macrae](#)

From: **Chris Macrae**, editor, Knowledgeboard, author & intangibles transparency mentor, [valuetrue.com](#), London.

Subject: have we defined accountability transparently?

Hi Rob.

I'm sorry if I missed it, but [did you define accountable - it's time span, it's value judgements, whose the judge of scope and system etc?](#)

In studying systemic transparency pretty hard these last 5 years, I could come up with a Letterman-style list of top 10 unaccountables but will stop at 5...(and I'll not even cross into political areas like whether national governments still serve for the people-)

1) surely the global accountant who still books people in as costs (machines as investment) and will do just about anything to preserve measurement monopoly of balance sheet

- 2) the corporation - see <http://www.thecorporation.tv/filingcabinet.html#book>
- 3) lawyers who represent clients, after disasters have happened and prevent learning from repeating the disaster
- 4) arguably a more subtle one this- don't we in a networking age need more accountability that strengthens connectivity of relationships, open borders? (isn't most value destruction and human distrust caused by silos and border defensiveness?)
- 5) organisations whose hierarchical rewards rule even in sectors where almost all work is now done in teams, eg UK National Health Service

...and so forth.

Chris

Date: Mon Jan 26, 2004 3:03 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. A Clear Definition of Accountability - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Conversion from Manager to Wise Counsel

Hi Chris.

I thought you'd enjoy [how we operationalize accountability of the old manager to the new Wise Counsel](#) (see below). I think this will define what we mean...If we simply place accountability into the ozone...we will flail our arms until they fall off.

[Contrasting the Manager's Role With the Wise Counsel's Role](#)

<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/Contrast.pdf>

Thanks...Rob

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 11:27 am

Subject: Accountability: Oops, Technical (User) Difficulties- Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

Hi everyone.

Jack Vinson has alerted me that he was unable to click on the URLs I inserted in some of Rob's posts and suspected it was because there was hidden html in the original messages. He was right.

The URLs work in my email program, but not his (and perhaps not yours); and, they don't work in the Yahoo archives. Therefore, I provide them again.

The Value & Attitude Study (VAS) can be seen at:
<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/SampleVAS2.pdf>

Contrasting the Manager's Role With the Wise Counsel's Role
<http://www.kwork.org/stars/lebow/Contrast.pdf>

Client List <http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/clients.pdf>

Creating great customer transactions
http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/customer_transaction.html

Accountability: Freedom and Responsibility without Control
<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>

I apologize for my screw up -- I know what I was doing wrong. Thanks to Jack Vinson for the heads up and the solution. And to Michele for the lecture!

Jerry

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 6:47 am

Subject: Accountability: Management Must Become Shared Leadership - Bob Parden

From: Bob Parden, professor, Santa Clara University, California

Subject: Blaming management rekindles unionizing

[Because of empowerment and networking , "management" must become "shared leadership"](#). To blame management is to rekindle "union organizing." bob parden.

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 11:55 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Management Must Become Shared Leadership - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: We taught young MBAs to act and behave this way.

Bob Parden ... you are right on. Heck, we have asked and taught young rising MBA's et. al. to act and behave this way. After the crap of Welchian philosophy with a nick name of Neutron Jack and Six Sigma, Top Ranking, Balanced Score Card, management by objective, measurement and incentive programs what do you expect.

After the raft of corruption ... what do you expect. But, most managers are just trying to pay their mortgage on a big house they can't afford and work at "staying alive" as the BeeGee's suggested in their song. Shareholders, Bankers, Business Schools, the Press and

yes all of us are to blame. [We are the ones who have made heroes out of the Jack Welches of the world.](#)

Rob Lebow

P.S. And to top it off, you want people to learn and acquire knowledge ... are we kidding ourselves?

Date: Sun Jan 25, 2004 6:39 am

Subject: [Accountability: Five Challenges for the 21st Century - Lebow](#)

From: Rob Lebow

Hi All.

To get the Dialogue going this week, I thought our five challenges for the 21st century would fuel the discussion.

These are the Five Greatest Challenges for Any Culture that Wants to Adapt to the 21st Century and Stay in Business

Challenge One: Introduce Ethical Standards at all levels of your operation.

Challenge Two: Challenge the Current Thinking regarding the effectiveness of Command & Control approaches to managing and motivating people.

Challenge Three: Redefine the Role of the Front-Line Worker.

Challenge Four: Empower Front-Line Workers to lead by example, not wait for management to change.

Challenge Five: Create an Authentic Learning Environment based on Intrinsic Motivators.

Rob

Thanks for being accountable every day!

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 11:55 am

Subject: [Accountability: Re. Management Not Universal Roadblock - Scheuring](#)

From: Dirk Scheuring, Founder/Chair, Xycos Text Animation Services, Germany

Subject: Re: Management or Leadership?

I was interested in solving the question "Can management be held accountable for the successful implementation of values like 'trust', 'honesty', 'encouragement of risk-taking',

etc., in a company's organizational structure and client relationships?" for myself. My conclusion is: It's not the person(s) that hold(s) a Management function that is/are accountable - it's the person(s) that hold(s) a Leadership function.

The tool I used for my decision is a table that functionally differentiates Management and Leadership, published by John Kotter in his Harvard Business Review article 'What Leaders Really Do' in May 1990.

<http://www.fourgateways.com/newsletr/reports3.htm#Difference>

By that definition, [Managements's generic function is given as 'coping with complexity'](#), whereas [Leaderships generic function is given as 'coping with change'](#).

If you look at the values in question here, like 'honesty' - they're not complex at all. It seems to me that 'honesty' is a concept that people generally can grasp quite easily. Likewise it is with the rest of the values that Rob Lebow proposes as fundamental for a company's success. [It's not that the values in themselves involve something complex that requires Management - it's the requirement of changing the way an organisation thinks about itself and the world it inhabits that is crucial for implementation. And 'coping with change' is Leadership's task.](#)

So, to me, the individual manager is accountable for the implementation of 'honesty' etc. to the extent that he assumes Leadership.

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Tue Jan 27, 2004 11:59 am

Subject: [Accountability: Separating KM from KP - Scheuring](#)

From: Dirk Scheuring

Subject: Freedom vs Control

I agree with Rob Lebow about the importance of implementing the values that he proposes as the guidance for the execution of all activities that our organisations perform. I assume, however, that those are values that can only be implemented by /individuals/, and into their /very own lifestyles/, and that they cannot be implemented into other people's lives, at least not directly. Trying to force them on people automatically appeals to the human resistance mechanism, and a healthy resistance mechanism is the sign of a robust personality. And as a company leader, I'd want the other employees to have robust personalities, to deal with the realities of daily business life. As a Leader, announcing that "from today, we'll all be honest" is just ridiculous. Always Being Honest yourself is where it's at.

Leaders need Freedom, because 'leading' means 'coping with change', and one needs to be free to cope with change. Freedom, however, is restricted by the Law, which is strongly associated with Complexity. Since Complexity is dealt with by Management, and since Complexity requires Control, the Control function is to be performed by Management. I don't think that we can abolish Control - Law wouldn't let us do that. Control has to be with Management, whereas Freedom has to be with Leadership.

Management and Leadership should therefore hold each other accountable. Leadership should hold Management accountable for:

- planning
- budgeting
- organizing
- staffing
- controlling
- problem solving

Management should hold Leadership accountable for:

- setting a direction
- developing a vision
- aligning people
- appealing to human needs, values, and emotions

This listing seems to show that [implementing the values proposed by Rob is a Leadership task, and should be controled by Management.](#)

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 2:26 am

Subject: [Accountability: Shared Values Are Universal, Research Shows – Lebow](#)

From: **Rob Lebow**

Subject: U.S. Sarbanes-Oxley Act Casts Pall Over Human Values

Dirk.

I could not disagree more with your approach, although you make good points that most folks not acquainted with Shared Values might make. [The basis of our work is 17,000,000 surveys from 40 countries around the world.](#) If your organization were tested, you would be overwhelmed by the similarity of your operation and every other client we have tested for these 8 Shared Values.

After 2,280+ surveyed sites from 20 countries in Africa, Asia, Middle East, Europe and North America we have concluded that "literally everyone we test exhibits the same Shared Values and sees their organization in a similar trend. Groups and operations always test out within our trend lines." So the good Dr. Kotter, whom I respect, needs to see these conclusions. I myself was a disbeliever for the first 6 years. But Lebow Research's results have made me a believer.

No Dirk, [Shared Values are universal](#). Your opinion is not based on voluminous data, our work is! The numbers state the obvious. Walt Disney was right: "It's a small world after all!" And, the folks at the federal government of the good old United States have now passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act because our dear leaders don't know the difference from right and wrong. The Shared Values - Values & Attitude Study even uncovers wrong doing and fraud. I'd love for Jerry to send the sample VAS to you or post it so everyone can see a SAMPLE of the VAS.

Note: It's on the AOK Web site <<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/SampleVAS2.pdf>>.

Again, I invite you to have your operation take the VAS. Thousands of sites have. Then you will be a believer. Best of luck and again thanks for the interesting argument.

Rob

Thanks for being Accountable Everyday!

[Editor's Note:

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 was aimed at restoring shareholder confidence in publicly traded securities following a series of corporate scandals in the U.S. The regulations that followed are said to have the following goals:

- * Provide greater transparency in corporate accounting and reporting.
- * Provide greater accountability by making board members and executives personally responsible for financial statements.
- * Place greater emphasis and structure around efforts to prevent, detect, investigate, and remediate fraud and misconduct.

Interpretations by happy consultants with a new cause see it as a mandate for organizations to gain 360-degree insight into their business operations. However, it is a hierarchical view -- intrusive (and therefore inhibited by resistance), not transparent.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Rob, but I believe you see it as a chilling requirement for accountability and responsibility at the top which endorses an even more heavy-handed command and control management system -- not good for the kind of workplace

environment needed to capitalize on the inherent values and attitudes revealed in your VAS research.

Jerry

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 2:46 am

Subject: Accountability: Freedom vs. Control - Randy Spitzer

From: Randy Spitzer, Accountability co-author Reply to Dirk Scheuring

Subject: Freedom vs Control

So far I've let Rob handle responses, but thought I'd finally chime in, so with your permission, I'll respond to Dirk.

The idea of "forcing" values on anyone is, of course, absurd. That's precisely the reason that corporate values statements, mission statements, vision statements and the like fail in a control-based setting. People quite naturally resist, even if the statements make sense.

The approach we're advocating engages the staff in a discussion of the eight shared values identified by Lebow Company research as being universal. The discussion is really an agreement to treat each other like "adults;" that is, with respect and dignity. Agreeing on a set of shared values significantly reduces the amount of inter-personal tension present wherever two or more people are in a relationship (be it personal or business.)

We're making an existential argument. That is, we're arguing that the essence of freedom is in making choices and living with the consequences of those choices... both the good and the bad. In fact, Peter Koestenbaum and Peter Block say in their book, *Freedom and Accountability at Work*, that there are four "costs" we must all learn to live with (not overcome) if we are going to come to terms with having the freedom to choose. The costs are:

1. Anxiety over the choices we must make as a result of our freedom,
2. Guilt from choosing to say "no" to either ourselves or to others,
3. Death of relationships because of the choices we've made, and
4. Evil from those who want to hurt us because they don't like what we have chosen.

In a "Freedom-Based" work environment, it's not just managers and executives that must have and learn to live with freedom; it's everyone in the organization. Here's why: customers want products and services that meet their unique wants and needs. Most "Control-Based" systems - that is, systems that keep control of customer transactions in the hands of management -- fail far too often because these systems, which rely heavily on processes and procedures, internal incentive systems and performance standards, are simply not flexible enough to deal quickly and efficiently with variation in customer demand. In fact, it's the inflexibility of top-down driven processes, systems and standards

that leads, in most organizations, to a very high "failure demand" (failure demand is the time spent fixing customer problems.)

This is why Rob and I argue that "control" should be in the hands of front-line workers, not management. To have that kind of control on the front-lines requires a tremendous amount of freedom (freedom which traditionally has been reserved for managers.) In the end your customers don't care a whit about your processes, systems and standards. All they want is good products and good services at a reasonable cost.

Management therefore, is accountable for what our friend and author John Seddon (Freedom from Command and Control, The Case Against ISO 9000, and I Want You to Cheat) calls, "making the work work." This requires systems that build in variation so that the system can better respond to variation in customer demand, and it requires a staff that "manages knowledge" to continually improve the systems. In other words, it's up to the staff to find solutions by first doing their homework. That's the idea that Ohno brought to Toyota. That's what Deming tried to convey to us in his 14 points.

In a "Freedom-Based" work environment people on the front lines are responsible for planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling and problem solving. In other words, with the help of management, who act as Wise Counsels (offering counsel without taking ownership of either the problem or the solution) they keep finding better ways of "making the work work!"

In a Freedom-Based context, management is accountable for creating the conditions where Kaizen can happen. This includes articulating a Keen Internal Vision and being the champion of the organization's Shared Values. [Management in a Freedom-Based organization creates a context that depends on the intrinsic motivation of interesting work, rather than relying on the extrinsic motivators of wages and job security, of processes and systems, and of performance standards and targets. This leaves the front-line free to be accountable for creating Great Customer TransActions!](#)

Thanks for always being accountable!

Randy Spitzer

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 11:48 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Freedom vs. Control - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Controls cause cheating

Again, we stress that controls cause cheating. Freedom does not mean anarchy. Dirk, please read our book and it will become much clearer. The title of the book is Accountability-Freedom and Responsibility without control.

<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>

* Editor's note: If you don't want to buy Rob and Randy's book (I recommend it), you can get a good understanding of the points by reading my interview with Rob Lebow:

<http://www.kwork.org/Stars/lebow/lebow.html#interview>

When executives are given salaries and financial packages of the sort we see today ... cheating will occur at very high percentages. Freedom is about choices ... not greed. This is not really very complicated. The premise of the book suggests that front-line workers need the freedom to make decisions. Freedom is not about encouraging cheating from executives nor does the book address that issue. Corruption is not our subject. Our subject is serving customers and working the work instead of managing, quoter [if that's a word], monitoring and measuring work - all destructive/counter-productive practices. That is what the book is about. Please read it or at least read the chapter headings!

Rob

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 6:51 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Randy Spitzer's Book References - Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: We've placed the following books in the AOK Bookstore:

The Case Against ISO 9000, John Seddon

<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#Seddon>

Freedom and Accountability at Work:Applying Philosophical Insight to the Real World, Peter Kostenbaum and Peter Block

<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#Koestenbaum>

The other book by Seddon, Freedom from Command and Control, is new and Amazon doesn't have it.

Date: Wed Jan 28, 2004 3:41 pm

Subject: Accountability: Time's Running Out - Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: Thursday is the last day to post messages for Rob Lebow

Hi Everyone.

In order for Rob to wrap up his duties on Friday, you will need to post messages to him no later than Thursday to be sure to receive a reply. As always, I encourage the group to continue the Dialogue among yourselves as long as you like; or to start new ones in the interim. Incidentally, the February STAR Series has an early start date -- February 9.

Jerry

Date: Thu Jan 29, 2004 8:50 am

Subject: Accountability: Re: Shared Values - David Snowden

From: Dave Snowden, Director, Canolfan Cynefin Centre, IBM Global Services, and previous STAR Series moderator

Subject: There Is No Fact That Is Universal or Absolute

Rob and all:

I have been a long time absent from this forum, although I have lurked. However the recent thread about values deserves some response I think this is partly because I have an instinctive reaction against the more evangelical of consultancy approaches, and the idea that there are six universal values falls clearly into this category. Coupled with a messianic mantra of "command and control is bad - freedom is good" I'm afraid my "Oh my God how stupid" reaction set in. I would make the following points/assertions/questions which come in two categories

ONE - I DON'T BUY THE SIX VALUES RESEARCH I'M AFRAID

[I can believe that with a suitably anodyne survey with good motherhood and apple pie language you could get the sort of correlations claimed.](#) But this beggars two main questions:

Firstly, do people mean the same thing by the same statements? For example I can read the parable of the good samaritan, listen to a television appeal and donate some money, or I can give up everything and hand it over to the poor. The same expression can mean different things depending on the social context and position of the individual responding. Also was the survey carried out in their native language or in American English? If in American English then there are problems; if native language then how was the translation carried out.

Secondly, most people will subscribe to the right form of suggested language "Do you want to be good" (to simplify), that does not mean they will act on that statement. Real values are linked to actions not statements and those differ wildly. There are new research techniques (based on emergence) that get us closer to understanding action based values, but the idea that they can be defined or categorised is arrant nonsense. Your six values are as bad (if held to be universal) as Six Sigma. I really see little difference between your approach and Welch's in practice; both claim universalism, both may have some value.

TWO - WHY IS IT EITHER OR?

Why do people keep trying to have "one right way"? There is a legitimate place for command and control top down approaches, and an illegitimate one. There are aspects of corporate ethics in respect of money transfer for example where I want rigid conformity with precise rules. However we should not be stupid enough to believe that such rules on their own create ethical behaviour. Without an underlying value system (values as belief systems leading to actions, not verbal statements in formal surveys) then no rules will work. [Its a matter of balance.](#)

Over- regulated systems increase the possibility of fraud, but so do under regulated systems. It is simply not true to say that regulation produces fraud.

There is a place for ISO9000 - I've written two manuals and taken a company through two audits, and I see huge value, provided it is not taken to excess.

Lets have more balance, more diversity and less messianic and naive idealism, then we might get somewhere.

Dave

Date: Thu Jan 29, 2004 3:05 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. Shared Values

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Response to David Snowden's Criticisms

For continuity, Rob Lebow has inserted his responses to Dave Snowden within Dave's original message:

Dave Snowden wrote:

I have been a long time absent from this forum, although I have lurked. However the recent thread about values deserves some response I think this is partly because I have an instinctive reaction against the more evangelical of consultancy approaches, and the idea that there are six universal values falls clearly into this category. Coupled with a messianic mantra of "command and control is bad - freedom is good" I'm afraid my "Oh my God how stupid" reaction set in. I would make the following points/assertions/questions which come in two categories

Rob Lebow:

David...on careful reading please note we list "EIGHT SHARED VALUES" that come from 17,000,000 pieces of research from a leading American University's social psychology department. Also, messianic mantra...hey...are you kidding? These EIGHT

SHARED VALUES are also found in the great religious books of all religions based on human values...something you dismiss as "Oh my God how stupid!"

In the Christian faith these EIGHT SHARED VALUES are literally discussed thousands of times. One scholar actually perfected a computer program and listed these values and their passages on 128 single spaced pages and sent it to us ... without our request. We work all over the world with Hindus, Moslems, Buddhists, Jews, Christians ... and each culture has no problem embracing these EIGHT SHARED VALUES as the basis of their social interactions, beliefs, and expectations. We have conducted over 2,280+ sites where each of these cultures related, identified and scored. Their trends are exactly alike. Surprise ... Surprise. David, these EIGHT SHARED VALUES might seem like we have gone over-the-top ... but I think your comments are as interesting as Howard Dean's rantings...!

Dave Snowden:

ONE - I DON'T BUY THE SIX VALUES RESEARCH I'M AFRAID

I can believe that with a suitably anodyne survey with good motherhood and apple pie language you could get the sort of correlations claimed. But this beggars two main questions:

Rob Lebow:

Perhaps you'd like to put some money where your mouth is.

Dave Snowden:

Firstly, do people mean the same thing by the same statements? For example I can read the parable of the good samaritan, listen to a television appeal and donate some money, or I can give up everything and hand it over to the poor. The same expression can mean different things depending on the social context and position of the individual responding. Also was the survey carried out in their native language or in American English? If in American English then there are problems; if native language then how was the translation carried out.

Rob Lebow:

David, we have the survey translated into many languages...English, Spanish, German, Polish, Arabic, Russian, Chinese. Also, please consider that English is the business language of the world and most folks in business know a little bit of English ... might you suspect?

David Snowden:

Secondly, most people will subscribe to the right form of suggested language "Do you want to be good" (to simplify), that does not mean they will act on that statement. Real values are linked to actions not statements and those differ wildly. There are new research techniques (based on emergence) that get us closer to understanding action based values, but the idea that they can be defined or categorised is arrant nonsense. Your six values are as bad (if held to be universal) as Six Sigma. I really see little difference between your approach and Welch's in practice; both claim universalism, both may have some value.

Rob Lebow:

I'm not sure whether we should take this as a compliment, insult or just within the context of your entire attitude regarding this subject for which you are talking out of your...!

David Snowden:

TWO - WHY IS IT EITHER OR?

Why do people keep trying to have "one right way"? There is a legitimate place for command and control top down approaches, and an illegitimate one. There are aspects of corporate ethics in respect of money transfer for example where I want rigid conformity with precise rules. However we should not be stupid enough to believe that such rules on their own create ethical behaviour. Without an underlying value system (values as belief systems leading to actions, not verbal statements in formal surveys) then no rules will work. Its a matter of balance.

Rob Lebow:

David ... it's not always a matter of balance. In this case, [Control-Based approaches to solving problems don't work!](#) Just look at IBM's behaviors which we at Microsoft capitalized on to get DOS into the marketplace. IBM tried to use controls ... and look what happened. Now, Microsoft hasn't learned the lesson and look at them struggling. Trying to dominate, control ... call it what you will, doesn't work when raising kids, stamping out drugs, losing weight, dealing with your wife or husband, muscling our national neighbors all around the world, treating people in general and the list of examples could go on. Controls are an easy answer and often even popular for a while ... but long-term controls are destructive.

David Snowden:

Over- regulated systems increase the possibility of fraud, but so do under regulated systems. It is simply not true to say that regulation produces fraud.

Rob Lebow:

Again...where is your data...?

David Snowden:

There is a place for ISO9000 - I've written two manuals and taken a company through two audits, and I see huge value, provided it is not taken to excess.

Rob Lebow:

One of your audits and work wasn't with Firestone Tires was it ? (lol)

Dave Snowden:

Lets have more balance, more diversity and less messianic and naive idealism, then we might get somewhere.

Rob Lebow:

Thank you holly father...! By the way, again ... you have not done your homework. Reading a book authors have spent years working on would at the very least be courteous.

Date: Fri Jan 30, 2004 4:10 am

Subject: Accountability: re. Shared Values - Snowden

From: Dave Snowden

Rob - I think the nature of your response has made my point for me and for anyone other than your true believers. As for reading your book, well on the basis of the "blurb" provided by your postings I've put it up there with books on the Bible Code and Alien Abduction. Oh and I'm really, really sorry that I said you had identified six rather than eight universal values, I am mortified by my error.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: This Dialogue officially ends today, Friday. Further posts will be distributed as "Other Posts" but not included in the STAR Series archives. Please do continue your conversations on topics inspired by "Accountability" or start new threads while we wait for the next STAR Series dialogue with David Gurteen to begin. And please, let us return to our usual demeanor of mutual respect and tolerance of competing ideas. -- Jerry]

Date: Sat Jan 31, 2004 6:13 am

Subject: Accountability: Breathless in Seattle - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Dave, the reason we all love you in Seattle is because of your sense of humor...Alien Abductions...gee - nice touch...Do you know 70% of the American folks do believe in the possibility of this. Hard to believe...Huh...?

Rob

Date: Fri Jan 30, 2004 7:54 am

Subject: Accountability: re. Shared Values - Frappaolo

From: Carl Frappaolo

Subject: No 'One Best Way'

Woe - Dave and Rob - now the KM Forum is amounting to something. Nothing like a little debate to get the creative juices going. Rob, I am afraid that in this debate I would have to side with Dave. In deed, he in a much more abrasive manner and broader context stated much the same as I had earlier - regarding management as a roadblock.

While your research may have some validity it is very dangerous to deal in black and white, absolutes and universal truths when it comes down to knowledge management and motivating people. At a high level generalities can be made. BUT every organization, just like every individual is unique, and will be motivated by different styles/approaches to leadership and knowledge management.

I hope you are not proposing that there is ONE BEST WAY to approach KM and leadership. In spite of Dave's attack on your survey methodology and validity, I hope you can see the validity in the underlying issues he is raising.

Carl

Date: Sat Jan 31, 2004 3:23 pm

Subject: Accountability: re. Shared Values - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: No One Way, but There Are Non-debatable Elements of Flight

Thanks Carl...of course there isn't just one way of doing anything. One has to only go to a flight museum to see all the different approaches to flight. But there are a few non-debatable elements to flight ... specifically 'lift' and 'gravity' and how that affects all aspects of flight.

As far as we are concerned ... the Lebow Research Group, management can be a problem or a solution. But, I will not blame anything or anyone. "It all depends!" Your opinion is "your research may have some validity." Perhaps ... but information is in the eye of the beholder. So the discussion seems to have come to an end for now ... but remember what we have learned and keep it in the back of your mind ...it is our Shared Values that lead

to our solutions and our troubles - that is what 17,000,000 folks in 40 countries told us ... turn your back on this idea [Shared Values] and enjoy the results.

Best Wishes...Rob

Date: Thu Jan 29, 2004 9:05 am

Subject: **Accountability: Reconciling Freedom and Control - Dirk Scheuring**

From: **Dirk Scheuring**

Subject: More similarities than differences

Rob,

I'm not questioning the results of the research at all, and your 8 Shared Values do make sense to me. It's just that my perspective is different, in that I don't use your "control-based vs freedom-based" dichotomy as the "root conflict" of my model; rather, I seek to integrate "functional primitives" like Control and Freedom into a larger framework (I use capitalization to indicate that I use those terms in a generic, de-personalized sense, as class names in a model).

That model is neither "freedom-based" nor "control-based" -- it's knowledge-based. Ontologically speaking, knowledge is the "root term" -- knowledge, among many other things, knows freedom; knowledge knows control, and ultimately, knowledge knows knowledge (i.e. its own finiteness).

As I said, I don't think that I can exclude "control" from the model, due to the existence of external regulations. My system will not be allowed to run uncontrolled, and if it were allowed to, that would be a mistake, like it was a mistake in the cases of Enron, Parmalat, Mannesmann, you name them. Nobody, on any level of the organization, including the CEO, should be allowed to execute the leadership function in any process without his/her actions being managed, and therefore, controlled for conformance with a given set of constraints. To me, that's a basic feature of any true democracy, and I'm not about to give up on it. Freedom is always the freedom of other people.

Integrating the dynamic relationship between "Freedom and Control," in that way, affords building a dynamic system in which those functional primitives are mutually dependant -- freedom has to always be in the position to challenge control, and vice versa.

Which brings me to the values that you proposed -- like honesty, mentoring, etc. To me, those have to be placed on a lower level, which doesn't mean that I don't hold them in high regard, but that they are implementation-level specializations of the top-level functions. From my perspective, they are associated with /both/ the freedom and the control functions: it takes freedom to be able to change the existing system so that it's geared to those values, and it takes control to make sure that they are actually implemented in the intended way, without corruption. It should be leadership's task to

drive the implementation process, and management's task to control it. The currently dominating practice in economic systems of placing the leadership and management functions in the same hands, at least on the top level of corporations, in my opinion, causes too many problems to persist. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act seems to acknowledge just that, and installs external control, but having to control organizations externally rarely seems to yield optimal results. So, I'd much prefer to place the control function /inside of/ the model.

To sum it up, you and me don't seem to disagree much, if at all, in our intentions -- the main difference seems to be that your model is built upon a root conflict of 'freedom-based vs control-based' and mine on a root conflict of "knowledge vs the lack of it." Although I can easily acknowledge that difference, I'd much rather emphasize the similarities -- seems to me that both of us want the same thing.

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Thu Jan 29, 2004 9:16 am

Subject: **Accountability: Reconciling Freedom and Control - Dirk Scheuring**

From: **Dirk Scheuring**

Subject: Front-line management

Randy,

You said that "Rob and I argue that 'control' should be in the hands of front-line workers, not management".

Cool. I'll buy. We just seem to have a little misunderstanding here - the one that I tried to avoid by typographically differentiating between 'management' (as used in the job title of a particular person) and 'Management' (as a generic function that needs to be executed for a process to work). It didn't work out right (ASCII-constrained email sometimes is a bit less expressive as a medium than I would wish for, and the programmers among the readers will curse me out for confusing the notational conventions for class and function names anyway), but my intention was to isolate the /function/ from particular person(s) conventionally thought to 'embody' it. As I do that, I can place the Management function (and its sub-routines, like 'control') anywhere I like in the model. Control in the hands of front-line workers? Right on! Makes them part of Management-the-function though, at least from my perspective.

Just as well, a front-line worker who drives a given process may be part of Leadership-the-function. The same person might even execute Management-the-function sometimes, and Leadership-the-function at other times. The only thing I consider dangerous is when somebody executes both Management-the-function and Leadership-the-function during the same process at the same time.

Hope that makes it clearer.

Dirk

[Editor's Note: I guess I ought to let Mr. ASCII take the blame but it probably was me on the "big Ms, little Ms." I didn't get the difference and since it didn't follow normal style, I probably made some changes. Unfortunately, I did it again in your previous post today and in some cases used quote marks instead. I think neither of us has successfully conveyed your subtle (but significant) meanings. Well, I haven't messed with this one. I apologize to you Dirk. -- Jerry]

Date: Thu Jan 29, 2004 2:40 pm

Subject: Accountability: Re. More Similarities than Differences - Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Still contend values are the drivers of our behaviors

Hi Dirk...you are quite right, we do want the same thing. Knowledge or the lack of it is not a cause of dishonesty.

Most of us lack knowledge and we are by all accounts honorable. Education, information or knowledge in any mix does not in by itself create honorable actions. No, I still contend that values are the driver of our behaviors and not knowledge levels or tiers as you state it. You are also correct that external controls, ie. Sarbanes-Oxley will not ensure honorable behavior. At the very least the act is causing great harm in certain circumstances due to the cost associated with compliance. What will be the net ... I have no idea.

But the boys in Washington are not including "knowledge" to the mix are they. They simply are using a "big hammer." And as we all know, some things are needing a hammer, but not all things. The basis of operations, society and behaviors are about control (not much choice) and Freedom (losses of choices but with it comes responsibility). [I'd like to understand, from your perspective, how we net out "the responsibility of the individual" without going through a values component that drives these behaviors.](#) Knowledge is great ... but it is most limited. It's like how do you continue to play the board game Monopoly without going past go? I await your comments.

Best wishes to you ... Robl

Date: Fri Jan 30, 2004 5:48 am

Subject: FW: [AOK_K-Net] Digest Number 306

From: Dirk Scheuring, Founder/Chair, Xyco Text Animation Services, Germany

Subject: Re: Still contend values are the drivers of our behaviors

Rob,

You wrote:

"I'd like to understand, from your perspective, how we net out "the responsibility of the individual" without going through a values component that drives these behaviors."

Simple example: My wife and me are enlisted to shepherd a group of 20 pre-schoolers from the kindergarten to the park. That describes the intended process.

From my perspective, to successfully complete the process, my system needs to perform two functions: Leadership and Management. Leadership-the-function sets the direction, provides the vision, looks out in front. Management-the-function backs up the rear, keeps tab of the numbers, solves system-internal problems that Leadership-the-function cannot see because it's busy looking out front.

Implementing this model, my wife is designated as being responsible for the flawless operation of Leadership-the-function, so she walks ahead, having the kids fall in line behind her, signaling to the drivers of cars crossing our way to let us pass, etc. I fill in for Management-the-function - I count the kids before we start walking, care for those that fall behind, rope in mavericks that try to break away from the herd, and count again when we reached our destination to make sure that they're still all with us.

"19! Hell, there's only 19 of 'em! We lost a kid!"

Since I performed Management-the-function, I would be accountable in that case. Likewise, if a kid got run over at a crossing, my wife would be accountable for failing to provide Leadership-the-function. We could swap roles on our way back from the park to the kindergarten, or find other people to do it, as long as the functions get performed.

[That's how I net out the responsibility of the individual - by describing the function to be performed as clearly as possible, and making a contract with someone who wants to perform it.](#) If the functions are properly separated, the result of the process will clearly show who is accountable in case the contract is broken. More important though: There exists another individual that is interested in holding the contract-breaker accountable, because not doing so would hurt. This individual is not present, for instance, on a corrupted corporate board where Leadership-the-function and Management-the-function are performed by a small group or a single individual, in a black-box style.

'Values' are important here in that, at the end of the process, we expect certain variables to hold certain values, like numberOfKids="20", meaning we want to end up with 20 kids in the park. So there /is/ something in the model that you could describe as a 'values component', and you could also say that 'values drive behaviour': in case of numberOfKids="19" as a result of the process, I'd expect some people's behavior to

change quite suddenly and drastically. It's just that I think that the number of values we need to be concerned with is far greater than 8.

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Sat Jan 31, 2004 6:14 am

Subject: Accountability: Re. Values as Drivers - Rob Lebow

From: Rob Lebow

Subject: Children are not dogs and education is not tricks - Hutchins

Dirk, as usual you're right if a children's outing is described as a "Process"! I wonder if those twenty mothers and fathers just look at what you and your wife are doing as a Process, what do you think?

Good God, man listen to what you are saying and the hands-off unhuman lack of emotion in the tone of your example. I don't want to get into the psychological implications of your example as it pertains to the 1930's " in you know where...but, if and when you have children ... remember this conversation. Of course values are part of this Process, but to call it a Process is stretching it from my position. Children are a gift from God. Fixing a car might be a great example of a Process approach ... but leading children on an adventure ... I don't think so. Nurturing, caring, exhibiting patience, openness, selflessness, honesty, imagination, and creativity with kids, are all values-based actions that drive this type of activity ... especially for 4 and 5 year olds ... unless I am crazy.

Many years ago, Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago was announcing a new program for people over 62 who wanted to be exposed to college classes and perhaps even get a degree. A young reporter raised his hand. "Dr. Hutchins, isn't this really like teaching old dogs new tricks?" Hutchins was visibly shaken. "Young-man he said. People are not dogs and education is not tricks!"

As Donald Trump might say: "You're Fired!" On a serious note ... I have really enjoyed our conversations...And, yes perhaps there are permutations of the eight shared values ... but that is the number. It's kind of like musical notes ... the basics plus combinations ... or there are only three fragrance groups ... lots of combinations, or primary colors ... so in nature their are finite numbers ... as there are for Shared Values.

Rob

Date: Sat Jan 31, 2004 6:14 am

Subject: Accountability: Conflicts Aside, Lebow/Spitzer Points Valid - Jack Ring

From: Jack Ring

Subject: An overview of and perspective on the Accountability Dialogue

Although Rob and Randy might have influenced our thinking better with more facts and discussion than with so many "if you don't believe me read my book" responses, I think their message is essentially sane, thus should not be dismissed as unscholarly or witchcraft. Their hypothesis is not new. Research on its prevalence (if not universality) among people of diverse domains and cultures is new. If you dismiss it then you must dismiss Hock, Herzberg, Bennis, Senge, Tichy, Schon, Argyris and a host of others.

Dirk's model is interesting though based on the mysterious function' and an insistence that two specific functions that he labels management and leadership cannot co-exist in the same human. Albert Einstein, Ishtak Perlman (especially his performance when one violin string broke) and others have widely and eloquently demonstrated that coexistence is possible. At least they have for an envelope of performance perhaps limited to disturbances of the kind NOT classified as the seven deadly' sins. However [Dirk does not explain how his model handles the "why" and "how well" aspects of his functions.](#) Why is a leader a leader and a manager a manager? How "well" does Larry lead and Mary manage? Who says that returning with only 19 kids is not good enough? [When these factors are thought through it may turn out that values are the foundation.](#) Capability and desire may cause a person to seize the leadership role but values will determine how well the person leads, especially when the disturbances become increasingly pernicious. Lie, Cheat, Steal? Depends on your character, simply the emergence choice making from your ensemble of values.

I suggest that values (not mouthed but lived) determine behavior. Snowden agrees else would not have invented the comparison of mouthed vs. lived. I suggest the next factor in the stack is thinking which quality determines the outcomes and the acceptability of the outcomes. Systems thinking is especially valuable. One benefit of systems thinking is that it nominates three modes of control --oversight, embedded and systemic. Oversight watches from a distance after the fact. Sarbanes-Oxley is the latest silly attempt at control by oversight. Embedded places the watcher at the scene of the action. Sports referees are embedded controllers. In Dirk's words, the embedded controller has no leadership role, only management. But embedded is limited in the situations it can handle. Cybernetician Ashby told us that "Requisite Variety and Parsimony" are the criterion of control. Embedded encounters limits in both. Systemic control means that the control is installed in the leadership and action system where it co-exists and cooperates. Further, systemic includes the knowledge and tools to change the system (self-adjusting). Whether the change is beneficial or not is determined by the goal -- in the systemic control -- which, of course, is the set of values.

When this KM fad/hysteria has run its course we all will turn toward the really important factor in socio-technical systems ---- enthusiasm --- then the enthusiasm management fad/hysteria will not be as easily co-opted by the bit-whackers among us as has KM. We will have to think about EM. As we sort out how to gestate enthusiasm in organizations and especially the enthusiasm for the right things, then it will not be so unpalatable to

admit that real humans have soul as well as body and that the fusion of the two is unique and generally wonderful but that dual (thus duel) always will exist as well.

What framework mediates human behaviors, preferably away from the dark side? Is it knowledge of values and principles or is it what we DO with what we know? Or what?

Anyway, thanks to Rob and Randy for the stimulating two weeks.

Jack

Date: Mon Feb 2, 2004 7:38 pm

Subject: Beyond the STAR Series: Manage/Lead Coexistence - Scheuring

From: Dirk Scheuring, Founder/Chair, Xyco Text Animation Services, Germany

Subject: No bout adoubt coexistence

Note: Message inadvertently delayed. Sorry Dirk.

Jack,

I've yet to ask Dennis Kozlowski for his opinion, but I'm sure that leadership and management as functions performed during corporate (and other) processes /can/ coexist. And they often do. Unfortunately, as I think. To me, the question is not whether they /can/ coexist, but whether they should be /allowed to/.

Seperating a function from the person who happens to be performing it at a certain time doesn't strike me as a particular 'mysterious' thing to do during system analysis. I already did the unpacking of the 'mystery' into subfunctions in another post; here it is again:

Leadership should hold Management accountable for the results of:

- planning
- budgeting
- organizing
- staffing
- controlling
- problem solving

Management should hold Leadership accountable for the results of:

- setting a direction
- developing a vision
- aligning people
- appealing to human needs, values, and emotions

If you have questions about the "why" of any item on this list, feel free to ask. As for the "how well", I cannot give an answer, because targets and measurement methods vary widely between companies. As for your question: "Who says that returning with only 19 kids is not good enough?", I'd reply: "The kid's parents." (What are you trying to do here - bait me? Why that?) Finally, I've no idea whether a character is driven to lie, cheat, or steal, by nature or by nurture. I only know that it happens, and am of the opinion that it should, by design, be as difficult as possible for someone to do it in a company. If the same people who decide upon the direction that a business takes also get to do the controlling, and the business is larger than a mom'n'pop shop, then I'd reckon that lying, cheating and stealing is not as difficult for them as it could be.

All the best,

Dirk

Date: Sat Jan 31, 2004 11:38 pm

Subject: Accountability: Wrapping Up - Lebow & Spitzer

From: Rob Lebow

Jack has summed up beautifully the perspective we hold as the most supportable. We hope you have enjoyed the discussions ... even the heated parts. Disagreement, different thought, paths and opinions are always grand.

Randy and I thought we would conclude our on-line dialogue with a summary of our "Freedom-Based" philosophy:

Running a successful business requires that management balance the needs of the organization (for profit and cash flow) with the needs of the people working in the business (for job security and a safe work environment.) In effect, business is a balancing act between profit and people.

While great customer transactions are the engine that drives operational success, shared values are the oil that keeps the engine running smoothly. When faced with difficult decisions, shared values -- both people and business values -- help managers and front-line workers decide the right thing to do. Shared values enable the organization to stay focused on serving customers.

Without shared values, operating a Freedom-Based organization is not possible. The reason for this is clearly evident. Without shared values, freedom becomes anarchy. With shared values in place however, "Wise Counsels" can feel confident in extending trust to front-line workers in exchange for a promise to be responsible and accountable for making Great Customer TransActions, for removing TransAction Blocks and for continually improving "how the work works." Shared values becomes a covenant between front-line workers and management to treat each other with dignity and respect, and to protect the health of the organization. Shared values also support Great Customer

TransActions by improving the capacity of the organization to serve the unique needs of each and every customer.

People Values From 17,000,000 workers & managers from 40 countries:

1. Truthfulness -- shared without compromise.
2. Trust -- lavished on everyone.
3. Mentoring -- shared unselfishly in all directions.
4. Openness -- to new ideas regardless of their origin.
5. Risk-taking -- daring to experiment in order to remain competitive.
6. Giving credit -- where it is due to everyone regardless of status.
7. Honesty -- as a matter of principal.
8. Selflessness -- considering the needs of others.

Business Values: A good example, but each operation creates their own.

1. Use your best judgment -- to meet the unique needs of each customer at the TransAction Point.
2. Take Responsibility for Removing TransAction Blocks -- challenge the way we do everything and find a way to improve it.
3. Be Accountable -- for delivering Great Customer TransActions.

Best Wishes Rob and Randy

P.S. We also thank Jerry Ash for all his hard work behind the scenes.

Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer Accountability: Freedom and Responsibility Without Control <http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>

Date: Sun Feb 1, 2004 3:09 pm

Subject: Accountability: The Upside of Plain Speak - Steve Else [+Jerry Ash]

From: Steve Else

Subject: Overall prize goes to Jack Ring for his overview and perspective

I am a big fan and advocate of AOK, even if I surface rarely to comment myself on the many thought-provoking messages I read with pleasure. Since Mark McElroy's session as a Star Moderator, where he tried, in his ever polite yet insistent way, to show us the light on what knowledge management really is (and how so many have failed to grasp the singular vision he offers), the past couple of weeks have been fascinating.

Because I know David Snowden, I enjoyed a great laugh at his reactions to Rob's eight universal values -- he enjoys hyperbole and it sells well on the KM circuit, but his comments were a bit rough, and I appreciate Rob's reciprocal reactions. At the same time, David's work with personas does have him trekking down a path of trying to make portals and the like more "manageable" through his techniques of grouping styles, interests, etc.

into types he identifies in his fascinating research. So he himself conducts original research and offers simplified rallying semi-stereotypes based on his work. It strikes me that this represents at least a modicum of commonality in what both Rob (and Randy) and David are doing.

But the overall prize, in my view, goes to Jack Ring for his most thoughtful "Overview of and Perspective on the Accountability Dialogue." Jerry, I think what he has written would be great in any future book you may have in mind based on collected comments. His comment on "enthusiasm" and "EM" - enthusiasm management, for example, capture so much of what is dangerous about the illusion of managing knowledge or the processes that contribute to managing it. [I have always felt that KM \(and the net-centric model of warfare that the Department of Defense is striving for\) miss the spark of creativity, the rush of enthusiasm and courage and the insertion of true wisdom into our personal and professional space.](#)

There is a trend, for example, toward linking innovation to knowledge management ... but it still begs the question of how to manage the special sparks of insight or brilliance that take us to new ways of seeing and doing. The same would be true, of course, for enthusiasm "management." The "management word" remains a problematic one, here, it appears to me. While leadership is clearly a concept with strong hooks into the above intangibles, it alone is not the right "bucket" to categorize or guide us in leveraging them.

That being said, I have read the messages of the past couple of weeks with great enthusiasm and congratulate the learned contributors for their impressive research undertakings and their ability to stir up new thinking, excellent syntheses of the thinking that has been shared, and approaches to explain such important issues as complexity, values, leadership, management, controls...recognizing that reality "probably" favors hybrid approaches (I have no data to support this conclusion).

Regards,
Steve

[+ Jerry Ash: Well, Steve, I have been missing you as well as recently-absent others who are valued participants in the STAR Series. Thanks so much for your observations about the exchange between David Snowden and Rob Lebow. I'm sure you recall that David also got roughed up a good bit during his time in the STAR seat (which he enjoyed in the British tradition of debate), and I must say those occasions aren't very comfortable for me. These guest moderators give us a great gift of time, knowledge and experience and while I don't view them at all as "untouchables," I worry about how they (and some of our members) will react to a debate that sometimes falls below my perceived line of respectability.

But, although the Series is within my control as a moderated list, I never exercise control (Rob will appreciate that) and never censor. On a few occasions, I have corresponded with a member about a particularly insensitive post prior to approving it and ask if the author could maybe tone it down a bit. (Could you imagine any such conversation I

would have with David Snowden? -lol-) I didn't in regard to Dave's "how stupid" post nor Rob's howling response(s). But at times I wished I had; especially when another of our prior STARS emailed me with strong displeasure! Who would ever guess -- since I don't really enjoy a good fight -- that I am a legislative veteran! I was in personal turmoil there for awhile!

However, Jack Ring's perspective piece and your very nice follow-up brings the whole thing back into the realm of respectability and the debate brought some important and multiple strategic disagreements into focus. As Carl Frappaolo pointed out, there are no absolute rights or wrongs at this stage of an emerging new management strategy. The dialogue between Dave and Rob, plus the views of Mark McElroy and others, were proof of that!

So, I too hope that the result was learning that only occurs when passion soars and attention follows. "Accountability" will be a strong candidate for Volume II of Stars of the NEW ORDER: What They're Telling Business Leaders (even if I do clean it up just a bit). -- Jerry]

Date: Sun Feb 1, 2004 3:30 pm

Subject: Accountability: Help Me Thank Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer - Jerry Ash

From: Jerry Ash

Subject: How about a round of applause for Rob and Randy!

[On behalf of the members of the Association of Knowledgework, I thank you, Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer, for a lively two weeks in the STAR Series Dialogue.](#) I could not put it in words anything better than those written previously by Jack Ring and Steve Else, whom I failed to fully identify (Steve is Executive Director, Center for Public-Private Enterprise).

Please join me with your own applause for Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer and all the others who made this a Dialogue by posting messages. You know the drill -- just follow the directions below and type the word "applause" or say more if you have a moment:

Date: Mon Feb 2, 2004 8:41 am

Subject: Beyond the STAR Series: Consciousness & Awareness - Hawthorne

From: David Hawthorne, president HCI; adviser, NYU

Subject: Difference between "consciousness" and "awareness."

It's not so much a matter of 'universality' but it matters, universally.

[I've been watching similar discussions in two different groups \(AOK and actKM\) over the past couple of weeks.](#) AOK's has focused on the ideas of Rob Lebow and Randy Spitzer's work on Accountability: Freedom and Responsibility Without Control

<<http://www.kwork.org/Store/featured.html#lebow>>, and its 8 "universal" principles (based on surveys of 17,000,000 people in 40 countries).

A thread at act.km has weaved its way through and around issues of culture- and language-based obstacles to implementing KM practice in transnational (or otherwise differently structured) organizations. Both discussions have generated substantial light and heat. In the AOK instance, considerable heat arose around whether a survey of 17-million people in 40-countries, no matter how carefully constructed, could be a legitimate basis for discovering "universal" principles, and an ensuing debate over a number of the principles and whether or not their authors had properly reduced them to their essence or just settled on descriptions of the "principles" that fit their perspective. In the act.KM case, many contributors related ample anecdotal evidence of cultural missteps, malapropos, and faux pas -- while others countered with assertions that "processes" when "properly" followed produce similar outcomes regardless of language or culture -- and that KM's approach to dealing with language and culture only needs to deal incidentally with refining "translations."

[It occurs to me that in both cases we are seeing evidence of the difference between "consciousness" and "awareness."](#) All humans have a common "consciousness;" that is, a capacity and need to reconcile their internal state with the "lived experience." And so, humans do share some universals ... which are hard to describe without passing them through our limited tools for expression, i.e. language and culture. The evidence of their existence is there nonetheless when we observe similar behaviors in all human cultures (procreation, social organization, fear, aggression, and so on). "Awareness," on the other hand, is constructed culturally, using language. People in different cultures "see things differently" and sometimes, they are unable to perceive the same things as people in another culture due to a lack of appropriate "descriptive" tools (e.g. the seven types of snow, described in Eskimo cultures or, if they do "see" the same things, they see them in a different context and so their awareness of them is "different.").

Differences in "awareness" can largely be explained by the environmental circumstances associated with the interplay of "consciousness" and "habitat." Universal "consciousness" drives humans to "reconcile" themselves with their "lived experience." As we've learned to build and use technology, the definition of "environment" has been expanded well beyond the immediate environment. Today, most cultures have relatively frequent and complex interactions. That places a premium on being able to operate cross-culturally. The challenge therefore appears to me to be a matter of understanding and amending "awareness." I doubt if a "universal" language will turn out to be particularly helpful - for it won't account for all the differences that remain and are important. But "consciousness" demands a reconciliation, therefore, we have to develop a "language of awareness," a sort of mathematics, a way of discussing and understanding the context of awareness as it plays out in different environments. Snowden's work in narrative and "sense-making" seems headed in this direction.

These discussions are interesting on many levels. Not the least of which is their ability to demonstrate how painful and how necessary it is to alter our own awareness. I cannot tell you how grateful I am for these forums and to the people who participate in them.

David Hawthorne

Date: Mon Feb 2, 2004 6:40 pm

Subject: [Beyond the STAR Series: Re. Consciousness & Awareness - Ring](#)

From: Jack Ring

Subject: Re: Consciousness & Awareness - Hawthorne

I get the message that consciousness is a single thing experienced by everyone (universal?) while awareness comes in various levels and expanses. Perhaps I misread. If not, I suggest that we consider consciousness to be a scalar as well. One person may have a higher level of consciousness than another (the Dali Lama vs. a twelve year old that just graduated from a Taliban School of Infidel Haters).

David Hawkins' "Force vs. Power" offers a view of levels of consciousness and some ramifications of each.

[IMO higher levels of consciousness transcend the conditioning of culture and understand man for what he does and is.](#)

Date: Mon Feb 2, 2004 6:54 pm

Subject: [Beyond the STAR Series: Thanks David \(Hawthorne\) - Lebow](#)

From: Rob Lebow

David (Hawthorne) ... thank you for the rolling out of ideas as well. [Randy and I enjoyed our visit ... we hope others did as well.](#) This Saturday, we are off to Saudi Arabia to work with one of our 300 plus worldwide clients.

Rob
