

"Quality Control Circles (QCC) Applications in Turkish Enterprises and Confronting Paradoxes"

*Özlem Özkanlı (Associated Professor)
Özgür Ateş (Research Assistant, Doctoral Student)*

Address: Faculty of Political Sciences,
Ankara University,
Cemal Gürsel Caddesi,
Cebeçi, 06590 – Ankara, TURKEY

Telephone: +90 –(312) –319 77 20 ext: 278 or 332 Fax: +90 – (312) – 319 77 36

e-mail: ozkanli@politics.ankara.edu.tr
ates@politics.ankara.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

It is clear that organizational transformation is taking place on a global scale. To be competitive, firms have to be sifter in their response to changing market conditions. In this new "high" competitive environment, a large number of Turkish firms in the past few years have mainly focused on one of the most popular approaches Total Quality Management and the application of Quality Control Circles (QCC) to be able to deal with the process. In fact some have been so successful applying that, Turkish firms have been a number of Quality Control Circles in International Competitions. The rise has been in Turkey and the rise has been in Turkey. The rise has been in Turkey.

In this study we will be examining whether the necessary organizational and managerial skills are available to apply in Turkey's large industrial enterprises. For the study we have chosen a number of Turkish organizations functioning in different sectors that are applying the QCC. The study will focus on the key aspects of the problems that they face, the problem solving process, the policies followed and the paradoxes in the prior modeling the application. The research methodology is interviews, observations and questionnaires.

.....

"Quality Control Circles (QCC) Applications in Turkish Enterprises and Confronting Paradoxes"

Table of Contents

- Introduction**
 - Definition of QCC and the Structure of Quality Control Circles**
 - QCC Application in Enterprises in Turkey**
 - Case Studies**
 - Arçelik**
 - Türk Traktör**
 - Turkish Military Academy**
 - Application Problems of QCC in Turkish Enterprises**
 - Confronting the Paradoxes**
 - Conclusion**
 - References**
-

Introduction:

For many years in Turkey, the main reason to increase productivity was thought to be hand in hand with the latest technological developments in machinery and tools. For this reason, other factors effecting productivity has always been neglected. Among these factors, the most important of all is

the creativity potential that an employee holds and the management that helps this potential to come to surface.

Beginning with the 1980's, the Turkish enterprises showed a rapid development entering foreign markets. As a result of the highly international competition. They aimed to take advantage of a more effective human resources management with the widespread applications. Total Quality Management, "Quality Control Groups" were perceived as important organizational change tools. In the first section of this study, a brief definition, aims and structure of the Quality Control Circles will be given.

1. DEFINITIONS, AIMS AND THE STRUCTURE OF QUALITY CIRCLES

The concept of Quality Control has been interpreted in many ways. The most commonly accepted definition in keeping with the essence of the philosophy as it originated in Japan is as follows;

"Quality Control Circle is a small group of employees in the same work- area or doing a similar type of work who voluntarily meet regularly for about an hour every week to identify, analyse and resolve work-related problems, leading to improvement in their total performance and enrichment of their work life".

A Quality Control Circle is a homogeneous group, not an inter-departmental or inter-disciplinary one. Members participating in Circle activities must be on the same wave-length. Discussions taking place at meetings should be intelligible to each one of the members . This is possible only if the composition of the Circle includes employees working in the same work area or engaged in a similar type of work. Designations of members need not necessarily be equal, but the work in which they all are engaged should be common. (S.R.UDPA)

This question should be considered by the managers, "Would Quality Circles go through the same way and die in a short time as other earlier practices have done?" One has to recognise the fact that the concept of Quality Control Circle is different from other techniques that have been used so far . QCC is:

- Voluntary
- Participative in the real sense
- A homogeneous group activity

QCC's aims can be grouped under the following main titles;

- Reduction defects and improving quality
- Enhancing problem-solving capacity
- Encouraging an attitude of problem prevention

- This particular study's aim is to show the implementations of QCC and the main problems that are faced during the process.

2. QCC Implementation in Enterprises in Turkey

In this particular study, enterprises in Turkey that have been implementing QCC since 1983 have been studied, regarding their success as well as in some cases failures. Some public and private sector organization as well as a military organization were studied. As a data collection methodology, interviews, supported by literature survey have been used. Also, discussions from the training and consulting services given by the National Productivity Center take place here.

In Turkey, since 1993, TUSIAD (Turkish Industry and Businessmen Association) and KALDER (The Quality Association) together have been giving the "Quality Award".

'The Quality Award' aims;

- Increasing the awareness of Quality
- Enhancing the attitudes of Enterprises towards the Concept of Quality
- Introducing Successful Quality Strategies for the use of our country. (TUSIAD-KALDER, 1998: 75).

In 1993, the Quality Award was decided to be given to an enterprise from the production sector, where after 1994 the Service Sector was also considered.

Criteria for the Quality Award are:

- Leadership
- Policies & Strategies
- Management of the Employees
- Resources
- Processes
- Customer Satisfaction
- Impact on the Society
- Result of Work.

The Corporations that have was the "Quality Award"

1993

Brisa Bridgestore Sabancı Lastik Sanayii ve Ticaret A.Ş.

1994

TAI-TUSAŞ Motor Sanayi A.Ş.

1995

NETAŞ-Northern electric Telecommunication

1995

KORDSA A.Ş.

1997

ARÇELŞK

1998

ECZACIBAŐI, Vitra Yapı ve ŐnŐaat Malzemeleri A.Ő.

In 1996, BRISA has won the "EUROPE TOTAL QUALITY AWARD", and the name was recognised internationally.

3.CASE STUDIES

A number of organizations such as Arçelik Dishwasher, Türk Traktör and The Turkish Military Academy, etc., where quality circles are in operation bring out special newsletters periodically publishing not only the activities, and achievement of Circle members but also case studies of problems identified and resolved by them. This not only affords the necessary recognition to their efforts but also helps disseminate information on how to go about the Circle activities. In order to bring home clearly the practical application of the theory discussed, a few typical examples of problems resolved by Quality Circles in different areas are given in the following case studies selected from diverse types of operations. These case studies would also establish the universality of application of the concept.

3.1. ARÇELİK DISHWASHER PLANT

Mass production started on October 20, 1993. At the moment the number of total employee is 308, 230 blue colors and 78 white colours (av.age 26, mostly technical high school graduates).

As a policy of the company, in a system based, on the philosophy that, the most important resource is Human beings, the young and dynamic staff incorporates the rapid development of the company by using latest technologies.

QCC implementations started in 1994. For the moment, by the end of June, 1999, seven circles are operating. Also this year they started a new rewarding system called, 'Circle of the Month'. Since the number of Circles did not increase satisfactory a "self assesment project team" was formed by one manager from the production department, three circle leaders and a quality circle coordinator. Due to their studies, they come up with the following problem identifications and solutions.

1. Lack of understanding and faith in the concept executives in higher position of the hierarchy started losing interest in the management presentation done by the circles. Most were not even attending the presentations due to business meetings and travels. The team found out that the presentations were not done periodically so that managers were not able to schedule before hand. Right now, all presentation are done on the first Thursday of each month. Managers could arrange their schedules accordingly. This led to recognition of the Circle Members by the top management and motivated them strongly.

2. The problem solution proposals were not evaluated regardless the result was positive or negative by the top management. Even it there were a positive answer, there was no trigger to solve the problem.

Due to this problem. A "Quality Proposal Evaluation Answer Team" was designed for use. With this implementation, all proposals (100%) were all evaluated. In 1998, 91.4% of the proposals were accepted and 77.6% were implemented. 13.8% of the proposals accepted needed investment and were put in order of importance to be implemented as soon as possible in the near future.

3. With the performance appraisal system, five circles were rewarded. However, studies demonstrated that the other circle's members felt unsuccessful and there was a significant decrease in motivation. Taking this into consideration, a number of criteria were set, and the circle fulfilling them would be "The Circle of the Month". This had a great impact. The average presentation number was 1.1 before this implementation, after it, it increased to 2.5. 70% of all the circles did a presentation more than once. This year in 1999, a Quality Circle named 'Sores 2000', did two presentation in a row and was chosen "The Circle of the Month' both in February and March. The results are published in Arçelik's monthly magazine with the circle's and problem identification proposals.

To increase motivation, once a year, together with all managers and circle members, they have a 'Circle Dinner'.

Monetary incentives are avoided. They do not want workers to concentrate on problems that bring a financial benefit.

4. Training is an important aspect of the Quality Circles activity. The study indicated that the understanding and assimilation of the concept was lacking. Due to this result, a new training program was designed concentrating on problem solving techniques and leadership as well.
5. Another important problem was that, there was no specific place for the meetings to be hold and need of stationary. The management immediately responded by arranging a special meeting room, and supplying the necessary stationary.

3.2. TÜRK TRAKTÖR

Established in 1954 as a corporation of the Koç Group, in 1993 joined a project named 'Koç 2000' where in the main theme was 'Total Quality Management'.

Türk Traktör's main target was

"To become world's best tractor producer".

Regarding this target Türk Traktör's duty in the Global Market was to serve its customers with.

- The Right Quality
- At The Right Time
- With the Right Definition
- & The Right Price.

Within the project, in 1994 they started a Self-Assessing Process (referring to the European Foundation of Quality Management). An intense training was given, teaching the '5S' (Seiri, Seiton, Seiso, Seiketsu, and Shitsuke) which are Cleaning up, cleaning, organizing, Standardizing and Discipline.

In 1998, their goals were set to;

- decrease cost by 12%
- to become the leader in the domestic market
- to increase their export from \$15 million to \$100 million.

The strategies attained to reach these goals were as the following;

- To define & improve the work process
- To develop a System for HRM
- To improve the Resources Management
- To increase Customer Satisfaction
- To improve the satisfaction of the community's needs and expectations.
- Improving the TQM, with the participation of all members in the organization.
- To be the only supplier for the New Holland Network.

Since 1998, they are very seriously working on the QCC. Thirteen quality control circles are operating and the number is expected to increase up to thirty five by Dec., 1999.

The quality circles process accordingly, fulfilling all the requirements of the problem solving operation cycles through the sequential management presentation. The organization also avoids monetary incentives to successful circles, and rewards them through token gifts to members on suitable occasions, publishing their achievements and activities and a sanction of paid vacations in some cases.

One very important fact is that, in October 1998, the European Total Quality Award Winner Brisa (Sabancı Group) and Türk Traktör formed a Quality Circle under the name "BRITURK" display that two competitors could actually come together and show that they form a very "Effective Team". It

has been a very important contribution for both parties as well as an excellent example for other Turkish enterprises working with TQM.

3.3. IMPLEMENTATION IN THE TURKISH MILITARY ACADEMY

The total quality management infrastructure was theoretically built up five years ago and implemented two years ago, with a customer focused oriented system design.

In January, 1999 before implementing QCC, project 'iyileştirme' Teams we built. All chose a leader. In six months. 110 project teams were established. On March 25, the Project Team leaders, prepared a report on the activities, implementation and results of the system, and submitted them to the top management. In April, the commander started the first activities for solving the available problems.

QCC, recently just started in June with four pilot circles. They were trained on problem solving techniques.

In every department in the Military Academy a meeting room is designed for TQM. In 1998, they received the ISO 9001 certificate from the Turkish Standards Institute.

What they interestingly did was, before applying the QCC on a team basis, they first initiated a proposal system of problem on the individual. The idea was that, if individual's saw that their proposals were evaluated with care, they would be convinced the QCC would successfully work. In 6 months, there were a total of 10,000 proposals.

The question; "When managers give people goals but Military Academy give them the means to achieve them, yet hold them responsible for outcomes --all in the name of empowerment-- how many people will continue to believe in a new management approach of sharing and not feel patronized once again? Too often what is called empowerment is really delegation of tasks, but with the same reporting requirements. Superficially 'empowering' teams may be the new version of quality circles. Evaluation of quality circles in the Military Academy indicated that most circles were not effective and were being disbanded (White & Konoske, 1989).

The Turkish Military Academy is planning on applying for the European Quality Award in the year 2001. The top management has been very supportive so far and they are trying to establish a system that does not change with the change of management. The system should be independent of people. The top management itself got 200 hours of training in 1,5 years. The aim is to help future managers with problem faced and solved in the past.

When the individual problem proposal system was introduced, very surprisingly, managers found out they actually did not know their limits of authority in the organization. They kept sending the

proposed problem to a superior, which ended up as a great loss of time. Three months ago, they carried out a job analysis and design program. Now everyone clearly knows his degree of authority as well as responsibility.

Some main pitfalls are;

- The Turkish military structure of is highly hierarchical.
- Subordinates are not very willing to take responsibility or use authority.
- In the project teams usually 1-2 people do the work, the rest just listen without participating. They are planning to conduct personality tests to form dynamic groups.
- The old managers showed an enormous resistance towards the new structural change. However the problem was with no surprise solved easily. The commander orders that, everyone in the organization was to cooperate through the implementation process without causing trouble! (A very clear paradox, against the true philosophy of TQM).

4. Implementation Problems of QCC in Turkish Enterprises

During our interviews as well as other channels we have come across the fact that, in many organizations, the definition of QCC was misleading. In most of the interviews, QCC was stated to;

- increasing quality
- decreasing cost
- reducing defects

Although these aspects are all true, they do not define the real application of QCC. They are just signs that the QCC are on the right track. In order to achieve high productivity, there are other major targets to be realized and achieved. Conviction of the top management and the senior executives of the company in the feasibility and utility of quality circle is pre-requisite for initiating quality circles in any organization. The aim should be well understood. If not then problems are expected mostly resulting as a failure.

QCC have the basic aspect;

1. Management getting to be participative in the real sense.
2. Fulfilling the needs of the members (Arkiş, 1995; 156)

Before starting implementing the QCC in an organization the managers should answer the following question:

How should the workers in our organization behave in order to implement quality control circles successfully?

The workers should be:

- Willing to work in the organization
- Do their job excellent
- Present their intrinsic wisdom and creativity

- Cooperate to achieve the common organizational goals with the different levels of the management as well as coworkers

If the management could achieve to have these four important aspects from the members, then the organization and could actually expect productivity improvement and better quality in the production or service they are attaining.

The second important question the managers should ask is:

Which managerial strategies should the managers adopt for successful implementation of QCC?

And the answer goes as;

- Enhancement of; job, interest, by giving maximum authority and responsibility
- Enhancing an attitude of controlling their own job
- Improving communication process
- Promotion of personal and leadership development
- Implementing an awarding system not effecting cooperation

In Turkey due to the high inflation, though not seen in the original Japanese applications, the monetary incentives that are earned as a result of the QCC are distributed.

When we come to the behavioural factors motivation is very important. Exactly what motivates an individual to give his best is a very critical issue. Together with motivation, participation and recognition are the three major aspects of the Quality Circle programme, which is by and for the employees at the grassroots.

Motivation refers to a feeling experienced within an individual. It is an emotion or a desire which influences a person's will and causes him to act in a certain way. Motivation is also the quality that makes it possible for people to achieve psychological growth. Performance is the function of an individual's ability, knowledge and motivation and it is only when a person is properly motivated that he or she uses his her ability, knowledge ad skill to perform at an optimum level.

The circle allows the worker to have a say in decisions affecting his work-area and provides a forum in which the worker is able to draw attention to problems affecting his performance. This creates a desire to do well, to work without close suspension and to do an honest day's work for a day's pay. In short, the Quality Circle's philosophy develops a positive approach and attributes. Which benefit both the workers themselves as well as the organization that employs them.

Participative management, in its true sense, is the essence of the 'Quality Circles' concept. The frank and objective discussions that take place in the Quality Circle meetings, afford an opportunity for them to know one another more intimately so that the spirit of camaraderie that is thereby gradually developed creates a more cohesive environment for them to work in. The concept of Quality Circles involves the top management too, in participative activities.

A very important aspect is recognition. If there is no expectation of monetary gains what makes members voluntarily take part in the activities of quality circles? They do this in order to satisfy the higher hierarchical human needs.

Suggested models of recognition of Quality Circles include; presentation of badges, taken gifts to members on suitable occasions, witnessing case-study presentations, sanction of paid vacations, awards for best presentations and effective circles, etc.

At this stage, it is good to remember in the efforts for getting results that

"through force/fear/authority-you can fell them"

"through persuasion/rewards-you can sell them"

"through satisfaction-you can involve them in improvement"

When Circles are initiated, the question looming large in the minds of prospective members was "What is in it for me?"

Many managers should doubt whether in Turkey any concept could work which does not benefit the participant in financial terms. The question should be debated in length.

The consensus that emerged in other countries was that by introducing monetary incentives, more problems are created rather than resolved. In an organization where Circles are operating in different departments, the ones in manufacturing areas would be better able to impress the assessing authority because most of the benefits accruing from resolving problems of quality or productivity are quantifiable in terms of millions of Turkish liras.

But this not the case of Circles operating in service areas. Although the overall benefits to the organization from the achievements of these groups in peripheral areas are of equal importance, the results achieved by the latter Circles, being only qualitative, may not attract the recognition that they deserve. Therefore, while one set of circles may be motivated through monetary incentives, others may be discouraged. Whereas the objective of circles is to eliminate or minimize conflicts, introduction of monetary incentives would only give rise to fresh problems and charges of disanimination in rewarding the circles would inevitably, arise.

So the third question the managers should ask would be;

"Do the new management strategies fulfill the needs of the workers in the organization?"

"What does a person actually expect from his/her work environment?"

Maslow's theory of Hierarchy of Needs, best explains the question.

In most of the Turkish Enterprises, the third level of needs "Social needs" is not fully satisfied. During consultancy and training programs we have noticed that most managers are not even aware of such a

need. This is a result of most managers in Turkey are engineers with no formal education of management.

The fourth and last question that the managers need to ask is;

"Which tool/technique do we need to apply to implement our organization's new management strategies?"

The answer is "Quality Control Circles".

When we look at the firms that have been using QCC for a number of years, we were surprised to see that most works are not even a member of circle, and that there is simply no authority given to the worker, which is simply a discouraging attitude for problem solving capability.

When asked a manager whether they were satisfied by the QCC, the answer is very simple; "of course; we have reduced defects and improved quality as well as productivity". And that is all that matters. They simple have no concern for improving communication, promotion of personal, leadership development and participative culture or of enhancement of job interest and more effective team work. By attaining all these poor quality of work life could be overcome, such as, high absenteeism and turnover, poor quality of products, low productivity, human relations conflicts.

In any organization, no matter what type of activities it is engaged in, the management has to give the lead and direction to all other employees.

The management should realize the need to bring about company wide improvement in quality and productivity, understand the concept of Quality Control Circles fully and develop faith in the participative philosophy, change over to the participative style of management and adopt it as one of the corporate goals, desire to foster initiative and creativity among the employees, develop the confidence in the capability of the employees at the grassroots to use their creativity.

All these don't happen in a short period of time. It takes time and effort. The management should be aware that the change is not an easy process and need not to be discouraged:

The managers should never start with;

"We can never implement QCC"

"Our workers can never succeed"

The initial factor a general manager decides to try implementing the QCC in his own corporation usually in Turkey, is that he saw the implementation and the advantages that the system brings in a foreign corporation. Usually the manager has no training of the implementation.

Sometimes the foreign partner of the corporation insists that QCC should be implemented or the management is informed that competitions have started the QCC process, so the implementation is quickly initiated at once.

Usually this proves us that the managers do not have a clear understanding of what QCC is all about.

The next pitfall after the implementation starts, is during the training programmes. The managers usually due to their 'tight schedule' are always busy and are not able to attend the training. As a result, this results in lack of support of the management to the process as well as wrong decision making issues.

Usually there are no problems with the project coordinators and the workers during training process. However the pinot groups after the training face very serious problems with the middle managers during the problem solving stage. Middle managers dislike, the new responsibilities the workers undertake and react against them by not supporting their contributions.

Management presentation is the culmination of a Circle's project study. The impact of the first management presentation usually was great in all firms in Turkey, however, after a while, the managers lose interest and supportless. Usually, they cancel this stage of the problem-solving operation cycle, letting it remain as a ongoing process on paper.

According to a conducted study, only 25% of the corporations in Turkey, have the suitable organizational structure and management aspects to implement QCC (Kırçıl, 1986: 20). The managers' and organizational structure aspect were evaluated, considering the followings;

1. Delegating responsibility to workers
2. The managers job is not to control the work,
3. That the worker can make decision for what job he is responsible for.
4. That managers believe in people working as group are more creative as well as productive.

5. CONFRONTING THE PARADOXES IN A TOTAL QUALITY ENVIRONMENT

This is the Age of Paradox. Paradoxes are no stranger to total quality management (QCC) as well. The pursuit of QCC requires leaders and followers to think and act in ways that are very different from their prior modes of operation and, in some cases, that seem to be based on contradictory principles – a paradox.

There is clearly something to be gained-over and above the satisfaction of a mental exercise-reflecting on and resolving a paradox. By doing so, we often gain a deeper understanding of the

principles behind the apparent contradiction or a clarification of how we have allowed ourselves to become confused in our thinking and use of terms.

In the same way, understanding the paradoxes that surface in a total quality environment sharpens our focus on the elements that create a culture dedicated to quality.

THE SEVEN PARADOXES

The paradoxes that develop in a quality environment result from various sources: the company's efforts to achieve multiple goals in trying to meet customer needs and wants in an efficient and realistic manner, broader roles for employees, and new ways of structuring tasks. Moreover, a number of principles in QCC indeed are contradictory.

PARADOX 1: Seek Diversity, but Build a Shared Vision

The use of teams is an important aspect of any quality effort, and virtually all QCC form cross-functional, continuous process, and quality teams. The core values of a QCC emphasize the importance of partnering, team focus, and participation.

It is the diversity of technical backgrounds, experiences and perspectives that makes the team output more valuable than an individual decision.

At the same time, the company needs to build a culture in which people move as one entity, tightly focused on serving customers. This shared value, a cornerstone of any quality philosophy, requires that each person understand and embrace the organization's definition of quality.

How does a leader effectively develop this cohesiveness while at the same time encouraging diversity? Isn't diversity, by definition, the opposite of unity?

One possible response to this paradox is to consider diversity and a common philosophy as different endpoints on the same continuum. In this way of looking at things, the leader must carefully balance each element, admitting that increased diversity weakens the organization's ability to build a shared vision. Hence, an organization can have diversity and a shared vision.

Managing Paradox 1:

Seeing diversity and a common vision as two different constructs provides the key to reconciling this first paradox.

Hence, the organization needs clear and accepted views about the individual's role and his or her acceptance of the organization's values. This is regardless of the degree of diversity of its members.

There may be differences in how to tackle problems and in framing the ideal solution. However, there also needs to be agreement that once the decision has been made, it is accepted by the group. The shared vision becomes just as important to the organization as the diverse viewpoints that are part of the team.

PARADOX 2: Encourage Creativity, but be Consistent in Everything

Promoting creative ideas is important in a QCC environment. By encouraging everyone with the stake in the company (employees, suppliers, and customers) to provide input to changes in processes, product, or service designs, and to suggest ideas for new products or services, the organization successfully extends its creative powers.

However there are performance metrics for each task. These tasks require dependable and consistent role performance, as evaluated by the company's specifications for the activities. No room for "out of the box" thinking here.

Is this a paradox or not? On the surface it would seem that it. However, if one considered that each job is really composed of two dimensions, the paradox becomes manageable. One dimension is the operational component, the normal activities associated with the individual's task. The second dimension relates to generating ideas to improve the organization, including the employee's own job.

Managing Paradox 2:

Once the leader and followers realize that there are two distinct dimensions to each task, the paradox is manageable. Conforming to standards must be reinforced in the operational dimension. A failure to reinforce creativity will reduce the capacity to be creative when the need arises. But if creativity is encouraged and reinforced at the expense of operational behavior, attention may shift away from the focus on the customer's, there may not be a need to look at the future. Encouraging creativity is not easy to manage. Rejection of a new idea may shut down creativity and lead to expensive lost opportunities.

PARADOX 3: Focus on Continuous Process Improvement, but Make Break-Through Change an Important Part of the Job

A continuous process improvement mentality stresses the need to constantly consider how to make a process or product faster, cheaper, and more reliable. Breakthrough change is a matter of revolution, not evolution.

But how does one facilitate breakthrough changes in a continuous improvement environment.

Managing Paradox 3:

Leaders must provide the culture to support both breakthrough and continuous process improvements. This can be done only through deliberate steps to balance both types of change. Without this balance, there is a risk that thinking will be so focused on incremental changes that it will preclude the “outside of the box” thinking needed for breakthrough changes.

PARADOX 4: Use Autonomous Work Groups to Enhance Performance, but Ensure Careful and Uniform Control of Product and Service Quality

Various studies have shown that work groups having control over how things are done are more productive than groups with little control. With greater control, employees feel stronger sense of ownership in the finished product. They are also more likely to find creative solutions to meet performance goals and to show greater commitment to the goals. This is another reason that autonomy, participation, and use of teams are at the core of any total quality approach.

Again, however, a total quality environment demands a high degree of reliability and consistency in performance, raising the need for enhanced control and monitoring.

Managing Paradox 4:

Reconciling this paradox takes a high degree of leadership skill. The leader must focus on finding key indicators of performance that still provide reliability and consistency, while allowing employees discretion in how they reach their performance goals.

PARADOX 5: Build a Cohesive Work Team, but Welcome Conflict When Critically Analyzing Ideas

Two dimensions seem to be important to a team’s effectiveness: cohesiveness and the ability to perform critical analysis. Research has demonstrated that the most productive teams are highly supportive of the organization’s goals.

However if there are teams too cohesive, the value of group decision making decreases. Hence, simply having a cohesive group is sufficient. An effective group must be one that will share divergent viewpoints and critically challenge the ideas of individual members-without producing destructive conflict and a loss in cohesiveness.

Managing Paradox 5:

Cohesiveness is important to build the team's ability to work for a common goal. However, a cohesive team will not be an effective team if the members focus on maintaining their cohesiveness at the expense of critical analysis. The ability to deal with conflict is one reason for the group's existence. Conflict is positive if built on foundation of mutual respect and focused issues, not on personalities.

PARADOX 6: Set Realistic, yet Challenging Goals for Maximum Performance, but Use Stretch Targets to Dramatically Improve Performance

The link between goal level and performance is closely related to an employee's acceptance of the goal, and much of the research on goal setting. A goal would be accepted if the individual viewed it as reasonable and reachable, and if the person assigning the goal had authority to do so.

Managing Paradox 6:

Challenging but realistic goals are helpful for normal operational performance and continuous process improvement. Stretch goals, on the other hand, are very helpful in creating the kind of culture that will foster breakthrough changes.

PARADOX 7: Reward Team Effort, but Create a High Performance Climate for Individuals

Using teams is to get employees involved in more than their individual tasks and thus more focused on the goals of the organization. Rewarding team effort will do much to focus individual effort toward common goals. However we come across troublesome questions such as: Won't team rewards diffuse the importance of individual effort? Will the organization lose good people who get frustrated because they feel that their efforts are not recognized individually?

Managing Paradox 7:

This paradox is real. The organization needs high levels of performance and involvement from each employee with respect to both the individual's basic task and to his/her distinctive creativity in providing ideas for quality improvements.

The focus of attention in managing this paradox is on assessing how well an individual works within the group. The leader needs to focus on the an individual’s contribution to be the team process as one component of that person’s performance evaluation.

BRINGING PURPOSE TO THE PARADOXES

There are purposeful reasons for apradoxes. By recognizing and resolving the paradoxes, leaders gain a sharper focus on the dynamics of a total quality environment. The seven paradoxes presented here are grouped around three focal points. The table demonstrates the relationships.

The first three paradoxes relate to creating the culture of the work enviroment. By a judicious handling of each of these paradoxes, the organizational leader will find that the culture is more conductive to the type of continual change, customer responsiveness, and idea generation necessary to sustain a competitive advantage.

Quality Focus Points	The Paradoxes
Creating the culture of the work environment	1. Seek Diversity, but Build a Shared Vision 2. Encourage Creativity, but be Consistent in Everything 3. Focus on Continous Process Improvement, but Make Break-Through Change an Important Part of the Job
Building a responsive team environment	4. Use Autonomous Work Groups to Enhance Performance, but Ensure Careful and Uniform Control of Product and Service Quality 5. Build a Cohesive Work Team, but Welcome Conflict When Critically Analyzing Ideas 6. Set Realistic, yet Challenging Goals for Maximum Performance, but Use Stretch Targets to Dramatically Improve Performance
Reinforcing a performance-centered environment	7. Reward Team Effort, but Create a High Performance Climate for Individuals

A second focal point centers on building a responsive team environment. Building a cohesive team that can critically analyze ideas is essential to its effectiveness. Specific targets help focus the team’s efforts. Stretch goals lead to dramatic results if the team has the necessary environment to support its efforts.

The third focal point relates to creating and maintaing an environment that supports performance. This is done by reinforcing team productivity, individual productivity, and the processes that are important to effective teamwork.

These paradoxese are important to building the kind of sensitive leadership that will be necessary to meet all of the different demands that are called for in building a truly cooperative organization. Each one of the paradoxes must be successfully reconciled so that a leader will be able to create the kind of organization that will be successful in the 21st century.

CONCLUSION

The research strongly indicated that employees, after they became QCC members, could change themselves for the better in many areas relevant to their personal growth and they perceived positive changes in certain important organizational aspects which helped them to function as effective workers in the organization.

The findings also indicate that members belonging to the QCC groups which were functioning effectively were enjoying a very high quality of worklife in all aspects compared to other workers. The findings support the validity of the basic motivational foundation on which QCC concept and practise rests. If the total organization is not geared to the participative concept and philosophy, the positive results appearing now as a result of QCC practises may remain a temporary phenomenon.

It is essential that anybody contemplating the implementation of the concept of "Quality Control Circles" in any organization understands clearly the major ingredients of philosophy before initiating any step for launching quality control circles. In organizations lacking of the culture of participative management, it would be difficult for employees to understand the role of "Quality Control Circles", which have also, as one of their long term objectives, a welcome change in the very style of management.

References:

- ARKIĞ, Nurdoğan (1995), "Kalite Çemberlerinin Amaçları", Verimlilik Dergisi Toplam Kalite Özel Sayısı, Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayını, Ankara.
- KIRÇIL, Olgun ve Nurdoğan ARKIĞ (1986), Türkiye'de Sorun Çözme Gruplarının Uygulanabilmesi için Gerekli Yönetim ve Organizasyon Özellikleri, Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara.
- ÖZKANLI, Özlem (1996), Ülkemizde Kalite Kontrol Çemberleri Uygulamaları, Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Proje Raporu, Ankara.
- ÖZKAYA, Meltem Onay (1999), "İşletmelerde İşsana Verilen Değer: Eczacıbaşı Holding Örneği", Yöneylem Araştırması ve Endüstri Mühendisliği XX.Ulusal Kongresi Bildiri Özetleri
- THOMPSON, Kenneth R. (1998), "Confronting the Paradoxes in a total Quality Environment", Organizational Dynamics, Winter 1998, pp.62-73.
- TÜSİAD-K (1998), Öz Değerlendirme El Kitabı, İstanbul.
- UDPA, S R, (1992), "Quality Circles – Progress through Participation", Second Edition, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.