Daily procedure

I established a system of digital records online because I don't want to keep all the paper, and I want to improve my daily routine.

Week 1

Week 1

Mon Tues Wed Thu Fri Sat Sun

1

31

29

How can I improve the daily routine through some card of Critical Point Analysis?
I would like to do some work on stake analysis to make sure that I am focusing on the right problem each day.
Perhaps I could continue what I did yesterday by adding a CPA to the process document for each of the processes I try to manage.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/4/08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/4/08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/4/08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11/4/08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/4/08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13/4/08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18/4/08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19/4/08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/12/08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/12/08</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8/12/08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11/12/08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/11/09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6/11/09</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this AR paper:

I want to say that AR is concerned with building multi-view models - for verifying and for predicting.

AR is a useful methodology if we are interested in organizational development by focusing on democracy. Research concerned with AR should be aimed at improving AR methodology (making AR more efficient). This is what Fain Keesey is saying.
A better approach for AR papers is probably to pretend to follow along with the ideology only to question its feasibility and then try to figure out why it failed and how it can be improved.
Hypothesis on design a firm

For knowledge sharing according
to ID principle.

Furthermore:

Attending meetings is hard to
follow the law of exponential
decay

\[ N(t) = N_0 e^{-kt} \]

Early enthusiasm peeters out.
A system
If this was a technical problem in electrical engineering, a
simplified solution for this kind of problem would be to
develop a feedback mechanism that tends to stabilize the
system at a given level.

As we are dealing with a voluntary forum for
exchange of ideas, it is not possible to arrange
enough to "force" people to attend, but the feedback mechanism
has to convince people that
nonetheless they should attend.
Research of group
behaviors indicates that XXX.
Could it be that YYY?

Hypothesis, measuring and
distributing the meeting protocol
and statistics leaned on it
will stabilize group attendance.

Quasi-experimental / AR.
AR can be seen as a special
case of Design Research as
the aim of the scientific
aim of AR is to improve
the effectiveness of AR method.
PD method.
Theory

As the problem begs for an answer in the shape of a method, the theory of action research might prove useful.

Despite this, more often described as a research paradigm than a theory, in the field.

Early notions of AR in IS, however, there has been a tendency for seeing AR as a family of methods for improving democracy at work. It is then better to descend research

...
Title: Mixing action research with control theory for instilling TQM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Quality TQM as a framework for organizational learning.
- Building sustainable communities.
- Enhancing knowledge sharing.
Model / Algorithm:

1. Define purpose of knowledge-sharing community.
2. Decide on a theme and place for a potentially endless series of meetings.
3. Establish a limited control mechanism that can be linked with each meeting.

Case Study:

4.1 Establish the framework.
4.2 Running the system.
4.3 Evaluating the failure.
5. Discussion

5.1 Framework

Almost perfect. Republicanism, enthusiasm. Only problem was that faculty numbers would not stand, meaning that the quality of discussion and interaction would depend on senior members.

5.2 Process

The SPC is not good enough for.

Are there other interpretations?

Does this scheme support that women had no effect?

No, they shriveled up.


Could it be that despite shining up our bars, there was no effect?

Difficult to imagine because people were polite. Anyway, it was not important whether people believed it or not, just

an action.

It is not necessary with 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 above.

The discusser should be a

comey of evaluation.

5.3 Examiner
Discussion

The method failed. What did we learn?

Consistent with control theory, the system dived when feedback ended. No surprise.

Perhaps the measured method was among? What other issues could be used as control units?

etavism of modeled. The plan was updated each week, but the former only charged once, i.e., "killed off".
What about the "anarchic method"? Get people to do something that can afterwards be easily counted?

What about a valuing of paper?

What about the "plan strategy"?

4. Extrinsic motivation.

How to relate evaluative with needs?

Why should people attend in the first place?

1) social needs
2) share ideas
3) get ideas
4) get feedback on their own thoughts
AR = desert intervention
    (intervention research)

What this means is that the hypothesis of the research should be related to whether the intervention works or not.

**Discussion**

The intervention failed as faculty "killed the system".

Although stirring up了一场 is not necessarily a bad thing, the method would publicly harm method better if the weekly evaluations focused on something useful and positive.
Discussion

People join a forum in order to test their ideas and learn. They should also focus on whether a given paper could be useful in their own research. How do we measure this?

- Combining people is good, but distributing protocol is perhaps not so good.
- What else could be distributed?
- If was also linked with a discussion forum, so discussion could be done 24/7.
What about communities of practice liberalism?

- Mapping of networks

Building James Hard group
Building Spain CSS group
Building Psycho-Cybernetics group
Building ANT group
Building Weimar Imperial group
Building philosophers of mathematicians group
Building Derrida group
Did this reading memorable have a significant effect on the junior bond group?

I think so, because it produced
prudence insights.

S99 and Mission impossible, on the other hand, for "academic" discourse made people fall off, and there was sinking of substance to cage up the senses, with, except, perhaps - the odyssey. At least that seemed like a better source than Shakespeare.
What kind of insights does this produce for "PhD Forum"?

Perhaps the forum might have worked better if there were some "sacred texts" that could be used as basic reference.

A good strategy might be to use Google Scholar for ranking the papers and then use the 80/20 principle to define the "sacred texts". Each discussion could then focus on comparing next texts to the canon of holy texts.
This enthusiastic/canonical discussion strategy worked well with the Space 1889 forum, although the idea was to compare 41 episodes with each other, explaining how they were all interconnected and how they added insight to R.A.M.

In the case of T2, however, discussion went less well because the episodes were difficult to understand and thus created agony.
Conclusion AR paper.

The paper failed because the existing method created negative reactions.

A much better approach would be to try to identify a "canon of sacred texts" and organize discussion around "intertextuality."

So, should I write this paper?

What is the purpose?

- reading, writing, discussions.

What are the sacred texts of TM?
Dury
(1) Out of the Crisis, 5542
(5) Dury, Acutebuck control handbook, 1913
(3) Crosby, Quality is Free, 1688
(6) Shingles, A study of the Toyalat (PS), 421
(4) Sheehan, Economic Control, 1936
(2) Taylor, Principles of SM, 3483
Conclusion of AR paper.

1) Unclear whether monitoring had any effect.
   "What gets measured gets done" does not necessarily apply because people would have to reconcile between going faster or doing other thing that was important.

2) Problems with selecting papers to share with others because there was little common misunderstanding of what matches up the "canonical sacred texts".

3) Discussions should be related to something. If the canon is unknown, the group should discuss and interpret and build upon it.
4) the manifesto should be used for G1.

5) Stewart Brand & Bauhaus should be used for DIS.

6) It's not very good to refer to Hermes and Monteiro. It's better to evolve from Ciborra. As he is no longer alive, this makes better opportunities for interpretation.

TITLE = Designing discussion forums for knowledge exchange and learning