Success Through Quality

My interests lie in discussing ideas with people, like I discuss with my research advisor, the people on the Santa Barbara staff or with fellow PhD students.

My career of interest is management. All of life contains studies of management; strategies and decision-making, assessments, control, plans, ...

My goal is to reduce all the trival stuff to a system. The very few little attention beyond studies of how to optimize the process.

An important aspect of the process is engineering and optimizing my own processes.

My once processes consist of doing research on how to optimize processes.
1) PDCA describes the rounds of experimental research (DNMM).

2) Research is part of a game ("how to convince").

- You must have something worth to say.
- You must be convincing. (SKY)

$\Rightarrow$ Research is a game and a machine.
The important issues is focus.

1) The world is process (flow)

2) We use methods (systems) for managing (shaping the ship, steering the vessel).

3) We want to optimize these managed systems.
Computing bandwidth is an enumerative study because we look at items from the past.

Should - enumerative or analytic?

I predict that the scan is stable.
What do we predict by SPC?

Hypothesis testing is predicted.

⇒ We predict H0.

\[ y = f(x) + \epsilon \quad \text{random variation} \]

\[ y = a + b + w \]

Sample model: \[ y = a + w \]
Not possible because our understanding
must change accordingly

< Name

Are all any instincts in life related to
TAM? No, TAM only deals with
process, not content.

System

This is why I found
Lamnek, Spera 1989,
Sennett, franklin, etc
initiating the issue
related to psychology and
sociology.

This is what we
have to investigate

— This is what Bela Sender, through his "intrinsic research"
The three other companies
- system
- numbers
- Epstein

These include in two of the marginal systems the methods.

- How do we manage change in order or organizations?

1) Sketch the system
2) Collect data and estimate results
3) Perceive and interpret feedback
4) Test whether this adds value to
   or the possibility of change for different sorts of
   organizations, different sorts of people.
Research to explain \( \rightarrow \) why
Research to predict

No, all recent research is concerned with explaining (and predicting).

The significance of my research is that producers are more clear than we think, and explain more. Indeed, it seems fit with the Adamic theme of consumer society.
Different nothing.
(Read on pure love, pure oh thing).

1) A person makes a product, gives it to another person, and receives payment and becomes famous for doing a good job.

2) Other people like to develop theories without too much practical work.

Some people are interested in people issues, other are interested in technical issues:

Boring = watching football
Interesting = interesting people, literature...

1) Trails began when it made in the garden → practical

2) I prefer to read and write. Thanks.
1) The output of research is theory.
   Practice is only an example or part of the argument (support).

2) For practical people, the practical outcome is not just empirical. There is
   one only useful if it supports
   [more legible text as support.]

   — This seems to be the essence of my life.

   — In order to motivate myself into doing something practical, I should
     frame it as research.
     [Change my goal strategy]
Can I summarize this?

1) Joy during learning and use.
   (Flow)

2) Whenever I learn to think practically, I should design
   much as necessary. Design, but to design instructions, and
   learn to think of the socio-technical results.

3) A system

   ![Diagram](image)
The aim of the research is to optimize the system ( Aim of SoPK).

Through this process, I also investigate the mind of PK.
The final self-observed was useful.

What I like to do is to investigate
the mind of Freidrich, the mind
of Henry, the mind of Taylor,
the mind of Being.

To me these random theories make
different sense unless they can be
seen as reminiscent elsewhere, ready
the text that is given us through
the life of Being and other
inducing people.

The mind of Heidegger, the mind of
Kierkegaard, the mind of
Sokrova, the difference between Being
and inducing research has to do with
whence are we able to find interesting individuals.

"The Sujing rebellion" is distinctly because of the complex character. Most individuals are inclined when one starts getting close to them.

How can I interpret the EUS paper in this tradition?

- Perhaps I could see it as getting into the head of Jackson Flood?
- Or discussion & Vegge?
- Or are these people in the SPI committee that I could build on? Jens Kathunder?

The focus on this paper is Flood’s TS 1/100.
I feel I have to summarize once more.

1) My kind of writing is integrated in the way that I need to understand. Being not only based on his "tools", but primarily on his philosophy of improvement.

2) This approach is similar to how I've been introduced in Heidelberg, Tübingen, Freiburg, Bonn, etc., and also Kassel, TuBingen, Bordeaux, etc.

3) I also use this approach in trying to understand Wlodarz, Töd, Kustner, Kneschke, Benedikt, etc.
Focusing only on the dangerous parts
one feels empty, sort of what
Adams describes, but focusing on
the different people makes me happy.

The reason I loved architecture
feeling more than complex science
more because of the people. I did not
have access to the complex people
they just seemed like engineers
"ordinary people" (engineers) solving
problems, while I was interested
in 18th, 19th, 20th, etc.,
Wren, Heathen, Wagner, industrial
people.

Juran, Shintzi, Deming, Taylor, Chinese,
French, Herderg, are all industrial
people who became things made "fast"
that help us to be enhanced.
5.2. System process

5.1 Cluster of excellent design
Case study with Brunson et al.

5.2 System process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[0.6 \times 1.0 \times 2.66 = 3.63\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[3.63 \times 2.35 \times 2.66 = 22.35\]
5.2 Z indicates process