1) Take as Science
2) Feedback - what gets measured gets done
3) False Quality

What I would like is a method similar to what I heard at Dunn, mainly doing the same one and over again each day, having the system decide what I should do,

2) Improve the measures.
At OPM 1 was concerned with improving our process of improving the system.

⇒ 1) We need someone to do the sort of thing I was doing.
2) We need to improve the process I was performing.

⇒ Do + improve

\[ \rightarrow \text{P1} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{P2} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{P3} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{P4} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{P improve} \]
Research project

Using my own PhD project so

\[ p_1 \text{ - SKD} \]
\[ p_2 \text{ - OWN} \]
\[ p_3 \text{ - Elaboration & analysis} \]
\[ p_4 \text{ - Write paper (review paper)} \]
\[ p_5 \text{ - Email} \]
\[ p_6 \text{ - Review} \]
\[ p_7 \text{ - Discussion} \]
\[ p_8 \text{ - Travel} \]
What I study is quality managers.

I want to find out:

- What do they do?
- Do they follow Deniers, etc.

1) I believe there is a correlation between the quality department and business results.

2) What should quality people do in order to influence business results? According to Deniers, what we do is optimizing...
1) Anticipate the role of the psychologist dependent in building organizational psychology.

2) [Diagram of interconnected roles]

process input = research.
What would be my advice to DRIFT:

1) Work on DRIFT N1.2 any week.

2) The document DRIFT should be filled with social thing and technical thing. It is not only a preface, but it should play a role in your burn, is inspiring performance.

→ It is not just about DRIFT, but it is about computer-based image in general.
3) All technical documents were written in the format of formal reports. (MRAD print).

4) The challenge of ONPI was to find RO and MTH of the technical reports.

5) A second challenge was that nobody cared. Nobody wanted to be involved in the reports unless I wanted to find a COP.
3) Even without a CoP, writing reports in IMRAD format is a way of improving-driven software development. We are forced to read, we are forced to accumulate data, we are forced to do testing...
Self-imposed research

Goal = improve perf. (DV)
outcome = achei. session (IV)
Research = control (MV)

Results = performance (FRIDA)
Idea = use self-image as a basis for organized argument.

Expected results = I become an expert in practice and sociology of science, meta-disciplines writing about scientists when they don't science? I expect that my area explore can only be circumscribed through my I might achieve suprascience and evolve to trans.

Focus on psychology within how society.
What is the weakest joint in my current self-assessment?

- I feel 180 degrees on myself.
- It doesn't add because I haven't properly understood the standard.

1. The problem is too much focus on the standard, and too little on process, or
2. Lack of ability to integrate much and implement through KIBTS method.
How do I get from here to GA?

What I like about GA is that it is a "non-thinking" approach. It is a way of exploring a space by trial and error rather than some "project management approach" that gets run into a single track.

- Exploring research
- Lots of feedback and lots of feedback → creates flow.

Perhaps GA could help me with any self-imposed research?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jahr</th>
<th>Klima</th>
<th>Klimas</th>
<th>konk</th>
<th>Summ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>