

April 2019



## The Science of Management

Dear Drew,

The application of scientific principles to the practice of management is a subject that has intrigued me for nearly 30 years now. By 1990 I had already studied Mechanical, Electrical and Computer Engineering. I was about to return to school to study the subject of business management, and more specifically Organizational and Behavioral Science. I realized after seven or so years at General Electric that I was insufficiently equipped to deal with the challenges that I had encountered to date. I eagerly embraced the concepts of 'quality management' and 'world class' (the terminology of the time). They struck a logical chord with me. I attempted to apply them in every position that I held, and to whatever inefficient or ineffective processes I encountered; manufacturing processes in high volume and low volume environments, engineering processes, office processes. I quickly learned that there are very few bad people, but there is an abundance of bad processes. However, time and time again, I encountered people who did not share my enthusiasm for the concepts. Why could they not see what I did? I realized that change, which is what process improvement represents in its most basic sense, and people's attitudes to it, were very real obstacles. So, learning about what makes people and organizations 'tick' was a necessary step for my personal development.

*"A Body at Rest....."*

It dawned on me soon into my studies of Organizational and Behavioral Science that several of the key concepts that I learned from the Engineering Sciences certainly did apply. Let's start with Newton's first law of motion. The first law, also referred to as the law of inertia, can be simply summarized as "an object at rest stays at rest and an object in motion stays in motion with the same speed unless acted upon by an unbalanced force." The concept of 'organizational inertia' is defined as the tendency of a mature organization to continue on its current trajectory, and is made up of two components - resource rigidity and routine rigidity or what I refer to as 'force of habit'. To overcome the 'rigidity' and initiate 'motion', an organization must apply a 'force'. Leaders must

provide an inspirational purpose, as well as the physical means to initiate change. Organizations cannot make change happen through sheer will. I have seen this happen in organizations where people are expected to make improvements in their spare time. First, most people tell me that they do not have spare time. Second, if improvement was not a part of associates' previous routines, then in all likelihood it just won't happen. Organizations must invest in improvement. Time and resources must be provided to make change happen.

I learned from colleagues in the mid-1990s about the power of rapid improvement or kaizen events. These multi-day events involve teams of people dedicating time to fulfill a predefined objective. It was a great approach to rapidly apply cellular/flow concepts, 5S, quick changeover and other concepts. Equally important was the impact it had on the people involved and the organization overall. The energy level throughout the event was truly impressive. People learned that change can happen quickly, and need not drag out. However, I also noticed that the 'buzz' would subside in a few weeks if leadership and support personnel attention turned elsewhere. Also disconcerting was that the lack of continual attention often led to a lack of sustainment of the changes made and the substantial results achieved. This leads us to the next scientific theorem.

### *"Without 'Work'....Disorder"*

The second law of thermodynamics states that "in all energy exchanges, if no energy enters or leaves the system, the potential energy of the state will always be less than that of the initial state." This is also commonly referred to as 'entropy' or disorder in a closed system. Without 'work', entropy can never become smaller. It can be said that without work, everything slowly goes to disorder. This is true of organizational systems. Take 5S for example. Many organizations lament their inability to sustain the high level of workplace organization achieved through the application of 5S concepts. A closer examination of the causes often reveals the discontinuation of periodic assessments. Other times, process changes were made, but associates were not given the opportunity (time) to re-organize the area to reflect those changes. The result? Greater disorder.

Leaders must continually perform 'work' to prevent disorder. Most of the activities that leaders are expected to perform as part of a Lean Management System can serve this important purpose. Daily Management with supporting tiered management systems, 'going to the gemba', rapid response to ANDON signals, are just a few examples of how leaders can continually keep order to the system. The concept of organizations as a 'system' will be explored next.

### *"Closing the Loop"*

Systems - open and closed - were part of my Electrical Engineering studies. 'Closed-loop' systems are designed to automatically achieve and maintain the desired output condition by comparing it with the actual condition. Truth be told, I began to consider the applicability of such systems to

organizations by the late 1980s. This is when I was first introduced to W. Edwards Deming's model for organizations. It was a closed-loop system that used market research, 'voice of the customer' information, and other inputs to trigger consideration of a re-design of the organizational system. It was a holistic model that included suppliers, product and service design and delivery, and distribution.

Deming also referred to the need for a 'control plan' as part of the 'Act' of Plan-Do-Check-Act. Without a control plan the changes made to a process in all likelihood will not be sustained over time. Statistical Process Control (SPC) charts were one way to do this. The periodic review of established standardized work was another. Simply updating procedures and training people was insufficient to 'Act to make standard'. This was perfectly aligned with 'closed-loop' system design.

The concept of 'plan versus actual' is prevalent throughout Lean Thinking. It is applied to process management, project management, even 5S. Planned or standard conditions are defined so that non-standard conditions or abnormalities can be quickly and easily identified. Unfortunately nothing is 'automatic' when it comes to organizations, in contrast to what can be designed in electrical and electronic systems. Leaders must deliberately respond (that 'work' term again). And each response represents a learning opportunity. It was in 1990, as I began my Organizational and Behavioral Studies, Peter Senge published "The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization". A must read, and probably 20 years ahead of its time. It is better understood and appreciated in recent years, and will be our next topic.

### *"The Learning Organization"*

The idea of an organization that creates and retains knowledge for future use is an extension of a topic that was making substantial progress by the late 1980s, Artificial Intelligence. I was introduced to AI concepts as part of my Computer Engineering studies. Within, AI, the concept of 'knowledge based management' consisted of two important components: Inference Engines and Heuristics. An Inference Engine is a component of a system that applies logical rules to the knowledge base to deduce new information. Heuristics are simple rules, which people often use to form judgments and make decisions. Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) has commonly been referred to as a 'learning cycle'. Deming emphasized that 'Do' was an experiment that must be assessed as part of 'Check' (or 'Study', as some people say). Only process changes that have proven effective should be fully deployed, standardized and sustained as part of 'Act'. Practitioners should use what was learned from conducting an experiment - with learning being the real objective of any experiment - to plan for the next experiment, the next PDCA cycle.

Now, most of what I learned in Computer Engineering in the 1980s is obsolete. But the concept of knowledge based management lives on. And it can be applied in various ways in organizations including; product design, troubleshooting process or product issues, equipment maintenance, equipment

operator training, to name just a few. I have personally witnessed the significant benefits organizations can realize by the application of knowledge based management concepts. I have also experienced the challenges.

For example, the development of standardized work for 'knowledge workers' is always a challenge. First, it often takes the form of a 'decision tree'. Identifying how people make decisions is difficult but necessary. The one's making decisions are often unaware of their 'thought process'. Further, there can be wide variation between people performing the same work. Identifying 'key points' - the how to perform a step of a process where it matters - only occurs through close process observation and robust dialogue with the people performing the process. Once this knowledge has been extracted, it can be re-used providing important benefits to the organization. Typical learning curves for knowledge workers can be reduced by up to 75%.

The creation of standardized work, instructing others using Job Instruction (JI) (part of Training-Within-Industries (TWI)), predictive maintenance (part of Total Productive Maintenance (TPM)), creating and archiving A3 storyboards for problem solving and process improvement efforts, and many other activities are examples of how an organization can indeed learn, and reuse that learning. Of course, leaders must provide the means to perform these important activities. There's that pesky 'work' idea again.

### *Summary*

Is there something that managers can learn from science? Absolutely. After all, W. Edwards Deming was initially educated as an Electrical Engineer and later specialized in mathematical physics. And Deming went on to develop a set of management principles that, presently, organizations in all industries are working to apply. Whether it be the First Law of Motion, the Second Law of Thermodynamics, Closed-Loop Systems, Artificial Intelligence, or a myriad other theorems and concepts, much can be gained in applying scientific concepts to the challenges that organizations face.

True, applying these concepts requires deliberate effort on the part of managers. As previously mentioned, the various activities that make up the Lean Management System, supported by comprehensive visual management systems, provide leaders the means to apply the concepts, in some form. And if a leader questions the importance of these activities, he or she can seek validation in scientific principles, some of which date back hundreds of years. Leaders can draw confidence knowing that the principles of Lean and Enterprise Excellence are grounded in science, the Science of Management.

**Best Regards**

**Drew Locher**

**Managing Director,**

**Change Management Associates**