

# Processes ain't Fortresses

Dirk Engel, [info@engel-internet.de](mailto:info@engel-internet.de), Oct 12, 2022  
<https://github.com/dirkengel/>

Once process instructions are clearly written down, it's easier to streamline each step and the entire sequence. The information can be shared with people and the procedure becomes reproducible. Unfortunately, while processes are obviously helpful, using process definitions can also have some pitfalls.

Example: This summer we took the train to the airport. The originally booked train and its replacement train were canceled, but as experienced travelers we are able to handle that. One last change to finally reach the airport in time, only ten more minutes to go. We get on the train and find four seats with table (!) right away. Lucky family. A few minutes later the conductor asks us to leave our place, the air condition is out of order but there is a nice, cool carriage at the end of the train. Me: "Ah, sorry, may we stay for eight more minutes, we have to get off the next stop anyway?" He: "No." Me: "?". He: "I have to wrap this red and white barrier tape around the seats." Me: "Eight minutes? We are OK with the climatic conditions and going through the entire train for the remaining short time doesn't make much sense." He: "I have to apply the barrier tape. By the way, no one but you had a problem with that." So we ended up for the last seven minutes staying in the corridor with other passengers and lots of baggage – next to numerous vacant but wrapped seats. :-(

In my opinion, this is just one of many examples where a process is subconsciously used as *barrier* to hide behind. The process serves as a line of defense to which one moves back, shrugs, and says "sorry, that's not me, it's the process that requires my (perhaps weird) action". That's neither reasonable nor the aim of *any* process. A process is always made for the people, not the other way around. Which people? *All* involved stakeholders. In particular, we shouldn't neglect the needs and multiplicity of *single* stakeholders – in this case the passengers or more general speaking *the users* can be a quite large group. But even taking this into account won't help preventing that a process is used as a shield. Why does this happen at all?

In my *personal theory*, this is the case since processes are typically written as a set of rules. Because of this commandment-like style which speaks like a parent figure to our child ego state (refer to Transactional Analysis), its execution often remains unquestioned. Some of us respond with a *free child* behavior (these guys who don't care about processes) and some of us respond as *adapted child* and do whatever the process says without reflecting on the current situation. To avoid switching ego states and speaking to somebody's *child* instead of keep talking to the *adult*, a simple statement at the beginning of each process definition may help: "*Do not apply this process in situations where it violates common sense. Please report your specific situation so that the process definition can be adjusted accordingly.*" At best, the potential adaptation is made along with a rationale for the change, to satisfy the *adult's* interest in *why*.

My conclusion: Processes ain't fortresses. They are neither set in stone nor are they created to hide behind.