Project Requirements and Quality Management - Practice Questions and Explained Answers

Version 0.3 · 30 October 2026

100 original study questions. Questions 1-80 retain their IDs and answer meanings. Questions 52-57 gain October 19 lecture references; 81-100 add October 19 applications. Question 45 and questions 58-60 retain textbook-supplement framing. These are practice questions, not recalled certification-exam questions. The PDF/Markdown work as a recall worksheet; the website supplies answer choices and feedback.

Page key

Questions

A. Earlier lecture coverage, retained

1. What best distinguishes the PM and BA responsibilities?
2. A statement explains why a loyalty app is valuable. Is that its purpose or its measurable objective?
3. Which list contains the six competing constraints taught in this course?
4. What distinguishes focus areas from performance domains?
5. Are the six BA knowledge areas six consecutive project phases?
6. Why is elicitation more than writing down what stakeholders ask for?
7. Which order best protects the link to business value?
8. What is a business requirement?
9. Which category describes the needs of a particular user group?
10. Classify: the customer can display the previous twelve months of interaction history.
11. Classify: the history screen loads within two seconds under specified peak usage.
12. What makes running old and new systems in parallel for a month a transition requirement?
13. A requirement conflicts with another approved requirement. Which quality check fails?
14. Why is "the app must be fast" weak as a requirement?
15. Does every item on a workshop candidate list have to be delivered?
16. What should a refined problem statement avoid?
17. Does a fishbone branch prove a root cause?
18. What does Pareto analysis help decide?

19. What does a swim-lane flowchart add to a basic sequence diagram?
20. Why identify requirement decision makers separately from stakeholder representatives?
21. What is the Kano behavior of an implicit/basic requirement?
22. What is a Kano explicit/performance requirement?
23. What is the Kano behavior of a delighter?
24. Which interview behavior supports reliable elicitation?
25. Why validate observation notes with the person observed?
26. What should happen before a survey is distributed broadly?
27. When should criticism and evaluation occur in a workshop?
28. How does nominal group technique help a difficult prioritization discussion?
29. Distinguish a business rule from a design constraint.
30. Which model reveals entities and relationship cardinality?
31. In the alarm-clock state model, is pressing snooze a state or an event?
32. Can one person be several use-case actors?
33. Which is the better use-case name: "Store fertilizer" or "Fertilizer storage"?
34. Why inspect a requirement-actor discovery matrix in both directions?
35. What is a WBS primarily meant to organize?
36. What does the WBS 100% rule mean?
37. Is a WBS required to have exactly four levels?
38. What is the primary QA/QC distinction?
39. Can a basic laptop have high quality?
40. A developer adds an unrequested feature to impress the customer. What course concept applies?
41. How should the PM respond to a valuable new requirement during execution?
42. How do reliability and resilience differ?
43. Does an expensive retailer automatically have higher quality in every respect?
44. Why define quality metrics and data-collection methods before delivery?

B. Documentation supplement (workbook)

45. Textbook supplement: what is a vision-scope document for?

C. Traceability and quality planning/control (October 14 + workbook)

46. What should traceability connect?
47. What follows identifying customers and their needs in quality planning?
48. What makes a QC plan actionable?
49. What information belongs in a QA review plan?
50. Is a process-control limit the same as a customer specification limit?
51. What is producer risk in sampling?

D. Improvement (October 19) and project control (workbook supplement)

52. what does PDCA stand for?
53. what happens during Check in PDCA?
54. comparing processes inside one organization is which benchmark type?
55. what should follow a suspected root-cause hypothesis?
56. what does DMAIC stand for?
57. what is the main Lean focus in the workbook?
58. Textbook supplement: how do a control factor and a threshold differ?
59. Textbook supplement: where should control be established?
60. Textbook supplement: who decides a change request?

E. October 14 applied quality practice

61. Why tailor an existing organizational quality-plan template to the project?
62. Which set belongs in a project scope statement?
63. A quality metric has no identifiable requirement or WBS element. What should the team investigate?
64. In the October 14 Kano discussion, how do indifferent and reverse features differ?
65. What is the House of Quality / QFD used to connect?
66. Which statement makes a proposed quality metric ready to use?
67. After collecting QC performance data, what comes next in the course workflow?
68. A deliverable repeatedly fails QC. What should QA help determine?
69. What distinguishes a check sheet from a checklist in the quality-tool discussion?
70. Which tool shows the frequency distribution of continuous measurements?
71. A scatter diagram shows humidity and defect counts moving together. What can be concluded from the plot alone?
72. What does the diamond represent in the flowchart described in class?
73. Seven consecutive observations fall within control limits but on the same side of the mean. What does the course rule recommend?
74. Does a stable process-control chart prove that customer specifications are met?
75. A sample leads the team to accept a bad lot. Which sampling risk is this?
76. A QC plan names a test but says nothing about what happens if it fails. What is missing?
77. Which review is primarily associated with a phase-level go/no-go decision?
78. Which set makes a QA review-plan row actionable?
79. What is the purpose of a structured, independent quality audit?
80. Who remains responsible for project quality when a quality specialist is assigned?

F. October 19: improvement and root-cause applications

81. A team processes requests faster but still delivers the wrong outcome. Which improvement is missing?

82. A team compares its transaction-handling function with a bank outside its industry. Which benchmark type best fits?
83. Why understand your own process before collecting benchmark data?
84. Results of an improvement trial fall short of its original objective. What should Check lead to?
85. A successful improvement has been verified. Which action makes it part of normal work?
86. Why does a car that will not start need further root-cause investigation?
87. A component fails, a maintenance task was missed, and no process assigned an owner. How should the team investigate?
88. Replacing an expired certificate restores service, but the same incident returns months later. What was missing?
89. What should an RCA problem statement contain before the cause is established?
90. After the team lists corrective actions, what completes the RCA response?
91. A fishbone branch looks plausible. What does that establish?
92. How many questions must a Five Whys investigation ask?
93. Which flowchart symbol represents a decision?
94. A team has generated many ideas and now groups related notes under labels. Which technique is it using?
95. A brainstorming group wants to evaluate every suggestion as soon as it is spoken. What should the facilitator do?
96. Members privately disagree but publicly reinforce a leader's preferred answer. What risk is present?
97. Which sequence best describes the nominal group technique taught in class?
98. A scatter plot associates faster work with more defects. What conclusion is justified by the plot alone?
99. Which improvement approach emphasizes customer-defined quality, management responsibility and organization-wide continuous improvement?
100. How do Kaizen and Genchi Genbutsu differ in the course's Lean discussion?

Explained answer key

1. PM integrates delivery; BA clarifies needs, requirements and the right solution. Both work with stakeholders, but delivery integration and requirements/solution analysis are distinct responsibilities. *(Oct 5, 00:37:24-00:50:49; segments 121-152.)*

2. Purpose; a measurable objective still needs an outcome and target. Purpose explains why. Objectives specify what result is intended and how success will be judged. *(Oct 5, 02:24:22-02:26:18; segments 359-364.)*

3. Scope, schedule, budget, risk, quality and resources. The constraints interact; changing scope may affect time, resources, budget, risks or quality. *(Oct 5, 01:22:37-01:32:45; segments 208-230.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 26.)

4. Focus areas organize when/how work occurs; domains organize what is managed. The five focus areas overlap and iterate. The course lists seven named performance domains despite a prose count typo. *(Oct 5, 01:32:48-01:49:27; segments 231-267.)*

5. No; they can overlap and interact iteratively. Analysis can reveal missing information and send the team back to elicitation, while other features may be in evaluation. *(Oct 5, 01:56:25-02:14:07; segments 286-326.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 27-28.)

6. Expressed wants may hide the underlying need and cause. Investigate and clarify what the stakeholder is trying to achieve; do not simply transcribe a proposed solution. *(Oct 5, 00:10:41-00:12:34; segments 36-38.)*

7. Need, requirement, feature. Derive requirements and features from a need rather than working backward to justify a predetermined feature. *(Oct 7, 00:06:35-00:10:57; segments 22-30.)*

8. An organizational goal or outcome explaining why change is initiated. Business requirements define intended outcomes and the basis for judging value. *(Oct 7, 00:13:41-00:15:30; segments 37-40.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 55.)

9. Stakeholder requirements. Stakeholder needs bridge organizational outcomes and solution capabilities. *(Oct 7, 00:15:36-00:17:02; segments 41-43.)*

10. Functional solution requirement. The statement describes what the system does. *(Oct 7, 00:17:05-00:18:16; segments 44-45.)*

11. Non-functional solution requirement. This is a measurable performance attribute. The operating condition belongs with the time target. *(Oct 7, 00:17:40-00:18:16; segments 45-45.)*

12. It is needed to move to the future state and ends after transition. Temporary migration, training or parallel operation supports change without necessarily becoming a permanent solution capability. *(Oct 7, 00:18:28-00:19:42; segments 47-48.)*

13. Consistency. Consistency addresses contradiction among requirements; the conflict needs resolution. *(Oct 7, 00:11:00-00:12:46; segments 31-34.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 54 and 87.)

14. It lacks a specific, agreed and verifiable performance expectation. Define the response target and usage conditions before deciding whether the app meets it. *(Oct 7, 00:09:36-00:12:46; segments 28-34.)*

15. No; refine and prioritize candidates before approving commitments. Candidate generation and approved scope are different states. Approved commitments must be met or formally changed. *(Oct 7, 02:15:07-02:23:28; segments 306-328.)*

16. Presupposing a chosen solution before the problem is understood. Define the problem and consequences in business terms so alternative solutions can be assessed. *(Oct 7, 00:27:06-00:37:08; segments 64-85.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 56.)

17. No; it organizes a possible cause to investigate. A diagram organizes hypotheses. Evidence and investigation establish which causes matter. *(Oct 7, 00:37:10-00:39:30; segments 86-90.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 57.)

18. Which measured categories account for the largest share of problems. Use descending categories to focus effort on the vital few; the heuristic is not an exact universal distribution. *(Oct 7, 00:39:48-00:43:29; segments 92-99.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 58.)

19. Responsibility and handoffs across roles, departments or systems. Swim lanes expose who does what and where cross-role misunderstandings may occur. *(Oct 7, 00:44:03-00:47:57; segments 101-108.)*

20. The person providing input may not have authority to approve or resolve conflicts. Representativeness and authority are different. Confirm both to avoid unapproved or contested requirements. *(Oct 7, 01:00:17-01:09:31; segments 138-163.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 60.)

21. Absence dissatisfies; presence is usually expected. Basic capabilities are often unspoken because stakeholders assume they exist. *(Oct 7, 01:15:39-01:18:23; segments 175-179.)*

22. A requirement whose greater fulfillment tends to increase satisfaction. Performance requirements relate degree of fulfillment to satisfaction; assess benefit and cost. *(Oct 7, 01:18:25-01:18:50; segments 180-180.)*

23. Its absence is usually acceptable, but its presence can strongly delight. Meet basics first; consider approved performance targets and then feasible delighters. *(Oct 7, 01:18:52-01:22:16; segments 181-187.)*

24. Probe, listen, reflect back understanding and avoid leading questions. Clarification reduces the gap between what the stakeholder means and what the analyst records. *(Oct 7, 01:22:16-01:30:16; segments 188-204.)*

25. Memory and interpretation can be wrong; confirm details and resolve questions. Observe with permission, document promptly and clarify afterward without disrupting the work. *(Oct 7, 01:30:17-01:37:08; segments 205-218.)*

26. Identify needed decisions/information and pilot-test suitable questions. Neutral, understandable questions and a suitable sample matter more than collecting a large amount of misleading data. *(Oct 7, 01:37:12-01:43:01; segments 219-230.)*

27. After idea generation, during clarification/reduction and prioritization. Separate divergent brainstorming from convergent reduction so generation remains open. *(Oct 7, 01:43:40-01:53:32; segments 232-263.)*

28. Structured individual selection/ranking can reduce domination and groupthink. The workbook describes structured ranking and tallying, followed by discussion of the result. (Workbook, PDF pp. 65-66.)

29. A rule governs required behavior/logic; a constraint restricts implementation choices or process. Make applicable policies and restrictions explicit rather than discovering them after design. *(Oct 7, 01:54:46-02:02:11; segments 266-280.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 67 and 102.)

30. Entity-relationship diagram. An ERD exposes the information the solution needs and the rules connecting entities. *(Oct 7, 02:28:36-02:29:54; segments 338-340.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 68.)

31. An event triggering a transition to snooze-wait mode. Distinguish an entity condition from the event that causes a change. *(Oct 7, 02:31:23-02:34:33; segments 345-351.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 69.)

32. Yes; actors represent roles and one person can fill multiple roles. Actors are external roles/entities. Many people can also fill the same actor role. *(Oct 7, 02:35:19-02:36:28; segments 354-355.)*

33. Store fertilizer: it names an actor goal. Use cases describe something an actor does, not just a feature the system has. *(Oct 7, 02:38:53-02:40:16; segments 360-362.)*

34. It can reveal a missing actor or a missing requirement. Cross-referencing actors and requirements helps check coverage. *(Oct 7, 02:40:18-02:44:31; segments 363-372.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 107.)

35. The total project scope into deliverable work at increasing detail. The WBS supports scope definition, estimation, scheduling, responsibilities and control. *(Oct 12, 00:06:47-00:12:43; segments 20-31.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 121.)

36. Include all approved work and only that work, with complete parent-child coverage. It concerns scope completeness, not spending or percent-complete status. (Workbook, PDF pp. 122 and 130.) *(Oct 12, 00:14:14-00:23:02; segments 40-68.)*

37. No; depth should support effective management of that project. Go deep enough to schedule, resource and describe outputs, without unnecessary complexity. *(Oct 12, 00:09:21-00:23:02; segments 25-68.)*

38. QA evaluates processes; QC evaluates actual deliverables against criteria. Plan both preventive process work and evidence-based deliverable checking. *(Oct 12, 01:49:29-01:53:46; segments 273-282.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 156 and 160.)

39. Yes, if it meets the intended requirements for its grade/use. Grade concerns technical category; quality concerns meeting the relevant requirements. *(Oct 12, 02:05:21-02:09:50; segments 329-340.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 138.)

40. Gold plating; assess additions through change control. Desirability does not remove the need to assess scope, cost, time and approval. *(Oct 12, 02:12:09-02:22:21; segments 351-374.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 139.)

41. Assess and route the change, then update approved commitments and records. Adaptability and formal control work together. Make the consequences and decision explicit. *(Oct 12, 02:16:07-02:22:21; segments 360-374.)*

42. Reliability is consistent operation; resilience is coping with disruption and recovery. A system can work reliably in normal conditions yet need better fallback and recovery behavior. *(Oct 12, 01:36:55-01:38:46; segments 247-251.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 138.)

43. No; define the product/service, requirements and quality dimension being compared. Comparisons must specify relevant criteria rather than substitute prestige or product breadth for evidence. *(Oct 12, 02:01:44-02:04:32; segments 321-325.)*

44. Without criteria and evidence, quality assessment becomes subjective and unmanageable. A measure needs a target, conditions, collection method and responsibility. *(Oct 12, 01:19:30-01:19:58; segments 212-212.) (Oct 12, 02:25:38-02:26:53; segments 394-395.)*

45. Record stakeholder agreement on solution, features and boundaries. It supports shared understanding, approval and expectation management. (Workbook, PDF pp. 78-80 and 110-113.)

46. Needs/requirements with related deliverables and verification evidence. Trace both directions to detect missing implementation and unjustified work. (Workbook, PDF pp. 81, 115 and 310.) *(Oct 14, 00:06:01-00:07:35; segments 11-13.)*

47. Negotiate requirements and establish relevant standards/criteria. The six-step process then documents tasks/responsibilities and develops the quality plan. (Workbook, PDF p. 152.) *(Oct 14, 00:20:39-00:25:39; segments 44-57.)*

48. A measurable criterion, collection method/owner/frequency and response trigger. The workbook examples specify both measurement and what happens when the result fails. (Workbook, PDF pp. 156, 172 and 311-312.) *(Oct 14, 02:05:09-02:10:49; segments 294-311.)*

49. Review focus, type/technique, owner, schedule and scope. Process reviews must have enough definition to be scheduled, owned and acted upon. (Workbook, PDF pp. 160-161, 179-181 and 313.) *(Oct 14, 02:18:17-02:26:22; segments 329-346.)*

50. No; process behavior and acceptance requirements are different questions. A stable process can still fail the required standard. Define the applicable control-chart and acceptance methods. (Workbook, PDF pp. 157 and 175.) *(Oct 14, 01:37:12-01:41:25; segments 219-226.)*

51. Rejecting a good lot; Type I/alpha risk. Sampling may misrepresent the population. Consumer risk is the opposite acceptance error. (Workbook, PDF pp. 159 and 174.) *(Oct 14, 01:33:31-01:35:06; segments 208-210.)*

52. Plan, Do, Check, Act. The workbook confirms the expansion where automatic transcription is unclear. (Workbook, PDF pp. 184-185 and 199.) *(Oct 19, 02:09:22-02:09:34; segments 420-421.)*

53. Compare results with the baseline and improvement criteria. Evaluate whether the improvement objective was achieved before deciding what to standardize or revise. (Workbook, PDF p. 184.) *(Oct 19, 01:59:55-02:01:02; segments 395-396.)*

54. Internal benchmarking. Competitive compares direct competitors; functional and generic broaden the comparison. (Workbook, PDF pp. 185-186 and 200-201.) *(Oct 19, 00:06:21-00:09:05; segments 14-18.)*

55. Gather/test evidence, identify corrective actions, implement and monitor results. RCA is systematic and may reveal multiple causes; Five Whys is a tool rather than a rigid count. (Workbook, PDF pp. 188-190 and 209-213.) *(Oct 19, 00:42:10-00:43:22; segments 163-166.)*

56. Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, Control. Six Sigma uses this process-improvement sequence to define the problem, gather data and sustain improvements. (Workbook, PDF pp. 194-195.) *(Oct 19, 02:03:18-02:04:01; segments 402-403.)*

57. Reduce waste while improving value, quality, time and cost. Waste reduction should preserve the purpose and value of the result. (Workbook, PDF pp. 195 and 230.) *(Oct 19, 02:05:50-02:07:21; segments 411-413.)*

58. The factor is the measure; the threshold defines acceptable variance or action. Control needs a measure, comparison baseline and decision trigger. (Workbook, PDF pp. 235-237 and 248.)

59. Across work, interim/major deliverables, milestones and phases as appropriate. Levels of control refer to different levels of project performance, not just severity labels. (Workbook, PDF p. 237.)

60. The authorized person or change control board defined by project governance. The CCB may be small or large; authority, evaluation, communication and records should be explicit. (Workbook, PDF pp. 240-242.)

61. The plan must apply organizational standards to this project's objectives, complexity and risks. The quality plan is part of the integrated plan and specifies the activities, resources and responsibilities for this project. Reusing a template does not replace tailoring. *(Oct 14, 00:02:50-00:05:58; segments 6-10.)*

62. Product scope, deliverables, acceptance criteria and explicit exclusions. Scope definition turns requirements into agreed boundaries. Requirements documentation is also updated as the scope is refined. *(Oct 14, 00:11:45-00:17:31; segments 22-34.)*

63. Whether the metric is unjustified or scope/traceability coverage has a gap. Trace quality measures to what the project must deliver. A missing link calls for investigation rather than attaching an arbitrary source or deleting required quality checks. *(Oct 14, 00:06:01-00:07:35; segments 11-13.)*

64. Indifferent features have little satisfaction effect; reverse features reduce satisfaction when present. These extend the earlier basic/performance/delighter discussion. A reverse-feature example is context-dependent and does not override required security or compliance. *(Oct 14, 00:36:38-00:40:25; segments 99-106.)*

65. Customer needs with product or technical characteristics, relationships, targets and tradeoffs. Recognize the purpose and arrangement of the course diagram. The lecturer says students need awareness of this mapping approach, not the ability to construct the full matrix for this preparation. *(Oct 14, 00:47:14-00:49:35; segments 120-124.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 154 and 169.)

66. It identifies the measure, acceptable threshold and defined measurement method. Conditions, ownership and data handling make the metric operational. For example, a measured 1.8-second response meets a specified under-two-second criterion under the agreed test conditions. *(Oct 14, 00:40:28-00:42:53; segments 107-111.)*

67. Evaluate the data against the quality standard, then respond to the result. The repeatable cycle identifies results, selects techniques, collects data, evaluates and responds. Failed checks may require rework, escalation or an authorized change. *(Oct 14, 01:05:04-01:10:38; segments 166-178.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 156 and 172.)

68. Whether the agreed process was followed and whether that process is adequate. Product results and process reviews work together. A process can be followed correctly but still be unsuitable; findings can lead to proposed improvements and controlled updates. *(Oct 14, 00:42:55-00:45:13; segments 112-116.)*

69. A check sheet records observations or tallies; a checklist verifies specified checks or steps. The instructor also calls check sheets tally sheets. The shared lesson recommends recording who collected the data, when and where. Neither the data form nor a checklist alone proves conformity or causation. *(Oct 14, 01:33:00-01:33:30; segment 207.) (Oct 14, shared lesson, 01:52:23-01:53:27; segments 259-261.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 173.)

70. Histogram. A histogram shows spread and shape of a measurement distribution. Pareto ranks categories by contribution; a control chart retains time order. *(Oct 14, 01:44:37-01:46:42; segments 237-240.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 176.)

71. There is an observed association to investigate; causation has not been established. The shared lesson explicitly distinguishes correlation from causation. Its later operating target assumes additional causal investigation; do not treat that example-specific target as a universal rule. *(Oct 14, shared lesson, 01:59:03-02:01:23; segments 276-282.)*

72. A decision with alternative paths. In this lesson the oval marks start/end, rectangles mark tasks and arrows indicate direction. Use the diagram's notation and labels to follow actual decision paths. *(Oct 14, 00:52:12-00:53:43; segments 131-133.)*

73. Investigate a possible process signal even though no point crossed a limit. The course's rule of sevens is a signal rule. A point beyond a control limit also warrants investigation; a real-process method still needs appropriate documented assumptions. *(Oct 14, 01:39:36-01:41:25; segments 223-226.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 175.)

74. No; stable process behavior and required acceptance limits are different questions. Control limits describe process behavior; specifications describe required acceptability. A statistically stable process can still fail the required standard. *(Oct 14, 01:37:12-01:41:25; segments 219-226.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 174-175.)

75. Consumer risk: Type II / beta. Producer risk rejects a good lot; consumer risk accepts a bad lot. Sampling results can misrepresent the population, so selection and decision criteria matter. *(Oct 14, 01:33:31-01:35:06; segments 208-210.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 159 and 174.)

76. Defined response, rejection or escalation criteria and responsibility for acting. The marker and service examples define standards, measurement and response. Their particular sample rates and limits are examples, not universal project requirements. *(Oct 14, 02:05:09-02:10:49; segments 294-311.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 176-177 and 311-312.)

77. Management / phase-gate review. The course contrasts team progress reviews, formal deliverable reviews and management reviews of phases or major decisions. Choose the review type for its purpose and authority. *(Oct 14, 02:22:22-02:26:22; segments 339-346.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 160-161 and 179-181.)

78. Review focus, technique/type, responsible person, date or frequency, and review scope. Define what will be reviewed, how, by whom, when and within what boundary. Conduct the review as planned, record findings and route necessary changes. *(Oct 14, 02:24:06-02:26:22; segments 342-346.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 180-181 and 313.)

79. Check whether project activities comply with applicable policies, processes and procedures. An audit examines compliance and process use. Inspection or testing of a specific deliverable remains a separate focus even when grouped into a broad quality plan. *(Oct 14, 02:22:22-02:23:00; segment 339.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 179.)

80. The whole project team; specialists support rather than replace shared responsibility. The lecturer explicitly assigns quality responsibility to everyone on the project team. Named inspection and review owners make that shared responsibility actionable. *(Oct 14, 02:24:45-02:24:56; segment 343.)*

81. Effectiveness: achieving the intended useful result. Speed/resource use and success at the intended goal are different dimensions; aim for both effectiveness and efficiency. *(Oct 19, 00:00:58-00:02:59; segments 3-6.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 184 and 198.)

82. Functional benchmarking. The shared function makes this the lecture's functional comparison. Internal stays within the organization; generic broadens to unrelated functions or industries. *(Oct 19, 00:06:21-00:09:05; segments 14-18.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 185 and 200.)

83. To know what is being measured and interpret the comparison meaningfully. Decide the measure, plan the study and understand the process before collecting and analyzing data. Periodically reevaluate the reference and criteria. *(Oct 19, 00:09:06-00:11:25; segments 19-23.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 185-186 and 201.)

84. Refine the solution and continue analysis or another cycle. Check evaluates results against the objective and criteria. Act can formalize a successful change; unsuccessful results call for refinement rather than automatic standardization. *(Oct 19, 01:59:55-02:01:55; segments 395-398.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 184-185 and 227-228.)

85. Update the relevant procedures, standards, training or specifications through the agreed process. Act makes the improvement official and sustainable. Document and govern the changes needed to preserve it. *(Oct 19, 02:01:06-02:01:55; segments 397-398.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 185 and 228.)

86. The observation is a symptom with several possible underlying explanations. The battery, alternator or other factors may explain the symptom. Gather evidence before selecting the cause or correction. *(Oct 19, 00:32:12-00:33:24; segments 106-110.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 188 and 207.)

87. Consider physical, human and organizational contributions and test their connections. The course's categories can be related and more than one contributor can exist. The described chain is a hypothesis to investigate, not a rule that every component failure has a human cause. *(Oct 19, 01:10:35-01:12:40; segments 250-254.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 210.)

88. A lasting renewal process with ownership and preventive controls. Restoration fixes an instance; recurrence prevention changes the process that permitted it. Assign action, implement it and monitor the result. *(Oct 19, 01:05:33-01:07:59; segments 239-243.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 189 and 210.)

89. A factual description of the event, separated from assumptions about its cause. The taught sequence starts with facts, then data and causal investigation. An assumed cause can bias later evidence gathering. *(Oct 19, 00:42:10-00:43:22; segments 163-166.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 188-189 and 209.)

90. Implement the actions, monitor effectiveness and follow up with affected stakeholders. The instructor's sequence includes implementation and monitoring. The IBM shared lesson adds communication and customer follow-up; that narration is media content despite its instructor speaker label. *(Oct 19, 00:42:10-00:52:27; segments 163-189.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 189 and 209.)

91. A candidate cause to investigate with evidence. The diagram organizes causal possibilities. It does not replace observation or testing of the proposed links. *(Oct 19, 01:29:40-01:34:35; segments 317-337.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 190 and 214-215.)

92. As many as needed to investigate supported causal links; not necessarily exactly five. The technique is repeated inquiry from a defined problem. The instructor explicitly allows fewer or more iterations according to complexity. *(Oct 19, 02:10:27-02:10:41; segments 426-427.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 190 and 211.)

93. A diamond. Use the symbol to show where a decision changes the next step; a swim lane adds responsibility across the workflow. *(Oct 19, 01:34:35-01:36:49; segments 338-341.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 191 and 216-217.)

94. Affinity diagramming. Affinity diagramming organizes ideas into categories during or after brainstorming. Its contribution is grouping, not proof of causation. *(Oct 19, 01:55:16-01:58:14; segments 384-391.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 193 and 223-225.)

95. Separate idea generation from later evaluation and give everyone room to contribute. The course delays criticism and analysis during generation so relevant and diverse possibilities can surface. *(Oct 19, 01:44:50-01:46:20; segments 361-363.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 193 and 221.)

96. Groupthink suppressing independent evaluation and dissent. Pressure to conform can conceal alternatives and apparent consensus. Invite constructive dissent and explicitly confirm the decision and next actions. *(Oct 19, 01:46:43-01:52:00; segments 366-375.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 222.)

97. Silent ideas, round-robin sharing, private voting, then tabulation/reporting. The structured sequence protects individual contributions before the group prioritizes options. The classroom group size is an example rather than a universal rule. *(Oct 19, 01:53:19-01:55:13; segments 379-383.)* (Workbook, PDF p. 223.)

98. A relationship worth investigating; the plot alone does not establish cause. Paired observations can reveal a pattern. Sample adequacy and causal explanations require further judgment and investigation; the lecture's point-count suggestion is not a guarantee. *(Oct 19, 01:58:18-01:59:51; segments 392-394.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 193-194 and 225-226.)

99. Total Quality Management (TQM). TQM combines customer needs, management responsibility, systematic analysis and continuing improvement throughout the organization. *(Oct 19, 02:02:26-02:03:15; segments 400-401.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 194 and 229.)

100. Kaizen concerns continuing small improvements; Genchi Genbutsu means going to observe the actual work. The textbook confirms both spellings. They complement Lean's focus on customer value and waste reduction; the transcript's garbled terms are not new concepts. *(Oct 19, 02:05:50-02:07:21; segments 411-413.)* (Workbook, PDF pp. 195 and 230.)

Using your results

Review missed concepts in the Cumulative Guide, then retry without the answer choices. Keep textbook-only preparation and shared-lesson examples separate from verified instructor study emphasis. Do not treat disputed QA/QC wording or unsupported statistical conversions as additional answer requirements. This is a study aid, not a pass predictor. Consult the Source Index for unresolved wording and edition differences.