010 The MBA Operator Divide

Perspective Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/010-the-mba-operator-divide/

MBAs and operators don't disagree on tactics. They disagree on what the math is for.

That disagreement is invisible until you name it. Once named, it explains the entire industry literature — the analyst class, the consulting firms, the public-company restaurant CFOs, the talking heads on any given week. They are not wrong people. They were trained for a different road.

The MBA toolkit treats the math as inputs. Build the model, run the sensitivity, optimize the variables — the number is the lever. Decisions cascade from the spreadsheet. Every case study ends at the number. The training rewards the operator who can pull the right lever in the model. It does not reward — and does not even measure — the operator who can read a room.

What the MBA was taught: the math is the input. Decisions flow from the model. The operator's job is to execute against the optimized number. The room is downstream of the spreadsheet.

The operator's toolkit treats the math as the report on the floor. You don't decide from the spreadsheet — you decide from the read of the room, the cast, the standards, the shift, the Guest. Then the spreadsheet tells you whether the read was right. The math is a consequence, not a control panel.

This is not intuition. It is training too — just a different one. It happens by being the person responsible when the room goes wrong at 7:42 on a Saturday night. The spreadsheet does not help you in that moment. The read does.

What the operator was taught: the math is the outcome. Decisions flow from the read of the room. The operator's job is to build the relational outcome the math will eventually report. The spreadsheet is downstream of the floor.

Same P&L. Two completely different reads.

The MBA looks at it and sees levers to pull. The operator looks at it and sees the verdict on choices already made. The MBA recommends moving a lever. The operator knows the lever is the wrong place to work — because by the time the lever shows up on the spreadsheet, the cause has already happened upstream, on the floor, in the room, in the read.

This is why MBA-led restaurant turnarounds default to discounting, throughput, labor optimization, off-premise volume, and tech consolidation. Those are the levers the model can see. The model cannot see presence, posture, the operator's read, the threading at the seams. So the model does not recommend any of those. It recommends what it can measure.

The [MBA/Operator Divide] is not a framework divide. It is a training divide. The MBA stands in the tower by training. The operator stands in the dining room by training. Both can visit the other side. Neither can re-train into it without years of reps in the other posture.

The industry does not have an MBA problem. It has a training-mismatch problem. The people analyzing it, advising it, writing about it, and capitalizing it were trained to read math as inputs. The people running it live inside math as outcomes. The two groups have been talking past each other for decades — and the literature, the consulting industry, and the public-company playbook all reflect the dominant training, not the actual work.

This book is a different posture, written by someone whose training is the floor.

What Changes Tomorrow

Before tomorrow's shift, pick one number on your P&L and ask whether you're treating it as an input you can move before service, or only reading it as a report after the fact. The MBA moves the lever before the outcome. The operator who wants that same leverage has to bring the math onto the floor, not just into the office after close.