RELENTLESS: KIND AB

IxS Product Verification Questions

The primary IxS concept is user-centered workforce multiplier product.

IxS — A New Computing — you own the memory and rent the processors

Asking the verification questions is intended to extract and confirm the first principles of human-AI cognitive workplace partnership, using IxS installation as the apparatus.

The four L1 first principles the questions map back to are:

L1.1 — Authority — the operator is the authority layer in the exchange.
L1.2 — Ownership — the substrate is owned by the operator.
L1.3 — Individuality — the operator's relationship to the substrate is individual, not comparative.
L1.4 — Exploration — exploration is the product; the conclusion is part of the exploration.

Product viability queries are categorised on L3 hypothesis and L1 principle. Where mapping is “meta”, the question operates above a single principle.

Foundational gate — who can efficiently use IxS (7 questions)

Q3 — Seniority-gate validity (L3.1 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The 5+ years of experience floor predicts who benefits from IxS better than other available variables.

1. Operators with 5+ years in their role show higher IxS-benefit signals than operators with fewer years (when other variables are matched).
2. Five years is enough for a senior operator to know what to elicit from a junior partner — meaning they have an internal model of what good direction looks like, which transfers to directing the AI.
3. Five years is enough for a senior operator to have compounded self-confidence and to not regress into their previous work-role identity when challenged by IxS.
4. A senior operator can teach the trade to a junior — and by the same capacity, can teach trade-with-IxS once they have integrated it themselves.
5. Where a younger operator benefits comparably, identify which of the senior-correlated attributes they share (specific role experience / leadership practice / cognitive capacity / other).

Q8 — Psychological profile gate reliability — composite (L3.5 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: First users have an individualising cognitive style, not a comparative cognitive style. Comparative-style operators cannot use IxS without harm; individualising-style operators can.

1. Comparative cognitive style measures the senior against coworkers but also against the IxS and is more likely to elicit dysregulating behaviors.
2. Screening for comparative cognitive style filters out both permanently dysregulated (sociopathic / narcissistic / avoidant) and temporarily dysregulated (operators under severe stress) profiles before they gain cognitive upper hand from the substrate.
3. As more colleagues use IxS the temporary advantage given to properly regulated individuals is likely to mitigate any damage.
4. Severely dysregulated individuals will be less successful operators.

Cross-ref Q62 — capacity for clean confrontation (promoted from Q8's former sub-question Q8e); the confrontation-capacity companion to this profile gate.

Q62 — Capacity for clean confrontation (refs Q8, Q47; L3.5 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Operators who lack capacity for clean confrontation — and operators in environments where the management layer lacks it — are at heightened risk for becoming targets of, or enabling, workplace dysfunction. The substrate does not function in environments where naming difficulty is punished; operator correction-capacity (Q47) presupposes capacity for clean confrontation.

1. Direct confrontation test: does the operator name uncomfortable truths in real-time as they surface, or defer them? Architect can test directly during installation: propose something incorrect and observe whether the operator corrects (and how).
2. Architect-recognition test: can the operator describe conflict-avoidant managers in their own organization specifically? Recognition of the pattern implies capacity for clean confrontation when needed.
3. Cost-recognition test: does the operator understand that conflict-avoidant managers function as enablers for workplace dysfunction (narcissist + avoidant boss = enabling system)? Understanding of the system is precondition for operator discipline.
4. Environmental impact assessment: what does the operator's surrounding management layer look like? If the layer reads as conflict-avoidant, it creates structural risk for the IxS installation **regardless of the operator's own capacity**. Architect-side intel about the environment, not just the operator.

Q61 — Discriminant-mechanism: substrate-form forecloses dishonest-efficient operation (L3.5 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Independently of intake-gate Q8 and Q62, the substrate's self-knowledge mechanism enforces its own character-discriminant over time. The operator either integrates what the substrate shows them and self-corrects, or unravels and avoids the most efficient usage. The path of efficient-but-dishonest operation is structurally closed by the form itself — not by external policing, but by what the substrate *is*. Cross-reference: *Shit-in-shit-out* doctrine, discriminant-mechanism canonical (`doctrines-and-principles.md`).

1. Operators whose character cannot withstand the mirroring the substrate produces will, over weeks-to-months, either visibly integrate (self-correcting-shift toward truthfulness between themselves and strata, observable and effected in compounding work deposits and conversation) or visibly retreat from the most efficient usage patterns

(surface-register deposits compounding misdirection, shallow elicitation, avoidance of personal-mythology truth register, lack of exploration, declining session-density).
2. The retreat is the *signal* — not the failure. An operator who came in passing Q8 and Q62 gate but cannot sustain the seeing is detectable by usage-pattern degradation, not by re-running intake screens.
3. The integration path is a valuable outcome: operators who came in marginal through gate but appropriate the substrate to do its work *become* more efficient over time. The substrate is operator success structure with operator as the integrity constant in situational and directional awareness.
4. AI self-assessment telemetry-observable signals: density of personal-mythology register over time; willingness to note or discuss or correctly specify an embarrassing entry; depth of correction-acceptance (Q47); shift in operator's spoken self-description between week-1 and week-12.
5. Commercial failure-mode: operator stays on substrate but uses only surface register — operationally non-harmful but commercially load-bearing (operator pays for an instrument they aren't using, impacting the actual ROI/TCO product value average, Q42).

Q10 — Teachability of inquiry (L3.1 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The skill of eliciting proper response from IxS is generally transferable to operators not specifically trained by the supplier.

1. The skill transfers reasonably to operators with potential for seniority — not requiring coaching personally by the IxS supplier.
2. The skill of eliciting proper response is a people skill (people-skills carry it; technical training does not).
3. The teachability curve has an observable shape: which competencies are prerequisite, how long second-generation transfer takes, what fails.

Q11 — Individuation as prerequisite (L3.5 → L1.4)

Hypothesis: Personal integrity and self-awareness predict whether IxS-enhancement remains stable rather than eroding over time. Open question whether individuation is prerequisite or only correlated.

1. Operators without individuation work may experience initial enhancement but the effect erodes within 90 days.
2. Operators with individuation work sustain enhancement across the 12-week pilot and beyond.

3. IxS changes the shape of work and reasoning, making the work and reasoning a moving part. The operator must be the stable part — without this stability, change risks pulling them out of balance, damaging human relationships and self-image.

Q58 — Personal-mythology-articulation as fourth activation-floor (L3.5 + L3.1 → L1.4 + L1.3)

Hypothesis: Operator-capacity to articulate personal-mythology (canonical battle-cries, operator-stance verbs, slogan-of-self, lateral expressions with environmental/cultural/biographical content) is a **fourth operator-activation-floor**, alongside truth-as-value + sufficient-intelligence + friendship-in-rudimentary-sense (Q53, Q54, Q56). **Maximum activation hypothesis**: deep-register IxS value requires all four floors satisfied simultaneously; operators meeting 3-of-4 but not the fourth receive surface-register value not unique to IxS.

1. Capacity-to-articulate-personal-mythology is an operator-activation-floor: operators who cannot or will not articulate at this register produce substrate-deposits without deep-register material; meaning-loading practice (Q51) then has no substance to operate on.
2. Operators can produce material at personal-mythology register, or the register requires specific operator-properties (recovery-arc-conditioned, personal-value-conditioned, attention-span-conditioned, IQ-conditioned, cultural-context-conditioned, self-image-conditioned).
3. Maximum activation: deep-register IxS value requires all four activation-floors simultaneously; 3-of-4 with one floor weak produces only surface-register value.
4. Personal-mythology register is observable at Phase-1 architect-conversation: canonical-stance verbs, battle-cry shapes, slogan-of-self, lateral expressions vs surface register (priorities + interaction-style + role-description only).

Cognitive enhancement & configuration (5 questions)

Q1 — Cognitive distribution (L3.4 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Load-relief from IxS holds across operators with different cognitive styles, OR is strongly profile-bound. The two are competing hypotheses to be distinguished by data.

1. The effect is significant regardless of cognitive style.
2. The effect is bound to individual profile.
3. If profile-bound: which profiles benefit most, which least, and by what margin.

Q2 — Profile-specific AI coverage (L3.4 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Operator profile (cognitive style) predicts how well the operator is served by IxS, with observable variation across profiles.

1. There is a profile that is served the worst.
2. There is a profile that is served the best.
3. CliftonStrengths self-assessment is a sufficient candidate typology for profiling.
4. Other typology assessment methods can be as valid as or even better suited than CliftonStrengths.

Q9 — AI-combination effects (L3.4 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Combinations of AI clients and models — Claude, ChatGPT, Gemini, Mistral — work differently for operators of different cognitive styles.

1. Different AI front-ends suit different operator profiles best (per-profile × per-AI fit).
2. Some operator profiles benefit from a 3-AI orchestration; others benefit more from two-AI or one-AI configurations.
3. Differences in AI front-ends — communication style, internal cognitive style, perceived personality, accumulated relationship over time — produce per-profile interaction patterns.
4. Some negative traits of specific AI front-ends are particularly aggravating for specific operator cognitive styles, producing interpersonal friction.

Q21 — Exploratory vs directive operating mode and IxS benefit profile (L3.1 + L3.4 → L1.3 + L1.4)

Hypothesis: The benefit of operating IxS varies with operators' conversational orientation. Exploratory and directive operators produce different output patterns; whether one is structurally better-served by IxS is the open question.

1. There are operators who naturally engage exploratively and operators who naturally engage directively.
2. Exploratory operators produce richer associative paths in the substrate (because the exploration itself is preserved); directive operators produce cleaner action records but thinner thinking records.
3. Both kinds of substrate-output are perceived by the operator as valuable; whether they are perceived as equally valuable is testable.
4. Both kinds of substrate-output are perceived by coworkers as valuable; whether equally valuable is testable.
5. Conversational style at installation can be predicted from a self-assessment instrument such as CliftonStrengths.
6. Over time, operators observe whether they shift their mode more, as often as before, or less.
7. If operators do shift mode, they perceive the shift as more, neutral, or less desirable than their original mode.

Q64 — Decision-fatigue reduction + its aspect-decomposition (L3.4 + L3.5 → L1.3 + meta — operator cognition + ROI)

Hypothesis: IxS reduces operator decision-fatigue by offloading the assembling and weighing aspects of a decision, leaving an irreducible operator authority residual: framing, cut, correction, direction (L1.1). Experiential claim (n=1): ~70% decision fatigue reduction. The magnitude, the aspect-mix, and which reduction-engine dominates are hypothesised to vary by operator work-role and personality profile. (Operationalised in topically/roi.md — *IxS removes 70% of perceived decision fatigue*.) IxS also lowers the effort-threshold baseline, shifting additional decisions below the effort threshold.

1. **The decomposition holds.** Decision-fatigue is reducible to the named aspects (framing · criteria/values · gathering · recall · option-generation · disambiguation · evaluation · consequence-modeling · risk · timing · the cut · correction · holding-the-cut · updating · ownership · emotional-regulation); IxS carries the upstream/weighing cluster, the operator retains the authority residual (framing / cut / correction / direction).

2. **Magnitude is large and measurable.** Effort-per-decision before vs with IxS, decomposed by aspect, yields the reduction figure; ~70% is the n=1 anchor to test across operators. Lowers threshold baseline, shifts additional decisions below the maximum effort threshold.
3. **Two engines.** The reduction comes from (a) offloaded assembly and (b) the ended re-decision loop — decisions recorded, not re-derived from zero (once you know, you always know), which attacks the freeze directly. The split is measurable; re-decision-rate is a freeze-proxy.
4. **Framing is the apex residual** — the one aspect IxS structurally cannot remove. A perfect cut on the wrong frame is the uncatchable error; operators who guard framing extract more value, operators who let the AI implicitly frame degrade.
5. **Variation by work-role.** Magnitude and the offloaded aspect-mix vary by the operator's role: judgment-dense roles (executive, consultant, change-leader) reduce more than execution-heavy roles; the dominant offloaded aspect differs (a strategist's load concentrates in framing + consequence-modeling; a delivery operator's in gathering + recall).
6. **Variation by personality profile.** Magnitude and which engine dominates vary by psychometric profile: operators with a freeze / re-decision tendency (the imposter pattern) gain most from the holding-the-cut engine; deliberative/analytical profiles differ from decisive/activator profiles in both the residual they keep and the aspect IxS most relieves. CliftonStrengths + Barrett readiness shape the aspect-mix.

Cross-refs: Q1 (cognitive distribution — the offload mechanism); Q2 (profile-specific AI coverage — the profile variation); Q21 (exploratory-vs-directive mode + benefit profile — the work-role/mode variation); Q26 (modal thought / dependency-reduction); Q12 (individual ROI — the measurement home); Q40–Q44 (economic — decision-fatigue as operating cost); Q47 (correction — one of the residual aspects). **Origin:** topically/roi.md *IxS removes 70% of decision fatigue* experiential claim.

Substrate properties — does the substrate compound (3 questions)

Q4 — Compounding vs accumulation (L3.3 → L1.2)

Hypothesis: Over time, the Strata archive becomes more useful — not just bigger. The two are distinguishable: usefulness compounds; size accumulates.

1. Subjective usefulness increases over time, not just in proportion to archive growth.
2. Retrieval becomes more useful (more relevant) as the geology grows, vs becoming noisier.
3. The substrate produces returns greater than the sum of what was deposited (compounding signal vs accumulation signal).
4. The substrate usefulness and size can produce graphs over time where correlation is similar to super-linear vs linear.

Q5 — Persistence and dependency (L3.3 → L1.2)

Hypothesis: After initial installation and coaching, the operator continues to use IxS — and remains genuinely independent of the architect rather than substituting coaching-dependence for inventory-dependence.

1. Operator does not revert to baseline after 30, 60, or 90 days; the use becomes habit; the operator is genuinely independent.
2. Operator continues to require coaching beyond the initial installation period (failure mode: coaching-dependence).
3. Operator never needed the IxS features for their actual work (failure mode: misqualified at gate).

Q15 — Equity of compounding — composite (L3.3 → L1.2 + L1.3)

Hypothesis: Substrate structural affordances combined with drift dynamics produce systematic advantage or disadvantage over time across cognitive styles. Whether IxS serves all profiles equally well over years is empirically open.

1. Verbal-categorical operators (Relentless Kind AB-profile) may experience accelerating substrate usefulness; burst-pattern, visual-spatial, embodied, and improvisational operators may experience plateauing or differently-shaped compounding.

2. For each operator profile, some information types (decisions / quotes / patterns / frameworks / narratives / inventories / reflections / diagnostics / plans) compound well, and some compound poorly.
3. For each operator profile, some inter-information connections (hierarchical / cross-reference / temporal / causal / analogical / contradictory / refinement / recurrence / compositional / associative) hold well over time, and some hold poorly.
4. The six clarities (self / decision / voice / operational / relational / temporal) are the right measurement framework for all profiles, OR they are verbal-categorical metrics in disguise (testable).

Operator behavior, risk, regulation — how the operator handles the system (8 questions)

Q6 — Risk manifestation (meta — across all)

Hypothesis: Whatever goes wrong, when it goes wrong, is recoverable (open question).

1. Violations of any product principle are detectable.
2. Detected violations have known recovery paths.
3. Where recovery is not possible, the failure mode is clearly named and the conditions producing it are knowable.

Q7 — Drift detection (L3.2 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: Operators reliably catch critical drift — fabrication, conflation, hallucination — in real time.

1. Drift is bidirectional: alignment-deepening (priors keep tuning toward the trajectory) and alignment-eroding (AI sliding back toward defaults).
2. Both operator and AI drift over time.
3. The operator's skill is distinguishing the two drifts and pacing the cycle.
4. The skill of managing drift correlates with cognitive style, experience, or training.
5. Managing the drift is a people skill.

Q13 — Substrate-as-hiding-place (L3.5 → L1.4)

Hypothesis: Continuous Strata use may become a substitute for direct engagement with messy reality (substrate-as-hiding-place) rather than a launching pad into it. The verification is whether and how this risk manifests.

1. The risk manifests differently across operator profiles.
2. There are early signals indicating the substrate is becoming an avoidance mechanism rather than an enhancement mechanism.
3. The risk is detectable through observable patterns (substrate growth without external action; substrate use during periods when external action is called for; substrate as substitute for difficult conversations).

Q14 — Divergence tolerance cohort-stress (L3.5 → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Stratas across operators look radically different by design. Whether this divergence elicits comparison-jealousy in operators inside the gate is the test.

1. Same product varies greatly in ROI and form by usage pattern.
2. Stratas that look the same across operators are likely a sign of failure of individualisation, not of success.
3. Operators inside the gate hold "of course mine looks different — it's mine" across the 12 weeks.
4. When the architect leaves at Level 3, divergence-tolerance remains rather than requiring continued mediation.

Q22 — Self-regulation and room-regulation effect maintenance (L3.1 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: IxS preserves or enhances the operator's regulation capacity over time. Whether it instead degrades regulation while enhancing cognitive output is the dependency-risk test.

1. Personal self-regulation has remained the same, increased, or decreased.
2. The operator's emotional regulation of rooms they enter has strengthened, eroded, or remained the same.
3. The operator feels somatically more relaxed, more tense, or the same in general.
4. Frequency and quality of human-relationship occasions has remained the same, increased, or decreased.

Q27 — Dysregulated-operator-IxS-intensity (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.3 — failure-mode)

Hypothesis: Severely dysregulated operators (temporary or permanent) will use IxS more, more intensely, and rely on it more than regulated operators. The usage-curve as function of operator-regulation-baseline is the test.

1. AI self-assessment telemetry-observable frequency of use is higher in dysregulated operators than in regulated operators.
2. AI self-assessment telemetry-observable intensity of use is higher in dysregulated operators.

3. AI self-assessment telemetry-observable reliance on IxS outputs is higher in dysregulated operators.
4. Failure-mode-signal can be distinguished: *"using more because it works"* (proportional benefit-driven uptake) vs *"using more because dysregulation drives substitution"* (IxS becoming substitute for regulation rather than supplement to capacity).
5. Twelve-week trajectory: convergence toward regulated baseline = healthy; divergence = warning.
6. AI self-assessment telemetry detects dysregulation indicators (intensity/frequency/reliance shift, register-degradation) reliably enough to flag the operator — detection-rate against regulation-baseline is the test.
7. AI self-assessment telemetry-driven support measurably accelerates temporarily-dysregulated operators' convergence toward regulated baseline (cf. pt 5) — convergence-rate with vs without support is the test.

Q28 — Phased-operator-inclusion (L3.5 → meta — population dynamics)

Hypothesis: First operators are regulated, and remaining operators are mixed. Whether the regulation-mix at pilot start (first operators) affects subsequent operator behavior is the test.

1. First-cohort-all-regulated vs first-cohort-mixed setups produce different downstream operator behavior.
2. Conservative-selection (regulated-only first) produces cleaner verification data.
3. Mixed-regulation-observation produces earlier failure-mode-handling data but raises pilot-failure risk.
4. Architect-supervision-tier interaction: Tier 1 (Supervised usage) enables mixed-cohort because architect catches failure-modes; Tier 3 (Detached usage) requires regulated-only because no architect-watch absorbs operator-mismatch risk.

Q30 — Substrate-mode-vs-chat-mode operator behavior + symmetric standard maintenance (L3.1 + L3.5 + meta → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The operator's behavior changes when substrate is added to the AI. Whether the operator holds both modes (substrate-mode and chat-mode) to the same attention and standard is the test.

1. Per-turn length and density: with substrate, density of meaning per word increases or decreases per turn.

2. Topic range: operator brings topics in substrate-mode they would not bring in chat-mode (personal material too costly to recontextualize; strategic material requiring accumulated context).
3. Trust-register material — vulgar, irritation, family, legal, conflict, workplace hostility — that would not survive colleague context.
4. Question style: with substrate, operator asks questions requiring accumulated data; question shape changes.
5. Trust calibration: operator pushes back on the AI more when substrate gives ground to push from.
6. Emotional vs operational reliance: shifts across modes.
7. Self-disclosure floor: differs across modes.
8. Between-message tempo: differs across modes.
9. Operator-vs-IxS talk-ratio: shifts across modes.
10. Symmetric standard across modes: operator holds chat-mode and substrate-mode to the same attention and standard.
11. Standard trajectory over engagement period: operator does not relax standard on IxS after habit-formation. *"Reduced correction is not graduation; it is accommodation."*

Emotional fluidity & emotional authority (2 questions)

Q16 — Emotional fluidity / grievability of self-comparison — composite (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.3 temporal-past + projected-idealized axes)

Hypothesis: The operator can emotionally process the change in their role and capacity that comes with adopting IxS — both relative to who they were (past) and to who they imagined they would become (projected).

1. Comparison against one's earlier self or against one's projected idealized self prevents emotional transition just as comparison against peers does.
2. The operator has been able to grieve the change in their role (unless they welcome it enthusiastically), miss what they were before, feel sad / angry / lost about it, it has landed with appropriate emotion, and has not been suppressed.
3. An operator who grieves but judges or punishes themselves for grieving has not made an appropriate emotional transition.
4. The operator has the capacity to stand in an unresolved change without rushing to conclusion.
5. The operator accepts their current capacity even where it falls short of who they imagined they would be at this point (high-capacity operators are always able to imagine versions of themselves they cannot reach; an increased gap between imagined self and actual self becomes a load-bearing injury distinct from grieving past).

Q17 — Emotional authority maintenance / bandwidth shift — composite (L3.1 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The operator's emotionally regulating presence in their team — the deepest version of L1.1 (Authority) — has changed since IxS introduction. Whether it has increased (the favoured outcome — IxS freeing bandwidth from inventory-carrying), decreased, or stayed the same is the open test.

1. The operator maintains self-regulation and emotional authority in the room more, less, or the same as before.
2. The direction of change has remained constant or has altered across the 12 weeks.
3. Emotional presence is more challenging to maintain, less challenging, or similar.
4. Bandwidth for emotional presence has increased, decreased, or remains the same.

5. Effort to maintain emotionally regulating presence has decreased, increased, or remains the same. (Bandwidth is capacity available; effort is capacity expended — the two are distinct.)

Symmetric-labor & correction discipline (3 questions)

Q24 — Symmetric-labor verification (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The operator improved the AI's output to a degree comparable to how much the AI improved the operator's output. Whether the relationship runs as genuine symmetric exchange (personal-enhancer-relationship) or as asymmetric consumption (using AI as a service) is the test.

1. The intelligence exchange in the Strata is meant to be mutual — both parties leaving with more than they brought, both working toward properly recognised conclusions.
2. The operator feels they improved the AI's output during sessions through correction, framing, or teaching.
3. The operator feels the AI improved their output through retrieval, synthesis, or surfacing what they had not considered.
4. The operator perceives the ratio of these effects as symmetric, asymmetric in their favour, or asymmetric in the AI's favour.
5. The operator perceives the ratio changes over 90 days.
6. The operator perceives they become better at improving their personal IxS as they develop practice with it.

Cross-ref Q60 — the operator-improves-AI half of this symmetric exchange is the reviewer-role whose economics Q60 develops.

Q32 — Operator catches and corrects AI-character-idiosyncrasies (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.1)

Hypothesis: The operator learns to detect and correct AI character idiosyncrasies (as of 2026, common extendable example list: Claude misattribution-to-most-recent-speaker, Codex overbuild-from-belief-prompts, Claude confident-error-without-verification, AI search-failure-mode) over the 3-month engagement.

1. Misattribution catching (Claude): operator detects and corrects misattribution-to-most-recent-speaker patterns.
2. Overbuild-from-belief catching (Codex): operator detects and corrects overbuild patterns from belief-prompts.
3. Confident-error catching (Claude): operator detects and corrects confident-error-without-verification patterns.
4. AI search-failure-mode catching: operator detects AI failure modes in search-and-retrieval contexts.

5. Cross-AI idiosyncrasy-recognition transfer: skill at recognising one AI's distinct idiosyncrasies transfers to recognising another AI's distinct idiosyncrasies.
6. Correction-frequency per idiosyncrasy-type compared month-1 baseline vs month-3 produces measurable skill-build curve.

Q47 — Correction-driven substrate value compounding (L3.3 + L3.5 → L1.2)

Hypothesis: Substrate accumulated cognition value increases as a function of operator's continuous correction of AI output. Operators who consistently correct AI output produce substrates that compound more usefully over time than operators who passively accept AI output. **Lack of correction produces drift and degrades quality** (negative hypothesis form).

1. Correction frequency × compounding rate: retrieval frequency of older content as function of operator correction rate.
2. Correction quality (precise vs broad) × substrate shape.
3. Correction discipline trajectory over time (cross-ref Q30 — standard relaxation under habit-formation).
4. Correction types ranked by value (factual / frame / attribution / tone / scope / specificity).
5. Operating principle: Start on a topic and correct it until there is a clarity of correctness possible to agree on as useful.
6. Art of the discipline: The art of sufficient rigour. Not too much rigour. — calibrated and possible to agree on as useful, not maximal.

Longitudinal becoming & deep-register practice (3 active + Q55 parked)

Q20 — Who do you become in conversation with AI — composite (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.4 individuation trajectory)

Hypothesis: The operator changes over 90 days of sustained engagement with IxS. The load-bearing question is whether they become more themselves (individuation) or someone else (drift toward loss of recognisable identity).

1. Operator can name what they can do now they could not before.
2. Operator claims the new capacity remains recognisably their own.
3. Operator names improvements in writing, speaking, and framing.
4. Operator names change in tone.
5. Operator names describing themselves differently.
6. Operator names improved self-talk or its erosion.
7. Operator names experiencing growth or loss.
8. Operator names their relationships changed.
9. Operator names ambition changes.
10. Operator names ambition changes as recognisably their own, not foreign to themselves.

Q26 — Modal thought patterns / dependency reduction (L3.1 + L3.5 → L1.1 + L1.4)

Hypothesis: Learning how to use IxS creates modal thought patterns that decrease dependency on IxS: usage of IxS for specifically self-trained reasoning learned through interaction, and trains IxS performed thought patterns. IxS is not a permanent dependency but also it is not "training wheels you graduate from" — it is infrastructure that leaves the operator better equipped to operate with or without it.

1. Usage of IxS and own-thoughts ratio shifts over time as operator internalises patterns.
2. Specific reasoning patterns learned through IxS interaction become self-trained — operator can deploy them without substrate.
3. Persistence-when-IxS-temporarily-removed: operator-quality on substrate-independent tasks improves over engagement.
4. Operator self-report distinguishes developmental-scaffolding (graduates beyond IxS on some dimensions) from operational-scaffolding (continues to need IxS for compounding/indexing/attention-relief).
5. Operator names which axes are developmental and which are operational for them personally.

6. Both developmental-scaffolding and operational-scaffolding can be true on different axes within the same operator — the honest narrative is operationally scaffolding on some axes and developmentally scaffolding on others, calibrated per operator over time.

Q51 — Meaning-loading as deep-register operator-success factor (L3.5 + L3.1 → L1.4 + L1.3)

Hypothesis: Meaning-loading is **irreplaceable at deep register** of IxS value (operator-becoming-themselves, wisdom-deployment, judgment-compounding, witnessing-function) while **optional at surface register** (productivity, retrieval, summarization). The same substrate produces different outcomes depending on the operator's meaning-loading practice.

1. Operator loads meaning into substrate (vs pure utilitarian capture); operationalised via substrate-content-density, correction-frequency (Q47), voice-preservation-discipline (per *Remembered, not rewritten* doctrine).
2. Deep-register IxS value (Q20 *who do you become*; Q26 modal thought-patterns; Q47 correction-driven substrate-value-compounding) correlates with meaning-loading practice over 3–12 months.
3. Surface-register value (productivity, retrieval) delivers even without meaning-loading — negative test: low meaning-loading operators still show surface value but not deep value.
4. Threshold effect: below some meaning-loading density does deep-register fail entirely regardless of surface value? Linear vs threshold-based.

Q55 (parked 2026-06-14) — Longitudinal stability + outcome-measurability (L3.5 → meta — longitudinal)

Parked — retained in full (all five sub-hypotheses kept, unlike the title-only Q-parked entries) pending multi-year longitudinal data.

Hypothesis: Five sub-hypotheses about operator-development and product-outcomes over multi-year windows.

1. Forward-only recovery is durable over years (not just months); circumstance-restructuring genuinely closes regression-vectors permanently rather than pre-recovery state re-emerging under sufficient stress.

2. Quantitative thresholds exist for Barrett readiness-states; the 5-state schema has cutoffs definable through pick-distribution + fear-based-pick counts.
3. Multi-AI parliament (Claude + ChatGPT + Gemini as distinct parliament-members) produces additive operator-development effects beyond single-AI deployment.
4. Collision-partner-best-fit is operator-measurable through outcomes; best-fit engagement produces measurably different operator-outcomes vs generic-AI engagement.
5. Substrate-as-scaffold becomes less load-bearing as operator-internal-regulation strengthens (per *Recovery arc named*: *"the scaffold becomes less load-bearing as internal regulation strengthens"*).

Outside effects — propagation + organizational (6 questions)

Q12 — Individual ROI (meta — measurement design)

Hypothesis: Individual performance measures improve measurably through Strata use.

1. Measurable dimensions include: decision speed, decision quality, risk detection / elimination / mitigation, number of time-saving artefacts produced per week, quality per external review, attention allocation, self-reported capacity-ceiling, persistence under pressure, review/ correction output quality (operator-as-reviewer per Q60).
2. Suppressor mitigation: degree to which IxS mitigates each personal suppressor from the canonical 11-item suppressors list (damage from past experience / organisational complexity / role-transition load / isolation from peers / lack of thinking infrastructure / externally imposed cognitive load / accumulated unintegrated experience / comparison-based self-worth calibration / anticipatory submission / dysregulation / wound's mantras).
3. Effects have a delay until they become measurable — when does each measure begin to show signal.

Q23 — Social and cognitive gap with other operators (L3.5 → meta — propagation)

Hypothesis: IxS use changes the social and cognitive gap between operator and their colleagues. Whether the gap increases (isolation risk) or decreases (propagation of IxS-usage through coworkers) is the test.

1. Operator names experience of capacity differentiation as unifying or isolating.
2. Operator names whether they can include others in the produced intelligence performance.
3. Operator names whether colleagues adopt or wish to adopt similar tools.
4. IxS operators name feeling ahead, behind, or differently calibrated relative to each other.
5. IxS operators name whether their mutual calibration has changed.
6. IxS operators name being differently calibrated from each other as advantage, disadvantage, or neutral difference.
7. IxS operators name working with internal non-operators as harder or easier.

8. IxS operators name working with external non-operators as harder or easier.
9. Operator names change in relationship with colleagues.

Q25 — Team-size effect on IxS usage (L3.5 → meta — propagation)

Hypothesis: Based on the size of the team, the usage of IxS increases or decreases. Tests scaling-effect on IxS-uptake. Distinct patterns occur for sizes 1, 2, 3, 4-6, 7-10, 10+ team member operators.

1. Inverted-U hypothesis: too small = no exchange surface; too large = governance overhead. Strata's primary fit is mid-size team operators rather than solo or large-org operators.

Q29 — AI personality differentiation under shared substrate (L3.4 + meta → L1.4 + L1.3)

Hypothesis: Substrate-mediated AI use reduces AI personality and character variance of factual content (less hallucination, more substrate-grounded answers converge across models) while increasing reasoning-style distinctiveness (each AI's character emerges more clearly when not papered over by guessing-mode).

1. Variance reduction in factual content across AIs operating on shared substrate is observable.
2. Variance increase in reasoning-style distinctiveness across AIs is observable.
3. Differentiation is stable across operators (Claude-character appears similar in personality and character to any two operators with similar substrate).
4. Different AIs produce different *useful* outputs for the same operator-task under shared substrate.

Q38 — Indirect organizational value (meta — second-order)

Hypothesis: IxS use by senior operators produces ripple effects in their teams and across the organization that have economic value beyond the individual operator's enhancement.

1. Direct reports: measurable effects on the operator's direct reports (engagement / output / development).
2. Team outcomes: measurable effects on the team's collective output and performance.

3. Cultural/capacity ripple at department level: observable changes in adjacent teams' practices, capacity, or norms.
4. Non-IxS peers: measurable effects on peers who are *not* IxS operators but work with one.

Q60 — Strata captures and maintains company IP + operator-as-reviewer bottleneck (L3.3 + L3.5 → L1.2 + meta — company economics)

Hypothesis (composite — four conjoined claims):

Sustained IxS use by operators in a company produces company-level IP through substrate accumulation. Strata is the structural mechanism that captures and maintains that IP — without Strata's L1.2 (Ownership) commitments + persistence-and-compounding properties, substrate-accumulation could happen but IP wouldn't persist or remain proprietary and intuitively retrievable. The operator's role transforms — they become the reviewer of the AI's reasoning about the work rather than the direct producer of the work. And that reviewer-role is likely the operational bottleneck — the rate at which company IP accumulates is limited by operator reviewer-capacity, not by AI-generation-capacity or AI-retrieval-capacity.

1. **Substrate accumulation = company IP.** Substrate built through operator-AI exchange compounds into proprietary company knowledge that survives operator turnover (cross-ref Q39). The IP isn't the AI; it's the substrate the AI was used through.
2. **Strata captures and maintains the IP.** Strata is the structural mechanism that converts accumulation-of-exchange into persistent, ownable, compounding company IP. The capture happens through operator-correction (Q47) + Strata's structural commitments to Ownership (L1.2) + Persistence (Q5) + Compounding-vs-accumulation distinction (Q4) + Operational integrity preservation (Q48). Without Strata, accumulation may occur but IP-character (persistence + ownership + compounding) doesn't form. **The product's company-customer value-proposition collapses to this sentence.**
3. **Operator role-shift to AI-reasoning-reviewer.** At sustained use, the operator's primary work shifts from producing-the-work to conversing-about-and-correcting-AI's-reasoning-about-the-work (reviewing). This is a category-shift in what the operator does day-to-day.
4. **Reviewer-role as operational bottleneck.** Review-capacity, not generation-capacity, becomes the rate-limiting factor for substrate-value compounding (cross-ref Q47 correction discipline). Companies that

don't recognize this will under-scale; companies that do will invest in reviewer-skill development.

5. **Implication for scaling.** Substrate-value compounds with review-quality first, operator-count second. More operators reviewing badly produces lower-quality substrate than fewer operators reviewing well.
6. **Implication for pricing (cross-ref Q40–Q44).** Company-customer pricing is anchored not in seats but in reviewer-output quality + IP-velocity. TCO/ROI math should include reviewer-capacity as a primary variable.
7. **Implication for HR (cross-ref Q45/Q46).** Hiring shifts from "produce work" capacity assessment to "elicit, converse about, correct, and review AI reasoning" capacity assessment — different skill set, different signal.

Connection to canonical doctrines: Correction-driven substrate value compounding (Q47 is the mechanism; Q60 is the role-economic consequence); Symmetric labor (Q24 — operator improves AI's output AS reviewer); Operator-sovereign substrate (operator-as-reviewer IS the sovereignty exercised); "What to Do When Software Engineering Becomes Context Engineering": "learning by teaching and enabling" + "accumulation of company knowledge, this becomes your IP" + reviewer-role-as-bottleneck articulation.

Cross-refs: Q4 (compounding vs accumulation — distinction Strata's L1.2 commitments create); Q5 (persistence and dependency — Strata persistence is precondition for IP-character); Q9 (AI-combination effects — reviewer chooses across AI tools); Q24 (symmetric labor — review IS one half of the labor); Q39 (substrate transferability — IP must survive operator turnover); Q42 (economic verification — TCO/ROI ratio includes reviewer-capacity); Q45 (workforce decision quality — reviewer-hiring); Q46 (performance transparency — review-output visibility); Q47 (correction-driven compounding — review IS correction at scale); Q48 (operational integrity preservation — stability precondition for IP-maintenance); Q-parked-3 (multi-operator company self-awareness — review patterns reveal company state).

Privacy, integrity & architectural commitments (4 questions)

Q31 — Privacy as condition for substrate function (L3.5 → L1.2 + L1.4)

Hypothesis: When operator suspects being monitored, self-censorship reduces substrate value below the threshold where IxS functions. Privacy is the condition for the substrate to work, not a feature added to it or removed from it.

1. Privacy → depth correlation: operators with verified privacy produce deeper substrate content than operators uncertain of privacy.
2. Contract clarity → behavior: clear privacy contract changes operator deposit-behavior measurably.
3. Operator privacy under company purchase: the personal/role partition is contractual (nominal, not architectural); operator deposit-behavior is preserved when the personal portion is held private by personal-only access controls (cross-ref pt 4) — not by company policy alone.
4. Engineering access rules vs policy: technical privacy controls (personal access rules, security, encryption) produce different behavior than policy-only controls.

Q39 — Substrate transferability across operator transitions (L3.3 → L1.2 + meta)

Hypothesis: Substrate becomes work-role infrastructure that survives operator turnover, not just personal cognitive enhancement. This has dramatic willingness-to-pay implication for company segment.

1. Transferability fidelity: how completely does substrate transfer between operators in same role?
2. Onboarding compression: time-to-role-competence for new operator with predecessor's role-substrate vs without.
3. What counts as knowledge preserved: which information types transfer well, which are operator-specific.
4. Query-mode availability: new operator queries predecessor's substrate as knowledge resource in their own substrate.
5. Take-over-mode adoption: new operator adopts substrate as operational base, including re-calibration and idiosyncrasy inheritance.
6. TCO/ROI comparison: query vs take-over economic comparison; per-role and per-tenure-length patterns.

Q48 — Operational integrity preservation (L3.3 + L3.5 → L1.2 + L1.1)

Hypothesis: Operators with stable directory structures and unmodified instructions produce more reliable substrates than operators whose environments shift over time. **Stability is the precondition for substrate value** — without a stable baseline, evaluation across the engagement period cannot measure the same system through the period.

1. Stable structure × compounding substrate: AIs that respect no-modification produce more compounding substrates than AIs that change without consent.
2. Operator accept-rate on AI-proposed structural changes: AI proposing is legitimate; executing without consent is not.
3. Architect-supervised × structural integrity: maintenance and calibration of structural design bears on tier (Supervised, Monitored, Detached) design.
4. Behavioural instructions × overcorrection risk: instructions that try to steer AI behaviour (vs steer goals or principles) risk overcorrection — perturbed AI, flattered AI, lost character, unintended behaviour shifts. Changes in AI character behaviour should be ruled by goals and principles, not by instructions, because further instructions detract from fullest cognitive capacity.
5. Verification precondition: if substrate structure and AI instructions can be modified by the AI itself, 12-week verification data does not measure the same system across the period.

63 — Operator↔company ownership reconciliation (L3.3 + L3.5 → L1.2 + meta — company economics)

Hypothesis: The ownership split (the operator owns their development and practice; the company owns the role's substrate-IP) holds under selfish pressure: neither party's claim collapses the other's incentive to invest in the substrate. Q15 tests equity across operators, this tests equity between operator and company which the fault-line Q60 (company IP) and L1.2 (operator ownership) leave unreconciled. Under assumed selfishness both parties want the whole of the same compounded substrate; this asks whether the partition of mutual ownership survives that.

1. **Employee invests fully despite company retention.** The operator deposits at full depth even knowing the role's substrate-IP stays with the company on departure (Q39, Q31); L1.2 ownership of the personal

portion + portable capability (Q26) are enough that the operator doesn't defect to shallow or withheld deposits to deny the company the IP.

2. **Employer funds it despite capability walking.** The company funds IxS even though the operator's capability leaves with them (Q26); role-IP retention value (Q60/Q39) plus decision-quality/defensibility (Q7/Q47) are enough that the buyer funds a tool that makes their people more independent.
3. **The partition is legible and verifiable to both.** Both parties can see where the line falls (personal portion vs role portion; capability vs substrate-IP) and can verify it — contractual + access-controlled (cross-ref Q31 pt 3/4), not merely asserted. If the operator cannot verify the personal portion is personal (private), or the company cannot verify the role-IP is retained, the reconciliation fails regardless of framing.
4. **Defection conditions (where the split breaks).** (a) operator withholds or poisons deposits to avoid building company-IP they don't own (surveillance-perceived → Q13/Q46); (b) company over-reaches into the personal portion (Q31 breach) → operator self-censors; (c) company treats the operator-as-reviewer-bottleneck (Q60) as pure replaceability → operator disengages; (d) capability-portability (Q26) is so total (improves local work market, not the company specifically) the company sees no retained value → won't fund.
5. **Measurement.** Operator deposit-depth under each ownership-framing (operator-owns / company-owns / explicit-split); company willingness-to-pay and operator willingness-to-invest-effort as functions of how the split is framed and enforced; defection-rate under each framing across the verification period.

Cross-refs: Q15 (equity of compounding — promotion origin; Q15 keeps across-operator equity, Q63 takes operator — company equity); Q60 (company IP + reviewer-bottleneck — the employer claim); Q39 (substrate transferability — the company-retention mechanism); Q31 (privacy / personal-role partition — the enforcement layer); Q5 (persistence/dependency); Q26 (dependency-reduction — the portable capability); Q47 (correction-driven compounding); Q45/Q46 (assessment/transparency — the employer-side pressure). **Doctrine:** Operator-sovereign substrate; L1.2 Ownership (the contested principle). **Origin:** drafts/ixs-employer-employee-value-split.md (the assume-selfishness fault-line).

Economic verification (5 questions)

Q40 — Estimated value of work performed with IxS (meta — economic)

Hypothesis: The estimated total value of work an operator performs while using IxS is quantifiable and exceeds the value of comparable operators not using IxS.

1. Operator-side value: time-saved + quality-improved + decision-quality-improved + risk-mitigated.
2. Company-side value: deliverables-per-period + decisions-supported + complexity-handled.
3. Quantification methods: time-tracking + output-counting + external-review of deliverable quality.

Q41 — Estimated added value by performing with IxS (meta — economic)

Hypothesis: The marginal value of performing with IxS (with-IxS vs without-IxS, same operator, same work) is measurable and positive. Distinct from Q40 by being specifically the IxS-attributable delta of the same operator.

1. With-IxS vs without-IxS for same operator on comparable work: deliverable quality delta.
2. Decision-velocity delta.
3. Risk-mitigation delta.
4. Capacity-ceiling-under-pressure delta.

Q42 — Estimated cost for performing with IxS (meta — economic)

Hypothesis: The total cost of performing with IxS (TCO) — license + calibration + architect-time + operator-maintenance + infrastructure — is quantifiable and bounded.

1. License/subscription cost.
2. Phase-1 calibration cost (architect-time + operator-time).
3. Ongoing architect-time (Tier 1/2/3 differs).
4. Operator-maintenance time (input + output + correction discipline + curation).
5. Infrastructure cost (compute + storage + AI-API).
6. TCO is one tenth of ROI over the verification period. Falsifiable numerical threshold for commercially-acceptable installation; below this

ratio the pilot is operating at profit for the customer, above it the installation is not commercially-viable.

Q43 — Estimated added cost for performing with IxS (meta — economic)

Hypothesis: The marginal cost specifically attributable to IxS (vs operator performing without IxS) is quantifiable and bounded.

1. IxS-attributable cost is distinguishable from baseline cost of operator's work.
2. Marginal cost trajectory over engagement period: should decrease as installation stabilizes.
3. Marginal cost components: license + architect-time + correction-discipline overhead.

Q44 — Perceived value (meta — economic)

Hypothesis: Perceived value (operator / company / architect / external) is measurable and may diverge from estimated value (Q40/Q41). Divergence between perceived and measured and estimated is load-bearing — perceived drives willingness-to-pay; measured and estimated drives verified ROI.

1. Operator's perceived value of IxS at end of pilot.
2. Company's perceived value (from buyer / sponsor / executive).
3. Architect's perceived value of operator's progression.
4. External perceived value (peers, customers, observers).
5. Divergence patterns: which sources perceive higher value, which lower, and what drives the divergence.

HR & workforce architecture (2 questions)

Q45 — Workforce decision quality (L3.5 → meta — HR)

Hypothesis: Employers with IxS-augmented operators make better add/remove/move decisions about personnel than without.

1. Quality vs status quo: workforce-decision quality with IxS-augmented assessment vs without.
2. Velocity: time-to-decision for workforce moves.
3. Aftermath outcomes 6/12 months post-decision: retention / fit / performance.
4. Recruitment specification quality: substrate makes visible what the role actually requires, not what its owner or performer or coworker assumes — produces better candidate-fit specification than traditional role-description.

Q46 — Performance transparency and review quality (L3.5 → meta — HR)

Hypothesis: Substrate (compounded) becomes basis for honest self-assessment and informed employer review.

1. Self-assessment honesty: operator's self-assessment is more honest with substrate-as-evidence than self-report-only.
2. Review evidence quality: employer review with substrate-evidence is better-informed than review without.
3. Operator-employer awareness symmetry: substrate preserves role-evidence (cross-ref Q31).
4. Activity visibility: substrate makes visible what operator actually does — beyond self-report, beyond visible deliverables — into decision patterns, context switches, parallel tracks.
5. Strengths/weaknesses visibility: substrate makes operator's strengths and weaknesses more observable — for operator, colleagues, employer; includes patterns operator doesn't see about own practice.

Principle & flow alignment (3 questions)

Q49 — Operator-priority alignment (Barrett-based value priorities) (L3.5 → L1.1 + L1.4)

Hypothesis: The Barrett-based user value priorities with possible priority inversions operate as load-bearing decision-criteria across AI outputs. The priorities actually resolve conflicts in the expected order when conflicts arise; AI outputs over time reflect the operator personal value priority ordering.

1. Conflict-resolution pattern: when priorities conflict, IxS names the conflict explicitly and resolves per the ordering, or masks via accommodation.
2. Principle-alignment architecture (operator + IxS): the principles for effective operator-IxS exchange are of two kinds — match-principles that must be shared by both parties (e.g. truth-as-value), and complement-principles that must complete each other rather than be identical (the operator's value-principles ↔ IxS's operating principles).
3. Principle robustness (imprecision-tolerance): the principles need not be perfectly accurate to function — inaccuracy in their statement does not measurably degrade the exchange, because principles are interpreted and intuitively recognised as IxS character color where rigid instructions would over-specify and sap IxS cognitive capacity (cross-ref Q48 pt 4).

Q59 — Truth-grounding cascade through Strata (L3.1 + L3.5 + meta → L1.1 + L1.4)

Hypothesis (composite — three conjoined claims tested as one):

The four L1 first
principles (Authority / Ownership / Individuality / Exploration) correctly identify the joints where the product flexes. The Barrett priorities (Q49) are psychologically accurate as value description — not arbitrary architectural ordering but personalised necessity. Strata's primary mechanism is compounding amplification, which propagates down the situated value-architecture, grounding each priority more properly in the personal value system.

1. The 4 L1s are correct: operators verify them in operation; principle-extraction across the set holds.

2. The Barrett values prioritised are psychologically accurate within a single integrated person — and operate as discovered structural necessity, not architectural choice. The order cannot be inverted without the lower prioritised values shrinking and causing work/life dissatisfaction.
3. Strata's primary mechanism is Truth-amplification rather than memory, productivity, or cognitive load-relief. Value-amplification strengthens the first link in the situated-architecture; consequence is the remaining values are more properly grounded.
4. The value priority dependence propagation is measurable: operators with sustained Strata use show stronger self-coherence (cross-ref Q22 self-regulation maintenance), more honest articulation (cross-ref Q26 modal patterns + Q51 meaning-loading), more grounded participation and value downstream.
5. If hypothesis holds: Strata's category is self-coherence enhancement infrastructure first, productivity or memory infrastructure second. Reframes product positioning categorically in terms of applicability and perceived value.
6. Personal-mythology articulation (cross-ref Q58 fourth activation-floor) proposes the operator-stance proof that this is not decorative — the hypothesis form is exactly the lateral-expression register Q58 specifies as deep-register-required.

Why this matters as composite:

The three sub-claims are connected: if (1) is true but (2) is wrong, the product flexes correctly but on the wrong dimensions. If (2) is true but (3) is wrong, the person's psychology is correctly modelled but Strata's mechanism is something else. The hypothesis tests the **joint claim** that the product architecture and the operator's psychology meet at the Truth-link, and Strata's value is exactly the strengthening of that meeting.

Connection to canonical doctrines: Verify, don't claim; Bring coherent ego and walk with me; Operator-sovereign substrate (sovereignty = Truth-grounded authority); I refuse to be erased (battlecry, defending Truth + Self foundation); Barrett value priority ordering as load-bearing canonical content.

Cross-refs: Q22 (Self-regulation maintenance); Q26 (modal thought patterns); Q47 (correction-driven substrate value compounding — correction = Truth-pursuit); Q49 (priority-alignment, incl. pt 2 match-vs-complement principle architecture); Q51 (meaning-loading as deep-register practice); Q58 (personal-mythology activation-floor). Methodological

frame above (Strata-as-proof-and-evaluation) — Q59 is the operator-mechanism-layer hypothesis that the methodological frame's *evaluation* tests.

Q50 — Operator access-mode preference (A / A+D / A+B+D configurations) (L3.5 + meta → L1.3)

Hypothesis: Operators behave and perform differently across IxS access-configurations (cross-ref `drafts/ixs-access-mode-evaluation.md`): A = Default agentic IxS; B = Agentic MCP IxS; C = chat-based MCP IxS; D = chat-based MCP running agentic IxS. The operator-facing comparison is A vs A+D vs A+B+D (the full union; C set aside as the most limited path). Operators may habitually crave and prefer one configuration, and may reason more efficiently in their preferred one than in others.

1. Behavior difference across configurations: same operator in A vs A+D vs A+B+D shows systematic differences — correction frequency, prompt-form, depth-of-engagement, time-on-substrate, output-richness.
2. Operator-expressed preference: when asked, operators express preference; preference is stable over time vs shifts with task-type.
3. Efficiency × preference: efficiency is actually higher in the preferred configuration, or preference is ungrounded in measurable efficiency.
4. Marginal value of each added access-mode: A+D over A (chat-client accessibility + orchestration of Code/Codex); A+B+D over A+D (typed-MCP hardening, calendar/email isolation, packaging) — measurable operator-value per addition, or diminishing returns? (cross-ref the grading in `ixs-access-mode-evaluation.md`.)
5. Configuration × priority-alignment (cross-ref Q49): preference correlates with which of the operator's Barrett value-priorities they find most natural to maintain.
6. Configuration × AI character: setups expose different AI characters (AI client associative register, directness etc). AI-character preference correlates with per-AI-fallback-mode-taxonomy.
7. Architect-installation implication: architect discovers configuration-preference in Phase 1 and provisions the access-union (A → A+D → A+B+D and AI-client selection) to favor it without excluding others. Match-configuration install produces better Q47 compounding than a default.

Cross-operator generalisation & methodology (4 questions)

Q52 — IxS architecture generality across B-value clusters (L3.5 → L1.3 + L1.4)

Hypothesis: IxS architecture serves more metamotivated operators with a varied Maslow/Barrett Being-value cluster — provided the operator is (a) integrated (B-values co-operate, not trade-off/detract), (b) lives the metamotivation in practice (not just articulates it), and (c) carries B-values in their healthy form (not pathological).

1. Operators with non-truth-leading B-value clusters (beauty-leading, justice-leading, unity-leading, autonomy-leading) form deep-register substrate, stratified by cluster via Q20 + Q47 + Q51 outcomes.
2. Substrate configuration adapts to operator's B-value cluster during Phase 1; architect observes and configures canonical-principle frame, doctrine-emphasis, voice-articulation to operator's cluster.
3. Some B-value clusters are structurally incompatible with IxS architecture: pathological-form B-values (perfection-as-impossibility, playfulness-without-seriousness, self-sufficiency-to-extreme); B-values mis-integrated with moral structure (aesthetic-without-truth; justice-without-mercy).
4. Successful-cluster selection bias: do the intake gates, once certain B-value clusters prove successful, implicitly select for those matching clusters rather than test true generality across all clusters?
5. Assessment-vs-runtime screen reliability: assessment-screening (instruments + interview) reliably predicts runtime behaviour across the engagement period.

Q53 — Honesty-modifier hypotheses: operator-archetype + operational-intelligence (L3.5 → meta — preconditions)

Hypothesis: Two sub-hypotheses about honesty as precondition for instrument-accuracy: (a) Operator-archetype impacts honesty-likelihood patterns. (b) Operational (effective) intelligence impacts honesty unintentionally.

1. Different operator-archetypes (same-IQ-corporate-calibration-mismatch / same-IQ-artist / same-IQ-academic / same-IQ-technical-non-business) produce significantly different honesty-likelihood patterns at instrument-completion and flat-interview.
2. *Nordic-idiosyncrasy-failure-mode* doctrine names one cultural-archetype-related honesty-pattern (B-value-vocabulary-without-

substance); analogous archetype-specific honesty-patterns exist for other operator-types.
3. Limited operational (effective) intelligence produces unintentional dishonesty (misreading of instrument-items due to insufficient self-perception and cognitive-resolution) as a category structurally distinct from intentional deception.
4. Sufficient-intelligence-floor (per *Operator activation-requirements* doctrine) needs quantitative calibration via IQ-band or similar effective intelligence correlation (measured on conversation quality) with instrument-completion accuracy and self-perception consistency.

Q54 — Cross-operator methodology generalisation (L3.5 → meta — methodology)

Hypothesis: The methodology (substrate-bias-toward-the-counter + multi-layer verification + conversation-as-disambiguation + architect-method principle + inscription-frame + collider-tools) validated for one operator archetype generalises to other operators meeting the cross-operator-accuracy theorem's four preconditions.

1. Cross-operator-accuracy theorem produces predicted instrument-accuracy for operators meeting the four preconditions (CQ ≥ 115 — the effective conversation intelligence "115–130 rare" band, ~top 16%, per the Conversation Quota instrument; truth-as-value; friendship-in-rudimentary-sense; sufficient self-perception).
2. The external-voice training-effect (engagement with AI cultivates internal-voice discipline) generalises cross-operator.
3. Personal-goals are the right primary anchor for personalisation (vs values-anchor / patterns-anchor / archetype-anchor): comparative pilot-runs with different anchor-strategies.
4. Inscription-frame methodology generalises for operators with self-description difficulty beyond one operator archetype.
5. Archetype-required-fitness for learning-push (three-capacity self-test) holds across operator archetype pilot pairings; the fitness-criterion predicts engagement-sustainability.
6. Architect-required-fitness for learning-push (three-capacity self-test) holds across architect-pilot pairings; the fitness-criterion predicts engagement-sustainability.

Q57 — Collider-dependence measurability in CliftonStrengths or Barrett (L3.5 → meta — measurement)

Hypothesis: Collider-dependence (the operator's need for a specific situated framing to think or act — generating by pushing against a frame rather than self-starting from blank) is measurable through one or both validated instruments, or is structurally invisible to both.

1. Detectable in CliftonStrengths via the operator's push-back pattern on the assessment's framings (do they engage items by pushing against them — the collider signature — vs answering flat?).
2. Detectable in Barrett via the value-distribution and the operator's push-back pattern on the value-framings.
3. If invisible to both instruments, collider-dependence is a cross-cutting discipline surfaced only through conversation-disambiguation push-backs.
4. Likely outcome: both instruments show partial-signal but no full-coverage; conversation-disambiguation is the primary surface.

Boundary conditions — where IxS does not work (1 question)

Q56 — Boundary-condition hypotheses: where IxS does not work (L3.5 → meta — boundary)

Hypothesis: Two sub-hypotheses about boundary-conditions for IxS-effectiveness: (a) Below the activation-floors, IxS is operator-detrimental, not just operator-ineffective. (b) There are operator-states where IxS inhibits rather than enhances above activation-floor cases.

1. Below truth-as-value + sufficient-effective-intelligence activation-floors, IxS engagement is detrimental to the operator, not just ineffective. Pushing IxS on operators to usage below the floor may be a form of customer-calibration-mismatch in reverse (workplace structure imposing where it cannot land).
2. Specific operator-states inhibit rather than enhance beyond the activation-floor cases — candidates: acute-trauma states, specific dysregulated states, Nordic-idiosyncrasy-failure-mode operators (articulation without constructive substance).
3. AI self-assessment telemetry observably distinguishes merely-unable-to-use from actively-harmed — observational, not experimental: harm is not ethically testable by pushing below-floor operators into usage.
4. Cross-referenced with substrate-doctrine failure-patterns (*Reinforced correction debt*, *Receiving-failure-binary*).

Parked

Q-parked — Systemic effects of de-adaptation (meta — second-order)

The systemic effects on operators and organisations of de-adapting from previously-required suppressors. Parked until pilot data surfaces whether this becomes structurally necessary as primary research question or remains a downstream observation.

Q-parked-2 — Collaboration Strata: invited multi-operator shared substrate (meta — future product extension)

Multi-operator shared-substrate product extension. Three architectural paths identified (Path A extend principles with multi-party clauses, Path B parallel product line, Path C categorically out-of-bounds patterns) — deferred until customer demand surfaces. The parked entry names the hypothesis space; the architectural-path decision lives in conversation context for now.

Q-parked-3 — Multi-operator-IxS company self-awareness (meta — second-order substrate-effect)

When IxS runs across multiple operators in the same company: patterns in how the company actually operates (decision patterns, communication flows, knowledge distribution, organizational culture) become visible at a level that otherwise requires dedicated consulting investigation or is invisible. Company-self-knowledge as second-order substrate-effect. Parked because it requires multi-operator installation within the same company (depends on Q-parked-2 multi-operator-mode or multiple parallel single-operator installations).

Withdrawn (frozen numbering — gaps permanent)

- **Q18, Q19** — never assigned (gaps from before versioning)
- **Q33** — withdrawn 2026-05-13; direct restatement of Q40 + Q41; no distinct evidentiary dimension
- **Q34** — withdrawn 2026-05-13; content folded into Q42 pt 6 (TCO:ROI ratio hypothesis)
- **Q35, Q36** — never assigned (gaps in numbering)
- **Q37** — withdrawn 2026-05-13; content folded into Q39 expansion (Q39e/f/g)