The RADIX Structural Profile

A Dynamic Model of Human Orientation and Organizational Alignment

Alexander Perrin
Null Ventures LLC

Version 1.0 | February 2026
Whitepaper | Public Methodology Document

Contents

SECTION I

Abstract

The RADIX Structural Profile (RSP) is a psychometric instrument designed to measure **structural orientation** rather than static personality traits. Unlike traditional personality systems, which attempt to define who a person is, the RSP identifies *where a person is* within a dynamic cycle of motivational development.

The model maps individuals and teams across four core movement phases—**Root**, **Rot**, **Reach**, and **Reform**—and further classifies orientation through 40 archetypal expressions. It integrates validated personality science (HEXACO six-factor model), forced-choice structural items, longitudinal change tracking, emergence–entropy dynamics, and organizational roll-up modeling to provide both individual-level diagnostic precision and macro-level alignment insight.

The instrument employs a dual-track measurement architecture: a 24-item short-form HEXACO inventory provides the empirically validated trait backbone, while 36 forced-choice structural items sharpen phase-specific interpretation. Movement scores are derived through weighted trait projection and refined via Thurstonian Item Response Theory modeling to produce normative, statistically independent estimates of structural orientation.

> *Traits describe predisposition. Structure determines present configuration. The RSP measures the second.*

This document presents the theoretical foundation, measurement architecture, scoring methodology, validation design, organizational application model, and ethical constraints of the RSP. All claims are bounded by the instrument's present empirical status and are explicitly staged according to the validation phase that warrants them. Where evidence is preliminary, this is stated. Where evidence does not yet exist, claims are presented as hypotheses under investigation.

The RSP is not a personality label. It is a living structural map.

SECTION II

The Limitation of Static Personality Models

The dominant paradigm in personality assessment operates on a fixed-identity premise. An individual completes an instrument, receives a type or trait profile, and that output becomes descriptive shorthand for who they are. The Big Five (Costa & McCrae, 1992), HEXACO (Ashton & Lee, 2007), and the widely distributed Myers-Briggs Type Indicator all share this structural assumption: personality is measured as a stable disposition, and the resulting profile is treated as a durable characterization.

This paradigm has produced significant scientific value. Trait stability is empirically well-supported, particularly for the Big Five and HEXACO dimensions, which show strong test-retest reliability and cross-cultural replicability (Lee & Ashton, 2004; Soto & John, 2017). The RSP does not challenge these findings. It builds on them.

However, trait stability is not the only variable that matters for applied contexts. Static personality models do not account for contextual adaptation—the way an individual's behavioral orientation shifts in response to environmental demands. They do not track phase-based growth, the structural transitions that characterize career inflection points, leadership evolution, and organizational change. They do not model organizational influence—the bidirectional pressure between individual orientation and systemic conditions. And they do not detect energetic redistribution, the reallocation of motivational resources that precedes visible behavioral change.

These limitations are not failures of trait science. They are boundary conditions. Trait models were designed to measure stable dispositions, and they do this well. But applied contexts—executive coaching, organizational diagnostics, leadership development, strategic planning—require a complementary instrument that measures what traits hold constant: the structural orientation through which dispositional tendencies are currently expressed.

> *Identity does not remain fixed. Architecture shifts. Systems change. Environments apply pressure. The RSP was designed to track orientation within motion, not identity in isolation.*

SECTION III

Structural Orientation: A Conceptual Framework

3.1 The Trait–Structure Distinction

The conceptual innovation of the RSP is the formal distinction between dispositional tendency and motivational configuration. A person may score high on Conscientiousness (trait) while currently operating in a phase of systemic restructuring (movement). A person may exhibit stable Extraversion while directing that energy inward during a period of reflective decomposition. The trait predicts behavioral consistency; the movement describes present directional orientation. Both are necessary for a complete structural read. Neither is sufficient alone.

This distinction has precedent in established psychological theory. Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997) differentiates between prevention and promotion orientations—motivational states that interact with, but are not reducible to, stable traits. Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000) distinguishes between basic psychological needs that remain stable and the degree to which contextual conditions satisfy or frustrate those needs. Goal Orientation Theory (Dweck & Leggett, 1988) describes learning versus performance orientations as dynamic states influenced by but not identical to personality. The RSP synthesizes these theoretical streams into a single evaluative framework.

3.2 Movements as Phase States

The term "movement" is deliberate. It replaces "type" (which implies permanence), "stage" (which implies linear progression), and "category" (which implies discrete membership). Movements are understood as motivational phases that an individual occupies with varying intensity across time, context, and life domain.

Every individual exhibits all four movements simultaneously. Dominance reflects relative projection strength—not the presence or absence of a capacity, but the preferential allocation of motivational energy toward a particular structural orientation. This is consistent with dimensional models of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and regulatory focus research (Higgins, 1997), both of which treat individual differences as matters of degree rather than categorical membership.

The four movements—Root, Rot, Reach, and Reform—are cyclical. They are not hierarchical. No phase is superior to another. What matters is alignment between internal orientation, role requirements, organizational stage, and environmental conditions. Misalignment produces friction. Alignment produces coherence.

SECTION IV

The Four Structural Phases

Each movement represents a distinct motivational vector derived from weighted combinations of validated personality dimensions. The following descriptions define each phase's core psychological process, behavioral expression, and organizational manifestation.

Phase	Core Process	Behavioral Expression	Organizational Strength
Root	Stabilization of identity and environment through structure maintenance and threat reduction	Preference for routine, anchoring in precedent, valuing loyalty and consistency	Policy, infrastructure, continuity, compliance, institutional memory
Rot	Recursive self-examination, meaning-construction, and internal elaboration of experience	Extended reflection before action, pattern-seeking, revisiting and reinterpreting past events	Risk identification, structural honesty, critique, quality assurance, truth-testing
Reach	Expansion of agency, influence, and environmental engagement through approach motivation	Initiative-taking, comfort with ambiguity, network expansion, gravitating toward growth	Growth initiatives, external relationships, market expansion, visibility, momentum
Reform	Systemic restructuring of environments and frameworks to align with internalized standards	Challenging existing systems, proposing alternatives, discomfort with inefficiency	Transformation initiatives, strategic recalibration, innovation, integration, redesign

Each phase expresses differently depending on environmental inputs, developmental history, and the interaction with stable personality architecture. Two individuals may both occupy Reach, yet one expands through relational diplomacy while another expands through aggressive acceleration. Two individuals in Rot may prune quietly through precision or publicly through confrontation. The phase identifies the structural direction; the archetype layer (Section V) captures the mode of expression.

4.1 Phase Interaction and Cycle Dynamics

The four phases form a continuous cycle. Root accumulates until the structure becomes brittle or overloaded. Rot decomposes what no longer serves. Reach extends into new territory with the energy released by decomposition. Reform integrates the gains of expansion into durable architecture. The cycle then returns to Root as the new architecture stabilizes.

Critically, this cycle does not proceed in lockstep. Individuals and organizations may occupy multiple phases simultaneously in different domains. A leader may be in Root operationally (consolidating systems) while in Reach strategically (expanding into new markets) and in Rot personally (shedding outdated assumptions). The RSP captures this multi-domain complexity rather than forcing a single classification.

SECTION V

The 40 Archetypal Expressions

Within the four primary phases, the RSP defines 40 archetypal expressions—10 per movement. Archetypes represent structural styles of movement within a phase. They are not identities. They are expressions of how movement occurs.

The archetype layer addresses a fundamental limitation of dimensional scoring: raw movement scores tell you *where* energy is directed, but not *how* it is expressed. Two individuals with identical Root dominance scores may operate through entirely different behavioral modalities. The archetype system resolves this by mapping each individual's HEXACO facet profile within their dominant movement, producing a more specific structural signature.

Each archetype is described through a multi-layer profile structure including: the Mirror (what the individual recognizes in themselves), the Cost (what the structural orientation demands), the Blind Spot (what the orientation obscures), and a developmental edge (the growth vector available from the current position). This structure ensures that archetype descriptions are neither flattering nor pathologizing, but structurally accurate.

> *The archetype layer introduces nuance without fixing identity. Archetypes are lenses, not labels.*

Archetype assignment is derived from HEXACO facet signatures within each movement composite. For example, within Root, the specific combination of Conscientiousness facets (Organization versus Diligence versus Perfectionism), Emotionality level (sentinel sensitivity), and Honesty-Humility orientation (sincerity versus modesty) produces distinct archetypal expressions of the stabilization impulse. The 10 archetypes within each movement represent empirically differentiable configurations of trait-within-phase expression.

The archetype system is the most experientially powerful and the least empirically validated component of the RSP at its current development stage. This is acknowledged by design. Archetype descriptions are marked as interpretive frameworks, not as measurement outputs, and their utility is evaluated through user engagement and qualitative feedback in parallel with quantitative validation of the underlying movement structure.

SECTION VI

Emergence and Entropy Dynamics

The RSP integrates a dual-force model that distinguishes healthy structural movement from structural distortion. Two forces operate simultaneously within every phase: emergence (the expansion of coherence through organized growth) and entropy (the degradation of structure through diffusion, overextension, or stagnation).

This distinction is critical for applied interpretation. A person in Reach may display high emergence—aligned expansion into domains well-suited to their capabilities and context—or high entropy—overextension across too many fronts, resulting in diluted effort and structural fragility. A person in Root may display emergence through deliberate stabilization or entropy through rigid stagnation. The movement phase tells you *where* energy flows. The emergence-entropy calibration tells you *whether that flow is structurally sound*.

Phase	Emergence Expression	Entropy Expression
Root	Deliberate consolidation, selective reinforcement of viable structures	Rigidity, refusal to release outdated structures, stagnation disguised as stability
Rot	Honest decomposition, purposeful shedding, clearing ground for new growth	Rumination, self-destructive critique, decomposition without reconstitution
Reach	Aligned expansion, strategic growth into well-matched domains	Overextension, scattered effort, growth without structural integrity
Reform	Principled restructuring, integration of new architecture with existing strengths	Compulsive reinvention, destruction of functional systems, change as avoidance

The emergence-entropy framework enables several applied functions that static personality profiles cannot support: development planning (identifying whether an individual's current phase is producing coherence or diffusion), intervention mapping (determining whether the appropriate response is support, redirection, or constraint), burnout detection (high entropy within any phase signals structural degradation that precedes visible breakdown), and growth readiness modeling (high emergence within the current phase indicates capacity for developmental movement toward the next phase).

SECTION VII

Construct Operationalization

Each movement is anchored to established psychological constructs—not as equivalences, but as convergent reference points that allow empirical testing. The following definitions establish what each movement measures, which validated constructs it should converge with, and which it should discriminate from.

7.1 Root

Operational definition. Root reflects an individual's dispositional tendency to prioritize environmental and identity stability, minimize unnecessary risk, and anchor decisions in established structures. Characterized by elevated prevention focus, heightened need for closure, and preference for incremental over discontinuous change.

Convergent constructs. Big Five Conscientiousness (order, dutifulness facets); HEXACO Emotionality (sentinel sensitivity); Regulatory Focus Theory prevention orientation (Higgins, 1997); Uncertainty Intolerance; Need for Cognitive Closure (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994).

Discriminant boundary. Should not correlate substantially with Openness to Experience, Sensation Seeking, or Promotion Focus.

7.2 Rot

Operational definition. Rot reflects a dispositional tendency toward deep recursive processing of experience, seeking meaning through internal elaboration rather than external action. Characterized by elevated need for cognition, heightened private self-consciousness, and reflective processing style.

Convergent constructs. Big Five Openness (Ideas, Aesthetics facets); Need for Cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982); Private Self-Consciousness (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975); Reflective Processing Style (Epstein, 1994).

Critical discriminant test. The Rot–Neuroticism boundary is the most consequential validity test. If Rot correlates above $r = .30$ with Neuroticism, this indicates clinical contamination requiring item revision before deployment.

7.3 Reach

Operational definition. Reach reflects a dispositional tendency to extend agency into new domains through approach-motivated behavior, prioritizing expansion over consolidation. Characterized by elevated promotion focus, high behavioral activation, and preference for opportunity capture over risk avoidance.

Convergent constructs. Big Five Extraversion (Assertiveness, Activity facets); Promotion Focus (Higgins, 1997); Behavioral Activation System (Carver & White, 1994); Self-Determination Theory competence and

autonomy needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000); Learning Goal Orientation (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

7.4 Reform

Operational definition. Reform reflects a dispositional tendency to evaluate existing systems against internalized standards and pursue structural change when discrepancies are identified. Characterized by elevated proactive personality, heightened fairness sensitivity, and preference for systemic improvement.

Convergent constructs. Big Five Openness (Values, Actions facets); HEXACO Honesty-Humility (Fairness facet); Proactive Personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993); Voice Behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998); Moral Foundation Theory fairness sensitivity (Graham et al., 2011).

7.5 Structural Question: Dimensionality

A critical open question: whether the four movements constitute independent dimensions or form bipolar pairs (Root↔Reform, Rot↔Reach). If bipolar, the RSP contains a two-factor model. This is not inherently a flaw—it may be the accurate latent structure—but it must be resolved empirically through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. This question takes priority over all other validation work.

SECTION VIII

Measurement Architecture

8.1 Dual-Track Design

The RSP employs a dual-track measurement architecture that separates the empirically grounded measurement layer from the interpretive projection layer, allowing each to be validated independently.

Track 1: HEXACO Trait Foundation. A 24-item short-form HEXACO personality inventory assessing six validated dimensions: Honesty–Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience (Ashton & Lee, 2007). Items are scored on a Likert-type scale and standardized before structural projection. HEXACO was selected over the Big Five for the additional explanatory power of Honesty–Humility, which maps directly onto the RSP's structural distinction between authenticity-oriented and impression-managed responding.

Track 2: Structural Movement Items. Thirty-six forced-choice items assessing phase-relevant behavioral tensions. Designed to sharpen interpretive mapping and capture motivational orientation that trait items alone may underdetermine. The forced-choice format controls acquiescence bias, reduces extreme response style artifacts, and forces differentiation that prevents flat profiles. These items refine structural interpretation; they do not override trait inference.

8.2 Forced-Choice Format: Assessment

Property	Evaluation
Acquiescence control	Eliminates agree/disagree axis, removing construct-irrelevant variance
Extreme response reduction	Prevents scale-endpoint clustering
Engagement	Comparative judgment reduces careless responding
Ipsativity constraint	Movement scores are mathematically interdependent; addressed via Thurstonian IRT (Section IX)
Information efficiency	36 binary items yield ~36 bits vs. ~83 bits from equivalent Likert items; offset by bias-reduction advantages
Desirability matching	Item pairs require social desirability calibration via pilot data

8.3 Item Design Standards

All items entering the final instrument satisfy the following: **construct purity** (each statement loads on exactly one movement), **behavioral anchoring** (behavioral-frequency language replaces trait-language to reduce abstraction bias), **balanced keying** (equal numbers of positively and negatively keyed items per movement), **domain sampling** (each movement assessed across work, relationships, and

self-development), and **cognitive interview verification** (minimum *n* = 15 confirming respondent interpretation matches intent).

8.4 Response Quality Controls

Control	Mechanism	Threshold
Consistency Index	Within-dimension response divergence monitoring	Flagged at 3+ point gap between same-dimension items
Speed Detection	Response latency tracking	Responses under 800ms flagged as potentially careless
Uniformity Check	Pattern detection across response set	All-identical responses flagged as disengaged

Quality flags are displayed alongside results. They are informational, not punitive—intended to support transparent interpretation rather than invalidate the profile.

SECTION IX

Scoring Model

9.1 Scoring Pipeline

The RSP scoring architecture comprises six sequential operations: (1) trait score computation from HEXACO items, (2) movement projection via weighted mapping matrix (M_W), (3) forced-choice integration via Thurstonian IRT, (4) relative dominance calculation, (5) confidence estimation based on score dispersion and standard error, and (6) narrative layer selection for interpretive output.

9.2 Movement Projection

HEXACO trait scores are projected through a weighted mapping matrix into four movement scores. Each movement corresponds to a characteristic HEXACO profile pattern, not a single trait dimension. Root correlates positively with Conscientiousness and Emotionality. Reach correlates with Extraversion and Openness. Rot correlates with Openness and reduced Conscientiousness. Reform correlates with Honesty–Humility, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Weight coefficients are theory-informed and subject to empirical refinement through factor-analytic calibration.

9.3 Thurstonian IRT

Binary forced-choice items produce ipsative scores where movement scores are mathematically interdependent. Thurstonian IRT (Brown & Maydeu-Olivares, 2011) resolves this by modeling a latent utility for each statement and estimating normative latent trait scores that are statistically independent. For each pair comparing movements *i* and *j*, the binary choice is modeled as $y = 1$ if $t_i - t_j > 0$, where each utility is a function of the person's latent score (θ) and item parameters.

Thurstonian IRT is not an optional enhancement. It is a structural requirement for any forced-choice instrument that intends to make normative claims about individual trait standing. Without it, the RSP can report only within-person relative standing but cannot validly compare individuals to a population reference.

9.4 Confidence Estimation

Each person's latent trait estimate has an associated standard error of measurement (SEM) that varies by trait level. The 95% confidence interval is computed as $\theta \pm 1.96 \times \text{SEM}(\theta)$, reported per person and per movement. If the difference between the dominant and second-highest movement is less than one standard error, the instrument reports "no clear dominant movement" rather than forcing a classification. No assessment should present uncertain results as certain.

SECTION X

Interpretation Framework

The RSP operates on three interpretive levels, each with distinct epistemic status.

Level	Content	Epistemic Status	Validation Requirement
Level 1: Trait Evidence	Dispositional tendencies from HEXACO backbone	High confidence; decades of cross-cultural validation	Bounded by short-form reliability
Level 2: Structural Movement	Motivational configuration from trait-weight mapping and forced-choice items	Moderate confidence; theoretical integration under empirical testing	Mapping matrix validation, CFA of movement structure
Level 3: Archetypal Interpretation	Narrative synthesis via 40 archetypes with Mirror, Cost, Blind Spot layers	Interpretive; experientially powerful, empirically preliminary	User engagement data, qualitative feedback, facet-signature validation

This layered architecture ensures epistemic transparency. Users and practitioners can distinguish between what the instrument measures with high confidence (trait dispositions), what it infers with moderate confidence (structural orientation), and what it offers as interpretive framework (archetypal narrative). Conflating these levels is the most common credibility failure in personality assessment.

SECTION XI

Validation Design

The RSP validation program follows a multi-phase structure establishing content validity, internal structure, convergent and discriminant validity, measurement stability, and fairness across demographic groups.

11.1 Phase Structure

Phase	Purpose	Minimum Sample	Warranted Claim
0: Content Validity	Expert review, cognitive interviews	5 experts + 20 interviewees	"Developed through systematic review"
I: Pilot	Item statistics, initial reliability, EFA	n = 300–500	"Derived from validated HEXACO constructs"
II: Confirmatory	CFA, convergent/discriminant validity	n = 500–800 (independent)	"Psychometrically calibrated"
III: Cross-Validation	Model stability, DIF, norming	n = 1,000+ (stratified)	"Cross-validated and normed"
IV: Longitudinal	Test-retest, predictive validity	n = 200+ (2–4 week retest)	"Validated"

Total unique participants across all phases: approximately 2,000–2,600.

11.2 Factor Analysis Protocol

Exploratory (Phase I). Polychoric correlation matrix. Extraction via Minimum Residuals or Weighted Least Squares. Oblimin rotation—orthogonality is not assumed. Factor number via parallel analysis and MAP test. Critical question: whether a 2-factor, 3-factor, or 4-factor solution best fits.

Confirmatory (Phase II). Four competing models tested: (1) four correlated factors, (2) two bipolar factors, (3) four factors with higher-order factor, (4) bifactor model. Estimator: WLSMV. Fit: CFI/TLI ≥ .95, RMSEA ≤ .06, SRMR ≤ .08. Model comparison via ΔCFI and Satorra-Bentler corrected chi-square difference tests.

11.3 Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Validation battery: BFI-2 (Soto & John, 2017), Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 2001), Need for Cognition Scale (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984), Need for Closure Scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), and Proactive Personality Scale (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Convergent targets: $r \geq .30$. No movement should exceed $r = .50$ with any external scale (redundancy threshold).

External Measure	Root	Rot	Reach	Reform
BFI-2 Conscientiousness	$r \geq .35$	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0
BFI-2 Openness	$r \leq -.15$	$r \geq .25$	≈ 0	$r \geq .30$
BFI-2 Extraversion	≈ 0	$r \leq -.20$	$r \geq .35$	≈ 0
RFQ Promotion Focus	$r \leq -.15$	≈ 0	$r \geq .35$	$r \geq .20$
RFQ Prevention Focus	$r \geq .35$	≈ 0	$r \leq -.20$	≈ 0
Need for Cognition	≈ 0	$r \geq .30$	≈ 0	$r \geq .20$
Need for Closure	$r \geq .30$	$r \leq -.20$	≈ 0	$r \leq -.25$
Proactive Personality	$r \leq -.15$	≈ 0	$r \geq .30$	$r \geq .35$

11.4 Differential Item Functioning

All items tested for DIF across gender, age cohorts (18–29, 30–44, 45–59, 60+), race/ethnicity (minimum n = 100 per group), and education level. Method: logistic regression DIF detection (Swaminathan & Rogers, 1990) or IRT-based DIF. Items flagged with $\Delta R^2 \geq .035$ are reviewed for revision or removal. DIF analysis is a legal and ethical prerequisite before any organizational deployment.

SECTION XII

Psychometric Standards and Targets

Quantitative targets are drawn from the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014) and contemporary personality assessment practice.

Metric	Target	Phase	Method
Internal consistency (ωh)	≥ .70 per movement	I	McDonald's omega-hierarchical
Factor structure (CFI/TLI)	≥ .95	II	CFA with WLSMV
RMSEA	≤ .06	II	CFA model fit
Convergent validity	r ≥ .30 with predicted constructs	II	MTMM or CFA-based MTMM
No redundancy	r < .50 with any external scale	II	Correlation analysis
Test-retest (ICC)	≥ .70 dev.; ≥ .80 classification	IV	ICC(2,1), 2–4 week interval
Classification consistency	≥ 80%	IV	Cohen's κ, simulation
DIF threshold	ΔR^2 < .035 retained items	III	Logistic regression / IRT DIF
Norming sample	n ≥ 1,000 stratified	III	Percentile rank computation

12.1 Reliability Requirements

Internal consistency. McDonald's omega (ω) is the primary estimate. Omega-hierarchical (ω_h) computed per movement to estimate variance attributable to the general movement factor versus specific item variance. Target: $\omega_h \geq .70$. Below .65 is unacceptable for individual interpretation. Cronbach's alpha reported by convention but recognized as a lower-bound estimate assuming tau-equivalence.

Test-retest. Subsample ($n \geq 200$) retested at 2–4 weeks. ICC(2,1) target: ≥ .70 developmental; ≥ .80 classification. For dominant movement classification: Cohen's $\kappa \geq .70$.

Classification reliability. Accuracy rate, expected accuracy from model simulation, and consistency index all reported. Target: ≥ 80% consistent. Below 70% indicates the system is unreliable for individual use.

SECTION XIII

Longitudinal Change Tracking

Unlike static assessments administered once and treated as permanent characterizations, the RSP is designed for recurring evaluation. This is not a commercial convenience. It is a methodological requirement of the structural orientation model.

If the RSP's central proposition is correct—that motivational configuration is dynamic while temperament is relatively stable—then the instrument must be capable of detecting meaningful change over time while distinguishing that change from measurement error. This is the fundamental challenge of longitudinal structural assessment, and the RSP addresses it through timestamped administration, within-person change scoring, and movement trajectory visualization.

13.1 Change Detection

Structural orientation changes as roles evolve, life phases shift, organizational pressure increases, strategic objectives pivot, and personal values reorient. Each RSP administration is timestamped. Movement scores are tracked over time. Structural drift—the gradual shift from one dominant movement toward another—becomes measurable. Growth is not conceptual; it becomes observable.

The critical psychometric requirement for longitudinal use is the distinction between true change and measurement noise. This requires: known test-retest reliability (Phase IV validation), reliable change index (RCI) computation to flag statistically significant shifts, and minimum retest intervals that respect both trait stability and practical utility. Recommended assessment cadence is quarterly for most applications; monthly for high-intensity coaching engagements.

13.2 Trajectory Modeling

Longitudinal data enables movement trajectory analysis: the identification of characteristic patterns in how individuals transition between phases. Preliminary theoretical predictions suggest that certain transitions are more common than others (Root $\rightarrow$ Rot, Reach $\rightarrow$ Reform) and that transition speed varies with environmental pressure and personality architecture. These predictions are empirically testable once sufficient longitudinal data is collected.

SECTION XIV

Organizational Roll-Up Modeling

At scale, the RSP aggregates structural data across teams, departments, and organizations. This roll-up capability transforms the instrument from an individual assessment into an organizational diagnostic system.

14.1 Macro-Level Metrics

Metric	Description	Application
Phase Distribution	Proportion of team/org in each movement	Identifies structural concentration or imbalance
Alignment Heat Mapping	Match between individual orientation and role requirements	Surfaces role-fit friction at organizational scale
Expansion Capacity	Ratio of Reach/Reform to Root/Rot across growth-facing teams	Forecasts organizational capacity for change initiatives
Risk Concentration	Clusters of entropy-flagged profiles within teams	Early warning system for burnout, disengagement, or structural failure
Transformation Readiness	Distribution of Reform and emergence scores pre-initiative	Predicts organizational receptivity to restructuring

14.2 Structural Signatures at Scale

Organizations develop characteristic structural signatures. An organization dominated by Reach may grow rapidly but lack structural stabilization—generating the expansion fragility that produces post-growth organizational crises. An organization dominated by Root may maintain strong continuity but resist innovation, producing the rigidity that precedes market displacement. High Rot concentration may indicate internal restructuring pressure that has not yet been surfaced strategically. High Reform concentration may signal a pending strategic pivot that leadership has not yet articulated.

These organizational patterns are not currently validated. They are theoretical predictions derived from the structural orientation model that will be tested as organizational deployment data accumulates. The roll-up modeling capability is presented as a design feature of the RSP platform, not as a validated analytic tool.

SECTION XV

Applications

15.1 Intended Use Contexts

The RSP is designed for executive advisory engagements, organizational diagnostics, strategic planning sessions, leadership development programs, team composition optimization, and personal alignment assessment. It is particularly suited for individuals and teams experiencing motivational stall, misalignment between capacity and output, phase transition after growth or disruption, or diffused effort across competing ambitions.

Pre-engagement profiling transforms facilitation into precision. The room is mapped before the first word is spoken.

15.2 Prohibited Applications

The RSP is explicitly not designed or validated for: clinical diagnosis or mental health assessment, personnel selection or hiring decisions, performance evaluation or termination decisions, forensic or legal proceedings, or educational placement. Use in any of these contexts would require separate validation studies targeting those specific applications, including criterion validity, adverse impact analysis, and compliance with EEOC guidelines and the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014).

15.3 Subscription Model

Because structural orientation changes over time, recurring measurement provides value that single-administration instruments cannot. The RSP platform enables users to view their current structural position alongside prior assessments, movement trajectory, phase transitions, and emergence-entropy variation. Recommended cadences: quarterly for organizational development; monthly for executive coaching engagements.

SECTION XVI

Credibility Safeguards and Ethical Constraints

16.1 Language Discipline

Replaced Term	Adopted Term	Rationale
"Diagnosis"	"Structural profile" or "structural read"	Avoids clinical authority the instrument has not earned
"You are [archetype]"	"Your responses are most consistent with..."	Preserves agency; reduces reification
Any permanence implication	"Reflects current self-reported tendencies"	Prevents identity-locking
Any comprehensiveness claim	"Measures specific behavioral dimensions"	Prevents scope inflation

16.2 Required Disclosures

The following accompany every administration: (1) The RSP is a self-reflection and development tool, not a clinical instrument or measure of mental health. (2) Results reflect self-reported tendencies at a single point in time. (3) Validation status is explicitly stated and updated as evidence accumulates—this is never omitted. (4) Movement categories are descriptive frameworks, not fixed personality types. (5) In organizational contexts: the tool is for development only, not validated for selection, promotion, or termination decisions.

16.3 Clinical Misinterpretation Safeguards

The movement name "Rot" carries elevated misinterpretation risk. In common English, "rot" connotes decay and deterioration. Non-expert users may interpret a dominant Rot result as pathological. This is monitored through respondent reaction data. The archetype system carries a separate risk: identity reification through evocative labels. All archetype descriptions are framed as interpretive lenses rather than identity assignments.

16.4 Ethical Framework

The RSP is not used to gatekeep opportunity, label individuals permanently, or rank or stratify worth. It is a structural read of current orientation. Orientation changes. Architecture evolves. No archetype is fixed. No phase is permanent. The instrument is designed for insight, not labeling.

SECTION XVII

Current Status and Development Roadmap

17.1 Present Status

The RSP is in Phase 0/I: prototype architecture with theory-informed scoring. The dual-track measurement design is implemented. Movement composites produce differentiable results. Confidence reporting is operational. Content validity work is in progress. Current warranted claim: "Derived from HEXACO personality science and established motivation research. Empirical validation is underway."

17.2 Development Roadmap

Phase	Activities	Status
Phase 0: Prototype	24 HEXACO + 36 structural items; rule-based composites; confidence bands; quality controls; full-depth archetype profiles	Complete
Phase I: Expansion	HEXACO-60 (10 items/dimension, 4 facets each); 200+ RADIX item bank; n = 500 calibration sample	Planned
Phase II: Calibration	Alpha/omega per dimension; EFA + CFA; IRT parameters; Thurstonian IRT implementation	Planned
Phase III: Validity	Convergent/discriminant validity; test-retest; criterion validity (burnout, satisfaction, career transitions); DIF	Planned
Phase IV: Adaptive	CAT with IRT-calibrated item bank; Thurstonian forced-choice scoring; dynamic archetype assignment	Future

17.3 Claim Escalation Protocol

Claims about the RSP are staged to validation evidence. This protocol prevents the instrument from making promises its data cannot support.

Milestone	Permitted Claim
Phase 0 complete	"Derived from HEXACO personality framework"
Phase I complete	"Built on validated HEXACO constructs"
Phase II complete	"Psychometrically calibrated"
Phase III complete	"Validated"
Phase IV complete	"Adaptive, precision-measured"

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. AERA.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(2), 150–166.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(2), 103–118.

Brown, A., & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (2011). Item response modeling of forced-choice questionnaires. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 71*(3), 460–502.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*(1), 116–131.

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 306–307.

Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 319–333.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual.* Psychological Assessment Resources.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*(2), 256–273.

Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist, 49*(8), 709–724.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*(4), 522–527.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 366–385.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*(12), 1280–1300.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(1), 3–23.

Jodoin, M. G., & Gierl, M. J. (2001). Evaluating type I error and power rates using an effect size measure with the logistic regression procedure for DIF detection. *Applied Measurement in Education, 14*(4), 329–349.

Kuhl, J. (1994). Action versus state orientation. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and personality* (pp. 47–59). Hogrefe.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*(2), 329–358.

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.

Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(1), 117–143.

Swaminathan, H., & Rogers, H. J. (1990). Detecting differential item functioning using logistic regression procedures. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 27*(4), 361–370.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(1), 108–119.

Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(6), 1049–1062.

The RADIX Structural Profile
Whitepaper | Version 1.0

Alexander Perrin
Null Ventures LLC

February 2026