

RADIX

Structural Profile

A Dynamic Model of Human Orientation
and Organizational Alignment

Alexander J Perrin
Null Ventures LLC

Version 2.0 | January 2026
Whitepaper | Public Methodology Document

Contents

- I. Abstract
- II. The Limitation of Static Personality Models
- III. The Cyclical Nature of Consciousness: Convergent Evidence
- IV. Structural Orientation: A Conceptual Framework
- V. The Four Structural Phases
- VI. The 40 Archetypal Expressions
- VII. Emergence and Entropy Dynamics
- VIII. Construct Operationalization
- IX. Measurement Architecture
- X. Scoring Model
- XI. Interpretation Framework
- XII. Validation Design
- XIII. Psychometric Standards and Targets
- XIV. Longitudinal Change Tracking
- XV. Organizational Roll-Up Modeling
- XVI. Applications
- XVII. Credibility Safeguards and Ethical Constraints
- XVIII. Current Status and Development Roadmap
- XIX. References

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.

The theoretical foundation of the RSP is not speculative. The cyclical phase model—stabilization, decomposition, expansion, restructuring—converges with multiple independent research traditions spanning systems ecology (Holling, 1986), developmental psychology (Piaget, 1952; Kegan, 1982), personality development theory (Dąbrowski, 1964), consciousness and complexity research (Csikszentmihalyi, 1993), and organizational change theory (Lewin, 1947). Each of these traditions independently identifies a recurring pattern in how complex adaptive systems—including human consciousness—accumulate structure, encounter the limits of that structure, decompose what no longer serves coherence, expand into new configurations, and integrate gains into durable architecture. The RSP operationalizes this convergent observation into a measurable instrument.

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

This document presents the theoretical foundation, convergent scientific evidence, 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.

The scientific basis for this distinction is well-established. Multiple research traditions, working independently across different domains, have converged on the same fundamental observation: that complex adaptive systems—including human consciousness—move through recurring phases of consolidation, decomposition, expansion, and restructuring. Section III examines this convergence in detail.

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

The Cyclical Nature of Consciousness: Convergent Evidence

The RSP’s central proposition—that motivational orientation cycles through phases of stabilization, decomposition, expansion, and restructuring—did not emerge in isolation. It converges with a substantial body of independent research across systems ecology, developmental psychology, personality development theory, consciousness studies, and organizational science. This section examines six major traditions that have independently identified the same cyclical dynamic the RSP operationalizes.

The significance of this convergence cannot be overstated. When independent research programs, working with different methods in different domains over different decades, arrive at structurally equivalent conclusions, the resulting theoretical claim carries a different epistemic weight than any single program’s findings. The RSP does not propose a novel theory of consciousness. It proposes a novel measurement of a well-observed phenomenon.

3.1 Holling’s Adaptive Cycle and Panarchy Theory

The most structurally precise analog to the RSP’s four-phase model comes from C.S. Holling’s work in systems ecology. Holling (1986) proposed the adaptive cycle, a four-phase model describing how complex adaptive systems evolve over time. The four phases—exploitation (r), conservation (K), release (Ω), and reorganization (α)—describe a recurring pattern observed across ecosystems, economies, and social-ecological systems (Gunderson & Holling, 2002).

Adaptive Cycle Phase	RSP Movement	Shared Structural Process
Exploitation (r)	Reach	Rapid growth, expansion into new domains, colonization of available opportunity space, approach-motivated behavior
Conservation (K)	Root	Accumulation and storage of structure, increasing connectedness, stability maintenance, consolidation of gains
Release (Ω)	Rot	Decomposition of rigid or overloaded structure, creative destruction, shedding of what no longer serves systemic coherence
Reorganization (α)	Reform	Restructuring of system architecture, innovation, integration of new configurations with existing strengths

The adaptive cycle alternates between two major transitions: the foreloop (exploitation to conservation), a slow phase of growth and accumulation, and the backloop (release to reorganization), a rapid phase of creative destruction and renewal (Gunderson & Holling, 2002). This temporal asymmetry—slow accumulation followed by rapid transformation—is consistent with

clinical observations of how individuals experience structural transitions: long periods of stabilization punctuated by comparatively compressed periods of decomposition and restructuring.

Critically, researchers have argued that adaptive cycles are ubiquitous in complex adaptive systems because they reflect endogenously generated dynamics resulting from self-organization and evolution (Allen et al., 2014). If this claim holds—and evidence from ecology, economics, and social systems supports it—then the phase dynamics the RSP measures are not idiosyncratic features of individual psychology. They are fundamental properties of any complex system capable of self-organization, including human consciousness.

Holling’s panarchy framework adds a further dimension that the RSP already captures: nested cycles operating at different scales simultaneously. An organization may be in conservation (Root) at the operational level while in exploitation (Reach) at the strategic level. An individual may be consolidating (Root) professionally while decomposing (Rot) personally. The RSP’s multi-domain complexity—its refusal to force a single classification—is a direct instantiation of panarchy’s cross-scale dynamics.

3.2 Dąbrowski’s Theory of Positive Disintegration

Kazimierz Dąbrowski (1902–1980), a Polish psychologist and psychiatrist who survived imprisonment by both Nazi and Stalinist regimes, developed the Theory of Positive Disintegration (TPD)—a framework that directly challenges the assumption that psychological tension, anxiety, and internal conflict are inherently pathological (Dąbrowski, 1964, 1967, 1972).

Dąbrowski’s central claim is that personality growth requires the breakdown of existing psychological structures. He observed that the individuals who demonstrated the highest levels of personality development—those who had constructed autonomous, self-directed value systems—had invariably passed through periods of intense psychological discomfort: anxiety, inner conflict, dissatisfaction with their existing self-organization. He termed these periods positive disintegrations—“positive” because they enabled the construction of more coherent, more autonomous psychological architecture at a higher level of organization.

The TPD describes five levels of personality development, from primary integration (undifferentiated, socially conditioned) through progressive stages of disintegration to secondary integration (autonomous, value-driven). The transition mechanism is structurally equivalent to the RSP’s phase cycle:

Primary Integration (Level I) corresponds to a stable but undifferentiated Root state—functional structure that has not yet been subjected to critical examination.

Unilevel Disintegration (Level II) corresponds to the entry into Rot—the initial loosening of existing structures, experienced as ambivalence, fluctuation, and the loss of prior certainties.

Spontaneous Multilevel Disintegration (Level III) deepens the Rot phase—the individual begins to differentiate between “what is” and “what ought to be,” generating the vertical tension that drives restructuring.

Organized Multilevel Disintegration (Level IV) marks the transition through Reach and into Reform—the conscious, directed reconstruction of personality according to self-authored values.

Secondary Integration (Level V) represents the completion of a full cycle—a new Root state at a higher level of organization, characterized by harmony between values, behavior, and self-concept.

Two features of Dąbrowski’s work are particularly relevant to the RSP. First, he insisted that disintegration is not pathology—that the anxiety and inner conflict accompanying structural transitions are signs of developmental potential, not illness. This maps directly to the RSP’s treatment of Rot as a legitimate and necessary structural phase rather than a deficit state. Second, Dąbrowski recognized multi-domain concurrency: individuals can occupy different developmental levels in different life domains simultaneously (Dąbrowski, Kawczak, & Piechowski, 1970). The RSP’s dimensional scoring—which allows simultaneous expression of all four movements—operationalizes this observation.

3.3 Piaget’s Equilibration

Jean Piaget’s model of cognitive development describes a continuous cycle of schema construction and disruption that operates throughout the lifespan (Piaget, 1952, 1977). Cognitive growth proceeds through *equilibration*—the dynamic balancing of two complementary processes: *assimilation* (incorporating new information into existing cognitive structures) and *accommodation* (modifying existing structures to incorporate information that resists assimilation).

The equilibration cycle maps onto the RSP’s phase model with precision. Equilibrium (Root): existing schemas adequately organize experience; structure is stable and functional. Disequilibrium (Rot): new information or experience creates cognitive conflict that existing schemas cannot resolve; the individual experiences discomfort as current structures prove insufficient. Accommodation and exploration (Reach): the individual extends into new conceptual territory, developing modified or novel schemas to address the insufficiency. New equilibrium (Reform/Root): the modified schemas integrate into a more complex and nuanced understanding, establishing a new stable configuration that will itself eventually encounter its own limits.

Piaget emphasized that this cycle is not a one-time developmental sequence—it is a continuously recurring process that drives cognitive growth at every level, from infant sensorimotor exploration to adult abstract reasoning. Each completed cycle produces a more differentiated and integrated cognitive architecture than the previous one. The RSP’s longitudinal change tracking (Section XIV) is designed to detect exactly these recurring transitions at the level of motivational orientation.

3.4 Kegan’s Constructive-Developmental Theory

Robert Kegan (1982, 1994) extended Piaget’s constructivist framework into adult development, describing how individuals construct increasingly complex meaning-making systems over the lifespan. Kegan’s theory centers on the *subject-object shift*: the process by which elements of experience that were once invisible to the individual (subject—embedded in, identified with, unable to reflect upon) become visible and examinable (object—can be observed, questioned, acted upon).

Kegan describes five developmental orders, each representing a qualitatively different way of constructing meaning. The transition between orders follows a consistent pattern: a period of stable meaning-making (Root) encounters demands that exceed its capacity; the individual experiences destabilization as their existing framework proves insufficient (Rot); new capacities emerge through engagement with the inadequacy (Reach); and the individual integrates these capacities into a more complex meaning-making system (Reform) that becomes the new stable ground.

Kegan’s research demonstrates that these transitions are not automatic—they require what he terms a “holding environment” that simultaneously supports the individual and challenges their current meaning-making (Kegan, 1982). This is consistent with the RSP’s emergence-entropy framework (Section VII): the same transition can produce either emergence (growth toward greater coherence) or entropy (fragmentation toward structural degradation), depending on environmental support and individual capacity.

Empirical research using Kegan’s Subject-Object Interview supports his prediction that at any given age, adults occupy different developmental levels, and that individuals at later stages demonstrate greater capacity to manage complexity in work and life (Berger & Fitzgerald, 2002; Eigel & Kuhnert, 2016). Estimates suggest that only 20–30% of adults reach the self-authoring (fourth) order (Brennan, 2017; Erikson, 2006), and that progression is a function of experience and challenge, not simply time. The RSP’s applied function—identifying an individual’s current structural position and the developmental edge available from that position—is designed to serve the same practical need that Kegan’s work identified: supporting intentional developmental movement.

3.5 Csikszentmihalyi’s Complexity Through Differentiation and Integration

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s work on optimal experience and the evolution of consciousness (1990, 1993) provides a complementary framework for understanding the forces that drive cyclical development. Csikszentmihalyi proposed that the growth of consciousness follows a dialectic between *differentiation* (becoming more uniquely individual, developing distinct skills and perspectives) and *integration* (connecting differentiated elements into a coherent, harmonious whole).

Csikszentmihalyi framed this dialectic against the constant backdrop of *entropy*—the tendency of psychological systems, like all complex systems, to decay toward disorder. The development of complex consciousness takes place against this entropic pressure. What Csikszentmihalyi described as the interplay between complexity (differentiation + integration) and entropy maps directly onto the RSP’s emergence-entropy dynamic (Section VII). Emergence represents the differentiation-integration dialectic operating productively; entropy represents its failure.

The connection to the RSP’s phase model is structural. Reach is the primary engine of differentiation—expanding agency, developing new capacities, engaging novel domains. Root is the primary engine of integration—consolidating gains, establishing coherence, maintaining the organizational structure that holds differentiated elements together. Rot addresses what Csikszentmihalyi identified as the necessary precondition for renewed complexity: the decomposition of structures that have become rigid or maladaptive. Reform completes the cycle by restructuring the relationship between differentiated elements and integrated architecture.

3.6 Additional Convergent Traditions

The cyclical pattern identified above appears in additional research traditions that further strengthen the RSP’s theoretical grounding:

Kurt Lewin’s Change Model (1947). Lewin’s unfreeze–change–refreeze model of organizational and individual change describes a three-phase process structurally equivalent to the RSP’s Rot–Reach/Reform–Root sequence. “Unfreezing” dissolves existing structures; “changing” introduces new patterns; “refreezing” stabilizes the new configuration. Lewin’s model has been widely validated in organizational development research and remains foundational to change management practice.

Post-Traumatic Growth Research (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996, 2004). The post-traumatic growth literature documents how individuals who experience significant disruption to their core assumptions—their “assumptive world”—can develop enhanced personal strength, new possibilities, improved relationships, greater appreciation for life, and spiritual deepening. The mechanism is a forced passage through the RSP’s cycle: existing Root structure is shattered; forced Rot processes decompose prior assumptions; Reach into new meaning-making follows; and Reform integrates the experience into more resilient architecture. Tedeschi and Calhoun explicitly describe post-traumatic growth as the reconstruction of shattered schemas—a process that produces more complex, more adaptive cognitive and motivational structures than those that preceded the disruption.

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). SDT’s distinction between basic psychological needs (which remain stable) and the degree to which contextual conditions satisfy or frustrate those needs provides a micro-level mechanism for the RSP’s phase dynamics. When autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs are met, individuals consolidate (Root) and expand (Reach). When these needs are frustrated, individuals enter reflective decomposition (Rot) or systemic restructuring (Reform) as motivational energy redirects toward resolving the frustration.

Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997). Higgins’s distinction between promotion orientation (approach-motivated, growth-seeking) and prevention orientation (avoidance-motivated, security-seeking) maps directly onto the Reach–Root axis. Critically, Higgins demonstrated that these orientations interact with but are not reducible to stable personality traits—they shift in response to contextual demands, exactly as the RSP’s movement model predicts.

3.7 What This Convergence Means for the RSP

The convergence documented in this section establishes a critical distinction about the RSP’s validation requirements. The claim that consciousness moves through cyclical phases of stabilization, decomposition, expansion, and restructuring does not require novel empirical evidence from the RSP’s own validation program. This claim is already supported by decades of independent research across multiple disciplines.

What the RSP’s validation program must establish is more specific and more tractable: that the RSP’s particular measurement architecture—its dual-track HEXACO/forced-choice design, its weighted mapping matrix, its Thurstonian IRT scoring, and its archetypal interpretation layer—can reliably and validly detect an individual’s position within this well-documented cycle. The theoretical question (“Do these phases exist?”) is answered by the convergent literature. The psychometric question (“Can the RSP measure them?”) is the focus of the validation design described in Section XII.

This distinction matters for how the RSP should be evaluated. It is not a speculative theory in search of evidence. It is a measurement instrument targeting a phenomenon whose existence is well-supported. The appropriate evaluative frame is precision of measurement, not plausibility of the underlying model.

SECTION IV

Structural Orientation: A Conceptual Framework

4.1 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 extensive precedent in the convergent traditions documented in Section III. Piaget distinguished between cognitive structures (relatively stable) and the equilibration process (dynamic). Kegan distinguished between the content of meaning-making (what is known) and the form of meaning-making (how it is known). Csikszentmihalyi distinguished between differentiated capacities (accumulated) and the integration of those capacities (ongoing). Dąbrowski distinguished between developmental potential (innate) and the level of personality development (dynamic). In every case, the researchers found it necessary to separate the stable substrate from the dynamic orientation—precisely the separation the RSP formalizes as the trait–structure distinction.

4.2 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), regulatory focus research (Higgins, 1997), and panarchy theory’s observation that complex systems operate across multiple phases simultaneously at different scales (Holling, 2001). All 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 V

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, organizational manifestation, and convergent research grounding.

Phase	Core Process	Behavioral Expression	Organizational Strength	Convergent Tradition
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	<i>Holling K-phase; Piaget equilibrium; Lewin refreeze; Higgins prevention focus</i>
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	<i>Holling Ω-phase; Dąbrowski disintegration; Piaget disequilibrium; Lewin unfreeze</i>
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	<i>Holling r-phase; Csikszentmihalyi differentiation; Higgins promotion focus; SDT competence/autonomy</i>
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	<i>Holling α-phase; Kegan subject-object shift; Csikszentmihalyi integration; Tedeschi PTG</i>

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 VI) captures the mode of expression.

5.1 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.

This cycle mirrors Holling's adaptive cycle with its alternation between the slow foreloop (Reach → Root: growth and accumulation) and the rapid backloop (Rot → Reform: creative destruction and renewal). It mirrors Piaget's equilibration cycle with its alternation between stable schemas and their disruption. It mirrors Dąbrowski's developmental sequence from primary integration through disintegration to secondary integration. The RSP's contribution is not the identification of this cycle—that work has been done—but its operationalization into a measurable, trackable, and organizationally deployable instrument.

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 VI

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 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 VII

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 dual-force model has deep convergent grounding. Csikszentmihalyi (1993) framed consciousness development as a dialectic between complexity (emergence) and entropy, arguing that growth occurs only when the organism successfully channels energy toward greater differentiation and integration rather than allowing it to dissipate. Holling’s adaptive cycle describes both productive transitions (e.g., healthy release enabling renewal) and pathological traps: the “rigidity trap” (excessive conservation preventing necessary release) and the “poverty trap” (insufficient accumulation preventing growth). Dąbrowski distinguished positive disintegration (emergence—disintegration that produces higher-level integration) from negative disintegration (entropy—disintegration that produces fragmentation without reconstitution).

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 VIII

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.

8.1 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); Holling K-phase conservation dynamics.

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

8.2 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); Dąbrowski's positive disintegration dynamics.

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.

8.3 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); Csikszentmihalyi's differentiation dynamics.

8.4 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); Kegan's subject-object transformation dynamics.

8.5 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 IX

Measurement Architecture

9.1 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.

9.2 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).

SECTION X

Scoring Model

10.1 Scoring Pipeline

The RSP scoring architecture comprises six sequential operations: (1) trait score computation from HEXACO items, (2) movement projection via weighted mapping matrix (MW), (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.

10.2 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.

10.3 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. Thurstonian IRT is a structural requirement for any forced-choice instrument that intends to make normative claims about individual trait standing.

10.4 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 XI

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; convergent 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 XII

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. As established in Section III, the validation target is measurement precision, not theoretical plausibility—the underlying cyclical model is already well-supported by convergent evidence across multiple disciplines.

12.1 Phase Structure

Phase	Purpose	Min. Sample	Warranted Claim
0: Content	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: Confirm.	CFA, convergent/discriminant validity	n = 500–800 (independent)	"Psychometrically calibrated"
III: Cross-Val.	Model stability, DIF, norming	n = 1,000+ (stratified)	"Cross-validated and normed"
IV: Longit.	Test-retest, predictive validity	n = 200+ (2–4 week retest)	"Validated"

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

12.2 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).

12.3 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 XIII

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 (wh)	≥ .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	$\Delta R^2 < .035$ retained items	III	Logistic regression / IRT DIF
Norming sample	n ≥ 1,000 stratified	III	Percentile rank computation

SECTION XIV

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—and a direct consequence of the convergent evidence documented in Section III.

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. Piaget's equilibration research demonstrates that the same cycle of schema construction and disruption recurs throughout the lifespan. Kegan's research shows that developmental transitions can be observed and measured across adult life. Holling's adaptive cycle has been empirically tracked in ecological and social systems. The RSP extends this capacity to the domain of individual motivational orientation.

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. Recommended assessment cadence is quarterly for most applications; monthly for high-intensity coaching engagements.

SECTION XV

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.

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

These organizational patterns are theoretical predictions derived from the structural orientation model—and from Holling’s observation that complex systems develop characteristic structural signatures at scale. They 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 XVI

Applications

16.1 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.

16.2 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).

SECTION XVII

Credibility Safeguards and Ethical Constraints

17.1 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

17.2 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.

17.3 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. The convergent evidence from Dąbrowski’s Theory of Positive Disintegration (Section III) provides the strongest rebuttal: decomposition is not pathology; it is a necessary precondition for structural renewal. This framing is reinforced in all Rot-related interpretive output. The archetype system carries a separate risk: identity reification through evocative labels. All archetype descriptions are framed as interpretive lenses rather than identity assignments.

17.4 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 XVIII

Current Status and Development Roadmap

18.1 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, established motivation research, and convergent cyclical development theory spanning systems ecology, developmental psychology, and consciousness research. Empirical validation is underway.”

18.2 Development Roadmap

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

References

Allen, C. R., Angeler, D. G., Garmestani, A. S., Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (2014). Panarchy: Theory and application. *Ecosystems*, 17(4), 578–589.

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.

Berger, J. G., & Fitzgerald, C. (2002). Leadership and complexity of mind: The role of executive coaching. In C. Fitzgerald & J. G. Berger (Eds.), *Executive coaching: Practices and perspectives* (pp. 27–57). Davies-Black.

Brennan, M. A. (2017). Measuring leadership development in emerging adults. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

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.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). *The evolving self: A psychology for the third millennium*. HarperCollins.

Dąbrowski, K. (1964). *Positive disintegration*. Little, Brown.

Dąbrowski, K. (1967). *Personality-shaping through positive disintegration*. Little, Brown.

Dąbrowski, K. (1972). *Psychoneurosis is not an illness*. Gryf.

Dąbrowski, K., Kawczak, A., & Piechowski, M. M. (1970). *Mental growth through positive disintegration*. Gryf.

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.

Eigel, K. M., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2016). *The map: Your path to effectiveness in leadership, life, and legacy*. Hogan Press.

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

Eriksen, K. (2006). The constructive developmental framework of Robert Kegan. *The Family Journal*, 14(3), 290–298.

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.

Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (Eds.). (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press.

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.

Holling, C. S. (1986). Resilience of ecosystems; local surprise and global change. In W. C. Clark & R. E. Munn (Eds.), *Sustainable development of the biosphere* (pp. 292–317). Cambridge University Press.

Holling, C. S. (2001). Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems. *Ecosystems*, 4(5), 390–405.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Harvard University Press.

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

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.

Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures*. Viking.

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.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 9(3), 455–471.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(1), 1–18.

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 2.0

Alexander Perrin

Null Ventures LLC

January 2026

© 2026 Null Ventures LLC. All rights reserved. This document is a living methodology reference. Content is updated as validation progresses. All claims reflect the instrument's empirical status as of the publication date. No claim exceeds the evidence that warrants it.