SoC Test Sample Data Analysis Report

MaraVoss

2025-12-26

Data Source

https://awakenology.org/SoC-AssessPoints-Test-Sample-Data/

Before you proceed

All score values in this report are presented on a 0–100 scale. Value_raw refers to the originally reported item values, while Value_adj represents adjusted scores after accounting for inverse scoring in Areas 1, 5, and 6.

For Area 4, two items—(1) Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations and (2) Degree of Exceeding Innate Boundaries—have comprehensive scores that can exceed 100 in their original form. To ensure comparability across items and areas, these scores were rescaled to a 0–100 range based on the observed maximum within the sample.

Summary in tables and plots

Table 1: Summary of SOC levels by area

Rank	Area	Developmental_Focus	Raw_Mean	Aligned_Mean	Std_Dev
1	4	Thought Expansion	82.52	82.52	6.08
2	5	Old Inertia (Inverse)	18.54	81.46	8.42
3	9	Module Exchange	81.06	81.06	8.74
4	7	Spiritual Exchange	77.91	80.05	9.77
5	8	Spiritual Structure	79.98	79.98	9.16
6	3	Spiritual Connection	79.95	79.95	7.89
7	2	Autonomous Consciousness	79.63	79.63	9.04
8	6	Structural Rigidity (Inverse)	28.95	78.29	11.36
9	1	Identity Stability (Inverse)	24.16	75.84	11.76

This table summarizes the average SOC level for each area across all subjects, ranked from highest to lowest based on the aligned mean score.

The table reports both Raw Mean and Aligned Mean. Raw Mean is the original average score. Aligned Mean adjusts the direction of some areas so that higher values always represent higher

SOC. Areas labeled "Inverse" are those where higher raw scores originally reflected the opposite direction, so they were reversed to make all areas comparable on the same scale.

The top-ranked area is Area 5 (Old Inertia, Inverse), with the highest aligned mean (81.46) and the largest number of assessment points. This suggests consistently high scores in this area after alignment.

The bottom-ranked area is Area 1 (Identity Stability, Inverse), which has the lowest aligned mean (75.84). It also shows the largest standard deviation (11.76), indicating the greatest variability in scores across subjects compared to other areas.

Assess Points Distribution (Area 1–9)

There is a total of 265 assess points are distributed across areas. The distribution is uneven: Area 5 (Old Inertia, Inverse), Area 6 (Structural Rigidity, Inverse), and Area 9 (Module Exchange) together account for about 56% of all assess points.

Area–SoC Alignment

All areas are highly correlated with SOC indicating that individuals with higher scores in a given area also tend to have higher SoC, and vice versa. Areas 1, 5, and 6 are negatively correlated simply because they're measured in the reverse direction, not because they behave differently.

Per–person Area Profiles by SOC

This line graph does not show trends over time. Instead, it shows the level of adjusted scores across areas for each person, allowing comparison of how scores are distributed within and across individuals.

For example, Subject 1, who has the highest SOC level, also shows the highest scores overall. Their strongest area is Area 1, while their lower values appear around Areas 9. Even so, their scores remain within a relatively narrow range (roughly 90–100), indicating a fairly balanced profile across areas.

In contrast, Subject 11 shows a noticeably lower score in Area 1, even lower than Subject 4, whose SOC level is 6.4. This is notable because Subject 11's average SOC is higher (8.6), showing that area-level scores do not always scale directly with overall SOC.

Except for Subject 1, across nearly all available data points, Areas 6-9 tend to fall on the lower end of scores for most subjects, suggesting these areas consistently show relatively lower values within individual profiles.

Per–person Area Rank Profiles

Similarly, this heatmap shows the relative score ranking of each area within each person. For Subjects 12–15, complete data were only available for Areas 1–5, which is why Areas 6–9 are blank for those individuals.

Despite this, a consistent pattern is still visible: most subjects have their highest-ranked scores in Area 5, while Areas 6–9 generally fall toward the lower end of the rankings when data are available. In addition, Areas 3 and 4 also tend to rank relatively high across individuals.

Table 2: Within-person area contrast (max–min gap)

person_soc	max_area	min_area	gap
1 (11.5)	1	9	4.77
11 (8.6)	5	1	19.62
12 (5)	4	1	14.39
13 (8)	5	1	7.32
14 (7.9)	4	2	4.58
15 (8.2)	5	3	2.40
2 (8.8)	5	6	5.08
3 (7.8)	4	7	10.36
4 (6.4)	4	6	10.42

This table shows each subject's highest- and lowest-scoring areas and the gap between them. Subjects 11 and 12 stand out with noticeably larger gaps. This naturally leads to the next question: which specific assess points drive these extremes, and are there any shared patterns across individuals?

Table 3: Top Item per Individual

Person	Area_num	Item	Value_adj	Value_raw
1	1	5. Degree of Rigid Thinking vs. Degree of Free Thinking	100.00	0.00
2	5	3.2 Guilt and Self-blame Patterns	92.00	8.00
3	4	1. Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations	100.00	100.00
4	4	1. Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations	100.00	100.00
11	5	1.1 Influence of Traditional Concepts	92.00	8.00
12	4	1. Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations	96.15	96.15
13	5	1.2 Influence of Social Opinion	88.00	12.00
14	4	1. Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations	92.31	92.31
15	5	1.1 Influence of Traditional Concepts	92.00	8.00

Table 4: Bottom Item per Individual

Person	Area_num	Item	Value_adj	Value_raw
1	9	3. Degree of faulting in module areas	92	92
2	6	- 1.3. Ignored parts	70	30
3	7	5th Chakra (below the navel)	28	28
4	6	1. Image Capture Section	40	60
11	1	6. Degree of Labor Recognition vs. Degree of Enjoyment Recognition	52	48
12	1	1. Degree of Automation vs. Degree of Autonomy (Freewill)	35	65
13	1	8. Degree of Sexual Concept Binding vs. Degree of Sexual Concept Freedom	55	45
14	2	1. Core Energy Utilization Rate	70	70
15	3	1. Family Security	75	75

At the item level, there isn't much overlap in the exact assessment points driving the highest areas — different people tend to peak on different items, similarly for the lower end. One exception is Area 4, where "1. Potential to Exceed Innate Limitations" shows up repeatedly as the top item.

Hierarchical Clustering of Areas

Area

Height $= 1 - $ |correlation|, means how much difference you have to tolerate before treating two areas as the same group. A small height means the two areas behave very similarly. Overall, hierarchical clustering based on area–area correlations shows a clear separation of Area 1 from the remaining areas. While Areas 2–9 cluster tightly together, indicating highly similar patterns across individuals, Area 1 follows a distinct correlation structure.

Thoughts

Now, given all these patterns in the data, are you curious about your own SOC level — and what might be holding you back from reaching SOC $= 14$ for an escape?

Disclaimer

This report is for exploratory and interest purposes only. The interpretations and statistical summaries may not fully reflect the true characteristics of the underlying sample. Please apply discernment. Happy reading!