Unified Metric Framework for App Integration

# Overall Quality Metrics

## Conceptual Compression

• Question: How much conceptual work is done per unit of language?

• High: High: “The will is the form of anticipation.”

• Low: Low: “In this chapter, I will explain the ways in which…”

## Epistemic Friction

• Question: Are claims under tension? Do they resist paraphrase?

• High: High: Complicated tradeoffs, ambiguities, or disjunctions are explored.

• Low: Low: Everything proceeds linearly and smoothly.

## Inference Control

• Question: Does the author show tight command over logical or quasi-logical progression?

• High: High: Strong inferential chaining, disambiguation of premises.

• Low: Low: Juxtapositions mistaken for arguments.

## Asymmetry of Cognitive Labor

• Question: Is the writer doing more work than the reader?

• High: High: The author scaffolds difficult ideas, discharges burdens.

• Low: Low: Jargon is dropped without explication; the reader must untangle.

## Novelty-to-Baseline Ratio

• Question: How much of the content exceeds textbook-level summary?

• High: High: New distinctions, perspectives, or critiques.

• Low: Low: Restating Wikipedia-level history or doctrine.

## Internal Differentiation

• Question: Are internal contrasts and tensions developed within the work?

• High: High: Competing theses are nested, refined, or resolved.

• Low: Low: One position stated, with no internal pressure.

## Problem Density

• Question: Are real problems identified, or is the text solution-shaped without a problem?

• High: High: Clear tension, paradox, conflict, or conceptual puzzle.

• Low: Low: Everything is a “survey” or summary.

## Compression Across Levels

• Question: Are sentence, paragraph, and structural layers all doing work?

• High: High: Each scale supports the others — structure follows thought.

• Low: Low: Structure is imposed mechanically (e.g. “This dissertation has 5 parts…”

## Semantic Specificity

• Question: Are key terms defined with internal rigor and used consistently?

• High: High: Key terms don’t drift and are operationalized.

• Low: Low: Terms like “transcendental,” “mental content,” etc., are thrown in without cost.

## Explanatory Yield

• Question: Does the text resolve or clarify phenomena that were obscure before?

• High: High: Theoretical payoffs are evident and usable.

• Low: Low: Descriptive or procedural rhetoric without payoff.

## Meta-Cognitive Signal

• Question: Does the author display awareness of the limits, affordances, or tensions of their own method?

• High: High: E.g., “This formulation may beg the question unless...”

• Low: Low: Claims are stated as if exempt from critique.

## Structural Integrity

• Question: Is the argument or content architecture coherent at scale?

• High: High: Early sections scaffold later insights; structure reflects logic.

• Low: Low: Arbitrary sequence; no cumulative logic.

## Generative Potential

• Question: Does the writing suggest future questions, applications, or generalizations?

• High: High: Opens doors conceptually.

• Low: Low: Closes loops or reiterates fixed boundaries.

## Signal-to-Rhetoric Ratio

• Question: What percent of the text actually says something, as opposed to procedural or rhetorical fluff?

• High: High: High signal. Each sentence matters.

• Low: Low: Meta-commentary about structure, scope, method dominates.

## Dialectical Engagement

• Question: Does the work engage objections or alternative views intelligently?

• High: High: Anticipates critique and responds.

• Low: Low: Straw men or echo chamber.

## Topological Awareness

• Question: Does the author map the conceptual terrain well (what’s upstream/downstream of what)?

• High: High: Awareness of where their view sits within larger structures.

• Low: Low: Flat sequence of points.

## Disambiguation Skill

• Question: Are ambiguous terms or ideas resolved precisely?

• High: High: Aware of multiple senses; avoids equivocation.

• Low: Low: Uses language loosely, with slippage.

## Cross-Disciplinary Fluency

• Question: Can the text move fluently across relevant domains (e.g., logic and language; history and theory)?

• High: High: Seamless integration of multiple disciplines.

• Low: Low: Bounded inside a single paradigm with no outreach.

## Psychological Realism

• Question: Are motivations, mental models, or interpretive frames psychologically plausible?

• High: High: Explains behavior or beliefs with realism and nuance.

• Low: Low: Treats philosophical positions as abstract islands.

## Intellectual Risk Quotient

• Question: Is the author actually putting a real intellectual position on the line?

• High: High: Willing to stake a claim that could fail or offend.

• Low: Low: Excessive caution, hedging, or hiding behind citations.

# Originality Metrics

## Transformational Synthesis

• Question: Does the author transform inherited ideas into something new?

• High: High: Combines known concepts in a way that reconfigures the field.

• Low: Low: Repetition of inherited materials without transformation.

## Generative Power

• Question: Does the work open new lines of inquiry or generate conceptual descendants?

• High: High: Sparks derivative questions, frameworks, or debates.

• Low: Low: Closes conceptual space.

## Disciplinary Repositioning

• Question: Does the text challenge or redraw the field’s internal boundaries?

• High: High: Pushes or redefines where the discipline starts/stops.

• Low: Low: Sits squarely within the pre-existing frame.

## Conceptual Reframing

• Question: Are familiar problems recast in novel terms or perspectives?

• High: High: Recasting a debate to bypass stale dichotomies.

• Low: Low: Accepts the standard frame and plays within it.

## Analytic Re-Alignment

• Question: Does the author redirect attention from false problems to better ones?

• High: High: Identifies conceptual errors in framing and corrects them.

• Low: Low: Takes conventional problems at face value.

## Unexpected Cross-Pollination

• Question: Does the author import tools or concepts from distant domains?

• High: High: Uses ideas from math to rethink ethics.

• Low: Low: Keeps to home-discipline conceptual stock.

## Epistemic Reweighting

• Question: Are marginal ideas made central (or vice versa) by principled arguments?

• High: High: Elevates neglected concepts through rational pressure.

• Low: Low: Follows disciplinary fashion.

## Constraint Innovation

• Question: Are new constraints introduced that improve the quality of reasoning?

• High: High: Raises stakes by adding generative limits.

• Low: Low: Works under same inherited conditions.

## Ontology Re-specification

• Question: Is the underlying structure of the entities or kinds reconsidered?

• High: High: Recasts the ontology (e.g. from substance to relation).

• Low: Low: Retains flat categories.

## Heuristic Leap

• Question: Is an intuitive or lateral move introduced that reframes the field?

• High: High: Insightful shortcut that bypasses stale terrain.

• Low: Low: Only linear, incremental development.

## Problem Re-Indexing

• Question: Are known problems recoded into more productive forms?

• High: High: Shifts what counts as the ‘same’ problem.

• Low: Low: Treats problem space as fixed.

## Axiomatic Innovation

• Question: Does the work posit a new fundamental assumption or shift?

• High: High: Introduces a new base axiom or principle.

• Low: Low: Builds entirely on existing foundations.

## Moral or Political Recomputation

• Question: Are prevailing moral/political frames creatively re-evaluated?

• High: High: Shifts what counts as progress or legitimacy.

• Low: Low: Accepts inherited ideological defaults.

## Subtext Excavation

• Question: Does the work uncover previously hidden conceptual background?

• High: High: Makes the tacit explicit in a productive way.

• Low: Low: Operates only with overt content.

## Second-Order Innovation

• Question: Is the method itself subject to creative evolution?

• High: High: Novel methodology or rethinking of practice.

• Low: Low: Assumes inherited methods uncritically.

## Temporal Inversion

• Question: Does the author treat past positions as futures not fully realized?

• High: High: Uses historical material as future seed.

• Low: Low: Treats history as inert background.

## Negative Space Manipulation

• Question: Does the author point to gaps or absences as fruitful?

• High: High: Productively frames the unsaid or unseen.

• Low: Low: Fills only what’s visible.

## Unnatural Pairing

• Question: Does the author combine concepts that are rarely or never combined?

• High: High: Rethinks epistemology using game theory.

• Low: Low: Concepts remain siloed.

## Disciplinary Hijack

• Question: Is another field's frame adopted wholesale for a new context?

• High: High: Uses engineering logic to rethink metaphysics.

• Low: Low: Standard field-bound discourse.

## Onto-Epistemic Fusion

• Question: Does the work entangle ontology and epistemology in productive ways?

• High: High: Knowledge structure and being-structure co-defined.

• Low: Low: Kept in separate silos.

# Cogency Metrics

## Argumentative Continuity

• Question: Is each claim supported by those before it?

• High: High: Smooth inferential buildup.

• Low: Low: Jump-cuts between ideas.

## Error-Resistance

• Question: Can the argument absorb counterpoints without collapse?

• High: High: Multiple lines of support or modular robustness.

• Low: Low: Collapses when one premise is challenged.

## Specificity of Commitment

• Question: Are claims stated precisely and clearly?

• High: High: Exact positions and definitions.

• Low: Low: Vagueness or hedging.

## Provisionality Control

• Question: Does the author know when to hedge and when to commit?

• High: High: Balanced modulation between certainty and openness.

• Low: Low: Blanket certainty or endless disclaimer.

## Load Distribution

• Question: Are inferential loads distributed efficiently?

• High: High: No premise bears too much unexplained weight.

• Low: Low: One hidden assumption props up the whole.

## Error Anticipation

• Question: Are potential objections built into the argument?

• High: High: Preempts or fortifies against known critiques.

• Low: Low: Blind to plausible challenges.

## Epistemic Parsimony

• Question: Does the argument avoid unnecessary complexity?

• High: High: Simplicity without loss.

• Low: Low: Bloated reasoning.

## Scope Clarity

• Question: Is the domain of applicability clear?

• High: High: Knows its boundaries.

• Low: Low: Overreach.

## Evidence Calibration

• Question: Are claims weighted relative to their support?

• High: High: Modulates confidence to evidence strength.

• Low: Low: Overclaims.

## Redundancy Avoidance

• Question: Are points repeated without need?

• High: High: No duplication.

• Low: Low: Filler or rhetorical looping.

## Conceptual Interlock

• Question: Do definitions and theses cohere together?

• High: High: Network of meaning is internally consistent.

• Low: Low: Fraying or contradictory concepts.

## Temporal Stability

• Question: Does the argument hold over time or over revisions?

• High: High: Durable logic.

• Low: Low: Sensitive to small tweaks.

## Distinction Awareness

• Question: Are relevant distinctions tracked and preserved?

• High: High: Makes and respects useful cuts.

• Low: Low: Collapses categories.

## Layered Persuasiveness

• Question: Does the argument work for multiple levels of reader?

• High: High: Intuitive and formal appeals present.

• Low: Low: Only works at one level.

## Signal Discipline

• Question: Is the signal-to-rhetoric ratio high?

• High: High: Content-rich claims dominate.

• Low: Low: Filler prose.

## Causal Alignment

• Question: Do causal claims line up with evidence and theory?

• High: High: Mechanistic or probabilistic fit is clear.

• Low: Low: Post hoc reasoning.

## Counterexample Immunity

• Question: Is the argument resilient to typical counterexamples?

• High: High: Survives standard tests.

• Low: Low: Easily broken.

## Intelligibility of Objection

• Question: Would a smart opponent know what to attack?

• High: High: Clear, bold claims.

• Low: Low: Foggy or elusive.

## Dependence Hierarchy Awareness

• Question: Are structural dependencies tracked?

• High: High: Author knows which claims are load-bearing.

• Low: Low: Flat argument map.

## Context-Bounded Inference

• Question: Are inferences valid only under clear assumptions?

• High: High: Arguments specify conditions of validity.

• Low: Low: Hidden contextual slippage.

# Intelligence Metrics

## Compression Capacity

• Question: Can complex ideas be expressed in compact form without loss?

• High: High: Dense formulations yield insight with minimal words.

• Low: Low: Rambling, bloated expression reveals conceptual weakness.

## Multi-Level Integration

• Question: Can the author operate across multiple levels (abstract/concrete, meta/object)?

• High: High: Seamless transitions between layers of analysis.

• Low: Low: Stuck on one plane.

## Dynamic Constraint Handling

• Question: Does the thinker maintain coherence under complex constraints?

• High: High: Manages tradeoffs without collapsing precision.

• Low: Low: Ignores or oversimplifies conflicting demands.

## Inference Architecture

• Question: Are ideas constructed with deep, layered inferential scaffolding?

• High: High: Multi-step reasoning with structural memory.

• Low: Low: Shallow or linear logic.

## Epistemic Risk Management

• Question: Does the thinker show awareness of the riskiness of their claims?

• High: High: Risky claims managed with discipline.

• Low: Low: Reckless or excessively cautious.

## Cognitive Friction Tolerance

• Question: Can the thinker endure unresolved tensions?

• High: High: Holds dissonance productively.

• Low: Low: Rushes to resolution or avoids it.

## Strategic Ambiguity Deployment

• Question: Can ambiguity be used intentionally and effectively?

• High: High: Selective ambiguity to provoke thought.

• Low: Low: Unintentional or incoherent.

## Representational Versatility

• Question: Can the thinker switch formats as needed?

• High: High: Moves between diagrams, prose, math, analogy.

• Low: Low: Rigidly sticks to one mode.

## Recursive Self-Monitoring

• Question: Does the thinker reflect on their own moves?

• High: High: Meta-awareness present.

• Low: Low: Blind to own method.

## Conceptual Novelty with Coherence

• Question: Are new ideas viable and structured?

• High: High: Original and operationalizable.

• Low: Low: Performative or incoherent.

## Noise Suppression

• Question: Can the thinker focus on signal?

• High: High: Ignores distractions.

• Low: Low: Chases tangents.

## Abductive Strength

• Question: Are best-explanation arguments creatively but plausibly formed?

• High: High: Surprising but cogent hypotheses.

• Low: Low: Appealing but unsupported.

## Causal Finesse

• Question: Are causal relations modeled with nuance?

• High: High: Layered causal logic.

• Low: Low: Simple linear cause-effect.

## Boundary Perception

• Question: Are the limits of scope/method recognized?

• High: High: Aware of constraints.

• Low: Low: Overreach or blind spots.

## Temporal Layering

• Question: Can change over time be tracked structurally?

• High: High: Coherent historical/evolutionary logic.

• Low: Low: Timeless or inert.

## Intellectual Empathy

• Question: Are opposing views reconstructed fairly?

• High: High: Strong steelmanning.

• Low: Low: Straw men.

## Conceptual Mobility

• Question: Can the thinker shift between domains?

• High: High: Fluid conceptual transitions.

• Low: Low: Stuck in one paradigm.

## Error Assimilation

• Question: Can mistakes be integrated into thinking?

• High: High: Errors are processed productively.

• Low: Low: Hidden or denied.

## Pattern Extraction

• Question: Can deep structure be detected across variation?

• High: High: Generalizes across difference.

• Low: Low: Stays at surface.

## Semantic Topology Awareness

• Question: Are dependencies between ideas tracked?

• High: High: Conceptual terrain is mapped.

• Low: Low: Flat or meandering flow.