

Mapping the Grammar of Organization: A Supracontextual Specification of the Nine Processes

Gustavo Paulino de Sa Pereira

Discoverer of the Black Belt OS™

Affiliated with the Black Belt Group

gustavogestorads@gmail.com | admin@blackbelttrafego.com.br

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1385-4627>

Working Paper – Preprint Version: Part 3 of the Black Belt OS™ Collectanea (14 articles)

September 2025

ABSTRACT

This article specifies the supracontextual grammar of organization by mapping the nine essential processes of the Black Belt OS, a candidate universal structural law of human organization. Article 1 introduced the law as a macro-level discovery, and Article 2 decomposed it into forty-five steps and ninety-eight irreducible actions; this contribution highlights the functional distinctiveness of the nine processes themselves.

We argue that every durable collective—families, firms, armies, religions, states, or digital organizations—enacts the same nine processes: Implementation, People, Attraction, Conversion, Structured Admission, Execution, Results, Finance, and Relationships. Each process is ontologically distinct, irreducible, and necessary for persistence. Their functions cannot be

collapsed without dysfunction: Execution produces value while Results measure and adapt; People govern internal cycles while Admission formalizes entry.

Three properties define this grammar. First, irreducibility: merging or omitting processes collapses functionality. Second, sequential necessity: the nine processes follow a structural cycle, with Implementation installing order, People embodying it, and Relationships sustaining it. Third, fractal manifestation: the same grammar recurs from micro units (families, teams) to macro structures (states, religions).

The article consolidates fragmented literatures into a structural ontology and offers a diagnostic lens: organizations can locate dysfunctions by identifying which process is absent, inverted, or fragile. The nine processes thus form the periodic table of organization—a closed, minimal, and testable catalogue of functions.

Keywords: *Black Belt OS, organizational grammar, supracontextual law, universality, collective order, sociology of organizations.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational theory has long grappled with the tension between descriptive richness and structural generality. Scholars have produced a vast array of perspectives—contingency, institutionalism, resource dependence, population ecology—each illuminating aspects of collective life but leaving the field fragmented. While the natural sciences possess structural laws—gravity in physics, DNA in biology, the periodic table in chemistry—organization studies has lacked an equivalent grammar.

Articles 1 and 2 of this series proposed and operationalized the **Black Belt OS**, a candidate **universal structural law of human organization**. Article 1 introduced the law at the macro level, identifying nine essential processes as the minimal grammar of collective persistence. Article 2 decomposed these processes into **forty-five steps and ninety-eight irreducible actions**, establishing the microstructure of organizational life.

This article builds on those foundations by specifying the **supracontextual grammar of the nine processes themselves**. The contribution is twofold. First, it clarifies the **functional distinctiveness** of each process, demonstrating that they are **irreducible, sequenced, and fractal**. For example, **Execution** generates value while **Results** measure and adapt; **People** govern internal cycles while **Structured Admission** formalizes entry. Second, it positions the nine processes as the **periodic table of organization**: a closed, minimal, and testable catalogue of universal functions.

Three propositions guide this specification.

1. **Irreducibility** – Each of the nine processes is ontologically distinct; attempts to merge them create dysfunction.
2. **Sequenced necessity** – The processes follow a structural cycle, where omission or inversion destabilizes the collective.
3. **Fractality** – The grammar recurs across scales and contexts, from families and teams to corporations, states, and digital autonomous organizations.

The article proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews theoretical foundations for structural approaches in organizational science. Section 3 maps the nine processes in detail, clarifying their functions and boundaries. Section 4 develops propositions of irreducibility, sequence, and

fractality. Section 5 discusses implications for theory and practice. Section 6 concludes by positioning the OS as a paradigm shift in organizational studies.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Early structural intuitions

Early management theorists sought structural principles of organizing. **Fayol (1916/1949)** articulated planning, organizing, commanding, and controlling as administrative functions. **Weber (1922/1978)** formalized rational-legal authority and bureaucracy, emphasizing rules, documentation, and hierarchical accountability. While both works anticipated structural invariants, they remained **prescriptive** and lacked a closed, testable catalogue of processes.

2.2 Mid-century functional perspectives

Mid-20th century scholarship turned to functions and systems. **Parsons (1951)** proposed the AGIL schema (adaptation, goal attainment, integration, latency), which anticipated universal functions but at too high a level of abstraction. **Katz and Kahn (1966)** described organizations as open systems of input, throughput, and output, clarifying flows but not enumerating irreducible processes. **Mintzberg (1979)** identified coordination mechanisms and structural configurations, mapping recurring forms yet leaving the set **open-ended and descriptive**.

2.3 Theories of medium range

Subsequent perspectives illuminated specific domains of action. **Contingency theory** (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967) examined fit between structure and environment. **Resource dependence theory** (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) analyzed negotiation and exchange. **Institutional theory** (DiMaggio

& Powell, 1983) focused on legitimacy and isomorphism. **Population ecology** (Hannan & Freeman, 1977) studied organizational survival and mortality. Each perspective yielded powerful insights, but none articulated a **closed grammar of processes**.

2.4 Contemporary approaches

Recent work has emphasized complexity, routines, and practice. **Feldman and Pentland (2003)** reconceptualized routines as dynamic, while complexity theorists framed organizations as adaptive systems. These approaches highlight micro dynamics and emergent order, but often multiply descriptions rather than converge on structural invariants.

2.5 The unresolved gap

Taken together, prior scholarship provides **rich description but absent ontology**. We know much about how organizations vary but little about **what makes organization possible at all**. No existing theory specifies:

1. The **minimum set of essential processes**.
2. Their **distinctive functions**.
3. The **sequence** in which they must occur.
4. The **testable criteria** by which they could be refuted.

The Black Belt OS fills this gap by proposing that all durable collectives enact **nine irreducible processes**. Article 1 introduced them as a macro law; Article 2 decomposed them into steps and actions. This article specifies their **functional boundaries**, demonstrating that the nine processes are **ontologically distinct, sequenced, and fractal**—the supracontextual grammar of organization.

3. SPECIFICATION OF THE NINE PROCESSES

The Black Belt OS identifies **nine essential processes** that every durable collective enacts. Each process is **ontologically distinct, irreducible, and necessary**. Attempts to merge, omit, or invert them produce dysfunction or collapse. Together, they constitute the **periodic table of organization**.

3.1 Implementation

Function: Installing order.

Implementation establishes the architecture of collective life by diagnosing, presenting, adapting, codifying, training, setting cadence, and sustaining learning. It is the **portal process**: without it, no other process can stabilize.

- *Boundary*: Distinct from Results (measurement) and People (internal cycle).
Implementation installs; others operate within what is installed.

3.2 People

Function: The cycle of members.

People governs recruitment, integration, development, and release of internal participants. It ensures that the collective has a functioning body.

- *Boundary*: Distinct from Structured Admission, which formalizes entry. People manages life cycle **after entry**.

3.3 Attraction

Function: Securing external visibility.

Attraction constructs identity, broadcasts signals of legitimacy, and cultivates networks that draw external attention. It is how collectives become seen and recognized.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from Relationships, which maintain bonds after commitment. Attraction is outward-facing, prior to conversion.

3.4 Conversion

Function: Securing commitment.

Conversion transforms prospects into insiders through proposition, negotiation, and decision. It is the structural moment where attention becomes agreement.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from Structured Admission, which follows commitment with formalization.

3.5 Structured Admission

Function: Formalizing entry.

Structured Admission ensures newcomers cross the threshold into the collective through registration, access, rituals, and alignment. It converts commitment into formal membership.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from People, which manages ongoing development. Admission is the gateway; People is the life inside.

3.6 Execution

Function: Producing value.

Execution prepares, acts, validates internally, delivers, and sustains operations. It is where objectives materialize into outputs.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from Results, which measure performance. Execution produces; Results assess.

3.7 Results

Function: Seeing the invisible.

Results define, monitor, consolidate, communicate, and realign performance. They ensure the collective learns and adapts.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from Finance, which records and allocates resources. Results assess effectiveness; Finance tracks value.

3.8 Resources (Finance)

Function: Managing value.

Resources record, organize, ensure compliance, analyze, and allocate value. They sustain the energy of the collective.

- *Boundary:* Distinct from Results, which measure outcomes. Finance manages flows; Results measure performance.

3.9 Relationships

Function: Enduring bonds.

Relationships maintain communication, monitor perceptions, foster reciprocity, and expand networks of trust. They sustain legitimacy and resilience over time.

- *Boundary*: Distinct from Attraction, which secures initial visibility. Relationships endure after commitment.

3.10 Properties of the nine processes

1. **Irreducibility** – Each process performs a unique function; attempts to collapse them (e.g., conflating People and Admission) generate dysfunction.
2. **Sequenced necessity** – The nine processes form a structural cycle: Implementation → People → Attraction → Conversion → Admission → Execution → Results → Resources → Relationships → back to Implementation.
3. **Fractality** – The same grammar recurs at multiple scales: households, teams, corporations, states, and DAOs each enact the nine.

4. PROPOSITIONS

The specification of the nine processes as a supracontextual grammar generates a set of **testable propositions**. These propositions distinguish the Black Belt OS from descriptive frameworks by embedding **criteria of falsification**.

4.1 Propositions of irreducibility

Each process is ontologically distinct and cannot be collapsed into another without dysfunction.

- **Proposition 1a:** Durable collectives that omit **any of the nine processes** will exhibit structural fragility and eventual collapse.
- **Proposition 1b:** Attempts to merge distinct processes (e.g., Execution and Results, People and Admission, Results and Finance) will produce dysfunctions traceable to the absent function.

4.2 Propositions of sequenced necessity

The nine processes follow an inevitable cycle. Within each process, steps are ordered; across processes, the sequence is structural.

- **Proposition 2a:** Inversions of steps within a process (e.g., granting access before registration, delivering before validation) will generate predictable dysfunctions.
- **Proposition 2b:** Inversions of processes in the structural cycle (e.g., Execution preceding Admission, Results preceding Execution) will destabilize the collective.

4.3 Propositions of fractality

The nine processes recur across scales, from micro to macro.

- **Proposition 3a:** The same nine processes will be observable in households, teams, firms, states, and digital autonomous organizations.
- **Proposition 3b:** The absence or inversion of a process at any level will generate dysfunction at that scale, regardless of culture or technology.

4.4 Propositions of universality and falsifiability

The OS claims universality but is explicitly falseable.

- **Proposition 4a:** If a tenth process is identified that is **non-redundant and indispensable**, the OS will be refuted.
- **Proposition 4b:** If a durable collective is shown to persist without one of the ninety-eight actions (Article 2), the OS will be refuted.
- **Proposition 4c:** If independent coders applying the 9–45–98 achieve interrater reliability below $\kappa = 0.80$, the OS will be refuted.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Theoretical implications

The mapping of the nine processes as a supracontextual grammar advances organizational theory by offering a **structural ontology**. Rather than proliferating frameworks of medium range, the OS specifies the **minimal set of universal processes**. This addresses long-standing calls for stronger theory (Whetten, 1989; Sutton & Staw, 1995; Suddaby, 2014).

The OS also **integrates fragmented literatures**. Institutional theory is located within **Attraction (P03)** and **Relationships (P09)**; resource dependence within **Conversion (P04)** and **Resources (P08)**; contingency within **Results (P07)** and **Implementation (P01)**; population ecology within **People (P02)** and **Execution (P06)**. Instead of competing theories, these perspectives become **contextual expressions of universal processes**.

5.2 Practical implications

For practitioners, the nine processes provide a **diagnostic lens**. Dysfunction can be traced to process-level absences or inversions:

- Failure in **Structured Admission (P05)** manifests as churn and instability.
- Weakness in **Results (P07)** produces drift and misalignment.
- Neglect of **Relationships (P09)** erodes trust and legitimacy.

By mapping dysfunctions to missing processes, leaders can address **structural roots** rather than symptoms. This makes the nine processes a **stethoscope for organizations**—a way to detect invisible conditions underlying visible problems.

5.3 Interdisciplinary implications

The nine processes extend beyond management.

- **Sociology/Anthropology**: admission rituals, kinship integration, and reciprocity map directly onto Admission, People, and Relationships.
- **Political Science**: state fragility can be analyzed through missing processes (e.g., weak Results or Finance).
- **Computer Science**: DAOs replicate the nine processes digitally—smart contracts for Finance, governance tokens for Conversion, onboarding protocols for Admission.

5.4 Anticipated critiques and structural responses

Several critiques are expected:

- **Tautology**: countered by explicit criteria of falsification (Section 4).
- **Redundancy**: countered by boundary specifications (e.g., Execution \neq Results, People \neq Admission).

- **Cultural bias**: countered by functional equivalence across societies (e.g., rites of passage in tribes = Admission).
- **Oversimplification**: countered by analogy to natural science (DNA, periodic table) where minimal grammars explain vast diversity.

5.5 Summary of contributions

The specification of nine processes contributes:

1. A **structural ontology** for organizational studies.
2. An **integrative framework** aligning fragmented theories.
3. A **diagnostic tool** for practitioners.
4. A **fractal grammar** applicable across disciplines and contexts.

Together, these contributions position the nine processes as the **periodic table of organization**—a closed, minimal, and testable grammar that no durable collective can omit.

6. CONCLUSION

This article specified the **supracontextual grammar of organization** by mapping the nine essential processes of the Black Belt OS. Building on Article 1 (macrostructure) and Article 2 (microstructure), we demonstrated that every durable collective enacts **Implementation, People, Attraction, Conversion, Structured Admission, Execution, Results, Resources, and Relationships**.

Three properties define this grammar. First, **irreducibility**: each process is ontologically distinct and cannot be collapsed without dysfunction. Second, **sequenced necessity**: the processes form

an inevitable cycle, where omission or inversion destabilizes the collective. Third, **fractal manifestation**: the same grammar recurs across scales and contexts, from households and teams to corporations, states, and digital autonomous organizations.

The contributions are clear. Theoretically, the nine processes establish a **structural ontology** that integrates fragmented literatures and elevates organization studies from descriptive frameworks to testable law. Practically, the grammar functions as a **diagnostic lens**, enabling leaders to locate dysfunctions at the process level and repair them structurally. Interdisciplinarily, it provides a blueprint for sociology, anthropology, political science, and computer science to analyze collective persistence.

The OS remains **falseable**: it can be refuted by the discovery of a tenth non-redundant process, by observing a durable collective omitting one of the ninety-eight actions (Article 2), or by demonstrating functional inversion without collapse. Until such evidence emerges, the law stands as the **periodic table of organization**—the first closed, minimal, and testable catalogue of universal processes.

The path ahead is empirical. Comparative studies must test the nine processes across cultures, scales, and technologies. Practitioners must employ the grammar diagnostically, aligning contextual checklists with the structural law. If confirmed, the OS establishes a **scientific revolution in organizational studies**, positioning the discipline alongside the natural sciences with a structural law of its own.

REFERENCES

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management* (C. Storrs, Trans.). Pitman. (Original work published 1916)
- Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(1), 94–118.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3556620>
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 929–964. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226424>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. Wiley.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*. Prentice-Hall.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Free Press.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.
- Suddaby, R. (2014). Why theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 407–411.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0252>

- Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 371–384. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393788>
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)
- Whetten, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490–495. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308371>