Cint

[Matthew Temple](#)

Overview

Cint (rhymes with "mint") is a measurement of a type of cultural intelligence. I thought of this in 2010.

It is a rough/quick text on cint.

It is a calculation based on a test, an observation, or some other quantification of qualities of people or other objects.

The designer of the test, the chooser of the qualities, need not know anything about anything..not about the nature of what is being tested, not about the culture of those being tested. The test can be designed programmatically, randomly, even meaninglessly. All that matters about the test is that it be able to be applied to the people or objects in question such that it produces/measures Boolean values for each quality associated with a person.

The test, if an interview or questionnaire, can present alternatives (alternate sentences, alternative images, etc.) and ask a question (which is scarier? which is cooler? which do you like best?). Cint is a calculation based on answers to questions like these..or any set of Boolean values. Its values can be observed

aspects that translate into Boolean values, without doing an interview.

Cint is a measure of cultural intelligence with respect to an abstractly named, dynamically constructed group.

Even though the designer of the test doesn't know what the test means to its takers (with respect to scariness, or coolness, or whatever other type of cultural knowledge ends up being measured), the test is still a measure of something real..even though it's something the test maker has not necessarily (in fact, most likely hasn't) defined.

What is measured here isn't what the test-maker was looking for. It isn't something with a descriptive name; and yet, the quantity measured is a relevant one—that of a certain type of cultural intelligence.

Calculation

P is the set of people.

Q is the set of qualities.

P_n is a particular person.

Q_n is a particular quality.

$P_n[Q_m]$ is the value of the quality Q_m for person P_n. For a given person and quality, $P_n[Q_m]$ always has a value of either *true* or *false*.

R is a group of qualities. $R \subseteq Q$.

R_S is a description. It's a set of quality values. For a group of qualities $R = \{Q_0, Q_1, Q_2, Q_7\}$ (or $R = Q_{\{0,1,2,7\}}$), R_S might be $\{0 : true, 1 : true, 2 : false, 7 : true\}$. Or R_S might be $\{0 : false, 1 : true, 2 : false, 7 : false\}$, etc. It's any of the possible sets of quality values that correspond to the qualities in R.

R_{S_T} is a set of people. It's the set of people for whom the description R_S holds true..the set of people who are described by the quality values in R_S.

$cint_n$ is the cint of person P_n. It starts at zero.

Then,

$$\forall R, |R| > 0; \ \forall R_S; \ \forall R_{S_T}, \left|R_{S_T}\right| > 1; \ \forall P_n \in R_{S_T}; \ cint_n \mathrel{+}= |R| \char`\^ \sqrt[\scriptstyle R_{S_T}]{2}.$$

Alternatively this can be scaled $cint_n \mathrel{+}= \left(2^{|R|-1}\right)^{\wedge} \overline{\left\lceil R_{S_T}\right\rceil^{\frac{2}{}}}$.

Details

Quality type

The qualities don't have to be Boolean. You can apply cint to the answers to most existing interview-style evaluations, very easily to multiple-choice ones.

Computational cost

Obviously this is very computationally intensive. When measuring cint, you don't need and may not be able to afford to have a large number of qualities that are measured about the people or objects involved.

Can't be calculated in a vacuum

Cint can't be calculated in a vacuum. There's no such thing as a cint measurement outside the context of a group of people. It's a relative measurement, a measure of a certain type of *cultural* intelligence. A person's cint is not independent to the cints of other people; one person's cint cannot be calculated independently.

This is unlike an IQ (with recognition that IQ is scaled, this is still unlike how IQ is calculated inasmuch as a single person can take an IQ test and their score be calculated in a relative vacuum)..it is also unlike Myers-Briggs, SAT, or most other tests.

Your cint is calculated in a group, relative to the others in the group. It is impossible to calculate the cint of one person, independent of others. Specifically, you have to have at least 2 people to calculate a cint at all; and it is with 3 people that cint calculations may start to become meaningful.

Hacking cint

There are odd configurations of knowledge-held—configurations of who knows what and how that knowledge overlaps and does not overlap among people—that ideally optimize the cint calculation for each person in the group. With an even number of people, the cint

measurement could be hacked by test-takers who were in collusion with each other—by splitting into pairs and each member of a pair producing the same measured output, which output was engineered to vary highly from pair to pair. It's hard to imagine this occurring naturally. Perhaps figuring out why and when this might happen naturally can help in understanding more precisely why cint measures what it does.

Excursions (todo)

Alternate algorithm

[For every group of people,
measure how alike they answered,
using the measure of alikeness and the size (smallness) of the group, produce a measure that applies to everyone in that group,
then produce composite measures for each person, overall]

Other measurements

[show/name groups of relevance to particular people, that could be useful in doing a kind of personality-group naming, beyond a singular measurement of cint]

Underlying reasoning

[[partly] because answering randomly, and answering with the herd, share a handicap in that the chances of having then answered vastly differently from everyone else is very small
those are the two tendencies we measure down, with this metric]
[and the embodiment nature..of oneness and therefore twoness..in [people]]