Observer–Observed: Collective Consciousness, Emotional Correspondence, Self-Acceptance, and Group Dynamics

Originating conceptual proposal and experimental research framework: Illa Isenor

Prepared for: Dr. David M. Boje and collaborating researchers

Date: November 8, 2026

Status: Proposed research program; hypotheses and experimental designs, not established findings or an approved human-subjects protocol

1. My purpose and underlying principle

I want to investigate our connection to one another through a series of experiments that begin with the individual and extend to group dynamics and, eventually, larger populations. I am calling this an investigation of observer–observed relationships, collective consciousness, group frequency dynamics, bidirectional emotional feedback, and self-acceptance. These are my conceptual terms and proposed mechanisms, not claims that a physical emotional frequency or transmission mechanism has already been demonstrated.

The principle I want to explore is “love your neighbor within yourself as yourself.” My question is whether the way I respond to my own internal feelings—anger, hurt, insecurity, sadness, joy, or painful memories—can change how I experience another person and, potentially, how that person or an entire group experiences the encounter.

I do not want to reduce this to identifying whether somebody is angry or happy. I want to test what happens inside the observer: what memories arise, what thoughts come to mind, what feelings emerge, what experiences are recalled, and whether those internal responses correspond with what another individual or group is actually experiencing. Then I want to test the next step: when the observer finds acceptance and peace with those feelings within themselves, does anything measurable change for the other people?

I want multiple versions of the experiments, with different assignments, group compositions, observer knowledge, silent and interactive settings, music, and repeated measurements. I want the results to tell us what happens, including if no measurable effect is found. My larger objective is to determine whether any reproducible individual or group effect can be scaled.

Illustrated study guide

The following diagrams are part of my proposal, not results. I have included Mermaid diagrams that render in compatible Markdown viewers (including many GitHub-style

editors), along with written examples so the protocol remains understandable even when diagrams are not rendered.

Figure 1 — My overall experimental research program

```
Flowchart TD
    A[My central principle: Love your neighbor within yourself as yourself] →
B[Observe my own feelings, thoughts, memories and sensations]
```

B → C[Recognition studies: Does my internal experience correspond with another person's or group's actual state?]

B → D[Transformation studies: Can accepting and resolving my own feelings change an encounter?]

C → E[Music and environment studies: What changes with sound, memory and room conditions?]

D → F[Group scaling: Does 1, 5, 10, 15 or 20 practitioners change group outcomes?]

E → G[Independent measurement, controls and replication]

F → G

2. Roles and definitions

Emotional-state participants

These participants may be randomly assigned an emotion or selected based on confidential screening surveys. When I ask someone to feel anger, I do not mean simply sitting in a chair and pretending to look angry. I mean that the person privately recalls something that genuinely made them angry, hurt, disappointed, or resentful, and attends to that memory and the emotion it brings up. For joy, they might remember the birth of a child, a beautiful experience, a celebration, or a moment of love. Other conditions might involve sadness, insecurity, discomfort, calmness, or neutral memories.

They should not announce their assigned emotion, exaggerate their expressions, or intentionally act out a role. Researchers must measure what they actually felt; an assigned emotion does not guarantee they experienced it. Some variations involve normal conversation; others are completely silent, with participants facing away from the observers.

Neutral observers

I use neutral to describe the observer's experimental role and their intention to attend to their own internal experience without judging or trying to fix another person. It does not mean they must feel emotionally blank. They might feel angry, sad, unsettled, affectionate, calm, or surprised by a memory. Their job in recognition studies is to notice and report their

own thoughts, feelings, memories, associations, and bodily sensations. Only after recording those experiences should they offer a guess about another person's or group's emotion.

Self-acceptance practitioners

In transformation studies, neutral observers are given a second instruction: when an emotion or memory comes up inside them, they are to acknowledge it, reflect on their own experience, and practice accepting themselves and finding internal resolve. If they are told that someone nearby is recalling anger, they may deliberately recall a time when they themselves were angry or hurt and practice compassion and acceptance toward that experience. They do not tell the other person to change, offer therapy, or announce that they are trying to influence the room.

Researchers and independent reports

Researchers assign conditions, monitor safety, record actual emotional states, and collect private reports. The observer's account, the emotional-state participant's account, and the assigned condition are separate records. Ideally, the person collecting or scoring a report does not know the experimental condition until responses are locked.

3. My overarching research questions

- Can an uninformed observer's spontaneous feelings, thoughts, and autobiographical memories correspond with another person's privately experienced emotion?
- Can observers report corresponding internal experiences when a whole silent group is instructed to recall the same emotion?
- Do several independent neutral observers report similar experiences in the same condition?
- Can deliberate internal self-acceptance change how an emotional-state participant experiences an observer, even when the participant does not know which person is the practitioner?
- Can one practitioner change a group's reported mood or comfort, and does introducing five, ten, fifteen, or twenty practitioners produce a different result?
- Can the direction be reversed: does introducing people privately recalling anger into a joyful group change the joyful group's reported emotional condition?
- How do music, sound, autobiographical memories, and previous room conditions change the results?
- If an effect is found, can it be replicated, distinguished from ordinary interpersonal cues, and evaluated at larger scales?

4. Participant screening and group selection

I want researchers to use initial questionnaires when a study requires a particular group profile. Participants may be asked about shyness, insecurity, confidence, current sadness, depressive symptoms, social comfort, hopefulness, and recent emotional experiences. These are not interchangeable traits: a person's general tendency toward insecurity or depression is different from their current emotional state.

Some studies will use groups selected for relatively high self-reported insecurity, distress, or social anxiety. Others will use mixed groups or randomly assigned emotional recall, including joy and calmness. Participants should never be labeled as inherently negative or as people who need to be fixed. Screening information is confidential; participation is voluntary; significant distress requires appropriate safeguards and support.

I want separate records for (a) baseline traits, (b) the emotion assigned for a particular round, (c) the emotion actually experienced during the round, and (d) the observer's internal response.

Figure 2 — Different people, different privately recalled emotions

```
Flowchart LR
  P1[Person A: recalls an angry memory] → O[Uninformed neutral observer]
  P2[Person B: recalls a joyful memory] → O
  P3[Person C: recalls a sad memory] → O
  P4[Person D: recalls a calm memory] → O
  O → R[Private report: My feelings, spontaneous thoughts, memories, bodily responses]
  R → G[Only then: What emotional state did I think each person was in?]
  P1 → V[Researchers compare against each person's actual self-report]
  P2 → V
  P3 → V
  P4 → V
  G → V
```

Example: If I meet Person A and unexpectedly remember an argument with my sister, I write down that memory before I am asked to guess whether Person A was angry. The researchers separately check whether Person A actually experienced anger during the interaction.

5. Study A — Individual emotional recognition, first encounter

Setup: A group of participants receives different private emotional assignments. Each person recalls a real event that evokes the assigned emotion internally. The observer does not know who was assigned anger, joy, sadness, hurt, or another emotion.

Observer instruction: “Pay attention to how you feel inside yourself around each person. Notice your emotions, thoughts, memories, associations, and physical sensations. Do not begin by judging their personality or trying to guess their role. Record what came up within you.”

Procedure: The observer meets or spends a brief period with each participant. In the interactive version, they may speak naturally without discussing emotional assignments. In the silent version, they do not speak. Immediately afterward, each side privately records its experience.

- Question: Does the observer’s own internal experience correspond with the other participant’s independently reported emotional state, beyond chance or ordinary cues?

6. Study B — Silent individual or mixed-group recognition

I also want a version in which participants sit silently, potentially facing away from the observer. Their privately recalled emotions may differ from one another. The neutral observer enters and attends to their own internal experience without conversation or direct facial observation.

The observer reports what they felt and remembered around each person, or what they experienced in the group overall. We compare those reports with the actual emotional states reported by participants. This is distinct from asking observers to identify personalities based on appearance or conversation.

Figure 3 — Silent-room arrangement (not to scale)

SAME EMOTION ASSIGNED TO 20 PEOPLE

(They privately recall real experiences; they do not perform anger or joy.)

```
[P01] [P02] [P03] [P04] [P05]   ← all facing away
[P06] [P07] [P08] [P09] [P10]   ← all facing away
[P11] [P12] [P13] [P14] [P15]   ← all facing away
[P16] [P17] [P18] [P19] [P20]   ← all facing away
```

[OBSERVER]

(does not know the emotion)

Observer exits → records feelings + thoughts + memories →

Separately estimates the group's emotional state.

Participants privately report the emotion they actually experienced.

Example: The group recalls joyful memories in one randomized round and angry memories in another. The observer does not know the condition. I want to see whether the observer's spontaneous memories and feelings change accordingly, not merely whether they can label the room "happy" or "angry."

7. Study C — Silent unified-emotion group recognition

Setup: Twenty participants are privately guided to recall experiences associated with the same emotion. In one condition, they remember anger; in another, joy; in another, sadness or calmness. They sit silently and face away. The observer does not know the group's assignment.

Procedure: One or more neutral observers enter for a defined interval and pay attention to all spontaneous internal content: feelings, thoughts, memories, images, bodily sensations, and overall atmosphere. The observers leave and report independently before learning the assignment.

Question: If twenty people are recalling anger, does the observer spontaneously report anger-related feelings or memories more often than in joyful or neutral conditions? If the observer remembers an argument with a sister, for example, that memory itself is part of the data—not merely the word "anger."

Measurement: The group reports what they actually felt, not merely what they were instructed to feel. Observers report free-text memories and thoughts before answering multiple-choice emotion questions.

8. Study D — Repeated emotional transitions and multiple observers

I want to change the same group's assigned emotion across rounds. They might begin by recalling anger, take a recovery break, and then recall joy. Neutral observers also take breaks and return to their own baseline before the next encounter. They do not know which emotion is being induced.

We can rotate several neutral observers one at a time, so their experiences remain independent, or compare that with a version where five observers enter together. If they enter together, they cannot discuss their experiences until all reports are collected. I want to know whether the observer reports shift as the group's actual emotions shift, and whether independent observers agree.

Researchers should use brief emotional-recall periods rather than requiring participants to sustain intense anger for a long sequence of visits. The order of emotions should be randomized or counterbalanced, and recovery should be checked rather than assumed after a fixed five-minute break.

Figure 4 — The two-round observer–observed transformation

```
Flowchart TD
    A[Emotional-state participants privately recall real experiences] → B[Round 1:
Observer is NOT told who feels what]
    B → C[Observer privately records own feelings, thoughts and memories]
    C → D[Participants independently record how each encounter felt]
    D → E[Round 2: Researcher MAY disclose assigned emotions to observer]
    E → F[Observer recalls own corresponding hurt, anger or sadness]
    F → G[Observer practices self-acceptance and finding internal resolve]
    G → H[Observer interacts without announcing the practice]
    H → I[Participants again report comfort, emotion, thoughts and memories]
    I → J[Compare rounds AND a control condition]
```

Example: In Round 1, I notice discomfort around someone but do not know their assignment. In Round 2, the researcher tells me that person was asked to recall anger. I deliberately remember a time I was hurt or angry, acknowledge that part of myself, and seek peace with it inside myself while around them. The other person is not told which individual is practicing self-acceptance. The research question is whether their independently reported experience changes.

9. Study E — Two-round recognition and internal resolution

This is one of my central original experiments and must remain distinct from the other studies.

Round 1: Uninformed recognition

Participants privately recall emotions drawn from their own lives. A neutral observer enters, meets individuals, notices their own feelings and memories, and privately reports those experiences. The observer is not told the assigned emotional states during this first round.

Round 2: Informed self-acceptance

After Round 1, the researcher may tell the observer which individuals are recalling anger, sadness, insecurity, or other emotions. This is a deliberately different experimental condition.

The observer is then instructed: “When you encounter someone recalling anger, remember a time in your own life when you felt deeply angry or hurt. Notice the feelings and memories it brings up. Practice understanding, accepting, and finding peace with that experience inside yourself. Do not try to correct the other person. Continue this practice as you encounter each participant.”

The emotional-state participants do not know which individual is the trained neutral practitioner. They continue their assigned internal emotional recall and may engage in ordinary interaction where that is part of the condition.

Independent evaluation

Afterward, each emotional-state participant reports how they felt around each person, which interactions were comfortable or uncomfortable, which memories arose, and whether their mood changed. Researchers compare their responses across the two rounds and against a control condition.

- My question: Can someone find resolve within themselves while around another person’s anger or hurt, and does that other person then report a different emotional experience—even though the practitioner never directly asked them to change?

Because revealing the assignment to the observer can alter expectations, this informed version must be compared with observers who receive no such information or receive an alternative instruction. That difference is a variable to test, not something to hide.

10.Study F — Concealed practitioner and comfort identification

In one variation, participants know that a neutral practitioner may be present but do not know who it is. In another, they know only that they are participating in an approved interaction study and are debriefed afterward. Any concealment requires ethics approval and informed consent procedures appropriate to the design.

After interacting with the group, participants privately answer: “How did you feel around each person? Who made you feel most comfortable? Who made you feel accepted or at ease? Did any encounter change your emotional state or the thoughts that came to mind?”

Researchers determine whether participants consistently identify the self-acceptance practitioners as more comfortable to be around, compared with other individuals. We should not presume that practitioners will be selected; that is the prediction to test.

11.Study G — Pre-screened emotional groups

Researchers use initial surveys to assemble consenting groups with specified emotional characteristics, such as higher insecurity, social discomfort, or current low mood. The group reports how it feels at baseline.

A neutral practitioner or group of practitioners enters. In one condition, they sit silently; in another, they speak and interact naturally. Their task is to attend to and accept their own internal feelings, memories, and reactions. They are not there to counsel, diagnose, or tell anybody else to be happier.

Group members privately report emotional comfort, tension, hopefulness, perceived acceptance, and other immediate experiences before, during, and after the session. A short session is not evidence that depression or trauma has been cured; the study measures momentary changes, and longer-term outcomes require separate follow-up.

Figure 5 — Practitioner-to-group ratios

I keep 20 measured group participants as the comparison baseline and vary the number of trained practitioners entering. These are illustrative study conditions, not observed results.

Practitioners	Measured participants	Total in room	Share of room
0 (control)	20	20	0%
1	20	21	4.8%
5	20	25	20.0%
10	20	30	33.3%
15	20	35	42.9%
20	20	40	50.0%

```
Flowchart LR
    A[20 measured participants: baseline mood report] → B[0 practitioners: control]
```

A → C[1 practitioner: internal self-acceptance]

A → D[5 practitioners]

A → E[10 practitioners]

A → F[15 practitioners]

A → G[20 practitioners]

B → H[Repeated private group mood reports]

C → H

D → H

E → H

F → H

G → H

H → I[Compare change from baseline across conditions]

Example: While one practitioner quietly works through their own feelings, the researcher prompts the twenty participants to record how they feel right now. The procedure is repeated

with five practitioners and then larger groups, either with the same measured group in randomized sessions or with new comparable groups. I want to learn whether one person's internal resolution is enough to make a measurable difference, whether more practitioners produce larger effects, or whether there is no effect.

12. Study H — One practitioner, then five, ten, fifteen, and twenty: group-scale dose and ratio

This scaling experiment is central to my larger objective. I want to know whether one individual practicing internal self-acceptance can influence the mood of a group, and whether adding more practitioners produces a stronger effect, a smaller effect, or no difference.

Start with a measured group of 20 emotional-state participants, perhaps a group recalling anger or sadness. Take a baseline survey. Then introduce self-acceptance practitioners in experimentally assigned numbers. The practitioners' task remains internal: notice their own memories and emotions, recall comparable life experiences where appropriate, and practice acceptance and resolve without directly trying to change the group.

Condition	Measured participants	Practitioners	Total in room	Practitioner share
Control	20	0	20	0%
One practitioner	20	1	21	4.8%
Five practitioners	20	5	25	20.0%
Ten practitioners	20	10	30	33.3%
Fifteen practitioners	20	15	35	42.9%
Twenty practitioners	20	20	40	50.0%

Repeated in-room measurements

An instructor or researcher may prompt the measured group at designated moments: "At this moment, privately record what you feel. What thoughts are going through your mind? What memories have arisen? How comfortable or uncomfortable do you feel? How hopeful do you feel?"

The same measurements are repeated at predetermined intervals after the practitioners enter. The practitioners do not see the group's responses. We track the direction and size of any changes, rather than relying on one final question.

Same group versus new groups

I want both variations:

Within-group series: The same twenty measured participants encounter different numbers of practitioners across sessions, with condition order counterbalanced and enough recovery time to reduce carryover effects.

Independent-group series: Different but comparably screened groups of twenty are randomly assigned to different practitioner counts, reducing the risk that repeated exposure, fatigue, or anticipation explains the findings.

A third variation can introduce practitioners incrementally while the same group remains in the room: first one, then additional practitioners until five, ten, fifteen, or twenty are present. This can show how the group's reports evolve, but it must be interpreted alongside randomized comparison sessions because time and increasing headcount also change the room.

What I want to learn

Can one self-accepting person make a measurable difference? Is five more effective than one? Does the effect level off? Does a larger number change anything? What would the ratio imply for a larger group, if the result can be replicated? I do not want to extrapolate to the masses before the underlying effect has been independently established.

Figure 6 — Reverse-direction test

```
Flowchart TD
    A[20 participants privately recall joyful memories] → B[Baseline: each person
privately records mood and thoughts]
  B → C[One or more entrants privately recall anger or hurt]
  C → D[Entrants sit at back, without announcing their assignment]
  D → E[Original group records mood, thoughts and memories again]
  E → F[Compare against joyful group with neutral entrants and no entrants]
```

Example: A joyful group is already seated. One entrant sits behind them while internally recalling anger. The group is asked again, without being told the entrant's condition, what thoughts and feelings arose. I then compare the same design with five angry entrants, with neutral entrants, and with no entrants. This is a proposed test, not evidence that angry thoughts are transmitted.

13.Study I — Reverse-direction emotional influence: angry entrants into a joyful group

I also want the reverse test. Begin with twenty participants privately recalling joyful, positive, personally meaningful experiences. Measure their mood and thoughts while they remain in the room.

Now introduce one or more other participants who have been privately instructed to recall experiences that genuinely made them angry, resentful, or hurt. They sit toward the back, remain silent, and are not directly observed by the joyful participants. They are not instructed to threaten, insult, or act aggressively.

At scheduled intervals, the joyful group privately reports how it feels, what thoughts or memories have arisen, and whether its overall experience has changed. The angry entrants separately report whether they actually experienced anger and how strongly.

Repeat with different numbers of angry entrants and appropriate comparison conditions, including emotionally neutral entrants and no entrants.

My question: Does the measured group's emotional condition change when people internally recalling anger join it, even without conversation or direct visual interaction? Is there any difference between one entrant and several? This is the reverse direction of the self-acceptance scaling experiment, and the two must not be assumed to have symmetrical effects.

14.Study J — Music changes the group's emotional condition

I want music introduced in several ways, not merely played as background entertainment.

J1. Music following an assigned emotion

A group privately recalls anger or another emotion, then listens to a selected musical passage—perhaps Mozart, house, trance, or another controlled sound condition. The group reports its mood and spontaneous memories before and after the music. The music stops before an uninformed observer enters. The observer records their own feelings, thoughts, and memories.

- Question: Did the music alter the group's actual emotional state, and did the observer's internal report correspond with that post-music state?

J2. Music and autobiographical memory

Participants listen to different musical selections and privately record what experiences came to mind: a childhood memory, a family event, a loss, a celebration, an argument, or anything else. Researchers record the emotional tone, intensity, and personal significance of those memories. Observers may then enter without knowing the selection and independently report their own internal experiences.

J3. Music with no assigned group emotion

A group receives no instruction to be angry or joyful. They simply hear a musical selection, report their actual state, and then receive an uninformed observer. This separates music's effects from the separate instruction to recall a particular emotion.

J4. Music and the self-acceptance intervention

A later study can investigate whether the effects of self-acceptance practitioners differ across musical environments. Music and practitioner count should be varied independently so researchers can identify which condition, if any, accounts for changes.

Figure 7 — Three-room rotation and sound exposure

```
Flowchart TD
    A[Room A: Mozart played before entry] → D[All playback OFF; verify comparable
conditions]
    B[Room B: recorded arguments played before entry] → D
    C[Room C: silence before entry] → D
  D → E[Uninformed participants enter rooms in randomized orders]
  E → F[Immediately report thoughts, feelings, memories and atmosphere]
  F → G[Rotate SOUND assignments between physical rooms on later sessions]
  G → H[Compare with chance, room effects and sensory-control conditions]
```

Example: I might enter Room B after arguing voices have been played there, with the speakers now silent, and write down whether I felt uneasy or remembered a conflict. Another participant may report nothing unusual. The purpose is to test whether responses systematically track the previous sound condition after ordinary room differences and lingering cues are controlled. I am not claiming that a room has already been shown to retain an emotional frequency.

15.Study K — Sound-conditioned rooms before anyone enters

I want to investigate whether people experience rooms differently when the rooms were exposed to different sounds before anyone arrived. One room might have played Mozart, another recordings of arguments, and another silence. The sounds stop before test participants enter.

Participants do not know the prior sound condition. They enter a room, privately record their feelings, spontaneous thoughts, memories, bodily sensations, and perception of the atmosphere, and then rotate to another room. We can complete multiple room visits in one day, with breaks.

I want to test both individual visits, where participants enter alone so they do not influence one another, and group visits, where several people enter together. Different participants should encounter rooms in different orders.

Critical control: The physical rooms must exchange sound conditions across sessions. We must account for lighting, temperature, odor, acoustics, lingering vibration, equipment noise, and expectations. A room retaining a detectable emotional influence after sound stops is an

unverified hypothesis, not an established physical phenomenon. The test must allow a null result.

16.Study L — Silent group versus interacting group

For several of the preceding studies, I want parallel conditions:

Participants are silent and face away from the observer or practitioner.

Participants are silent but can see one another.

Participants interact naturally without discussing their assigned emotions.

Participants interact naturally while practitioners privately engage in self-acceptance.

This separates effects potentially associated with ordinary social cues—voice, posture, breathing, expression, warmth, and responsiveness—from effects proposed to occur without direct interaction. If an effect occurs in conversation but not in the silent condition, that is still useful evidence about the process.

17.Study M — Shared attention and live audience demonstration

I have also considered a separate live demonstration in which an unexpected silence or pause occurs at the beginning of a presentation. The audience's experience of uncertainty, awkwardness, attention, and social connection could be examined afterward as an illustration of observer–observed dynamics.

This belongs in a separate approved demonstration or study. Any concealed research purpose, collection of audience responses, or later analysis of participants requires suitable consent, ethical review, and debriefing. A demonstration alone would not prove collective consciousness or emotional transmission.

Figure 8 — When researchers collect the reports

```
sequenceDiagram
    participant R as Researcher
    participant G as Emotional-state group
    participant O as Neutral observer
```

R->>G: Assign memory-based emotion privately

G->>R: Record actual emotional state

R->>O: Enter; attend to own feelings, thoughts, memories

O->>R: Record free-text internal experience FIRST

O->>R: Estimate group emotion SECOND

G->>R: Record post-encounter emotion and comfort independently

R->>R: Lock reports before revealing assignments

Example observer entry: “I felt tense. I remembered the argument with my sister last winter. I noticed pressure in my shoulders. The room seemed irritable, although nobody spoke.” This is an illustrative fictional response, not a research result.

18. Standard instructions and measurements

Instruction for privately assigned emotional recall

“Privately recall an experience from your own life associated with the emotion you have been assigned. Allow yourself to notice the thoughts, memories, and feelings that arise. Do not announce the assignment or deliberately perform the emotion for anyone else. You may stop the exercise at any time.”

Instruction for an uninformed neutral observer

“Enter the room without trying to determine who is right, wrong, happy, angry, or insecure. Pay attention to your own internal experience. Notice feelings, spontaneous memories, thoughts, associations, images, and bodily sensations. When you leave, describe what actually arose for you before making any guess about the other participants.”

Instruction for an informed self-acceptance practitioner

“You may be told which emotional condition another participant is recalling. As you encounter that person, attend to your own experiences associated with that emotion. If anger arises, recall a time you felt angry or hurt. Acknowledge your own experience and practice acceptance and compassion toward yourself. Do not attempt to counsel, confront, diagnose, or directly change the other participant. Notice whether your own response changes.”

Repeated researcher prompt for measured group participants

“At this moment, privately record how you feel. What thoughts are going through your mind? What memories or associations have arisen? How comfortable, tense, hopeful, accepted, or unsettled do you feel right now?”

Observer scorecard

Session and condition code (hidden from observer until completion)

Baseline mood before entry

Emotions experienced during entry, with intensity ratings

Free-text spontaneous memories, thoughts, and associations

Bodily sensations and perceived atmosphere

Changes over time and any recovery afterward

Perceived emotional condition of an individual or group, recorded after the free-text report

Confidence in the perception

Emotional-state participant scorecard

Baseline mood and relevant screening profile, stored confidentially

Assigned emotion, if applicable

Personal memory category used for recall (without requiring disclosure of traumatic details)

Actual emotion experienced and its intensity

Current thoughts, memories, comfort, tension, hopefulness, and perceived acceptance

Feelings around each person encountered, where applicable

Whether any encounter seemed to change the participant's emotional experience

Follow-up mood after the condition ends

Researchers should use appropriate validated scales where available. Illustrative survey questions are not automatically validated instruments. Open-ended responses should be categorized by independent raters unaware of the condition, using predefined coding rules.

19. Comparison conditions and analysis

I want the study to be capable of disproving my predictions. Researchers should preregister primary outcomes, analysis plans, and what counts as emotional correspondence or meaningful improvement. The design should include, as applicable:

No-practitioner baseline conditions.

Ordinary silent entrants who do not practice self-acceptance.

Alternative internal attention tasks to distinguish self-acceptance from simply sitting quietly or focusing inward.

Participants whose assigned emotion is neutral or different from the target emotion.

Randomized or counterbalanced condition order, adequate recovery, and independent groups where needed.

Separate measures of assigned emotion, actually experienced emotion, and observer report.

Blinded scoring of memories and thoughts, with controls for chance agreement and multiple comparisons.

Attention to time, crowding, anticipation, experimenter effects, sound, movement, and other ordinary cues.

Follow-up sessions and independent replication before any claim about wider social application.

The ratio study must distinguish number of practitioners, proportion of practitioners, and total room occupancy. These are different variables. Repeated prompts themselves may alter mood, so the timing and wording of prompts should be consistent across conditions.

If observers report matching memories or emotions, the first result is a correspondence to investigate, not proof of direct transmission. If group mood improves, the first result is a measured change, not proof that anyone has been healed. I want to investigate mechanisms rather than assume them.

20. Ethics, participant safety, and consent

These studies involve human participants and, in some conditions, emotional recall and partial concealment of experimental roles. Before implementation, the research team should obtain appropriate institutional review and approval or a documented determination about the required review.

Participants must give informed consent consistent with the approved protocol, be able to stop without penalty, and receive an appropriate debriefing. Any authorized withholding of role assignments should be limited and justified; researchers must not mislead participants about material risks. Recruitment must not exploit people experiencing depression, trauma, or vulnerability.

Emotional recall should use low-intensity, voluntary prompts and avoid requiring people to relive severe trauma, sustain intense anger for long periods, or disclose painful autobiographical details publicly. A qualified team should establish procedures for distress, withdrawal, privacy, and referral to support where needed. The experiment is not a treatment for depression, trauma, or other medical conditions, and no participant should be promised healing.

I use words such as healing, energy, field, frequency, and collective consciousness to express the conceptual direction of my inquiry. The operational outcomes will be emotional reports, memories, thoughts, behavior, group-level ratings, and other measurable variables. A physical emotional frequency or residual field has not been established merely by naming it; such a mechanism would require direct, independent evidence.

21. My intended progression toward larger group dynamics

I want to begin with a clear individual observer–observed test, establish whether any correspondence exists, then investigate whether deliberate internal self-acceptance changes interpersonal experience. From there, I want to examine groups, the number and ratio of practitioners, reverse-direction emotional effects, and music and environmental conditions.

If one person practicing self-acceptance makes no measurable difference, I want to know that. If one person makes a difference and five make more, I want to know how much, under what conditions, and whether the result repeats. If twenty practitioners do no better than one, that also tells us something. I am not assuming that positive thoughts automatically overpower anger or that a joyful group can be changed by people recalling hateful experiences. These are hypotheses to test.

My larger interest is whether learning to acknowledge and love our own difficult feelings —rather than projecting them outward or demanding that others change—can improve the way we live with one another. I want to investigate the connection from one person to another, from a person to a group, and eventually from small groups to larger social environments. The path to broader application must be built on results, controls, replication, and ethical practice.

22. Authorship, provenance, and research development

This document consolidates my originating experimental concepts, their variations, participant instructions, philosophical premise, and intended research progression. I want my role in proposing and developing these concepts accurately attributed as Illa Isenor. Any future collaboration, authorship order, intellectual-property arrangement, data collection, publication, or institutional study should be discussed and documented transparently by the participants in that collaboration.

This observer–observed research program is distinct from my other work on future-backward reconstruction (Point B → Point A → Point B) and prospective provenance/documentation of creative contributions, even though these research lines may eventually inform one another. I do not want them collapsed into a single experiment.

Closing statement

My aim is to investigate whether recognizing the self within our emotional experiences can help us understand and relate differently to others. The question is not simply whether someone can identify anger in a room. It is whether our feelings, thoughts, and memories correspond with those around us, whether internal acceptance changes the encounter, and whether that change—if real and reproducible—can be studied across groups of increasing size. I want the experiments to answer that question, not assume the answer in advance.

Illa Isenor

Originating conceptual proposer