Appendix A

The Concord Tesseract™ Seven Point Scoring Foundation

XYZA behavioral anchors and the normalized multiplicative M

A1. Purpose and theoretical extension

This appendix establishes one seven-point behavioral scale for each Concord Tesseract™ dimension: X, Y, Z, and A. X, Y, and Z retain their established directions. A begins with special answerability and proceeds through increasingly demanding forms of moral answerability. The design is David Boje's operational extension of Mikhail Bakhtin's distinction, not a numerical scale proposed by Bakhtin.

Bakhtin distinguishes answerability for an act's content from moral answerability for Being, and argues that these must be unified in the actual, unique act (Bakhtin, 1993, pp. 2–6). In this scale, A1 represents special or role-bound answerability for the content of an act. Role-based responsibility becomes an alibi when it is used to avoid a leader's unique participation. A2 begins the scale's moral-answerability range with non-alibi participation.

This extension continues the author's earlier engagement with Bakhtin in Storytelling Organizations (Boje, 2008). It translates the distinction into behaviorally anchored codes for dated leadership and organizational events so students and researchers can identify what evidence would support each level.

A2. One normalized multiplicative formula

For a fully scored event, calculate M as follows:

$$M = (X/7) \times (Y/7) \times (Z/7) \times (A/7)$$

Each dimension uses anchors 1–7, so every denominator is the same fixed positive value and no anchor produces a zero factor. This normalized product ranges from 1/2401 to 1. The multiplication structure follows the monograph's application of Trafimow's multiplication approach; the XYZA dimensions, anchors, and normalization are Boje's operational choices, not a formula supplied by Trafimow. The ratings are behaviorally anchored ordinal codes, so M is an exploratory, theory-building index—not a validated stand-alone measure. Preserve the component ratings and evidence with every M value.

Example	Calculation	M	Meaning
NVIDIA / Huang FY2025 event (provisional X=5, Y=3, Z=2, A=1)	(5/7)×(3/7)×(2/7)×(1/7)	0.012495	Special answerability only; no higher moral anchor coded in this episode.
Anthropic / Amodei DA-03 (X=5, Y=5, Z=4, A=2)	(5/7)×(5/7)×(4/7)×(2/7)	0.083299	A2: non-alibi personal participation and stated rationale; higher dialogue/repair anchors are not established.
NVIDIA / Huang admission-apology episode (1,1,1,1)	(1/7)×(1/7)×(1/7)×(1/7)	0.000416	A1: special answerability for the admitted act; no A2 moral answerability inferred.

A3. Unit, attribution, and missing evidence

Code	Use	Rule
A1–A7	Numeric event rating	Score the leader, organization, or joint actor named in the event record. State which unit is rated.
NE	Evidence unavailable or event unscorable	Not a numeric anchor and not zero. Use only when the source record cannot support a rating. Do not calculate M for that record.

Code	Use	Rule
NS	Not yet scored for the period	Not zero, not unchanged, and not a carried-forward score.
Profile M	Profile summary	Use a stated summary rule for X/Y/Z and A. Do not combine unrelated event ratings without labeling the result as a profile index.
Context event	Election, market move, outage, board action	Context alone does not score an executive. Attribute a behavior to its actor before assigning A.

A4. X — Transactional to Transformational

Score	Anchor	Behaviorally anchored definition
1	Transactional exchange	Directions, output targets, compliance, or reward/punishment exchanges dominate; decisions are bounded to immediate task or return.
2	Compliance-centered	Efficiency and control remain primary; incentives or monitoring are refined, with little change to work design or stakeholder purpose.
3	Limited development	Task exchange remains central, while some training, consultation, or development is added without changing core processes.
4	Mixed transaction/development	Performance commitments coexist with a developmental purpose; at least one practice or process is revised and reviewed.
5	Purposeful redesign	Purpose and development guide material changes to products, work, or governance; stakeholder consequences enter evaluation.
6	Systemic transformation	Operating model or accountability structures are redesigned to build capability and address system-level consequences across boundaries.
7	Sustained shared transformation	Learning and long-horizon stakeholder consequences shape revisable decisions; shared productive value is built into ongoing practice.

A5. Y — Power/Egocentric to Serving Others

Score	Anchor	Behaviorally anchored definition
1	Power concentrated	Decision rights and benefits are concentrated in the leader or organization; observable costs or risks are shifted to others.
2	Solidarity without service	Service language appears, but decisions, resources, access, and benefits remain concentrated; no material service action is evidenced.
3	Consulted, not empowered	Stakeholders are heard but have little effect on decisions and receive no meaningful transfer of access, resources, or authority.
4	Partial shared service	Some stakeholder input changes a decision and limited resources, access, or protections are provided; important asymmetries remain.
5	Material service	A documented action materially serves affected others through access, resources, protections, or benefit, with results monitored.
6	Shared power and burden	Rights or resources are shared; the organization reduces burdens or repairs harms while accepting measurable costs or constraints.
7	Institutionalized service	Governance sustains stakeholder influence; benefits and burdens are tracked, and inequities are addressed over time.

A6. Z — Monophonic to Polyphonic

Score	Anchor	Behaviorally anchored definition
1	Single authorized voice	One official account governs; competing accounts are absent from the decision record or actively excluded.
2	Dissent excluded	Alternative voices may be acknowledged symbolically but do not affect deliberation or decisions.
3	Filtered plurality	Some perspectives are solicited, then narrowed or filtered; they have little influence on interpretation or decision.
4	Voices considered	Multiple perspectives are represented and discussed, and some influence is visible, although the dominant account remains controlling.
5	Voices shape options	Affected people's accounts alter options, priorities, or explanations, and disagreement remains visible.
6	Dialogic revision	Competing perspectives interact, revise interpretation or decision, and receive follow-up; dissent is preserved rather than erased.
7	Institutionalized polyphony	Ongoing structures give diverse stakeholders meaningful influence; unresolved tensions remain accessible and can reopen decisions.

A7. A — Special to Moral Answerability

Score	Anchor	Behaviorally anchored definition
1	Special / role-bound answerability	Answers for the content of a specific act, decision, duty, or procedure. This is not yet moral answerability for unique participation. A role is an alibi when used to avoid that personal answer.
2	Non-alibi in Being	Owns unique participation and choice in the event rather than relying on office, market pressure, procedure, or board action as an excuse.
3	Affected others and consequences	Names particular affected others and concrete consequences; accepts that these consequences require an answer.
4	Dialogic answerability	Engages affected others' accounts and allows their testimony to challenge or revise the leader's understanding.
5	Answerable commitment and repair	Commits to a specific response or repair tied to the event, includes affected others in shaping it, and accepts material cost or constraint.
6	System intervention and verified repair	Implements and verifies a corrective intervention in the relevant organizational or interorganizational system, addressing linked causes rather than only visible symptoms.
7	Sustained systemic answerability	Sustains answerability over time: affected others can review results, system learning changes practice, and leaders remain open to correction across connected layers.

A8. Event coding procedure

1. Define one dated event, the evidence boundary, the focal actor, and the affected others. Mark whether the unit is the leader, organization, or both.
2. Record the source, locator, excerpt, organizational decision, and context. Separate reported facts, allegations, and analyst interpretation.
3. Assign X, Y, and Z using the highest anchor fully supported by observable evidence. Assign A1 when the evidence supports special answerability only; assign A2–A7 only when the corresponding moral behaviors are evidenced.
4. Calculate event M when X, Y, Z, and A are numeric. Keep full precision in the workbook and round only for display.
5. Do not infer a leader score from a market move, election result, role title, board action, system failure, or another person's behavior. Context can motivate a search for evidence but is not itself a score.

6. Retain rival interpretations, confidence, prior scores, and revision dates. Re-score when new attributable evidence appears and report the reason.

A9. Trafimow, limits, and self-correction

The normalized product is a transparent operational rule for developing and challenging theory. It does not make ordinal anchors ratio measurements by itself. Future researchers can test the anchors, event selection, attribution, profile aggregation, normalization, and predictions. Report alternative calculations alongside the source coding and allow evidence to revise the result.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1993). Toward a philosophy of the act (V. Liapunov, Trans.; V. Liapunov & M. Holquist, Eds.). University of Texas Press.

Boje, D. M. (2008). Storytelling organizations. Sage.

Trafimow, D. (2026, November 11). The unappreciated theoretical implications of multiplication versus addition [Presentation]. World Scientific Series 3: Business Storytelling in the Age of AI. https://davidboje.com/ws/Multiplication-AI.pdf