mentratiK

THE UPSTREAM PROBLEM

Seventeen Workplace Problems Commonly Treated Downstream

Different symptoms. Shared mechanics?

J. Rick Sanchez
Founder, MentratiK

◆

Version v1.6

Date 10 November 2026

Steward MentratiK

Corpus 17 workplace problems

Evidence state Hardened research synthesis

Release state FROZEN · AUTHORIZED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

Research posture Built to Break

Architecture MK → MM → MF

Validation state Empirical testing required

Class B - Research / Technical
Production authority MK-IDPS-001 v0.3

Governing rule: the Stack is allowed to explain only what survives source comparison, construct collision, scale control, measurement boundaries, and explicit break conditions.

Why this architecture matters

Organizations do not experience the seventeen workplace problems examined here as abstractions. They encounter them through different functions, budgets, leaders, programs, technologies, and interventions. Many of those separations are valid. This paper asks whether some are also incomplete.

The governing question is whether conditions that appear downstream in different forms partly share upstream mechanical dependencies. If they do not, separate treatment should remain separate. If some do, organizations may be repeatedly managing symptoms while leaving part of the dependency structure untouched.

The completed seventeen-problem synthesis identifies five proposed upstream mechanical families and one cross-cutting intervention-architecture meta-condition. That compression is research architecture, not empirical fact. Its value is that it creates a smaller, falsifiable set of mechanical propositions that can be tested against strong established explanations.

INSTITUTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Organizations have spent decades addressing these conditions through separate departments, budgets, frameworks, technologies, and interventions. Many of those distinctions are valid. This study asks a harder question: whether some of the problems commonly treated downstream partly share upstream mechanical dependencies, and whether the architecture of the response corresponds to the architecture of the problem.

Across seventeen workplace conditions, the analysis produces five proposed upstream mechanical families and one cross-cutting intervention-architecture meta-condition. The result is not one cause for seventeen problems. It is a smaller, falsifiable architecture through which apparently separate organizational pressures can be examined against their dependencies, competing explanations, load paths, and break conditions.

That changes the starting point. Before selecting another intervention, organizations can first ask what architecture is generating or carrying the load, which dependencies are actually shared, which remain distinct, and whether the proposed response corresponds to the problem it is intended to affect.

Don't begin with the intervention. Find the mechanics generating the load. Then test whether those mechanics are actually there.

Executive finding

The full seventeen-problem analysis does not support one universal cause. It does support a consequential and testable structure: five proposed upstream mechanical families, plus one cross-cutting intervention failure mode. The result is a research architecture, not empirical proof.

- Formation and Meaning Participation
- Coherence Carrying
- Legitimacy and Relational Authority
- Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity
- Human–AI Meaning Interface
- Cross-cutting meta-condition: Fragmented Intervention Architecture

The two newly visible families are Legitimacy and Relational Authority, strengthened by institutional distrust and leadership credibility, and Human–AI Meaning Interface, surfaced by human adaptation during AI transformation and human–AI meaning interaction. Post-layoff reconstruction and post-crisis organizational resilience materially strengthen Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity. Repeated failure of disconnected downstream interventions does not behave like an ordinary symptom; it behaves like a system-level sign that intervention design may be fragmented relative to the dependency structure of the problem.

Bounded breakthrough: the seventeen-problem corpus yields a proposed compression architecture of five upstream mechanical families plus one cross-cutting intervention-architecture meta-condition. It does not establish that the five families are latent factors, causal mechanisms, or validated organizational constructs. Those claims require empirical testing.

Abstract

Organizations often manage disengagement, purpose disconnection, drift, distrust, trust rupture, narrative and cultural fragmentation, leadership credibility, identity instability, resistance, failed transformation, post-layoff reconstruction, post-crisis resilience, adaptation to artificial intelligence, human–AI interaction, coherence loss, and repeated intervention failure as separate downstream problems. This report tests whether some of these seventeen workplace problems may partly depend on shared upstream meaning mechanics.

The synthesis yields five proposed upstream mechanical families and one cross-cutting meta-condition. No family is claimed as empirically established. Several conditions retain strong non-MM explanations, and some MM mappings narrow to sub-classes. The report therefore establishes a falsifiable research program and a disciplined public claim: the Stack may organize and test shared mechanics across an important subset of the meaning crisis, but the degree of explanatory and practical reach remains an empirical question.

1. Research question and claim boundary

Do some recurring workplace problems that are managed as separate downstream conditions depend in part on shared upstream meaning mechanics, and if so, which problems, which mechanics, by what evidence, and where does the mapping fail?

- This report does not claim that all seventeen share one cause.
- The existence, prevalence, or cost of a workplace problem does not validate an MM explanation.
- A native Stack construct is not automatically an organizational construct.
- Established external explanations remain valid competitors.
- A useful MM contribution may apply to only a measurable sub-class of a problem.
- Failure to explain all seventeen would not invalidate what the architecture explains within scope.

2. The seventeen-problem source corpus

1. Employee disengagement
2. Purpose disconnection
3. Organizational drift
4. Institutional distrust
5. Trust rupture
6. Narrative fragmentation
7. Leadership credibility
8. Identity instability
9. Cultural fragmentation
10. Change resistance
11. Failed organizational transformation
12. Post-layoff reconstruction
13. Post-crisis organizational resilience
14. Human adaptation during AI transformation
15. Human–AI meaning interaction
16. Organizational coherence loss
17. Repeated failure of disconnected downstream interventions

These are treated as a governed problem surface, not as product categories and not as proof that every condition is meaning-generated. Transformation fatigue is retained as a relevant sub-condition within change resistance and failed organizational transformation rather than substituted for one of the original seventeen.

3. Architectural provenance and definitional authority

- Meaning-Mechanics Physics Stack → mechanical development substrate.
- MK/MM/MF Formal Technical Glossary → controlled vocabulary and collision boundaries.
- Dependency map, Saenz/SMP-1.0, MM-TC-001/OIS, audits, and Break Records → operational and falsification controls.
- Meaning Sovereignty and Meaning Participation → governance boundary against manufactured meaning.
- State of the Stack / Nine Breakthroughs → synthesis and the seventeen-problem public surface.
- This report → organizational application and break-test.

Native terms are used only where their controlled distinction changes what can be observed or falsified. Structural Courage remains governed Stack vocabulary but is not inserted without a demonstrated mechanical role.

4. Method

Each condition is evaluated through the same analytic sequence: external construct definition; competing explanations; proposed MM relationship; construct collision; scale declaration; measurement boundary; Meaning Sovereignty or misuse boundary; and explicit break condition. Internal architectural status and external empirical status remain separate.

The competing explanations listed for each condition identify non-exhaustive comparator classes that proposed MM mappings must survive; they do not constitute a systematic or exhaustive review of every neighboring literature named.

5. External evidence base and discriminant burden

External evidence defines neighboring constructs and provides comparators; similarity is not validation. Systems thinking supports the general importance of leverage and structure, but does not validate MentratiK mechanics. Existing implementation-science work also studies strategy-mechanism linkages, causal pathways, context-dependent mechanisms, and implementation mapping. PIC/FIA therefore carries a direct distinctiveness burden rather than receiving novelty by proximity. (Meadows, 1999; Lewis et al., 2018; Mody et al., 2023; Walker et al., 2025).

PIC/FIA earns no novelty merely by saying interventions should align with mechanisms, context, or one another.

6. Seventeen condition analyses

6.1 Employee disengagement

Finding: Partial candidate

Proposed family: Formation and Meaning Participation

Competing explanations: Management quality, workload, pay, role design, labor-market conditions, and established engagement models. (Kahn, 1990; Steger et al., 2012).

Break condition: MM variables add no incremental explanatory power beyond established engagement and meaningful-work measures.

6.2 Purpose disconnection

Finding: Strong partial candidate

Proposed family: Formation and Meaning Participation

Competing explanations: WAMI dimensions, job design, value incongruence, role clarity, and organizational hypocrisy. (Steger et al., 2012).

Break condition: MM measures are redundant with established meaningful-work measures, or implementation prescribes substantive purpose.

6.3 Organizational drift

Finding: Native mechanic; organizational bridge unvalidated

Proposed family: Coherence Carrying

Competing explanations: Policy drift, goal displacement, adaptation, environmental change, governance failure, and strategic reorientation.

Break condition: External drift constructs explain the condition without an incremental MM bridge, or legitimate adaptation is mislabeled as drift.

6.4 Institutional distrust

Finding: Strong partial candidate; distinct from episodic rupture

Proposed family: Legitimacy and Relational Authority

Competing explanations: Ability, benevolence, integrity, justice, history, governance, performance, and risk. (Mayer et al., 1995).

Break condition: MM adds no incremental explanatory value beyond established institution-specific trust and justice constructs.

6.5 Trust rupture

Finding: Sub-class only

Proposed family: Legitimacy and Relational Authority

Competing explanations: Actual misconduct, breach, incompetence, unfairness, deception, and psychological-contract violation. (Mayer et al., 1995).

Break condition: The condition is fully explained by breach and trustworthiness variables; MM may not reframe wrongdoing as a meaning mismatch.

6.6 Narrative fragmentation

Finding: Strong partial candidate

Proposed family: Coherence Carrying

Competing explanations: Normal pluralism, local sensemaking, strategic ambiguity, subculture, and communication failure. (Weick, 1993).

Break condition: Narrative divergence is unrelated to coordination or integrated operation, or high plurality coexists with high functioning.

6.7 Leadership credibility

Finding: Strong partial candidate; new family-strengthening result

Proposed family: Legitimacy and Relational Authority

Competing explanations: Competence, integrity, transparency, authentic/ethical leadership, communication, track record, and follower expectations.

Break condition: Established leadership variables fully account for engagement, trust, and team effects.

6.8 Identity instability

Finding: Partial candidate; scale controlled

Proposed family: Formation and Meaning Participation

Competing explanations: Role ambiguity, restructuring, status threat, insecurity, career transition, and organizational-identity ambiguity.

Break condition: Established identity or role constructs explain the condition; organizational analysis crosses into personal identity without a valid bridge.

6.9 Cultural fragmentation

Finding: Sub-class only after decomposition

Proposed family: Coherence Carrying

Competing explanations: Normal subcultures, power, incentives, structure, geography, professional identity, and coordination design.

Break condition: The proposed construct collapses into narrative fragmentation or ordinary subculture, or fragmentation is inferred from difference alone.

6.10 Change resistance

Finding: Sub-class only

Proposed family: Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity

Competing explanations: Fairness, interests, loss, disposition, poor design, low participation, uncertainty, workload, and legitimate dissent. (Oreg, 2003; Piderit, 2000).

Break condition: No residual MM contribution after established explanations; dissent is treated as defect.

6.11 Failed organizational transformation

Finding: Native reconstruction adjacency; organizational bridge unvalidated

Proposed family: Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity

Competing explanations: Strategy, resources, sponsorship, incentives, execution, timing, market change, politics, design, and change saturation. (Abrahamson, 2004; Bernerth et al., 2011).

Break condition: The MM sequence cannot be operationalized at organizational scale or does not improve prediction beyond established transformation factors.

6.12 Post-layoff reconstruction

Finding: Strong partial candidate; materially strengthens reconstruction family

Proposed family: Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity

Competing explanations: Organizational justice, perceived control, job insecurity, workload, support, communication, and labor conditions.

Break condition: Established justice/control models fully explain outcomes, or reconstruction merely renames recovery.

6.13 Post-crisis organizational resilience

Finding: Strong comparator and partial candidate

Proposed family: Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity

Competing explanations: Dynamic capabilities, preparedness, redundancy, leadership, psychological capital, learning, resources, and crisis governance. (Weick, 1993).

Break condition: Homeogenesis/Aftermight cannot be distinguished empirically from established resilience, adaptation, learning, or growth constructs.

6.14 Human adaptation during AI transformation

Finding: Partial candidate; establishes distinct AI-transition problem family

Proposed family: Human–AI Meaning Interface

Competing explanations: Training, access, workflow redesign, usability, incentives, labor-market threat, leadership, implementation quality, and change management.

Break condition: MM adds nothing beyond skills/workflow/change models, or low adoption is treated as meaning failure without evidence.

6.15 Human–AI meaning interaction

Finding: Candidate research frontier; not yet an established MM organizational construct

Proposed family: Human–AI Meaning Interface

Competing explanations: HCI/HAX, usability, explainability, trust calibration, cognitive offloading, automation bias, task fit, and governance.

Break condition: The construct reduces to HCI, trust, or task-performance variables; no distinct meaning-mechanical phenomenon is observed.

6.16 Organizational coherence loss

Finding: Native MM construct; organizational mapping unvalidated

Proposed family: Coherence Carrying

Competing explanations: Coordination failure, conflicting incentives, strategy ambiguity, communication failure, power, structure, and external shock.

Break condition: A proposed measure reduces to agreement, compliance, fluency, narrative uniformity, or an established coherence scale.

6.17 Repeated failure of disconnected downstream interventions

Finding: Cross-cutting meta-condition; strongest systems-level result

Proposed family: Fragmented Intervention Architecture

MM relationship: Repeated isolated interventions may fail when each targets a local symptom while shared dependencies, load paths, or interactions remain unchanged. This is not proof of one root cause; it is a signal to test whether intervention architecture is fragmented relative to problem architecture.

Competing explanations: Poor intervention quality, inadequate implementation, weak fidelity, insufficient resources, wrong diagnosis, politics, timing, and change overload.

Measurement boundary: Requires portfolio-level intervention maps, shared-outcome models, dependency traces, and longitudinal evidence.

Break condition: Integrated upstream models do not outperform well-designed targeted interventions, or repeated failure is explained entirely by execution and resource factors.

7. Controlled seventeen-problem matrix

The controlling matrix retains all seventeen conditions and the same hardened classes. The v1.4 hardening pass added a PIC/FIA cross-reference to Condition 17 without changing its evidence state or converting it into an eighteenth problem.

Problem	Hardened class	Proposed upstream family	Principal comparator	Primary break test
Employee disengagement	Partial candidate	Formation and Meaning Participation	Management quality, workload, pay, role design, labor-market conditions, and established engagement models.	MM variables add no incremental explanatory power beyond established engagement and meaningful-work measures.
Purpose disconnection	Strong partial candidate	Formation and Meaning Participation	WAMI dimensions, job design, value incongruence, role clarity, and organizational hypocrisy.	MM measures are redundant with established meaningful-work measures, or implementation prescribes substantive purpose.
Organizational drift	Native mechanic; organizational bridge unvalidated	Coherence Carrying	Policy drift, goal displacement, adaptation, environmental change, governance failure, and strategic reorientation.	External drift constructs explain the condition without an incremental MM bridge, or legitimate adaptation is mislabeled as drift.
Institutional distrust	Strong partial candidate; distinct from episodic rupture	Legitimacy and Relational Authority	Ability, benevolence, integrity, justice, history, governance, performance, and risk remain primary established explanations.	MM adds no incremental explanatory value beyond established institution-specific trust and justice constructs.
Trust rupture	Sub-class only	Legitimacy and Relational Authority	Actual misconduct, breach, incompetence, unfairness, deception, and psychological-contract violation.	The condition is fully explained by breach and trustworthiness variables; MM may not reframe wrongdoing as a meaning mismatch.
Narrative fragmentation	Strong partial candidate	Coherence Carrying	Normal pluralism, local sensemaking, strategic ambiguity, subculture, and communication failure.	Narrative divergence is unrelated to coordination or integrated operation, or high plurality coexists with high functioning.
Leadership credibility	Strong partial candidate; new family-strengthening result	Legitimacy and Relational Authority	Competence, integrity, transparency, authentic/ethical leadership, communication, track record, and follower expectations.	Established leadership variables fully account for engagement, trust, and team effects; the proposed coherence bridge adds no explanatory value.
Identity instability	Partial candidate; scale controlled	Formation and Meaning Participation	Role ambiguity, restructuring, status threat, insecurity, career transition, and organizational-identity ambiguity.	Established identity or role constructs explain the condition; organizational analysis crosses into personal identity without a valid bridge.
Cultural fragmentation	Sub-class only after decomposition	Coherence Carrying	Normal subcultures, power, incentives, structure, geography, professional identity, and coordination design.	The proposed construct collapses into narrative fragmentation or ordinary subculture, or fragmentation is inferred from difference alone.
Change resistance	Sub-class only	Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity	Fairness, interests, loss, disposition, poor design, low participation, uncertainty, workload, and legitimate dissent.	No residual MM contribution after established explanations; dissent is treated as defect.
Failed organizational transformation	Native reconstruction adjacency; organizational bridge unvalidated	Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity	Strategy, resources, sponsorship, incentives, execution, timing, market change, politics, design, and change saturation.	The MM sequence cannot be operationalized at organizational scale or does not improve prediction beyond established transformation factors.
Post-layoff reconstruction	Strong partial candidate; materially strengthens reconstruction family	Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity	Organizational justice, perceived control, job insecurity, workload, support, communication, and labor conditions.	Established justice/control models fully explain outcomes, or reconstruction merely renames recovery.
Post-crisis organizational resilience	Strong comparator and partial candidate	Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity	Dynamic capabilities, preparedness, redundancy, leadership, psychological capital, learning, resources, and crisis governance.	Homeogenesis/Aftermight cannot be distinguished empirically from established resilience, adaptation, learning, or growth constructs.
Human adaptation during AI	Partial candidate; establishes distinct AI-	Human–AI Meaning Interface	Training, access, workflow redesign, usability, incentives, labor-market	MM adds nothing beyond skills/workflow/change models, or

Problem	Hardened class	Proposed upstream family	Principal comparator	Primary break test
transformation	transition problem family		threat, leadership, implementation quality, and change management.	low adoption is treated as meaning failure without evidence.
Human–AI meaning interaction	Candidate research frontier; not yet an established MM organizational construct	Human–AI Meaning Interface	HCI/HAX, usability, explainability, trust calibration, cognitive offloading, automation bias, task fit, and governance.	The construct reduces to HCI, trust, or task-performance variables; no distinct meaning-mechanical phenomenon is observed.
Organizational coherence loss	Native MM construct; organizational mapping unvalidated	Coherence Carrying	Coordination failure, conflicting incentives, strategy ambiguity, communication failure, power, structure, and external shock.	A proposed measure reduces to agreement, compliance, fluency, narrative uniformity, or an established coherence scale.
Repeated failure of disconnected downstream interventions	Cross-cutting meta-condition; strongest systems-level result	Fragmented Intervention Architecture; PIC/FIA cross-reference	Poor intervention quality, inadequate implementation, weak fidelity, insufficient resources, wrong diagnosis, politics, timing, and change overload.	Integrated upstream models do not outperform well-designed targeted interventions, or repeated failure is explained entirely by execution and resource factors.

8. Full-corpus synthesis

8.1 Family I — Formation and Meaning Participation

Purpose disconnection is the strongest member; disengagement and identity instability are partial candidates. The major boundary is Meaning Sovereignty: organizations may support architecture but may not manufacture substantive purpose or diagnose disagreement as defect.

8.2 Family II — Coherence Carrying

Narrative fragmentation, cultural fragmentation, organizational drift, and organizational coherence loss cluster around how meaning is carried across people, practices, time, and institutional structures. The family is not equivalent to agreement or uniformity.

8.3 Family III — Legitimacy and Relational Authority

Institutional distrust, trust rupture, and leadership credibility produce a distinct proposed family. This family must survive strong trust, justice, and leadership comparators.

8.4 Family IV — Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity

Failed organizational transformation, post-layoff reconstruction, post-crisis resilience, and a bounded sub-class of change resistance cluster around what happens after disruption or during major transition.

8.5 Family V — Human–AI Meaning Interface

Human adaptation during AI transformation and human–AI meaning interaction create a distinct research frontier concerned with role meaning, agency, judgment, authorship, interpretive dependence, and Meaning Sovereignty in hybrid human–AI work.

8.6 Meta-condition: Fragmented Intervention Architecture and Problem–Intervention Correspondence

Repeated failure of disconnected downstream interventions is not treated as an eighteenth workplace problem or as evidence that the seventeen conditions share one underlying cause. The completed synthesis instead exposes a more bounded implementation-research question: whether the architecture of an intervention, or portfolio of interventions, corresponds adequately to the relevant architecture of the problem it is intended to affect.

Problem–Intervention Correspondence (PIC) is the candidate upstream research object. PIC asks whether the architecture of a response corresponds to the relevant dependency structure, causal classes, load paths, interactions, and competing explanations present in the condition being addressed. Fragmented Intervention Architecture (FIA) is the candidate failure-state construct: a condition in which interventions may be organized around separated symptoms, programs, owners, or targets in ways that fail to represent or act upon relevant dependencies or interactions.

This distinction separates intervention failure from architectural mismatch. An appropriate intervention may fail because of poor execution, weak fidelity, insufficient resources, timing, adoption, leadership, politics, inadequate capability, or other established implementation factors. Those explanations remain valid competitors. A different possibility is that an intervention performs competently against its local target while the larger intervention architecture corresponds inadequately to the larger problem architecture.

A locally successful intervention may still participate in a globally inadequate intervention architecture.

Shared upstream dependency does not eliminate specialized downstream repair. It changes the architecture within which specialized responses are understood, selected, sequenced, coordinated, bounded, and evaluated. The architecture therefore refuses both fragmentation and one-root-cause reductionism.

PIC proposes a two-map research architecture. The Problem Dependency Map represents observed conditions, established causal classes, competing explanations, hypothesized shared and distinct dependencies, load paths, interactions, and MM components only where warranted. The Intervention Dependency Map represents interventions in operation or under consideration, intended targets, assumed mechanisms, organizational owners, dependencies being acted upon, sequencing, relationships among interventions, evidence states, and possible interaction effects.

PROBLEM DEPENDENCY MAP
↕
PIC
correspondence
↕
INTERVENTION DEPENDENCY MAP

Prospective research question: Can architectural mismatch be detected before an intervention portfolio is selected, funded, or implemented?

Prospective usefulness is not assumed. It must be empirically earned.

Five provisional FIA mismatch states are presently specified:

- FIA-1 Dependency Omission: a relevant dependency remains untouched.
- FIA-2 Intervention Collision: individually reasonable interventions interact in ways that compete, transfer load, obscure causation, or degrade another part of the architecture.
- FIA-3 False Integration: programs appear administratively coordinated or rhetorically unified without demonstrating structural correspondence to the problem architecture.
- FIA-4 Redundant Coverage: multiple interventions operate substantially on the same dependency while another relevant dependency remains uncovered.
- FIA-5 Load Transfer: an intervention improves its local target while increasing load elsewhere in the architecture.

FIA-4 and FIA-5 are v0.2 candidate extensions and are not retroactively attributed to the original FIA formulation.

8.6.1 Distinctiveness and collision boundary

PIC/FIA sits adjacent to established work in implementation science, mechanisms of action, causal pathway modeling, implementation mapping, intervention alignment and fit, systems thinking, portfolio approaches, program theory, organizational change, and causal/dependency modeling. These literatures are comparators, not evidence for PIC/FIA.

PIC/FIA earns no novelty merely by saying interventions should align with mechanisms, context, or one another.

Three outcomes are permissible: full collision, in which PIC/FIA breaks as an independent construct; partial distinctiveness, in which the two-map correspondence architecture survives only as a bounded contribution; or strong distinctiveness, in which map correspondence demonstrates measurable additional explanatory, predictive, diagnostic, design, or implementation value. MentratiK does not determine in advance which outcome must survive.

8.6.2 Relationship to the Stack and implementation

PIC/FIA does not create a fourth layer of the Stack. Its current proposed home is Meaning-First implementation research. Meaning-Mechanics asks what mechanics and dependencies may be generating or carrying a condition. PIC asks whether the architecture of the response corresponds to the proposed problem architecture. Meaning-First governs translation into implementation where warranted. The Meaning-First evidence loop returns the result of contact with reality.

MK → MM → MF

Architecture → Hypothesis → Implementation → Evidence or Break → Architecture

PIC/FIA operates as a candidate joint inside Meaning-First implementation research, not above or beside MK → MM → MF.

8.6.3 Break conditions and evidence boundary

PIC/FIA must narrow, split, or break if correspondence adds no incremental value beyond established mechanism or alignment approaches; cannot be measured reliably; predicts nothing materially important; FIA states cannot be distinguished prospectively; dependency maps become retrospective storytelling devices; proposed mismatch states collapse into established constructs; PIC encourages false one-cause integration; MM is privileged merely because MentratiK originated the hypothesis; commercial incentives bias diagnosis toward MentratiK-dependent interventions; or well-designed specialist approaches consistently outperform the proposed integrated architecture.

The problem representation may be wrong. The intervention may be wrong. The MM hypothesis may be wrong. MentratiK may be wrong.

PIC remains a candidate research object. FIA remains a candidate failure-state construct. Neither is Canon, validated, or a new discipline.

9. What qualifies as a breakthrough

Evidence-state rule: these are internal architectural breakthroughs because they create new research capability. They are not empirical validation of causation, latent factors, intervention efficacy, or historical world-first priority.

Breakthrough A: Legitimacy and Relational Authority emerges as a distinct proposed family.

Breakthrough B: Human–AI Meaning Interface emerges as a distinct research frontier.

Breakthrough C: Post-layoff reconstruction and post-crisis resilience materially strengthen Reconstruction and Adaptive Continuity.

Breakthrough D: Repeated failure of disconnected interventions is reclassified as a cross-cutting meta-condition that tests whether intervention architecture matches problem architecture.

Breakthrough E: The full corpus does not support a one-handle thesis. Its strongest current architecture is plural but integrated.

v1.4 hardening clarification to Breakthrough D: the subsequent PIC/FIA specification distinguishes the candidate failure state, Fragmented Intervention Architecture, from the more upstream research object of Problem–Intervention Correspondence: whether intervention architecture measurably corresponds to the relevant dependency structure of the problem. This increases specification without increasing the evidence state.

9.1 What would constitute an empirical breakthrough

A genuine empirical breakthrough would require evidence that one or more proposed upstream families explain covariance or incremental variance across workplace conditions after established predictors are controlled; that their measures demonstrate discriminant validity; that upstream movement precedes downstream change longitudinally; and, ultimately, that governed family-level interventions improve outcomes beyond well-designed condition-specific alternatives.

9.2 Discovery synthesis: when an answer exposes the next layer

Completion of the seventeen-condition synthesis does not close the inquiry. It changes the question. Some conditions may share upstream structure, they do not appear to share one universal cause, and the strongest current representation is plural, integrated, falsifiable, and breakable. That is an architectural answer, not an empirical verdict.

v1.6 preserves one next-order question explicitly: how intervention dependencies should be represented when conditions share some structure but retain distinct causal classes, and whether PIC can distinguish architecture-level mismatch from ordinary implementation failure prospectively.

10. Empirical program

- Create condition-specific operational definitions and measures without turning one instrument into a universal diagnostic.
- Run confirmatory and exploratory factor models to test whether five families are supported, merge, split, or fail.
- Test discriminant and incremental validity against established predictors and neighboring constructs.
- For PIC/FIA, operationalize the two maps independently before computing or interpreting correspondence.
- Test whether proposed correspondence predicts outcomes beyond implementation quality, fidelity, resources, timing, politics, change load, and other established implementation factors.
- Test FIA mismatch states prospectively where feasible; do not infer them solely after failure.
- Use intervention studies with comparison arms to test whether family-level or architecture-guided interventions outperform well-designed condition-specific alternatives.
- Pre-register break conditions and preserve negative, null, contradictory, and collision findings.
- Protect Meaning Sovereignty: no individual ranking, employment decision, covert optimization, or prescribed substantive meaning.

11. Strategic interpretation

The completed analysis supports a strategically meaningful but bounded proposition: MentratiK has an original architecture capable of organizing a heterogeneous workplace problem surface into a smaller number of falsifiable research families without claiming that all problems share one cause. The PIC/FIA hardening extends that research capability from problem compression toward a testable question of whether response architecture corresponds to problem architecture. It does not establish intervention efficacy or distinctiveness in advance.

Founder/civilizational boundary: if an upstream architecture is ever to function as infrastructure across independent institutions, it must be able to specify where it applies, coexist with specialist domains, travel without absorbing them, and lose cleanly when the evidence favors another explanation or intervention architecture.

12. Meaning Sovereignty and misuse controls

- No measure may be used to prescribe a person's substantive purpose, identity, values, or reason to live.
- No individual score may be used for hiring, firing, discipline, promotion, compensation, performance ranking, or covert behavioral control.
- Disagreement with leadership, an employer, a change program, an AI system, or MentratiK is not evidence of defect.
- Organizational constructs may not silently become judgments about personal identity or personal meaning.
- Human–AI research must preserve human override, agency, interpretive authority, privacy, and informed participation.
- Dissent, pluralism, resistance, low adoption, and refusal to participate remain open to legitimate non-MM explanations.
- PIC/FIA may not be used to pre-authorize MentratiK-dependent interventions. The problem representation, dependency map, intervention map, and correspondence claim all remain breakable.
- Problem and intervention mapping may not silently become person-level surveillance, covert meaning optimization, or employment scoring. Map-derived data must remain governed by privacy, scale, access, and voluntary-participation controls.
- Where research or implementation reaches individuals, participation and personal disclosure must be voluntary. Legitimate nonparticipation may not be penalized or treated as evidence of defect.

13. Meaning-First: from shared mechanics to governed intervention

Meaning Kernel is the upstream generative architecture; Meaning-Mechanics is the structural-mechanical domain; Meaning-First is the principal discipline through which mechanics that survive scrutiny become investigable, teachable, governable, and available for responsible application. PIC/FIA, if it survives collision and measurement, sits inside Meaning-First implementation research as a joint between problem architecture and governed response architecture.

13.1 From mechanical proposition to governed use

Meaning-First requires an ordered translation: locate the bounded condition without presuming a meaning-mechanical cause; specify proposed dependencies and scale; retain credible non-MM explanations; represent the problem architecture; represent candidate intervention architecture; test correspondence rather than assume it; declare evidence state and comparison conditions; implement only within authorized scope; and return evidence or break upstream.

13.2 Institutional research and implementation

Operating institutions and specialist implementation institutions remain independent. PIC/FIA does not require MentratiK to become each downstream trade. If the architecture survives, MentratiK may steward upstream architecture, mapping, measurement, evidence states, governance, Sovereignty, break conditions, and conformance while domain specialists retain their specialized roles.

13.3 Governed translation across institutions

The candidate concept of transinstantiation remains the research problem of translating common upstream architecture into context-distinct downstream forms while preserving required invariants. It remains candidate, not Canon or an empirical finding.

13.4 Implementation ecosystem, pull architecture, and evidence return

Implementation requires a governed return-of-evidence loop: architecture to hypothesis, hypothesis to implementation, implementation to evidence or break, and evidence or break back to architecture. Commercially valuable claims are not insulated from adverse evidence.

13.5 Larger human purpose

The long-range thesis remains infrastructure for the meaning layer. v1.6 does not report that thesis as empirical fact. It strengthens the route by which implementation itself can become inspectable, comparable, and breakable.

14. Research, implementation, and economic continuity

MentratiK does not commercialize vocabulary. If PIC/FIA or any other candidate architecture survives, economic pathways must descend from architecture into method, mapping, measurement, governed implementation capability, evidence, and only then appropriate licensing or implementation pathways. Revenue may support research and infrastructure; it may not determine what the evidence is allowed to say.

15. Limitations

This is a completed research synthesis and hardening manuscript, not a validation study, systematic review, or meta-analysis. It does not report original organizational data demonstrating MM causation, five latent families, PIC correspondence effects, FIA predictive validity, or intervention effectiveness. Existing implementation science directly studies mechanisms, strategy-mechanism linkages, causal pathways, context, and implementation mapping; PIC/FIA must therefore demonstrate discriminant and incremental value rather than claim novelty from general alignment language.

16. Conclusion

The seventeen workplace problems do not collapse into one cause. They support a disciplined upstream research architecture of five proposed families and one cross-cutting intervention-architecture meta-condition. v1.6 preserves the systems-level result by distinguishing FIA, the candidate failure state, from PIC, the upstream research object asking whether response architecture measurably corresponds to problem architecture.

The consequence is not a claim that MentratiK has solved organizational intervention. It is a harder research program: represent the problem without privileging the Stack, represent the intervention without assuming integration, measure correspondence, compare against established implementation explanations, test prospectively, preserve specialist competence, and let the architecture lose wherever the evidence requires it.

Don't begin with the intervention. Find the mechanics generating the load. Then test whether those mechanics are actually there. And before calling execution a failure, test whether the response architecture corresponded to the problem architecture in the first place.

17. References

Abrahamson, E. (2004). Change without pain: How managers can overcome initiative overload, organizational chaos, and employee burnout. Harvard Business School Press.

Bernerth, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Harris, S. G. (2011). Change fatigue: Development and initial validation of a new measure. Work & Stress, 25(4), 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2011.634280

Hughes, M. (2011). Do 70 per cent of all organizational change initiatives really fail? Journal of Change Management, 11(4), 451–464. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2011.630506

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.5465/256287

Lewis, C. C., Klasnja, P., Powell, B. J., Lyon, A. R., Tuzzio, L., Jones, S., Walsh-Bailey, C., & Weiner, B. J. (2018). From classification to causality: Advancing understanding of mechanisms of change in implementation science. Frontiers in Public Health, 6, 136. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00136

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080335

Meadows, D. H. (1999). Leverage points: Places to intervene in a system. The Sustainability Institute.

Mody, A., Filiatreau, L. M., Goss, C. W., Powell, B. J., & Geng, E. H. (2023). Instrumental variables for implementation science: Exploring context-dependent causal pathways between implementation strategies and evidence-based interventions. Implementation Science Communications, 4, 157. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-023-00536-x

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(4), 680–693. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.680

Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 783–794. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.3707722

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). Journal of Career Assessment, 20(3), 322–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711436160

Walker, T. J., Are, F., Heredia, N. I., Onadeko, K., Saving, E. E., Kang, E., & Fernandez, M. E. (2025). Identifying mechanisms of action for implementation strategies using a retrospective Implementation Mapping logic model approach. Prevention Science, 26(2), 161–174. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-025-01790-2

Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38(4), 628–652. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393339

18. Internal MentratiK source architecture

- Meaning-Mechanics Physics Stack | Working Draft.
- MK/MM/MF Formal Technical Glossary v1.3 | Working Canon Draft.
- Meaning-Mechanics Canonical Dependency Map v1.3.
- Saenz Canonical Unit Definition and SMP-1.0.
- MM-TC-001, Operational Indicator Specification, Audit Records, and Break Records.
- MK Generative Interface Research (MK-GIR-001).
- State of the Stack 2026 public master.
- State of the Stack: Nine Breakthroughs.
- MPL-28 v0.1, experimental and unvalidated.
- MentratiK_MF-Intervention-Architecture_FIA-and-Problem-Intervention-Correspondence_Candidate-Research-Object_20261029_v0.2 | Candidate research object; NOT CANON; NOT VALIDATED.

Publication control note

Version v1.6 public release. This manuscript preserves the complete seventeen-condition research core, five bounded internal architectural breakthroughs, Discovery Synthesis, Meaning Sovereignty controls, and governed return-of-evidence loop. v1.4 performs a localized hardening of the Condition 17 / intervention-architecture result by distinguishing Problem–Intervention Correspondence (PIC) as the upstream candidate research object from Fragmented Intervention Architecture (FIA) as the candidate failure-state construct; specifying the two-map correspondence architecture; carrying FIA-1 through FIA-5 with FIA-4 and FIA-5 explicitly marked as v0.2 candidate extensions; adding prospective, distinctiveness, collision, and break tests; and strengthening the boundary with established implementation science. These changes increase specification, not evidence state. PIC/FIA remain NOT CANON, NOT VALIDATED, and not a new discipline or fourth Stack layer. The seventeen-condition corpus is unchanged. v1.5 propagated two release-bound Meaning Sovereignty safeguards from the controlling v0.2 misuse review: voluntary individual participation/protected nonparticipation, and explicit prohibition of person-level surveillance through problem/intervention mapping. v1.6 adds an Institutional Significance statement to the front matter to state the study's contribution at institutional altitude and completes author attribution and preferred citation metadata before freeze. No finding, evidence state, seventeen-condition classification, PIC/FIA status, citation, architecture relationship, or conclusion is changed. Following founder pagination, final visual inspection, and cross-format verification, v1.6 is FROZEN and AUTHORIZED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. No finding, evidence state, Stack relationship, or PIC/FIA validation state is promoted.

About the Author

J. Rick Sanchez is the founder of MentratiK, the research and infrastructure institution developing and stewarding MK → MM → MF, an integrated architecture for the meaning layer. His work centers on the architecture, research, measurement, governance, and implementation development of Meaning Kernel, Meaning-Mechanics, and Meaning-First.

Preferred citation

Sanchez, J. R. (2026). The Upstream Problem: Seventeen Workplace Problems Commonly Treated Downstream. MentratiK. Version 1.6.