

APPENDIX A

Academic validation walkthrough.

How the methodology is positioned for independent academic review: what exists today, what remains open, and the protocol by which reviewers engage.

VERSION Version 6 · Appendix A

CONTACT hello@silkclarity.com

Academic validation

01 · POSITIONING

Defensible by construction.

The methodology is intended to be reviewable. Every dimension is defined in observable terms. Every score is anchored to evidence. Every evidence stream is documented as an independent source. This document walks an academic reviewer through what is currently in place, what is open, and what we ask reviewers to test.

02 · CURRENT STATUS

What exists today.

- Framework, dimensions, and competency definitions — written and locked.
- Evidence stream protocols — defined and operational.
- Scoring rubrics — documented; under iterative calibration.
- Inter-rater reliability work — initial cohort underway.

03 · OPEN QUESTIONS

Where we are honest.

- Calibration across role contexts (CEO vs functional leadership vs early-career).
- Cross-cultural validity at the dimension level.
- Discriminant validity vs adjacent psychometric instruments.
- Longitudinal stability of the Communication Signature.

Academic validation

04 · REVIEW PROTOCOL

How we engage reviewers.

Reviewers receive: full methodology documentation, scoring rubrics, sample evidence with assessment commentary, and access to anonymised assessment output. We ask reviewers to challenge construct definitions, evidence-to-score logic, and any claim of generalisability.

COMMITMENT

Reviewer feedback is logged in a public Change Record. Methodology revisions are versioned and dated.