Methodological Note on the K* Model

Coherence Thresholds, Systemic Tension, and Regime Transitions of Stability

Katarzyna Anna Paruzel
Sir Roger Penrose Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies

2026

This methodological note presents the conceptual and operational foundations of the Report K analytical model.*

Contents

1. Purpose of the Methodological Note

The purpose of this methodological note is to present the general assumptions of the K^* model, used within the Report K^* series to analyse stability, systemic tension, and transitions between regimes of coherence in social, political, institutional, and strategic systems.

This note is not intended to serve as a complete operational manual for the model. Its function is to clarify the basic analytical logic, the scope of application, and the meaning of the central concepts, including the K^* threshold, systemic tension, stabilizing potential, variable scaling, model weights, the logistic function, and empirical calibration. The full modelling procedure, the selection of weights, the detailed criteria for evaluating variables, and the internal rules of interpretation remain part of the author's proprietary research methodology.

The K^* model is not a classical predictive model designed to mechanically forecast isolated events. Its primary function is to diagnose the stability regime of a system, that is, to determine whether a given configuration of variables supports the preservation of coherence, a transition into conditional stability, the growth of fragmentation, or the crossing of a threshold beyond which the system begins to organize its decisions around fear, delay, self-demobilization, or the loss of agency.

In this sense, the K^* model is used to analyse the direction of systemic tension, rather than to reduce reality to a single numerical value. The numerical value obtained within the model has a diagnostic and interpretative character. It indicates the position of the system in relation to the coherence threshold, but it does not replace qualitative analysis, empirical data, expert judgement, or the political, historical, and institutional context.

The methodological note therefore has three basic functions. First, it organizes the conceptual language of the K^* model. Second, it indicates how the model understands complex systems as systems susceptible to transitions between regimes of stability. Third, it explains why, in Report K^* analyses, the crucial issue is not the mere presence of tension, but the relationship between systemic tension and the system's capacity to preserve decision-making coherence.

The K^* model is a tool of proprietary systemic analysis. Its application requires not only data, but also structural interpretation, recognition of relations between variables, and an assessment of whether the observed processes reinforce the stability of the system or lead it toward a different regime of functioning. For this reason, the present note describes the methodology at the conceptual and diagnostic level, while preserving the internal operational procedures as part of the author's research practice.

2. The Concept of the $K^\star$ Threshold

The K* threshold denotes a transition point at which a complex system begins to change its regime of functioning. It is not a single mechanical boundary, nor a simple numerical value after which one specific event automatically occurs. The K* threshold should be understood as a critical zone in which the relation between systemic tension and the stabilizing potential of the system begins to shift the system from one mode of decision organization into another.

In the K* model, the central issue is not the level of tension itself, but whether the system is capable of transforming that tension into a coherent response. High tension does not necessarily lead to collapse, escalation, or demobilization. It may become an impulse for mobilization, correction, accelerated decision-making, or the strengthening of adaptive capacity. The same level of tension may therefore produce different effects depending on the coherence structure of the system.

The K* threshold is reached when systemic tension begins to exceed the system's capacity for stable processing. In such a state, the system may still preserve the language of continuity, declare agency, and maintain formal procedures, while its actual decisions begin to reveal a transition into another regime. This may be a regime of delay, fragmentation, defensive self-preservation, reactivity, or the loss of the capacity to act in accordance with its declared objectives.

Within Report K* analyses, the K* threshold performs a diagnostic function. It makes it possible to identify the moment when change does not yet have to be visible as an open crisis, but is already present in the structure of decisions, communication, resource allocation, and the hierarchy of priorities. For this reason, the model can be applied to processes that develop before the appearance of classical indicators of systemic breakdown.

It should be emphasized that the K* threshold is not a universal constant assigned to all systems in the same way. Its position depends on the nature of the system, the type of variables under analysis, the availability of data, the dynamics of the environment, and the degree of internal institutional resilience. For this reason, the model requires contextual interpretation in each case and cannot be used as a ready-made scheme of mechanical measurement.

In general terms, the K* threshold may be treated as an indicator of the relation between destabilizing pressure and the system's capacity to preserve coherence. The greater the dominance of tension over stabilizing potential, the greater the probability of transition into a fragmentation regime. The stronger the stabilizing potential in relation to tension, the greater the chance that the system will transform pressure into mobilization, adaptation, or controlled correction.

The concept of the K* threshold is therefore a tool for identifying boundary moments. Its aim is not to indicate one certain future, but to determine whether the system is approaching a zone in which its previous mode of functioning may no longer be sufficient to preserve coherence.

3. The Diagnostic Character of the Model

The K* model is diagnostic rather than event-predictive in character. This means that its purpose is not to forecast a single event in a simple chronological sense, but to identify the stability regime in which the analysed system is located and to determine whether its current trajectory leads

toward the preservation of coherence, the growth of tension, fragmentation, self-demobilization, or a transition into a new configuration of action.

This distinction is essential. A classical event forecast attempts to answer the question: what will happen and when. The K^* model asks a prior question: what decision-making, informational, and structural conditions make a certain type of event more or less probable. In this sense, the model does not replace forecasting, but precedes it diagnostically by showing whether the system is entering a state of increased susceptibility to a specific direction of development.

The K^* model does not treat social, political, or strategic reality as a simple sequence of causes and effects. Systems of this type are complex systems in which not only input data are relevant, but also relations between variables, decision delays, feedback loops, levels of trust, the capacity of institutions to coordinate action, the quality of communication, and resilience to narrative pressure. The final event usually becomes visible only after the transition process has already been present within the structure of the system.

For this reason, the K^* model analyses regime change rather than the event itself. A system may formally preserve continuity while simultaneously moving from a regime of agency into a regime of delay, from a regime of mobilization into a regime of self-preservation, or from a regime of coherence into a regime of fragmentation. Such transitions often precede an open crisis and may be recognizable earlier than classical indicators of breakdown.

The diagnostic character of the model also means that its result should not be interpreted as a self-sufficient answer to the question of the future. The value obtained within the model indicates the position of the system in relation to the K^* threshold, but it requires qualitative interpretation. This interpretation includes the political, historical, institutional, media, and strategic context, as well as an assessment of whether the observed tension is being processed by the system in a coherent or destabilizing manner.

In practice, the K^* model makes it possible to distinguish a situation in which high tension strengthens the system's capacity for action from a situation in which the same tension begins to produce blockage, dispersion, or self-demobilization. This is particularly important in the analysis of political and security processes, since institutional systems rarely collapse suddenly. They first lose the capacity to process tension unambiguously, then begin to produce inconsistent decisions, and only later reveal the consequences in the form of crisis.

A diagnostic model therefore does not ask only whether a given event will occur. It asks whether the system is changing its own mode of functioning in such a way that a specific direction of events becomes more accessible, more probable, or more costly to prevent. In this sense, the K^* model is a tool for the early identification of structural changes before they are named by the classical categories of crisis.

4. Complex Systems and Transitions Between Stability Regimes

The K^* model assumes that the political, social, institutional, and strategic systems under analysis should be treated as complex systems. This means that their behaviour does not result from the simple addition of isolated factors, but from the relations between them, the dynamics of feedback

loops, decision delays, levels of coordination, and the quality of information that organizes the system's action.

A complex system may appear stable for a long time even while tension is accumulating within its structure. The external continuity of procedures, declarations, and institutions does not necessarily imply actual coherence. A system may preserve formal stability while gradually losing the capacity to respond coherently to pressure. For this reason, the analysis of complex systems requires the examination not only of events, but also of the way in which the system processes tensions before an event becomes visible.

In this framework, stability does not mean the absence of change. A stable system is not an immobile system, but one that is capable of absorbing disturbances, transforming tension into adaptation, and preserving the capacity to act in accordance with its own objectives. An unstable system, by contrast, does not have to collapse immediately. It may continue to function, produce decisions, and maintain the language of agency, while its decisions become increasingly reactive, inconsistent, or subordinated to the short-term avoidance of costs.

A transition between stability regimes means a change in the system's mode of functioning. It does not have to take the form of sudden breakdown. It is often gradual and first becomes visible in a change of priorities, a shift in decision-making language, delays, growing caution, dispersion of responsibility, or the loss of the capacity to connect strategic declarations with actual action.

In Report K^* analyses, particular attention is given to moments in which a system moves from a regime of coherence into a regime of conditional stability, and then from conditional stability into a fragmentation regime. A regime of coherence means a situation in which tension is recognized and processed by the system in a consistent manner. A regime of conditional stability denotes a state in which the system continues to function, but its responses become increasingly dependent on external pressure, narratives, and resource constraints. A fragmentation regime emerges when the system loses the capacity to maintain a single direction of action and begins to produce decisions that weaken one another.

Transitions between stability regimes are rarely visible immediately. They often first appear in the structure of language, in the way decisions are justified, in the changing hierarchy of risks, and in the arguments that begin to dominate public or institutional debate. For this reason, the K^* model treats narrative not as a secondary element, but as one of the carriers of information about the state of the system. Narrative may reveal whether the system is transforming tension into mobilization or into a blockage of action.

From the perspective of the K^* model, the key issue is whether the system preserves the capacity to reduce predictive entropy. This means that the system should limit the excess of contradictory trajectories of action, strengthen decision coherence, and maintain the predictability of its own responses. When the number of inconsistent impulses increases and the system ceases to integrate them into a single direction of action, the risk of crossing the K^* threshold grows.

Complex systems therefore do not move from stability to crisis in a linear way. More often, they pass through intermediate zones: adaptation, overload, conditional stability, fragmentation, and correction. The K^* model is used to identify these zones and to assess whether the observed system is approaching a point at which its existing regime of action is no longer sufficient.

5. Systemic Tension

Systemic tension denotes the accumulated pressure acting upon a complex system, which may result from political, social, economic, institutional, military, narrative, or technological factors. In the K* model, systemic tension is not understood as a single crisis impulse, but as a configuration of forces, expectations, constraints, and conflicting trajectories that influence the way in which the system makes decisions.

Tension may be external or internal. External tension originates in the system's environment: war, geopolitical pressure, economic crises, technological change, migration pressure, hybrid operations, or informational destabilization. Internal tension, by contrast, arises from the structure of the system itself: institutional conflicts, declining trust, procedural overload, social polarization, ambiguity of competences, incoherent communication, or discrepancies between declared objectives and actual decisions.

In K* analysis, the crucial issue is not the mere existence of tension, but its direction, intensity, and the way in which it is processed by the system. The same impulse may lead either to mobilization or to demobilization. It may strengthen the agency of the system if it is transformed into coordination, production, decision, and clear communication. It may also lead to fragmentation if it activates fear, delay, mutual accusations, the transfer of responsibility, or withdrawal from previous commitments.

Systemic tension becomes particularly significant when it begins to affect the hierarchy of priorities. At that point, the system is not merely responding to pressure, but begins to change its own decision-making structure under its influence. This means that some actions are accelerated, others delayed, some decisions are postponed, and certain commitments begin to be reinterpreted as too costly, too risky, or too difficult to maintain.

In the K* model, systemic tension may be understood as a factor that increases the predictive entropy of the system. The more contradictory stimuli, unclear signals, delayed decisions, and competing narratives there are, the more difficult it becomes for the system to maintain a predictable direction of action. An increase in tension does not, however, automatically imply destabilization. Destabilization appears only when the system lacks sufficient stabilizing potential to transform pressure into a coherent response.

Systemic tension also has a narrative dimension. In political and strategic systems, a story about threat may become an independent carrier of pressure. A narrative does not have to directly describe an actual operational intention in order to influence decisions. It is enough for it to change the perception of risk, redirect the attention of decision-makers, amplify social fear, or create an argument for delay, withdrawal, or limitation of action.

For this reason, in Report K* analyses systemic tension is examined not only as a sum of objective factors, but also as a structure of perception, interpretation, and response. A system may be under strong pressure and still preserve coherence if it recognizes the source of tension and responds to it in an organized manner. It may also become destabilized under a lower level of pressure if its own decision-making structure is susceptible to fear, informational chaos, or contradictory impulses.

Systemic tension in the K* model is therefore not treated as unambiguously negative. Rather, it is a condition that reveals the actual resilience of the system. Only the relation between tension and stabilizing potential makes it possible to assess whether the system is moving toward reinforcement, correction, fragmentation, or the crossing of the coherence threshold.

6. Stabilizing Potential

Stabilizing potential denotes the capacity of a complex system to process systemic tension in a way that does not lead to the loss of coherence. It is not identical with the absence of crisis, nor with resilience understood as passive survival. Stabilizing potential refers to the active capacity of a system to absorb pressure, organize information, preserve decision coherence, and transform disturbances into adaptive action.

In the K* model, stabilizing potential functions as a counterweight to systemic tension. If tension describes destabilizing pressure, stabilizing potential describes the system's capacity to preserve its direction of action despite that pressure. The stronger the stabilizing potential, the greater the chance that the system will not cross the threshold of fragmentation, but will instead transform tension into mobilization, correction, or controlled adaptation.

Stabilizing potential may arise from several layers of system functioning. At the institutional level, it includes the capacity for coordination, clarity of competences, speed of decision-making, procedural efficiency, and organizational resilience. At the social level, it includes trust, readiness for cooperation, resistance to panic, and the capacity to maintain a shared interpretative frame. At the strategic level, it includes continuity of objectives, consistency between communication and action, predictability of response, and the capacity to maintain commitments despite external pressure.

Stabilizing potential does not, however, mean rigidity. An overly rigid system may appear stable for a certain period of time, but under strong tension it loses the capacity to adapt. Stabilization in the K* model means dynamic coherence: the ability to preserve direction while allowing corrections, shifts, and reorganization where they are necessary for maintaining the system's agency.

A particularly important component of stabilizing potential is the capacity to reduce predictive entropy. A stable system does not eliminate all uncertainty, since this would be impossible in social and strategic reality. It does, however, limit the excess of contradictory trajectories, strengthen the readability of priorities, and allow participants in the system to understand which actions are consistent with the strategic direction and which actions weaken it.

In Report K* analyses, stabilizing potential is assessed not only through institutional declarations, but above all through the observable effects of action. A system may declare resilience, coherence, and readiness, but if its decisions are delayed, its communication inconsistent, its resources inactive, and its responsibility dispersed, its actual stabilizing potential is lower than official language suggests. Conversely, a system may be under strong pressure and still preserve high stabilizing potential if it is able to integrate information quickly and translate it into action.

Stabilizing potential also has a narrative dimension. A system preserves coherence not only

through procedures and resources, but also through maintaining an interpretative frame that does not transform tension into paralysis. In this sense, strategic communication is not an addition to action, but one of its conditions. If a narrative organizes risk, strengthens agency, and connects specific actions with a general objective, it increases stabilizing potential. If, by contrast, it disperses attention, amplifies fear, or justifies delay, it may reduce the system's capacity to preserve coherence.

The relation between systemic tension and stabilizing potential is one of the central elements of the K^* model. Only their mutual proportion makes it possible to assess whether the system is located in a regime of coherence, conditional stability, fragmentation, or demobilization. High tension combined with high stabilizing potential may lead to the strengthening of the system. High tension combined with low stabilizing potential increases the risk of crossing the K^* threshold.

7. Variable Scaling

Variable scaling denotes the process of bringing different types of data, observations, and qualitative assessments into a shared comparative space. In the K^* model, this is necessary because the processes under analysis do not belong to a single order of measurement. Quantitative data, such as expenditure levels, decision delays, production dynamics, or social indicators, have a different character from qualitative data, such as communication coherence, narrative intensity, social fear, institutional coordination, or the quality of strategic leadership.

The K^* model does not assume that all variables can be measured in an identical way. It assumes, however, that their direction, strength, and significance for systemic coherence can be assessed. Scaling is therefore not intended to reduce reality to a simplified number, but to make it possible to compare the influence of variables that, in their natural state, belong to different orders of description.

In general terms, variables are interpreted according to their systemic function. The assessment concerns whether a given variable increases tension, strengthens stabilizing potential, neutralizes the effects of pressure, or remains relatively neutral for the stability regime under analysis. What matters is not only the occurrence of a variable, but also its position within the structure of relations with other variables.

Variable scaling in the K^* model is contextual. The same variable may have different significance in different systems or at different moments in the development of a situation. An increase in defence expenditure may indicate resilient mobilization if it is accompanied by coordination, production, and a clear strategic direction. It may also indicate reactive fear if it occurs without a coherent strategy, without executive decisions, and without the capacity to integrate action.

For this reason, the model does not apply variables mechanically. Each variable is assessed in relation to the system to which it belongs and to the analytical question that organizes a given report. In one case, the speed of decision-making may be crucial; in another, the coherence of communication; in yet another, the capacity to maintain commitments despite pressure. Scaling places these elements within a shared interpretative structure, but it does not replace expert judgement.

An important element of scaling is the distinction between observed value and systemic significance. The observed value indicates that a given phenomenon is present. Systemic significance, by contrast, determines how that phenomenon affects the coherence of the system. The mere fact that social tension, alarmist communication, or the intensity of public debate is increasing does not yet determine the direction of change. Only the analysis of the relation between these phenomena and the institutional response makes it possible to determine whether the system is moving toward mobilization or demobilization.

Variable scaling also includes the assessment of dynamics. The K* model does not analyse only the static level of a variable, but also its change over time. A variable that remains at a moderate level, but is rising rapidly and beginning to influence other areas of the system, may have greater diagnostic significance than a high variable that is stable and well absorbed by the system.

The internal scaling procedure is part of the proprietary methodology of the K* model. The present note does not present it as a computational instruction. It only indicates that scaling is used to organize variables according to their influence on systemic tension, stabilizing potential, and the position of the system in relation to the coherence threshold. This allows the model to integrate quantitative data, qualitative observations, and narrative analysis without losing the distinction between these levels.

8. Model Weights

Model weights determine the relative significance of individual variables in the analysis of the system's position in relation to the K* threshold. Their function is not to give variables an artificial appearance of mathematical precision, but to organize their influence on systemic tension, stabilizing potential, and the probability of transition between stability regimes.

In the K* model, not all variables have the same force of influence. Some factors may occur frequently while having limited structural significance. Others may appear less often, but affect the entire system strongly because they change the hierarchy of decisions, strengthen or weaken coordination, activate feedback loops, or shift the system toward mobilization, fragmentation, or demobilization.

The weight of a variable depends on its function within the analysed system. A high-weight variable is one that not only occurs, but also organizes the behaviour of other elements of the system. It may affect the speed of decision-making, the quality of communication, the allocation of resources, the level of trust, narrative resilience, or the capacity of institutions to maintain a coherent direction of action. A low-weight variable may be descriptively relevant, but does not necessarily determine a transition of the stability regime.

Weights in the K* model are contextual and analytical in character. This means that they are not assigned once and for all to all variables in all reports. Their significance depends on the subject of analysis, the type of system, the phase of the situation, the available data, and the research question. The same variable may have high weight in a report on strategic security and lower weight in an analysis of institutional or social stability if it performs a different systemic function in that context.

The selection of weights requires a distinction between media significance and structural significance. Not every variable that is strongly present in public debate has high weight in the sense of the K^* model. A factor may dominate media discourse while not decisively influencing the actual direction of system action. Conversely, a variable that is weakly visible publicly may have high structural significance if it determines the system's capacity to execute decisions, maintain resources, or preserve coordination.

Weights also make it possible to distinguish symptoms from causal factors. A symptom indicates that a certain process is taking place within the system, but it does not necessarily drive that process. A causal factor, by contrast, affects the trajectory of the system. In the K^* model, variables that mediate between tension and the system's response are particularly important, since they often determine whether pressure is transformed into mobilization or into a blockage of action.

The model weights are not disclosed in this note as a ready-made operational table. Their full structure belongs to the author's proprietary analytical procedure. The note indicates only the general principle: variables are weighted according to their influence on the coherence of the system, and not merely according to their visibility, frequency, or media attractiveness.

Understood in this way, weights perform the function of a structural filter. They help distinguish data that merely describe the background of a situation from data that actually change the system's position in relation to the K^* threshold. This allows the model to preserve its capacity to analyse complex processes without reducing them to a simple list of indicators.

9. The Logistic Function

The logistic function in the K^* model is used to describe the transition between stability regimes in a continuous rather than abrupt manner. Its use follows from the assumption that complex systems rarely move from full stability to crisis at a single moment. More often, they pass through intermediate zones in which increasing tension gradually changes the probability of entering a different regime of functioning.

In its classical form, the logistic function describes a process in which change initially grows slowly, then accelerates near a threshold, and subsequently approaches a state of saturation. In the K^* model, this logic is used not as a mechanical forecasting formula, but as a tool for interpreting regime transition. It captures the fact that the impact of systemic tension on system stability does not grow linearly.

At a low level of tension, a system may absorb disturbances without a significant change in its regime of action. In the intermediate zone, the same disturbances begin to produce stronger effects, because the system consumes part of its stabilizing potential. Near the K^* threshold, even a relatively small change in one or several variables may shift the entire system significantly if it affects an already overloaded decision-making structure.

The logistic function therefore reflects the nonlinear character of systemic stability. Diagnostic value does not result only from the sum of variables, but from their position in relation to the threshold and from whether the system is still in the zone of tension absorption or has already entered the zone of accelerated transition. For this reason, the K^* model does not treat differences

between values as always equivalent. The same numerical difference may have limited significance in a stable zone and very high significance near the threshold.

In general terms, the logistic function may be understood as transforming the complex result of the relation between systemic tension and stabilizing potential into an indicator of the system's position in relation to the coherence threshold. This does not mean, however, that the formula itself exhausts the method. The prior interpretation of variables, their scaling, weighting, and placement within a specific analytical context remain essential.

The use of the logistic function also has methodological importance. It protects the analysis from the false assumption of linearity, according to which every increase in tension would have the same effect on the system. In reality, complex systems may preserve relative stability for a long time and then change their mode of functioning rapidly after entering a critical zone. The K^* model incorporates this property by treating the threshold as an area of increased susceptibility rather than as a single point of automatic breakdown.

In the present note, the logistic function is presented at the level of methodological principle. Its detailed parametrization, the selection of input values, and the internal procedure of interpretation remain part of the author's proprietary analytical practice. What is essential for the reader is that the K^* model does not describe stability as a simple line, but as a nonlinear process in which the significance of variables increases as the system approaches the coherence threshold.

The logistic function therefore allows the model result to be understood as an indicator of the probability of regime transition, not as a literal forecast of a single event. Its role is to indicate whether the system remains in a stable zone of tension absorption or is moving toward a zone in which further pressure may produce a qualitative change in the system's mode of action.

10. Empirical Calibration

Empirical calibration denotes the adjustment of the K^* model to a specific field of analysis on the basis of available data, observations, and expert knowledge. Its purpose is not to automatically determine one universal threshold value for all systems, but to establish how, in a given context, the relation between systemic tension, stabilizing potential, and the change of the system's regime of functioning should be interpreted.

The K^* model assumes that every complex system has its own structure of resilience, vulnerability, and response to pressure. For this reason, calibration cannot consist in mechanically transferring the same values from one report to another. A political system, a security system, an institutional structure, and a social or narrative process must each be analysed differently. In every case, it is necessary to determine which variables have structural significance, which function as background, and which are merely symptoms of a deeper process.

Empirical calibration is based on the combination of several types of material. These may include quantitative data, strategic documents, institutional decisions, economic indicators, the dynamics of public communication, changes in resource allocation, the analysis of media narratives, statements by political actors, and observations concerning the behaviour of the system over time. What matters is not only whether a given phenomenon is present, but also whether its

presence changes the mode of action of the system.

In practice, calibration requires a distinction between descriptive data and diagnostic data. Descriptive data indicate that a particular phenomenon exists. Diagnostic data make it possible to assess whether that phenomenon affects the system's transition between stability regimes. In the K* model, greater importance is assigned to those elements that change the relation between tension and stabilizing potential than to those that merely increase the amount of information about the background of the situation.

Calibration is not a one-time operation. Complex systems change over time, and with them the significance of individual variables also changes. A variable that functions as an early warning signal in one phase may become part of the normal background in another. Conversely, a previously secondary variable may acquire high significance if it begins to affect decisions, resources, communication, or the level of coordination. For this reason, the K* model requires updating as the situation changes.

Another important element of calibration is the assessment of source quality. Not all data have the same status. Some information may be official, some expert-based, some media-based, some survey-based, and some merely indicative. The K* model does not treat them as equivalent. Analysis requires determining which sources point to an actual structural change and which merely amplify informational noise or the temporary intensity of debate.

Empirical calibration in the K* model does not consist in adjusting the result to a thesis assumed in advance. On the contrary, its task is to verify whether the observed data genuinely support the diagnosis of regime transition or merely create the impression of change. For this reason, the model should be continuously confronted with new information, and earlier assessments should be corrected when the structure of the data or the direction of system action changes.

The full calibration procedure remains part of the proprietary methodology of the K* model. The present note indicates only its general principle: the model result should be grounded in empirical data, but these data must be interpreted structurally rather than merely statistically. Calibration ensures that the model remains connected to reality while preserving its capacity to identify processes that are not yet visible in classical crisis indicators.

11. Falsification and Model Updating

The K* model should be treated as an analytical tool subject to falsification, correction, and updating. This means that its diagnoses are not accepted as closed claims, but as structural assessments of a situation that must be confronted with further developments, new data, and changes in the behaviour of the analysed system.

Falsification in the K* model does not consist solely in checking whether one predicted event has occurred. Since the model is diagnostic rather than event-predictive, the primary object of assessment is whether the identified stability regime genuinely corresponds to the subsequent trajectory of the system. If the model indicates growing fragmentation while the system later begins to recover decision-making coherence, strengthen coordination, and stabilize priorities, the previous diagnosis requires correction. If the model indicates high resilience while the system

begins to produce inconsistent, delayed, or self-demobilizing decisions, this likewise requires a revision of the assessment.

In this sense, falsification concerns not only the numerical result, but the entire structural interpretation. What must be examined is whether the selected variables actually had systemic significance, whether the weights assigned to them corresponded to their function within the system, whether tension was properly distinguished from stabilizing potential, and whether the observed signals were symptoms of regime transition or merely temporary situational noise.

Model updating consists in placing the variables once again within a changing context. Complex systems do not remain static. Their resources, priorities, constraints, narratives, dependency structures, executive capacities, and levels of resilience change over time. For this reason, a diagnosis made at one moment may require modification if the system enters a different phase of action or if new factors appear that alter the relation between tension and stabilization.

Cases in which the system behaves contrary to the previous diagnosis are particularly important. Such divergence is not treated merely as a technical error, but as information about the structure of the system. It may indicate that the system possessed a stabilizing potential that had not previously been visible, that part of the tension was incorrectly assessed as structural, that a new mediating variable has appeared, or that the earlier interpretation of a narrative overestimated its impact on decisions.

Falsification and updating are therefore integral parts of working with the K^* model. The model is not intended to confirm theses assumed in advance, but to examine whether a given configuration of variables actually moves the system toward a specific regime of functioning. Where the data do not confirm the diagnosis, the diagnosis should be changed. Where the data reveal a new structure of relations, the model should be recalibrated.

In practice, this means that successive reports should not be treated as separate, unrelated interpretations, but as part of a continuous process of observation. Each analysis creates a reference point for the next. If the system develops in accordance with an earlier diagnosis, this strengthens the credibility of the adopted interpretation. If it develops differently, it provides material for correcting the model and deepening the understanding of the analysed process.

The falsifiability of the K^* model is one of the conditions of its analytical value. A model whose diagnoses cannot be corrected becomes a rhetorical tool rather than a research tool. For this reason, in the Report K^* series, what matters is not only the formulation of assessments, but also the readiness to revise them in light of new data, changing context, and the actual behaviour of the system.

12. Scope of Application

The K^* model has been developed as a tool of systemic analysis for complex systems in which the relation between tension, decision-making coherence, and the capacity to preserve functional stability is of central importance. Its primary field of application includes political, institutional, social, strategic, and narrative processes in which classical quantitative indicators are insufficient to capture the moment of transition between regimes of action.

The model may be applied wherever a system formally preserves continuity, but the question arises whether its actual capacity for action remains coherent. This is especially relevant in situations where there is a discrepancy between declarations and decisions, between resources and their activation, between strategic communication and execution, or between the official image of stability and the observable symptoms of systemic overload.

In the field of security, the K^* model may be used to analyse the susceptibility of states, institutions, or alliances to demobilization, fragmentation, decision delay, narrative pressure, and the loss of strategic coherence. It does not replace military, intelligence, or operational analyses, but may complement them by examining the decision-making, cognitive, and narrative layers in which the first symptoms of a regime shift often appear.

In the field of public policy, the model may be used to assess the capacity of an administrative system to absorb social, economic, or institutional pressure. It makes it possible to analyse whether the system responds to tension through coordination and correction, or rather through the dispersion of responsibility, delay, competence conflicts, or merely symbolic action. In this sense, the model may support the diagnosis of the resilience of the state, local governments, public institutions, and crisis management structures.

In social analysis, the K^* model may help identify moments in which social tension ceases to be merely a signal of dissatisfaction and begins to change the mode of functioning of a political community. This applies to phenomena such as polarization, loss of trust, increasing social fear, fragmentation of public debate, radicalization of narratives, or the declining capacity to agree on shared priorities.

In narrative analysis, the model makes it possible to examine situations in which a particular public narrative begins to function as a systemic factor. A narrative may strengthen coherence if it organizes risk, clarifies objectives, and supports agency. It may also reduce stabilizing potential if it generates fear, disorientation, delay, mutual accusations, or a belief that action is no longer possible. In the K^* model, narrative is therefore treated as an element of the decision-making structure, not merely as a layer of communication.

The scope of application also includes the analysis of long-term processes that do not have a single clearly defined crisis point. In such cases, the model may be used to observe gradual shifts: changes in language, the hierarchy of priorities, the quality of coordination, readiness for action, institutional resilience, and the system's capacity to transform pressure into a coherent response.

The K^* model is not limited to one type of system, but each application requires adjustment to the context under examination. A state, an international alliance, a public administration, a media system, and a social process must each be analysed differently. In every case, it is necessary to determine which tensions are relevant, which stabilizing mechanisms operate within the system, and which variables may indicate that the system is approaching the coherence threshold.

For this reason, the model should be treated as a diagnostic framework, not as a universal forecasting machine. Its value lies in its capacity to organize complex data and identify structural changes that may precede visible turning points. Proper application of the model requires the combination of data, qualitative observations, expert knowledge, and systemic interpretation.

13. Limitations of the Model

The K^* model is not an absolute instrument or a closed system for predicting reality. Its function is to support the diagnosis of stability regimes in complex systems, not to replace full political, strategic, social, institutional, economic, military, or intelligence analysis. Every application of the model requires placement within a specific context and confrontation with the available data.

The first limitation of the model is its dependence on data quality. The model may integrate quantitative data, qualitative observations, narrative analysis, and expert assessment, but it does not remove the problem of incomplete, delayed, selective, or distorted sources. If the input data are fragmentary or affected by interpretative error, the model result must also be read with caution.

The second limitation is the contextual character of variables. The same variable may have different significance in different systems, phases of crisis, or decision-making structures. An increase in tension may indicate a risk of fragmentation in one system and mobilization with increased agency in another. For this reason, the model cannot be used as a mechanical scheme in which identical data always lead to identical interpretation.

The third limitation is the impossibility of fully capturing hidden factors. In political and strategic systems, publicly unavailable information may be of crucial importance: backstage decisions, intelligence data, the actual state of resources, internal institutional conflicts, alliance pressure, negotiation channels, or personal variables. The K^* model may indicate structural symptoms, but it does not replace access to classified or non-public information.

The fourth limitation is the nonlinearity of complex systems. Even a correctly identified direction of tension does not guarantee that the system will develop along a single trajectory. Complex systems may change direction under the influence of new events, decisions, corrections, random impulses, or a sudden increase in stabilizing potential. The K^* model makes it possible to diagnose susceptibility to regime transition, but it does not eliminate the indeterminacy of the process itself.

The fifth limitation is the risk of overinterpreting the numerical result. The value obtained within the model should not be treated as a self-sufficient truth about the system. It is a diagnostic indicator that requires qualitative commentary, contextual interpretation, and comparison with the observed behaviour of the system. A number without structural interpretation may create false precision.

The sixth limitation is that the model does not directly determine the intentions of political actors. It may analyse the consequences of decisions, the coherence of actions, the structure of narratives, the direction of pressure, and the change of the regime of functioning, but it does not provide full access to the motivations of actors. Intention can only be reconstructed indirectly through the configuration of actions, declarations, costs, benefits, and systemic effects.

The K^* model should therefore be used as a tool for identifying coherence, tension, and regime transitions, not as a closed apparatus of automatic prediction. Its value lies in its capacity to organize complex information, identify areas of risk, and reveal processes that may precede visible turning points. Its limitations arise from the nature of complex systems themselves: variable, partly opaque, nonlinear, and context-dependent.

For this reason, every model result should be treated as a working diagnosis, subject to updating as new data become available. The model does not close the analysis, but organizes it. It does not replace expert reasoning, but provides a framework within which it is possible to determine whether a system is approaching the coherence threshold or preserving the capacity to process tension in a stable manner.

14. Final Remarks

The K^* model constitutes a proprietary framework of coherence-based analysis, designed to identify the relation between systemic tension, stabilizing potential, and transitions between stability regimes. Its purpose is not to replace existing methods of political, strategic, social, or institutional analysis, but to introduce an additional interpretative layer that makes it possible to identify processes that often precede visible turning points.

This methodological note presents the general language of the model and its basic diagnostic assumptions. It does not constitute a complete operational manual or a technical description of the internal procedures used in the preparation of reports. The detailed selection of variables, their scaling, weighting, calibration, and interpretation remain part of the author's proprietary research practice.

Within the Report K^* series, the K^* model is applied to areas in which the central question concerns the preservation or loss of systemic coherence. This primarily includes complex systems: states, institutions, alliances, social processes, public narratives, decision-making regimes, and strategic structures. In each case, the application of the model requires separate contextual interpretation and cannot be reduced to an automatic computational scheme.

The value of the model lies in the fact that it makes it possible to ask not only what may happen, but also how a system processes tension before an event becomes visible. This level of analysis constitutes the methodological foundation of the Report K^* series.