

What's behind the score

This is for the person in the room who asks how we know. It sets out where Clairsyn Threshold comes from, what it draws on, and how a score is calculated, without publishing the instrument itself.

Built to be checked, not taken on faith

Every question in Clairsyn Threshold traces to research, a named standard, or a governance principle before it ever reaches a respondent. That trail lives in an internal Evidence Traceability Matrix (ETM): a version-controlled knowledge base, not a spreadsheet we wrote once and left alone. It is checked against 21 automated integrity tests before every release.

80

RESEARCH REFERENCES

28

PEER-REVIEWED

74

STANDARDS CLAUSES

11

STANDARDS FAMILIES

89

 GOVERNANCE-PRINCIPLE
LINKS

158

EVIDENCE RELATIONSHIPS

Almost nobody in this category publishes what their instrument is built on. We would rather show our working and let you judge it.

The standards and frameworks we cross-reference

ISO 37000

Governance of organisations: purpose, accountability and oversight

ISO 31000

Risk management principles and process

ISO 56000

Innovation management fundamentals

COSO ERM Framework

Connecting enterprise risk to strategy and performance

OECD Corporate Governance Principles

The international benchmark for board accountability

King IV

Ethical leadership and stakeholder-inclusive governance

NZX & ASX Governance Codes

Listed-entity governance standards for New Zealand and Australia

Overleaf: how the four pillars are weighted, how a score is actually calculated, and what we deliberately leave out of this note.

HOW THE INSTRUMENT WAS DESIGNED

How the instrument was designed

The thirteen questions were built against established survey-design principles, not written from instinct. Item wording is balanced to reduce acquiescence bias. Responses use a five-point Likert scale, the granularity the measurement literature supports for judgements like these. Every item describes an observable behaviour, not an attitude, so two honest respondents should land close together even on a day they feel differently about the organisation.

Instrument design follows DeVellis (2017), Fowler (2014), Dillman et al. (2014), Likert (1932), and Preston & Colman (2000) on optimal scale granularity.

Inside the evidence base

The ETM is a 20-sheet structure, not a single table. It carries a capability register, a research register, a standards register, a governance-principles register, an observable-evidence register, leading and lagging indicator libraries, an improvement-action library, and a maturity model, each one cross-linked back to the questions above them. Every question is traceable all the way down; nothing sits on the page unsupported.

80–90%

of technology adoption projects fail to meet their performance goals. The research attributes this to organisational readiness before the project starts, not the technology.

JOURNAL OF INNOVATION & KNOWLEDGE

39%

of workers' core skills are expected to change by 2030, which is why we treat workforce capability as a moving target rather than a fixed inventory.

WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM, FUTURE OF JOBS REPORT 2025

Four pillars, not weighted equally

The four pillars don't carry equal weight in the final score. Governance and Trust carries the most, because when governance breaks down, it tends to compromise the other three pillars as well. The exact coefficients live inside the ETM and drive every report; we don't publish them here, for the same reason we don't publish the question wording below.

01

Operations & Infrastructure

Systems, process, delivery under changing conditions

02

Governance & Trust

Accountability, transparency, decision-making

03

Workforce & Culture

People, purpose, psychological safety

04

Strategy & Sustainability

Direction, resilience, long-term viability

HOW A SCORE IS BUILT

How a score is built

Governance, leadership and employees each answer the same thirteen questions, anonymously, on a five-point scale. Each question maps to exactly one pillar, and each pillar score is the weighted result of the questions inside it. Scoring is deterministic: the same answers always produce the same result. No model interprets your data, no human adjusts your score, and nothing about what we might sell you afterwards can move the number.

The organisation score is a weighted composite across all four pillars. What actually drives the conversation is the gap between how governance, leadership and employees each scored the same pillar. That gap is the diagnostic signal; the absolute number matters less than where the three views come apart.

Reading the result

Every pillar score, and the organisation score overall, lands in one of five bands. They are an interpretive scale, not a pass or fail gate. An organisation can be Advanced overall and still be Exposed on the one pillar that matters most to what it's trying to do next.

EXPOSED

EMERGING

PROGRESSING

ADVANCED

FUTURE-READY

WHAT WE DON'T PUBLISH, AND WHY

We don't publish the exact wording of the thirteen questions, the names of the capabilities they map to, or the precise weighting and score-band thresholds. Not because the method is fragile, but because publishing them would let a respondent learn what earns a better answer. The moment that happens, the diagnostic stops measuring the organisation and starts measuring who read the manual.

What this is not. This is perception data. It measures what people in your organisation believe to be true, which is what shapes how they act. It is not an audit, and we don't present it as one.

“A finding that came from everyone, scored by a method nobody in the room can adjust, is very hard to dismiss as somebody's agenda.”

CLAIRSYN

[Start an assessment at assess.clairsyn.com](https://assess.clairsyn.com)

[See Clairsyn Threshold →](#)