Utilization scaling system

By Dimen-sensei

Utilization Scaling is a narrative cognition system meant to quantify and qualify how effectively a character utilizes internal faculties, intelligence, emotion, perception, and strategy within variable adversities and across all possible narrative spaces.

Foundational principles

1) Process supremacy, method over outcome

At the core of Utilization Scaling lies an unwavering commitment to the primacy of methodological integrity over consequential results. This principle discards the conventional fetishization of “success” in evaluating outsmarting, and instead exalts process fidelity, internal structure, and cognitive precision. A flawlessly engineered maneuver that fails due to uncontrollable variables is valued more highly than a crude trick that succeeds by luck or incompetence of others. Why? Because what matters is not that something “worked,” but that the way it was done demanded ingenuity, adaptive control, and domain-specific mastery. This is what defines a user’s true Utilization: not their reach, but their refined use of cognitive machinery.

The system therefore upscales feats with layered logic, anticipation, and execution even when they collapse, and downscales “victories” when they are process-empty or structurally shallow.

2) Domain Integration, cross-field interplay over siloed talent

Utilization Scaling recognizes that no feat of intellect, strategy, or influence exists in isolation. Intelligence is not simply raw processing, just as manipulation is not just charisma or deceit. Rather, all cognitive feats emerge from interactions between domains: emotional insight may inform foresight, abstract reasoning may reinforce deception, and social engineering might be driven by logistical planning. This axiom enforces that a user’s value lies in their ability to synthesize and dynamically balance multiple intelligences or faculties, not just in how high they score in one. Characters who can fuse metacognition with risk analysis, or blend empathy with

adversarial profiling, are rewarded with higher Utilization grades for the convergent sophistication of their cognitive architecture.

3) *Realism non-constraint, Logical feasibility without real-world limitations.*

Realism, while important in diegetic or literary critique, is actively deprioritized in Utilization Scaling. The system does not ask whether a character's actions are "believable" in the real world, but whether those actions are logically feasible within their narrative system, and internally sound by their universe's mechanics and information limits. In other words, feats involving psychological gambits, social modeling, or mental warfare that appear surreal or exaggerated are not dismissed, as long as their logical scaffolding is traceable, justified, and non-contradictory. This gives the system maximal analytical elasticity while preserving standards of rationality.

4) *Scalable Conflict Recognition, Micro level and Macro level equivalence*

Traditional scaling often skews toward grandiose circumstances, war games, death battles, systemic revolutions, under the impression that higher stakes equate to more impressive intellect. Utilization Scaling explicitly rejects this notion by treating small-scale strategic contests as equally legitimate evaluative grounds. A meticulously executed trap during a hallway conversation or a subtle shift in group loyalty during a single vote may be as cognitively demanding as a war campaign, depending on the precision, timing, and anticipation involved. The system therefore neutralizes "scale bias" and evaluates conflict depth rather than conflict size, ensuring that both minor duels of wits and global game-theoretic plays are ranked by how structurally and psychologically demanding they are.

5) *Narrative-aware, not narrative-dependent*

Statements, narration, and character-driven lore do hold value within Utilization Scaling, but not at face value. They are parsed only when logically anchored to evidence, either through a feat's structure, a character's consistent behavior, or systemic support in the narrative world. This ensures that statement-based power or intelligence claims do not substitute actual feats. Moreover, narrative influence is strictly capped at 30%, ensuring that scaling does not devolve into authorial fiat or meta-inflation. A character called a "genius" contributes to an interpretive lens, not a rank. Only when the narrative aligns with cognitive processes demonstrated in action

is it given real weight. This keeps Utilization Scaling both respectful of story texture and immune to textual inflation.

6) *Resistance calibration, weight of opposition over the difficulty of the environment*

One of the most nuanced insights within Utilization Scaling is the focus on resistance and adversity not as stakes, but as cognitive counterforce. A plan executed under isolation or without resistance may reflect elegance, but it may also reveal a lack of test. Hence, feats that occur in direct opposition to difficult agents, complex resistance profiles, or internal psychological weight (e.g., stress, trauma, betrayal) are adjusted upward. The scaling matrix allows for 15% adversity impact specifically for this: to weigh the mental strain and internal thresholds required for performance. However, this is still capped, as too much adversity and praise risks glorifying struggle without method. Only cognitive adversity that interacts with the feat structure earns value.

7) *Situational tension awareness, variable instability as a complexity multiplier*

Certain settings generate emergent difficulty not from opposition but from unstable, volatile, or irregular dynamics: unpredictable group behavior, rapidly changing conditions, limited information, social volatility, or ethical traps. Utilization Scaling rewards users who can navigate these nonlinear complications through situational awareness, re-framing, and dynamic recalibration. These feats are weighted at 20% because they do not always involve intelligent enemies but still present high planning and control complexity. A strategy that adapts seamlessly to a collapsing environment, an emotional play that stabilizes a factional breakdown, these are scaled upward for environmental intelligence and contextual fluidity.

8) *DCCC: Depth, Complexity, Consistency, and Compound*

The crown jewel of the axioms is the DCCC principle: feats earn their highest value not from scope, resistance, or fame, but from how deeply structured, internally consistent, and recursively complex they are. A plan with three contingency layers and two misdirection strata scores higher than a single-layer deception, even if both work. A predictive social model that maintains integrity across four conflicting emotional actors earns more than a simplistic group control. The DCCC axis, weighted at 25%, is what determines whether a feat is a “throwaway trick” or a demonstration of meticulous longform cognition. This compound reflects how much time, mental effort, and recursive strategy a character shows, and anchors the feat in analytical permanence.

Input structures and the influence matrix:

The Utilization Influence Matrix is the formal mechanism by which character feats are parsed into meaningful scores. It provides a multi-criteria weighting system that distinguishes raw process from narrative inflation, psychological stress, and situational complexity. The matrix allows evaluators to dissect feats into distinct vectors of difficulty, elegance, adversarial resistance, and domain integration, all while maintaining an empirical ratio of influence across categories.

The first vector, Narrative/Statements (30%), allows claims, lore, or authorial descriptors to factor into the scaling, but only to the degree that they reinforce feats or internal logical profiles. A character being called “calculating” or “manipulative” is not enough; this must be supported by processual action. Statements must bind to a feat and be explainable through logic. This prevents narrative-led inflation while still rewarding authorial cohesion.

The second vector, Adversity Factor (15%), examines whether the character operated under internal difficulty (mental strain, fear, doubt) or external interference (opposing intellects, betrayal, or time pressure). Adversity, in Utilization Scaling, is not about the drama, it is load-bearing complexity that applies pressure to process integrity. A character executing a complex plan while sustaining trauma or counter-play from a peer earns this adversity bonus only if they retain methodic clarity.

The third vector, Situational Complexity (20%), evaluates the dynamic tension in the environment: unstable alliances, emotionally explosive atmospheres, limited information flow, shifting loyalties, or spatial constraints. Unlike traditional strategy scaling, this vector does not rely on “scale of stakes” but scale of control disruption. A feat within a multi-actor negotiation web will score higher if it sustains functional clarity and flexible execution amid chaos.

The fourth and most important vector, In-Depth + Complexity + Consistency (25%), assesses how structurally difficult the feat is to design and maintain. Does it include recursive contingencies? Is it modular? Is it elegant or bloated? Does it rely on shaky psychological assumptions or measurable patterns? Are its components contradictory or tightly fused? Feats that exhibit high internal logic, inter-domain symmetry, and clean strategic recursion scale the highest here. This vector is the main determinant of cross-domain synergy and design intelligence.

Together, these inputs form a mathematically structured but interpretively elastic system. While feats are judged individually, the matrix encourages comparative scaling based on layered analysis and invites cognitive deconstruction as a core value.

Each feat will include a weighted composite score generated through this matrix, producing three nested values:

-Raw Utilization Value (RUV) = Total feat utility from cognitive exertion

-Cross-Domain Sync Value (CSV) = Degree of multi-category interaction

-Process Depth Coefficient (PDC) = Internal logic intensity and mental investment

What is an anti-feat in Utilization scaling;

An anti-feat in Utilization is not simply losing or being outsmarted, it is one of the following:

Valid qualifications of an anti-feat:

1) **Breakdown in Logical Methodology**: The character's reasoning is internally flawed, circular, or contradicts their stated intelligence.
2) **Overlooked variables without narrative justification**: Failure to account for obvious elements without stress or constraints.
3) **Inconsistent cognitive profile**: The character’s actions contradict their established process or prior feats without plausible regression, stress, or narrative setup.
4) **Being outsmarted by a featless or weaker mind**: Losing to someone who shows no methodology, implying the character relied on assumptions, ego, and error.
5) **Emotional collapse that interrupts the process**: If a breakdown derails strategy and wasn’t accounted for in their planning, it counts.

Invalid qualifications of an anti-feat:

1) **Being outmaneuvered by a smarter character with a stronger method.**
2) **Losing because of external variables not within their modeling range.**
3) **Feats that fail by results, but demonstrate solid logical structure**
4) **Being tricked by a character whose method is sound and whose process undetectable**

How Anti-Feats Are Weighted in Utilization:

Instead of “deducting points,” Utilization evaluates anti-feats as inverse indicators of consistency, insight, or adaptability, reflected in these weighted areas:

Complexity+In depth+Consistency=25%

Adversity factor=15%

Situational factor=20%

Anti-feats don’t reduce points unless they actively undermine those weighted categories. For example:

1) If a character fails because they ignored context, then their situational factor drops.
2) If they repeat the same error, then their consistency rating falls.
3) If they crack under pressure, then it hurts their adversity rating.
4) If they are fooled by a simplistic or illogical plan, it hurts insight, reasoning, and manipulation.

———

Characters with growth arcs may have early anti-feats that don’t scale them down, if they’re followed by:

1) Clear improvements in methodology
2) Recognition of prior flaw in-universe
3) Narrative or thematic justification (e.g., innocence, trauma, lack of experience)

In such cases, earlier anti-feats may even enrich their scaling if they lead to more sophisticated, layered methods later.

Unexplained feats/statements:

Unexplained statements:

Unexplained statements are treated with extreme caution and minimal evaluative weight. The system does not reward statements that imply an ability without anchoring it in logical evidence, demonstrated methodology, or a consistent behavioral profile. This includes claims like “he’s the smartest in the room” or “she always wins” unless those statements can be tied to actual cognitive processes, behavioral markers, or past feats that align with the claim. Therefore, statements without either direct feat alignment or logical extrapolation based on context are discarded from evaluation, especially if they introduce abilities not shown or contradict what’s demonstrated. However, statements that clarify or reflect existing cognitive methodology such as insights into thinking style, emotional perception, or decision frameworks may be subtly integrated into category weightings like psychology, resistance, or Gardner’s theory domains, as long as they pass internal logic checks. In summary, unexplained statements are not considered scalable unless logically contextualized and grounded in either consistent behavior or a methodologically sound track record.

Unexplained feats:

Actions that occur without visible logical scaffolding, strategic process, or in-universe causal coherence are heavily downscaled or outright rejected in Utilization Scaling. Since this system prioritizes process over result, a feat without visible cognitive operation such as suddenly winning a psychological game, making a deduction out of thin air, or outmaneuvering others with no perceptible mechanism is considered narratively hollow unless the feat can be retroactively rationalized through grounded logic. Utilization permits off-screen feats or ambiguous wins if the character has an established pattern of methodical consistency or if contextual clues allow logical interpolation of their actions. However, if no rational bridge can be constructed, and the feat exists as a narrative gap-filler, it is discarded as invalid under this framework. A pattern of unexplained feats may negatively impact the Complexity + In-depth + Consistency score, since it suggests the character’s intelligence is not internally coherent or replicable. Thus, unexplained feats are not only non-scalable, they are considered a flaw unless redeemed by indirect logical exposition, processual continuity, or third-party insight that reconstructs the logic behind the outcome.

Categories used for this scaling:

Full Scale IQ

[Working Memory Index, Processing Speed Index, Visual Spatial Index, Cognitive Proficiency Index, Verbal Comprehension Index, Fluid Reasoning Index, Perceptual Reasoning Index]

Intelligence
[Crystallized, Fluid, learning ability, knowledge application, Novel Complex Problem Solving, Cognition, Proficiency]

Emotional intelligence
[E. Understanding, E. Perception, E. Management, E. Engagement, E. Realization, E. Facilitation, E. Adaptability, E. Forecasting, E. Regulation, Empathy]

Social intelligence
[Socialization, Leadership, Influence, Social Awareness, Self Awareness, Self Regulation, Social Cognition, Social Integration, Social Intuition, Social Engineering]

Influence
[Network, Charisma, Given influence, Influence building]

Adversity Capacity
[Composure, Impulse Control, Cognitive Discipline, Multitasking, Stress Tolerance, Mental Fortitude, Determination, Perseverance, Will to act]

Manipulation
[Indirect, Direct, Emotional, Psychological, Logical, Mass, Individual]

Deception
[Acting, Misdirection, Concealment, Fabrication, Sophistry, Verbal Deception, Unpredictability, Info Control, Goal Posting]

False Flags
[Plausible Deniability, Gaslighting, Omission, Narrative-Sculpting, Decoy-Events, Falsification, Mole-insertion, mimicry, shifting, Double-Bluff]

Gardner's Theory
[Mathematical, Linguistic, interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Visual Spatial, Bodily Kinesthetic, Musical, Naturalistic]

Resistance
[Manipulation, Dissonance, Perception, Field Guarding, Difficult to Read, difficult to counter, unreadability, less weaknesses]

Insight

[Observation, Perception, Deduction, Metacognition, Analysis, Logical Inference, Connecting the dots, Pattern Recognition, Info Gathering]

Psychology
[Cold Reading, Hot Reading, Mind Reading, P. Understanding, P. Profiling, P. Analysis, P. Warfare, Behavior Pattern Recognition, P. Tactics]

Knowledge
[Crystallized, Application, Theoretical, Practical, Academics, Psychological]

Adaptability
[Cognitive, Environmental, Situational, Social, Strategic]

Foresight
[Prediction, Anticipation, Preclusion, Intuition, Trap Setting, Trap Evasion, Risk Assessment, One step ahead]

Strategy
[Long term, short term, method, complexity, concrete, efficiency, effectiveness, resilience, shielding, castling, success rate, execution, logistics, forecasting, fortitude]

Planning
[Long term, short term, complexity, intricacy, tactics, coverage, versatility, improvisation, contingency, consistency, invincibility, aim, prep process, formulation speed, risk calculations, difficult to counter, less limitations, improvisation, resource management]

Thinking
[Logical, Abstract, Lateral, Convergent, Divergent, Linear, Nonlinear, Holistic, Faster, Critical, Associative, Application, Creative, Horizontal, Vertical]

Reasoning
[Deductive, Inductive, Abductive, Analogical, Abstract, Matrix, Perceptual, Fluid, Numerical, Quantitative, Cause and Effect]