



# **Justification of the WQI Core Organization Quality Factors**

**WHOLE QUALITY JUSTIFICATION WQI\_OFJ1**

Methodological Justification of the Four-Factor Architecture of the  
WQI Organization Quality Standard - Core

**Article - September 2026**

**WHOLE QUALITY INSTITUTE**

## Table of Contents

|                                                                              |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| FOREWORD .....                                                               | 5  |
| 1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE.....                                                    | 5  |
| 1.1 Purpose of This Article.....                                             | 5  |
| 1.2 What Is Being Justified .....                                            | 6  |
| 1.3 Scope of the Justification.....                                          | 6  |
| 2. ORGANIZATION AS A QUALITY OBJECT .....                                    | 7  |
| 2.1 Organization as the Quality Object .....                                 | 7  |
| 2.2 Organization and Its Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects.....   | 7  |
| 2.3 Organization and Management System as Different Quality Objects.....     | 8  |
| 2.4 Organization Intended Function.....                                      | 8  |
| 2.5 Organization Intended Result .....                                       | 9  |
| 2.6 Organization Function Realization.....                                   | 9  |
| 3. THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY FACTOR PROBLEM .....                             | 10 |
| 3.1 Why Organization Quality Requires Core Quality Factors.....              | 10 |
| 3.2 Required Methodological Resolution .....                                 | 10 |
| 3.3 Risk of Too Few Factors .....                                            | 11 |
| 3.4 Risk of Excessive Factor Detail .....                                    | 11 |
| 3.5 Boundary Between Core Factors and Application Detail.....                | 11 |
| 4. METHOD FOR DERIVING AND TESTING THE CORE QUALITY FACTORS .....            | 12 |
| 4.1 Derivation from Organization Intended Function and Intended Result ..... | 12 |
| 4.2 Functional Necessity Test.....                                           | 12 |
| 4.3 Removal Test.....                                                        | 13 |
| 4.4 Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test .....                                  | 13 |
| 4.5 Absorption and Combination Test .....                                    | 13 |
| 4.6 Missing-Function Test.....                                               | 14 |
| 4.7 Cross-Context Applicability Test.....                                    | 14 |
| 4.8 Collective Architecture Test .....                                       | 15 |
| 5. FACTOR 1 — PERFORMANCE .....                                              | 15 |
| 5.1 Derivation of Performance .....                                          | 15 |
| 5.2 Determination Function of Performance .....                              | 15 |
| 5.3 Necessity and Removal Test.....                                          | 16 |
| 5.4 Distinctness from Capability, Integration, and Continuity .....          | 16 |
| 5.5 Factor 1 Finding.....                                                    | 17 |
| 6. FACTOR 2 — CAPABILITY .....                                               | 17 |
| 6.1 Derivation of Capability.....                                            | 17 |

|                                                                     |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 6.2 Determination Function of Capability .....                      | 18 |
| 6.3 Necessity and Removal Test .....                                | 18 |
| 6.4 Distinctness from Performance, Integration, and Continuity..... | 19 |
| 6.5 Factor 2 Finding .....                                          | 19 |
| 7. FACTOR 3 — INTEGRATION .....                                     | 20 |
| 7.1 Derivation of Integration.....                                  | 20 |
| 7.2 Determination Function of Integration.....                      | 20 |
| 7.3 Necessity and Removal Test .....                                | 21 |
| 7.4 Distinctness from Performance, Capability, and Continuity.....  | 21 |
| 7.5 Factor 3 Finding .....                                          | 22 |
| 8. FACTOR 4 — CONTINUITY .....                                      | 22 |
| 8.1 Derivation of Continuity.....                                   | 22 |
| 8.2 Determination Function of Continuity.....                       | 23 |
| 8.3 Necessity and Removal Test .....                                | 23 |
| 8.4 Distinctness from Performance, Capability, and Integration..... | 23 |
| 8.5 Factor 4 Finding .....                                          | 24 |
| 9. HORIZONTAL TESTING ACROSS THE FOUR FACTORS .....                 | 24 |
| 9.1 Purpose of Horizontal Testing .....                             | 24 |
| 9.2 Performance and Capability .....                                | 25 |
| 9.3 Capability and Integration .....                                | 25 |
| 9.4 Capability and Continuity .....                                 | 26 |
| 9.5 Integration and Continuity.....                                 | 26 |
| 9.6 Performance and Continuity .....                                | 27 |
| 9.7 Factor Placement and Non-Redundancy.....                        | 27 |
| 9.8 Horizontal Testing Finding .....                                | 28 |
| 10. MISSING-FACTOR TEST .....                                       | 28 |
| 10.1 Purpose of the Missing-Factor Test.....                        | 28 |
| 10.2 Requirements .....                                             | 28 |
| 10.3 Management and Governance .....                                | 29 |
| 10.4 Resources and Organizational Means.....                        | 29 |
| 10.5 Relationships and Interfaces .....                             | 30 |
| 10.6 Change and Adaptability.....                                   | 30 |
| 10.7 Resilience and Recovery .....                                  | 31 |
| 10.8 Improvement and Other Candidate Functions.....                 | 31 |
| 10.9 Missing-Factor Finding .....                                   | 32 |
| 11. CROSS-CONTEXT STRESS TESTING .....                              | 33 |

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 11.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing .....                        | 33 |
| 11.2 Different Types of Organizations .....                        | 33 |
| 11.3 Different Required Functions and Results .....                | 34 |
| 11.4 Different Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects .....  | 34 |
| 11.5 Different Boundaries and Interfaces .....                     | 34 |
| 11.6 Different Contexts and Applicable Conditions .....            | 35 |
| 11.7 Different Temporal Bases and Conditions of Change .....       | 35 |
| 11.8 Cross-Context Finding .....                                   | 36 |
| 12. WHY FOUR — AND NOT FEWER OR MORE .....                         | 36 |
| 12.1 Why Fewer Factors Would Reduce Determination Capability ..... | 36 |
| 12.2 Why Additional Factors Are Not Presently Required .....       | 37 |
| 12.3 Why Four Is the Presently Supported Core Resolution .....     | 37 |
| 13. STABILITY AND CONDITIONS FOR CONTROLLED REVISION .....         | 38 |
| 13.1 Need for Core Stability.....                                  | 38 |
| 13.2 Conditions That Could Justify Revision .....                  | 38 |
| 13.3 Controlled Revision Principles .....                          | 39 |
| 13.4 Stability Finding .....                                       | 39 |
| 14. CONCLUSION .....                                               | 39 |
| COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE .....                                     | 40 |

## FOREWORD

An Organization can be examined as a Quality Object.

Its Quality cannot be determined only from individual products, services, activities, resources, organizational units, or management arrangements. The Organization operates as a whole, and its Quality depends on the degree to which its Intended Function and Intended Result are realized.

This creates a methodological question:

*What should be examined to determine Organization Quality at the Core level?*

This article addresses that question by deriving and testing the Core Quality Factors needed to examine Organization Function Realization.

The analysis begins with the Organization as the Quality Object and with its Intended Function and Intended Result. It then examines whether distinct dimensions of Organization Function Realization are necessary, whether any can be removed or combined, whether any necessary determination function remains uncovered, and whether the resulting architecture remains applicable across different organizational contexts.

The analysis supports four Core Organization Quality Factors:

1. Performance
2. Capability
3. Integration
4. Continuity

These Factors are not intended to describe every characteristic of an Organization or prescribe how an Organization should be structured or managed. They identify the Core dimensions through which Organization Function Realization can be examined at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

Detailed requirements, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, methods, and application-specific subjects may vary according to the Organization, its required functions and results, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and applicable conditions.

The purpose of this article is therefore not to establish a universal model of how organizations should operate. Its purpose is to provide the methodological justification for the four-Factor architecture proposed for the WQI Organization Quality Standard — Core.

## 1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

### 1.1 Purpose of This Article

The purpose of this article is to provide the methodological justification for the Core Quality Factors used to examine Organization Quality.

The analysis addresses a specific question:

*What distinct dimensions must be examined to determine the degree to which an Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result?*

The article derives the proposed Factors from Organization Function Realization rather than from conventional organizational structures, management functions, resource categories, or industry-specific practices.

Each proposed Factor is tested for necessity, distinctness, possible removal or combination, and contribution to the collective architecture. The analysis also examines whether an important dimension of Organization Function Realization remains uncovered.

The resulting architecture is stress-tested across different organizational contexts to determine whether the Factors can remain stable while application-specific requirements, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, methods, and organizational arrangements vary.

The article therefore provides the methodological basis for determining whether the proposed four-Factor architecture is sufficiently complete and distinct at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

## 1.2 What Is Being Justified

This article justifies the proposed Core Quality Factor architecture for determining Organization Quality.

The proposed architecture consists of four Factors:

1. Performance
2. Capability
3. Integration
4. Continuity

The justification concerns whether these four Factors represent necessary and distinct dimensions of Organization Function Realization at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

The analysis therefore examines:

- whether each Factor represents a necessary determination function;
- whether removal of any Factor would reduce determination visibility;
- whether any Factor can be absorbed into another without reducing determination visibility;
- whether the Factors are sufficiently distinct and non-redundant;
- whether an important dimension of Organization Function Realization remains uncovered; and
- whether the four-Factor architecture remains applicable across different organizational contexts.

The article does not assume that four Factors are correct because four were initially proposed. The architecture is supported only to the extent that the methodological analysis demonstrates that the Factors are necessary, distinct, collectively sufficient at the present Core Methodological Resolution, and not unnecessarily detailed.

The individual Core Quality Indicators beneath these Factors are not justified in this article. Their derivation and justification are addressed separately.

## 1.3 Scope of the Justification

This article is limited to the methodological justification of the Core Quality Factors for Organization Quality.

It examines the Organization as the Quality Object and considers the Factors necessary to determine the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result.

The analysis is conducted at the Core Methodological Resolution. It therefore seeks Factors that can remain stable across different types of organizations while allowing application-specific requirements, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, methods, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, and other details to vary.

The article does not prescribe how an Organization should be structured, governed, or managed. It does not establish universal organizational objectives, resource arrangements, processes, technologies, or performance measures.

It also does not determine the Quality of any particular Organization.

The justification is limited to the four proposed Core Quality Factors. Detailed derivation and justification of the Core Quality Indicators are addressed separately.

The conclusions of this article are methodological and bounded. They support the Factor architecture at the present Core Methodological Resolution and do not preclude controlled revision if later analysis or application identifies a necessary determination function that is not adequately represented.

The analysis is conceptual and architectural. It does not constitute empirical or statistical validation of the proposed Factor architecture.

## **2. ORGANIZATION AS A QUALITY OBJECT**

### **2.1 Organization as the Quality Object**

For this justification, the Organization is examined as a Quality Object.

This means that the subject of the Quality Determination is the Organization itself, rather than any single product, service, process, organizational unit, asset, person, or Management System associated with it.

An Organization may contain or depend on many constituent and contributing Quality Objects. Each may have its own Intended Function, Intended Result, requirements, Quality State, and Evidence.

Their individual Quality States do not, by themselves, determine Organization Quality.

The Organization must therefore be examined at its own Methodological Resolution and against its own Intended Function and Intended Result.

This preserves an important distinction: Organization Quality concerns the degree to which the Organization, as the defined Quality Object, realizes what is required of it.

The Quality of constituent and contributing Quality Objects may affect that realization, but Organization Quality is not established by simply adding, averaging, or otherwise combining their individual Quality States.

The Organization remains the Quality Object throughout the determination.

### **2.2 Organization and Its Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects**

An Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result through multiple constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

These may include organizational units, people, Management Systems, processes, facilities, infrastructure, information systems, technologies, external providers, and other Quality Objects relevant to organizational realization.

The applicable Quality Objects depend on the Organization, its requirements, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and Methodological Resolution.

A constituent or contributing Quality Object may itself be examined as a separate Quality Object. Its Quality can therefore be determined against its own Intended Function and Intended Result.

However, its individual Quality State does not automatically establish the Quality State of the Organization.

A contributing Quality Object may have a favorable Quality State while its contribution to organizational realization remains insufficient. Conversely, a weakness in one contributing Quality Object may have different significance depending on its relationship to the Organization's required functions and results.

The relevant question at the Organization level is therefore not simply whether each contributing Quality Object has favorable Quality.

The question is how the relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects contribute to realization of the Organization's Intended Function and Intended Result.

This preserves the Organization as a distinct Quality Object while allowing the Quality and contribution of other Quality Objects to be examined where relevant.

### **2.3 Organization and Management System as Different Quality Objects**

The Organization and its Management System are different Quality Objects.

The Organization is the broader Quality Object whose required functions and results are examined at the organizational level.

The Management System is the actual management used by the Organization to realize a required product, service, work, or other Intended Result.

Management System Quality therefore concerns the degree to which the Management System realizes its own Intended Function.

Organization Quality concerns the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result.

The Management System may be a critical contributing Quality Object within the Organization, but its Quality State does not automatically determine Organization Quality.

A Management System may function favorably while required organizational functions or results are not fully realized. Conversely, an organizational result may be observed without establishing that the Management System itself has a favorable Quality State.

The two Quality Determinations must therefore remain distinct.

This distinction also prevents the Organization Quality Factors from becoming a second Management System Quality architecture. Organization Quality examines the Organization as a whole. Management System Quality separately examines the management used in realizing what is required.

Where Management System Quality is relevant to Organization Quality, it may contribute Evidence and findings to the Organization-level determination while retaining its identity as a separate Quality Object and Quality Determination.

### **2.4 Organization Intended Function**

The Organization Intended Function provides the functional basis for determining Organization Quality.

For this justification, the Organization Intended Function is:

*To operate as an organizational whole so that the required results are produced within the applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis of the Organization.*

This formulation treats the Organization as a whole rather than as a collection of independently assessed parts.

It does not prescribe how the Organization should be structured or managed. Different organizations may use different structures, Management Systems, people, resources, technologies, processes, and relationships to realize what is required.

The phrase “as an organizational whole” is important. It recognizes that organizational realization may depend on multiple constituent and contributing Quality Objects and on their relationships, without defining Organization Quality as the sum of their individual Quality States.

The phrase “so that the required results are produced” connects organizational operation to what is required without assuming a particular type of organization or result.

The remaining terms bound the Intended Function. Organization Quality is determined within the applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis of the Organization.

The Intended Function therefore provides a common functional basis from which the Core Organization Quality Factors can be derived and tested.

## 2.5 Organization Intended Result

The Organization Intended Result describes what should result when the Organization realizes its Intended Function.

For this justification, the Organization Intended Result is:

*The Organization realizes its required functions and produces the required results within its applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.*

The Intended Result complements, but does not repeat, the Intended Function.

The Intended Function describes what the Organization is intended to do as a Quality Object: operate as an organizational whole so that the required results are produced.

The Intended Result describes the resulting organizational condition: the required functions are realized and the required results are produced.

This distinction is important because organizational Function realization and organizational Result realization cannot automatically be inferred from one another.

An Organization may perform required functions while a required result is not produced. An observed result may also be insufficient, by itself, to establish that all required organizational functions are being realized.

The Intended Result therefore preserves both Function and Result as relevant subjects of Organization Quality Determination.

Together, the Organization Intended Function and Intended Result provide the functional basis for deriving and testing the Core Organization Quality Factors.

## 2.6 Organization Function Realization

Organization Function Realization concerns the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result.

It is examined at the level of the Organization as the Quality Object.

Organization Function Realization may depend on many constituent and contributing Quality Objects. However, favorable Quality of individual contributing Quality Objects does not by itself establish favorable Organization Function Realization.

The Organization must operate as an organizational whole, realize its required functions, and produce its required results within the applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.

This requires examination of more than the results observed at a single point in time.

The determination must be able to distinguish whether required functions and results are actually realized, whether what is necessary for realization is sufficient, whether the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole, and whether realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

These distinct determination needs provide the basis for deriving and testing the Core Organization Quality Factors.

### **3. THE ORGANIZATION QUALITY FACTOR PROBLEM**

#### **3.1 Why Organization Quality Requires Core Quality Factors**

Organization Quality cannot be adequately understood from a single overall observation of the Organization.

An Organization may realize some required functions or results while important conditions of organizational realization remain weak or uncertain.

Core Quality Factors are therefore needed to separate the main dimensions of Organization Function Realization that must remain visible in a Quality Determination.

The Factors should be broad enough to apply across different types of organizations, but distinct enough to prevent important weaknesses from being hidden within a general judgment of Organization Quality.

They should not prescribe organizational structure, management methods, resources, or industry-specific practices.

Instead, each Factor should identify a distinct determination function needed to understand the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result.

The methodological problem is therefore to identify the smallest sufficiently complete set of distinct Core Quality Factors needed for that determination.

#### **3.2 Required Methodological Resolution**

The Core Quality Factors must be defined at a Methodological Resolution appropriate for Organization Quality.

If the Factors are too broad, important differences in Organization Function Realization may remain hidden.

If they are too detailed, the Core architecture may become dependent on particular organizational structures, industries, technologies, management practices, or other application-specific conditions.

The required Core Methodological Resolution lies between these two extremes.

At this resolution, each Factor should represent a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization that remains meaningful across different types of organizations.

More detailed subjects can be examined through Core Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and application-specific analysis.

The purpose of the Core Factors is therefore not to describe every element of an Organization. It is to preserve the main dimensions necessary for determining Organization Quality.

### **3.3 Risk of Too Few Factors**

Too few Core Quality Factors can reduce the visibility of important differences in Organization Function Realization.

A single broad Factor could combine conditions that need to be examined separately.

For example, an Organization may currently realize its required functions and results while lacking sufficient capability to sustain that realization. It may also have sufficient individual capabilities while the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as a whole are inadequate.

If these different conditions are combined within one general Factor, a favorable condition in one area may obscure a weakness in another.

Too few Factors could therefore weaken the ability of the Quality Determination to identify where Organization Function Realization is adequate, inadequate, uncertain, or otherwise requires separate interpretation.

The Core architecture must preserve each distinct dimension whose absence would reduce meaningful determination visibility.

### **3.4 Risk of Excessive Factor Detail**

Too much detail at the Core Factor level creates a different problem.

If separate Factors are created for subjects such as people, resources, finance, technology, information, governance, processes, or infrastructure, the architecture may begin to describe particular organizational arrangements rather than Organization Quality itself.

These subjects may be important, but their relevance and form differ among organizations.

Excessive Factor detail can therefore make the Core architecture unnecessarily complex and less applicable across different organizational contexts.

Detailed subjects should remain below the Factor level where they can be examined through applicable Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and application-specific analysis.

A separate Core Factor is justified only when it represents a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization that cannot be adequately examined through another Factor.

The Core architecture should therefore contain no more Factors than are necessary to preserve the distinct dimensions required for Organization Quality Determination.

### **3.5 Boundary Between Core Factors and Application Detail**

The Core Quality Factors identify the main dimensions of Organization Function Realization. They do not define all subjects that may need to be examined in a particular Organization.

Application detail depends on the Organization, its required functions and results, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and applicable conditions.

For example, personnel, finance, technology, infrastructure, information, governance, external providers, or other subjects may be important in a particular Organization. Their importance does not by itself make them separate Core Quality Factors.

Such subjects should be examined where they contribute to one or more Core Factors at the applicable Methodological Resolution.

The same principle applies to the methods, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and detailed conditions used in a Quality Determination. These may vary without changing the Core Factor architecture.

Maintaining this boundary allows the Core Factors to remain stable while the detail needed for a particular Organization can vary.

A subject should therefore be elevated to the Core Factor level only when it represents a distinct and generally applicable dimension of Organization Function Realization that cannot be adequately represented within the existing Factor architecture.

## 4. METHOD FOR DERIVING AND TESTING THE CORE QUALITY FACTORS

### 4.1 Derivation from Organization Intended Function and Intended Result

The Core Quality Factors are derived from the Organization Intended Function and Intended Result.

The starting question is:

*What distinct dimensions must be examined to determine the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result?*

The Factors are not derived from conventional organizational structures, management functions, resource categories, or industry practices.

Instead, the analysis begins with what the Organization, as the Quality Object, is required to realize.

A proposed Factor is considered only where it represents a distinct dimension of that realization and where its absence could reduce determination visibility.

The derivation must also avoid building proposed Factors into the Organization Intended Function or Intended Result. Otherwise, the Factor architecture would partly justify itself.

For this reason, the Factors are derived and then separately tested for necessity, removal, distinctness, possible combination, missing functions, and cross-context applicability.

This provides a common methodological basis for determining whether the proposed Factor architecture is sufficiently complete without unnecessary Core-level detail.

### 4.2 Functional Necessity Test

Each proposed Core Quality Factor must represent a necessary dimension of Organization Function Realization.

The test asks:

*Is this Factor necessary to determine the degree to which the Organization realizes its Intended Function and Intended Result?*

A Factor is not necessary merely because its subject is important to some organizations.

Its determination function must be relevant at the Core level and cannot depend on a particular organizational structure, industry, technology, management practice, or other application-specific arrangement.

The test therefore focuses on the function represented by the Factor rather than on the particular organizational subjects that may be examined beneath it.

A proposed Factor passes the Functional Necessity Test when its determination function is necessary for Organization Quality Determination at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

#### 4.3 Removal Test

The Removal Test examines what would be lost if a proposed Core Quality Factor were removed from the architecture.

The test asks:

*Could an important dimension of Organization Function Realization become insufficiently visible if this Factor were removed?*

The purpose is not simply to show that the Factor is useful. Its removal must create a meaningful loss in Organization Quality Determination.

A Factor fails the test if its determination function remains adequately represented by the other Factors.

A Factor passes the test when removing it would leave a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization insufficiently examined.

The Removal Test therefore helps determine whether each proposed Factor is necessary to the collective Core architecture.

#### 4.4 Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test

Each Core Quality Factor must represent a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization.

The test asks:

*Does this Factor examine something meaningfully different from what is examined by the other Factors?*

Factors may interact and may depend on some of the same organizational conditions. This does not make them redundant.

The important question is whether each Factor preserves a separate determination function.

If two Factors ask substantially the same determination question, they may not need to remain separate.

If each Factor can identify a condition that the other cannot adequately reveal, they are distinct even where their application overlaps.

A proposed Factor passes the Distinctness and Non-Overlap Test when its determination function cannot be adequately represented by another Factor without reducing determination visibility.

#### 4.5 Absorption and Combination Test

The Absorption and Combination Test examines whether a proposed Core Quality Factor can be adequately included within another Factor.

The test asks:

*Can this Factor be absorbed into or combined with another Factor without losing a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization?*

Related Factors should not remain separate merely because they can be described using different terms.

At the same time, apparent similarity does not justify combination if the Factors answer different determination questions.

The test therefore considers what would happen to determination visibility if two Factors were combined.

A proposed Factor should remain separate when combination would make an important condition less visible or would require one Factor to represent two distinct determination functions.

A Factor passes the Absorption and Combination Test when its determination function cannot be adequately absorbed into another Factor without reducing the clarity or completeness of Organization Quality Determination.

#### 4.6 Missing-Function Test

The Missing-Function Test examines whether the proposed Factor architecture leaves an important dimension of Organization Function Realization uncovered.

The test asks:

*Could an important dimension of Organization Function Realization remain insufficiently visible even when all proposed Factors are examined?*

If yes, an additional Core Quality Factor may be needed.

However, an important organizational subject does not automatically require a separate Factor. It may already be represented within an existing Factor or belong at the Indicator or application level.

A new Core Factor is justified only when it represents a distinct determination function that is not adequately covered by the existing architecture at the same Core Methodological Resolution.

The Missing-Function Test therefore helps determine whether the proposed Factor architecture is sufficiently complete without unnecessary Core-level detail.

#### 4.7 Cross-Context Applicability Test

A Core Quality Factor should remain meaningful across different organizational contexts.

The test asks:

*Does this Factor represent a necessary dimension of Organization Function Realization across different types of organizations and conditions?*

The Factor does not need to be applied in exactly the same way in every Organization.

Different organizations may have different required functions and results, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, Boundaries, Interfaces, Contexts, and applicable conditions.

The applicable Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods may also differ.

These differences should be accommodated beneath the Core Factor without requiring the Factor itself to change.

A proposed Factor passes the Cross-Context Applicability Test when its determination function remains meaningful across different organizational contexts while allowing application detail to vary.

## 4.8 Collective Architecture Test

The Core Quality Factors must also be tested as a complete architecture.

The test asks:

*Taken together, do the proposed Factors provide a sufficiently complete and distinct basis for examining Organization Function Realization at the present Core Methodological Resolution?*

Passing the individual Factor tests is not sufficient. The Factors must also work together without leaving an important determination function uncovered or creating unnecessary duplication.

The collective test therefore examines whether:

- each Factor contributes a distinct determination function;
- the Factors together cover the necessary dimensions of Organization Function Realization;
- no Factor can be removed or absorbed without reducing determination visibility; and
- no additional Factor is required at the same Core Methodological Resolution.

The architecture passes the Collective Architecture Test when the Factors together provide a sufficiently complete and non-redundant basis for Organization Quality Determination while allowing application-specific detail to remain below the Core Factor level.

## 5. FACTOR 1 — PERFORMANCE

### 5.1 Derivation of Performance

Organization Quality requires examination of what the Organization actually realizes.

The Organization Intended Result states that:

*The Organization realizes its required functions and produces the required results within its applicable responsibilities, authority, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and temporal basis.*

This creates a direct determination need: whether the required organizational functions are realized and the required organizational results are produced.

This dimension is represented by Performance.

Performance concerns actual organizational realization. It does not establish whether the Organization has sufficient capability, whether the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole, or whether realization is maintained through time and relevant change. These are separate determination functions.

Performance is therefore derived as a distinct Core Quality Factor because Organization Quality cannot be adequately determined without examining what the Organization actually realizes.

At the Core level, Performance is defined as:

*The degree to which the Organization realizes its required functions and produces its required results.*

### 5.2 Determination Function of Performance

Performance examines whether the Organization actually realizes what is required.

It addresses two basic questions:

- Are the required organizational functions realized?

- Are the required organizational results produced?

These questions concern actual realization rather than the conditions that may support it.

An Organization may have sufficient people, resources, systems, or other capabilities without realizing its required functions or results. It may also have appropriate relationships among its constituent and contributing Quality Objects while actual realization remains inadequate.

Performance therefore cannot be inferred from Capability or Integration.

Performance also differs from Continuity. Performance examines whether required functions and results are realized. Continuity examines whether that realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The determination function of Performance is therefore to make actual Function and Result realization separately visible within Organization Quality Determination.

### 5.3 Necessity and Removal Test

Performance is necessary because Organization Quality cannot be adequately determined without examining actual realization.

The removal test asks:

*Could Organization Quality be adequately determined without separately examining whether the Organization realizes its required functions and produces its required results?*

No.

Capability may show that the Organization has what is necessary for realization. Integration may show that the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole. Continuity may show whether realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

None of these establishes whether the required functions and results are actually realized.

Without Performance, an Organization could appear to have favorable Quality because supporting conditions are favorable even when required functions or results are not being realized.

Removing Performance would therefore leave actual organizational realization insufficiently visible.

Performance passes the Functional Necessity Test and the Removal Test.

### 5.4 Distinctness from Capability, Integration, and Continuity

Performance represents a determination function that is distinct from the other three Core Quality Factors.

Performance asks:

*What is actually being realized by the Organization?*

Capability asks whether what is necessary for that realization is sufficient.

An Organization may have sufficient capability while required functions or results are not actually realized. Conversely, favorable current Performance does not by itself establish that the necessary capability is sufficient.

Integration asks whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization as an organizational whole.

Appropriate relationships do not establish actual Performance. Likewise, favorable Performance does not by itself establish that all necessary relationships adequately support organizational realization.

Continuity asks whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while that realization cannot be maintained. Performance and Continuity therefore examine the same subjects from different determination dimensions: actual realization and maintenance of realization.

Performance cannot be absorbed into Capability, Integration, or Continuity without reducing the visibility of actual organizational realization.

Performance therefore remains a distinct Core Quality Factor.

### 5.5 Factor 1 Finding

The analysis supports Performance as a necessary and distinct Core Quality Factor for Organization Quality.

Performance examines actual organizational realization: whether the Organization realizes its required functions and produces its required results.

Removing Performance would leave actual realization insufficiently visible. Absorbing it into Capability, Integration, or Continuity would combine different determination functions and reduce clarity.

Performance also remains applicable across different types of organizations because the required functions and results may vary without changing the determination function of the Factor.

Performance therefore satisfies the Functional Necessity, Removal, Distinctness and Non-Overlap, Absorption and Combination, and Cross-Context Applicability tests.

At the present Core Methodological Resolution, Performance is supported as Factor 1 of the Organization Quality architecture.

## 6. FACTOR 2 — CAPABILITY

### 6.1 Derivation of Capability

Actual Performance does not by itself establish that the Organization has what is necessary to realize its required functions and results under the applicable conditions.

An Organization may presently produce required results while depending on insufficient people, resources, knowledge, technology, infrastructure, information, management arrangements, or other necessary capabilities.

This creates a separate determination need:

*Does the Organization have what is necessary to realize its required functions and produce its required results under the applicable conditions?*

This dimension is represented by Capability.

Capability does not prescribe what every Organization must have. What is necessary depends on the Organization, its required functions and results, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and applicable conditions.

Capability is therefore derived as a distinct Core Quality Factor because Organization Quality cannot be adequately determined from actual Performance alone.

At the Core level, Capability is defined as:

*The degree to which the Organization has what is necessary to realize its required functions and produce its required results under the applicable conditions.*

## 6.2 Determination Function of Capability

Capability examines whether the Organization has what is necessary for required organizational realization.

It addresses the basic question:

*Is what is necessary to realize the required functions and produce the required results sufficient under the applicable conditions?*

The particular capabilities involved may differ among organizations. They may include people, competence, resources, information, technology, infrastructure, finance, management arrangements, external support, or other necessary contributors.

The Core determination function is not to prescribe these categories. It is to determine whether what is necessary is sufficient for the required organizational realization.

Capability therefore differs from Performance, which examines actual realization, and from Integration, which examines the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

It also differs from Continuity, which examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The determination function of Capability is therefore to make the sufficiency of what is necessary for organizational realization separately visible within Organization Quality Determination.

## 6.3 Necessity and Removal Test

Capability is necessary because actual organizational realization does not by itself establish that the Organization has what is necessary for that realization.

The removal test asks:

*Could Organization Quality be adequately determined without separately examining whether what is necessary for required organizational realization is sufficient?*

No.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while relying on capability that is insufficient under the applicable conditions.

Performance does not reveal this condition because it examines actual realization.

Integration does not replace Capability because appropriate relationships among constituent and contributing Quality Objects do not establish that what is necessary for realization is sufficient.

Continuity also does not replace Capability because maintenance of realization and sufficiency for realization are different determination functions.

Without Capability, an important weakness could therefore remain insufficiently visible even when current Performance is favorable.

Removing Capability would reduce the ability of Organization Quality Determination to distinguish actual realization from the sufficiency of what is necessary to support that realization.

Capability passes the Functional Necessity Test and the Removal Test.

#### 6.4 Distinctness from Performance, Integration, and Continuity

Capability represents a determination function that is distinct from the other three Core Quality Factors.

Capability asks:

*Is what is necessary for required organizational realization sufficient under the applicable conditions?*

Performance asks whether the required functions and results are actually realized.

An Organization may presently realize what is required while its capability is insufficient under the applicable conditions. Conversely, sufficient capability does not establish that required functions and results are actually realized.

Integration asks whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization as an organizational whole.

The Organization may have sufficient individual capabilities while necessary relationships among them are inadequate. Conversely, appropriate relationships do not establish that the capabilities necessary for realization are sufficient.

Continuity asks whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

An Organization may have sufficient capability at a determination point while required realization is not maintained through time or change. Continuity of realization also does not by itself establish that what is necessary under the applicable conditions is sufficient.

Capability therefore cannot be absorbed into Performance, Integration, or Continuity without losing the separate determination of sufficiency for organizational realization.

Capability remains a distinct Core Quality Factor.

#### 6.5 Factor 2 Finding

The analysis supports Capability as a necessary and distinct Core Quality Factor for Organization Quality.

Capability examines whether what is necessary to realize the Organization's required functions and produce its required results is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Removing Capability would leave the sufficiency of what is necessary for organizational realization insufficiently visible. Absorbing it into Performance, Integration, or Continuity would combine different determination functions and reduce clarity.

Capability remains applicable across different types of organizations because the particular capabilities needed may vary without changing the determination function of the Factor.

Capability therefore satisfies the Functional Necessity, Removal, Distinctness and Non-Overlap, Absorption and Combination, and Cross-Context Applicability tests.

At the present Core Methodological Resolution, Capability is supported as Factor 2 of the Organization Quality architecture.

## 7. FACTOR 3 — INTEGRATION

### 7.1 Derivation of Integration

An Organization may have sufficient individual capabilities while still failing to operate effectively as an organizational whole.

Organizational realization may depend on relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects. These relationships may involve organizational units, people, Management Systems, processes, technologies, infrastructure, information, external providers, or other Quality Objects.

This creates a separate determination need:

*Do the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization of the Organization's required functions and results?*

This dimension is represented by Integration.

Integration does not require every part of an Organization to be connected in the same way. The relationships that matter depend on the Organization, its required functions and results, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and applicable conditions.

Integration is therefore derived as a distinct Core Quality Factor because sufficient individual capabilities do not by themselves establish that the Organization operates as an organizational whole.

At the Core level, Integration is defined as:

*The degree to which the relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization of the Organization's required functions and results.*

### 7.2 Determination Function of Integration

Integration examines whether the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole support required organizational realization.

It addresses the basic question:

*Do the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization of the Organization's required functions and results?*

These relationships may take different forms. They may involve dependencies, Interfaces, communication, coordination, transfers, handoffs, authority, information, resources, or other forms of interaction.

The Core determination function does not prescribe which relationships every Organization must have or how those relationships should be arranged.

It examines whether the relationships necessary for the particular Organization support what the Organization is required to realize.

Integration therefore differs from Capability. Constituent and contributing Quality Objects may individually have sufficient capability while the relationships among them are inadequate for organizational realization.

It also differs from Performance and Continuity, which examine actual realization and maintenance of realization rather than the relationships supporting realization as an organizational whole.

The determination function of Integration is therefore to make the condition of necessary organizational relationships separately visible within Organization Quality Determination.

### 7.3 Necessity and Removal Test

Integration is necessary because sufficient individual capabilities do not by themselves establish that the Organization operates as an organizational whole.

The removal test asks:

*Could Organization Quality be adequately determined without separately examining whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support organizational realization?*

No.

Performance may show that required functions and results are presently realized. Capability may show that what is necessary for realization is sufficient. Continuity may show whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

None of these separately determines whether the relationships necessary for organizational realization adequately support the Organization as a whole.

Constituent and contributing Quality Objects may individually perform adequately and have sufficient capability while weaknesses in their relationships reduce or threaten organizational realization.

Without Integration, these relational weaknesses could remain insufficiently visible.

Removing Integration would therefore reduce the ability of Organization Quality Determination to examine the Organization as an organizational whole.

Integration passes the Functional Necessity Test and the Removal Test.

### 7.4 Distinctness from Performance, Capability, and Continuity

Integration represents a determination function that is distinct from the other three Core Quality Factors.

Integration asks:

*Do the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support organizational realization?*

Performance asks whether the required functions and results are actually realized.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while weaknesses exist in relationships necessary for continued or broader organizational realization. Conversely, appropriate relationships do not establish that required functions and results are actually realized.

Capability asks whether what is necessary for organizational realization is sufficient.

Relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects may have sufficient individual capabilities while the relationships among them are inadequate. Conversely, appropriate relationships cannot compensate for insufficient capability.

Continuity asks whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Necessary relationships may be appropriate at a determination point while required realization is not maintained through time or change. Likewise, observed continuity does not by itself establish that all necessary relationships adequately support organizational realization.

Integration therefore cannot be absorbed into Performance, Capability, or Continuity without losing the separate determination of the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

Integration remains a distinct Core Quality Factor.

### 7.5 Factor 3 Finding

The analysis supports Integration as a necessary and distinct Core Quality Factor for Organization Quality.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization of the Organization's required functions and results.

Removing Integration would leave important relational conditions of organizational realization insufficiently visible. Absorbing it into Performance, Capability, or Continuity would combine different determination functions and reduce clarity.

Integration remains applicable across different types of organizations because the relevant Quality Objects and relationships may vary without changing the determination function of the Factor.

Integration therefore satisfies the Functional Necessity, Removal, Distinctness and Non-Overlap, Absorption and Combination, and Cross-Context Applicability tests.

At the present Core Methodological Resolution, Integration is supported as Factor 3 of the Organization Quality architecture.

## 8. FACTOR 4 — CONTINUITY

### 8.1 Derivation of Continuity

Organization Quality cannot be determined only from realization observed at a single point in time.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and produce its required results while that realization is not maintained through the applicable temporal basis or relevant change.

This creates a separate determination need:

*Are the Organization's required functions and results maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

This dimension is represented by Continuity.

Continuity does not require every organizational function or result to remain unchanged. What must be maintained, for how long, and under what conditions depends on the applicable requirements, Context, and temporal basis of the Organization.

Relevant change may alter how required functions and results are realized without changing the need to determine whether required realization is maintained.

Continuity is therefore derived as a distinct Core Quality Factor because favorable current Performance, sufficient Capability, and appropriate Integration do not by themselves establish that required organizational realization is maintained.

At the Core level, Continuity is defined as:

*The degree to which the Organization maintains realization of its required functions and required results through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.*

## 8.2 Determination Function of Continuity

Continuity examines whether required organizational realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

It addresses two basic questions:

- Is realization of the required organizational functions maintained?
- Are the required organizational results maintained?

These questions concern maintenance of realization, rather than realization at a single determination point.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while that realization later becomes interrupted, degraded, or otherwise not maintained as required.

Continuity therefore differs from Performance, which examines actual Function and Result realization.

It also differs from Capability and Integration. Sufficient capability and appropriate relationships may support organizational realization, but neither establishes that required realization is maintained through time and relevant change.

The determination function of Continuity is therefore to make maintenance of required Function and Result realization separately visible within Organization Quality Determination.

## 8.3 Necessity and Removal Test

Continuity is necessary because favorable realization at one point in time does not establish that required organizational realization is maintained.

The removal test asks:

*Could Organization Quality be adequately determined without separately examining whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

No.

Performance may show that required functions and results are presently realized. Capability may show that what is necessary for realization is sufficient. Integration may show that the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole.

None of these establishes that required realization is maintained through time and relevant change.

An Organization may therefore have favorable Performance, sufficient Capability, and appropriate Integration while required functions or results later become interrupted, degraded, or otherwise not maintained as required.

Without Continuity, this temporal dimension of Organization Function Realization could remain insufficiently visible.

Removing Continuity would therefore reduce the ability of Organization Quality Determination to distinguish current realization from maintenance of realization.

Continuity passes the Functional Necessity Test and the Removal Test.

## 8.4 Distinctness from Performance, Capability, and Integration

Continuity represents a determination function that is distinct from the other three Core Quality Factors.

Continuity asks:

*Is required Function and Result realization maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

Performance asks whether the required functions and results are actually realized.

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while that realization is not maintained through time or relevant change. Performance therefore does not establish Continuity.

Capability asks whether what is necessary for organizational realization is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Sufficient capability may support Continuity, but it does not establish that required Function and Result realization is maintained. Conversely, observed Continuity does not by itself establish that all necessary capability is sufficient.

Integration asks whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support organizational realization.

Appropriate relationships may support Continuity, but they do not establish that required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Continuity therefore cannot be absorbed into Performance, Capability, or Integration without losing the separate determination of maintenance of organizational realization.

Continuity remains a distinct Core Quality Factor.

## 8.5 Factor 4 Finding

The analysis supports Continuity as a necessary and distinct Core Quality Factor for Organization Quality.

Continuity examines whether realization of the Organization's required functions and required results is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Removing Continuity would leave the maintenance of organizational realization insufficiently visible. Absorbing it into Performance, Capability, or Integration would combine different determination functions and reduce clarity.

Continuity remains applicable across different types of organizations because what must be maintained, for how long, and under what conditions may vary without changing the determination function of the Factor.

Continuity therefore satisfies the Functional Necessity, Removal, Distinctness and Non-Overlap, Absorption and Combination, and Cross-Context Applicability tests.

At the present Core Methodological Resolution, Continuity is supported as Factor 4 of the Organization Quality architecture.

## 9. HORIZONTAL TESTING ACROSS THE FOUR FACTORS

### 9.1 Purpose of Horizontal Testing

The four proposed Core Quality Factors have been tested individually. They must also be tested against one another.

Horizontal testing examines whether the Factors remain distinct when considered as a complete architecture.

The test asks:

*Do Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity represent different determination functions, or does unnecessary overlap remain between them?*

Some interaction among the Factors is expected. Actual organizational realization may depend on sufficient capability, necessary relationships, and maintenance through time and change.

Interaction, however, does not make the Factors redundant.

The purpose of horizontal testing is to determine whether each Factor preserves information about Organization Function Realization that cannot be adequately represented by the other Factors.

The analysis therefore examines the closest Factor relationships, possible overlap, Factor placement, and whether any Factor can be removed or absorbed without reducing determination visibility.

## 9.2 Performance and Capability

Performance and Capability are closely related but represent different determination functions.

Performance asks:

*Are the Organization's required functions realized and required results produced?*

Capability asks:

*Is what is necessary for that realization sufficient under the applicable conditions?*

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while depending on capability that is insufficient under the applicable conditions.

Conversely, an Organization may have sufficient capability while its required functions or results are not actually realized.

Performance therefore cannot be inferred from Capability, and Capability cannot be inferred from Performance.

Combining the two Factors could hide the difference between actual organizational realization and the sufficiency of what is necessary for that realization.

Performance and Capability therefore remain distinct and should be separately visible in Organization Quality Determination.

## 9.3 Capability and Integration

Capability and Integration examine different conditions of organizational realization.

Capability asks:

*Is what is necessary for organizational realization sufficient under the applicable conditions?*

Integration asks:

*Do the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support organizational realization?*

An Organization may have sufficient people, resources, knowledge, technology, infrastructure, information, or other necessary capabilities while the relationships among them are inadequate.

Conversely, appropriate relationships cannot compensate for insufficient capability.

Capability therefore concerns the sufficiency of what is necessary for realization.

Integration concerns whether the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole.

Combining the two Factors could hide the difference between having sufficient capability and having the relationships necessary for that capability to contribute effectively to organizational realization.

Capability and Integration therefore remain distinct and should be separately visible in Organization Quality Determination.

#### 9.4 Capability and Continuity

Capability and Continuity represent different determination functions.

Capability asks:

*Is what is necessary for organizational realization sufficient under the applicable conditions?*

Continuity asks:

*Is required Function and Result realization maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

An Organization may have sufficient capability at a determination point while required realization is not maintained through time or relevant change.

Conversely, observed continuity of required functions and results does not by itself establish that what is necessary for realization remains sufficient under all applicable conditions.

Capability therefore concerns sufficiency for organizational realization.

Continuity concerns maintenance of organizational realization.

Combining the two Factors could hide the difference between having what is necessary for realization and actually maintaining that realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Capability and Continuity therefore remain distinct and should be separately visible in Organization Quality Determination.

#### 9.5 Integration and Continuity

Integration and Continuity represent different determination functions.

Integration asks:

*Do the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support organizational realization?*

Continuity asks:

*Is required Function and Result realization maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

An Organization may have appropriate relationships at a determination point while required realization is not maintained through time or relevant change.

Conversely, observed continuity of required functions and results does not by itself establish that all necessary relationships adequately support organizational realization.

Integration therefore concerns the relationships necessary for the Organization to operate as an organizational whole.

Continuity concerns maintenance of required organizational realization.

Combining the two Factors could hide the difference between the condition of necessary organizational relationships and the maintenance of required realization.

Integration and Continuity therefore remain distinct and should be separately visible in Organization Quality Determination.

## 9.6 Performance and Continuity

Performance and Continuity both concern required Function and Result realization, but they examine different conditions.

Performance asks:

*Are the Organization's required functions realized and required results produced?*

Continuity asks:

*Is that Function and Result realization maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change?*

An Organization may presently realize its required functions and results while that realization is not maintained through time or relevant change.

Performance therefore concerns actual organizational realization.

Continuity concerns maintenance of that realization.

The same subjects — Function and Result — may be examined under both Factors, but the determination function is different.

Combining Performance and Continuity could hide the difference between what is realized at a determination point and whether that realization is maintained as required.

Performance and Continuity therefore remain distinct and should be separately visible in Organization Quality Determination.

## 9.7 Factor Placement and Non-Redundancy

Horizontal testing also examines whether each determination subject is placed under the appropriate Core Quality Factor.

The four Factors preserve different determination functions:

- Performance — actual Function and Result realization;
- Capability — sufficiency of what is necessary for realization;
- Integration — relationships necessary for realization as an organizational whole; and
- Continuity — maintenance of Function and Result realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

A particular organizational subject may contribute to more than one Factor. This does not require duplication of the Factors.

For example, people, technology, information, infrastructure, or Management Systems may be relevant to Capability, Integration, Performance, or Continuity depending on the determination question being examined.

Factor placement is therefore based on the determination function, not simply on the organizational subject being examined.

The horizontal analysis finds no unnecessary duplication among the four Factors at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

Each Factor preserves a distinct determination function that would become less visible if it were removed, absorbed, or placed under another Factor.

### 9.8 Horizontal Testing Finding

Horizontal testing supports the separation of Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity as four distinct Core Quality Factors.

The analysis finds that each Factor answers a different determination question:

- Performance examines actual Function and Result realization;
- Capability examines the sufficiency of what is necessary for realization;
- Integration examines the relationships necessary for realization as an organizational whole; and
- Continuity examines maintenance of Function and Result realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The Factors interact, but their determination functions are not redundant.

No Factor can be absorbed into another without reducing the visibility of a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization.

The horizontal analysis therefore supports retaining all four Factors as separate components of the proposed Organization Quality architecture at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

## 10. MISSING-FACTOR TEST

### 10.1 Purpose of the Missing-Factor Test

The four proposed Core Quality Factors must be tested for possible omission.

The test asks:

*Is there another distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization that is necessary at the same Core Methodological Resolution but is not adequately represented by Performance, Capability, Integration, or Continuity?*

An important organizational subject does not automatically require an additional Core Quality Factor.

A candidate Factor is justified only if it represents a distinct determination function that cannot be adequately examined within the existing four-Factor architecture.

The analysis therefore considers several possible candidates, including requirements, management and governance, resources and organizational means, relationships and Interfaces, change and adaptability, resilience and recovery, and improvement.

Each candidate is examined to determine whether it identifies a missing Core determination function or is already represented within the existing architecture or at a more detailed Methodological Resolution.

### 10.2 Requirements

Requirements are essential to Organization Quality Determination because they establish what the Organization is required to realize.

The question is whether Requirements should therefore constitute a separate Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support Requirements as a separate Core Quality Factor.

Requirements provide the basis against which the Organization's required functions, results, capabilities, relationships, and continuity conditions are determined. They define what is required; they do not represent a separate dimension of Organization Function Realization.

Their effects are examined through the existing Factors.

Performance examines whether required functions and results are actually realized.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for that realization is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support organizational realization.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Requirements therefore remain essential to the Quality Determination without becoming an additional Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not identify Requirements as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.3 Management and Governance**

Management and governance can be important to Organization Function Realization.

The question is whether they require a separate Core Organization Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

Management and governance are organizational means through which required functions and results may be realized. Their particular form, responsibilities, authority, and importance vary among organizations.

Where relevant, their contribution can be examined through the existing Factors.

Performance examines whether the required organizational functions and results are actually realized.

Capability examines whether the necessary management and governance capability is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships, responsibilities, authority, and Interfaces support organizational realization as a whole.

Continuity examines whether required organizational realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Management may also be examined separately through Management System Quality when the Management System is defined as its own Quality Object.

Creating a separate Organization Quality Factor for management or governance would therefore mix a particular organizational means with the Core dimensions of Organization Function Realization.

The analysis does not identify Management or Governance as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.4 Resources and Organizational Means**

Resources and other organizational means may be necessary for Organization Function Realization.

These may include people, competence, finance, information, technology, infrastructure, equipment, facilities, external support, and other means relevant to the Organization.

The question is whether these subjects require a separate Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

The particular resources and organizational means required vary according to the Organization, its required functions and results, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, and applicable conditions.

Their sufficiency is examined primarily through Capability.

Their actual contribution to required Function and Result realization may also be reflected in Performance, while necessary relationships among them may be examined through Integration and their contribution to maintained realization through Continuity.

Creating separate Core Factors for individual resource categories would move the architecture toward application-specific organizational detail.

Resources and organizational means are therefore important subjects of Organization Quality Determination without constituting an additional Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not identify Resources or Organizational Means as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.5 Relationships and Interfaces**

Relationships and Interfaces are important to Organization Function Realization because an Organization may depend on interactions among multiple constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

The question is whether Relationships and Interfaces require a separate Core Quality Factor beyond Integration.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

Integration already examines whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization of the Organization's required functions and results.

Interfaces are one important form of these relationships. Depending on the Organization, other relevant relationships may involve dependencies, communication, coordination, transfers, handoffs, authority, information, resources, or external interactions.

Creating a separate Factor for Relationships or Interfaces would therefore duplicate the determination function already represented by Integration.

Specific relationships and Interfaces may require detailed examination through applicable Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and application-specific analysis without changing the Core Factor architecture.

The analysis does not identify Relationships or Interfaces as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.6 Change and Adaptability**

Organizations may experience changes in requirements, Context, technologies, resources, relationships, external conditions, or other relevant circumstances.

The question is whether Change or Adaptability requires a separate Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

Change is a condition under which Organization Function Realization may need to be examined. Adaptability is relevant where adaptation is necessary to continue realizing what is required.

Their effects are already represented within the existing Factors.

Performance examines whether required functions and results are actually realized under the applicable conditions.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for realization remains sufficient.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships continue to support organizational realization.

Continuity examines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Creating a separate Factor for Change or Adaptability would therefore duplicate determination functions already represented within the four-Factor architecture.

The analysis does not identify Change or Adaptability as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.7 Resilience and Recovery**

Resilience and recovery may be important when an Organization experiences disruption, failure, or other adverse conditions.

The question is whether Resilience or Recovery requires a separate Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

Resilience and recovery are relevant where they are necessary for the Organization to maintain required realization or to realize an applicable recovery requirement after disruption.

Their effects can be examined through the existing Factors.

Capability examines whether what is necessary to withstand or respond to applicable conditions is sufficient.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support organizational realization during and following disruption.

Performance examines actual Function and Result realization.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change. Where recovery after interruption is itself required, realization of that recovery requirement is examined through the applicable Factors.

The specific need for resilience or recovery depends on the Organization, its requirements, Context, and applicable conditions.

Resilience and Recovery therefore remain important subjects where applicable without requiring an additional Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not identify Resilience or Recovery as a missing Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **10.8 Improvement and Other Candidate Functions**

Improvement may be important where an Organization is required to improve its functions, results, capabilities, relationships, or other conditions.

The question is whether Improvement requires a separate Core Quality Factor.

The analysis does not support a separate Core Quality Factor for this subject.

Improvement is not universally required as a separate dimension of Organization Function Realization. Its relevance depends on the applicable requirements, Context, and conditions of the Organization.

Where improvement is required, its realization can be examined through the existing Factors.

Performance examines whether required improvement functions and results are actually realized.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for required improvement is sufficient.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support realization of the required improvement.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained as applicable through the resulting change.

Other possible candidates may arise in particular organizational contexts. Their importance does not by itself justify an additional Core Quality Factor.

A new Factor would be justified only if a candidate represents a necessary and distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization that cannot be adequately represented within Performance, Capability, Integration, or Continuity.

The analysis does not presently identify Improvement or another candidate function as a missing Factor at the same Core Methodological Resolution.

### 10.9 Missing-Factor Finding

The Missing-Factor Test does not identify an additional Core Quality Factor at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

Requirements provide the basis for determining what the Organization is required to realize but do not represent a separate dimension of Organization Function Realization.

Management, governance, resources, organizational means, relationships, Interfaces, change, adaptability, resilience, recovery, and improvement may all be important. Their relevance, however, can be examined within Performance, Capability, Integration, or Continuity, or at a more detailed Methodological Resolution.

None of the candidates examined introduces a necessary and distinct determination function that remains outside the four-Factor architecture.

This finding does not mean that no additional Factor could ever be justified. A new Core Quality Factor would be required if later analysis or application identifies a necessary dimension of Organization Function Realization that cannot be adequately represented by the existing Factors.

At the present Core Methodological Resolution, the Missing-Factor Test therefore supports the sufficiency of Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity as the proposed four-Factor architecture.

## 11. CROSS-CONTEXT STRESS TESTING

### 11.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing

A Core Organization Quality Factor architecture should remain applicable across different organizational contexts.

The test asks:

*Do Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity remain meaningful when the type of Organization and the conditions under which it operates change?*

The purpose is not to require identical application in every Organization.

The cross-context test is conceptual. It examines whether materially different organizational conditions expose a missing, redundant, or context-dependent Core determination function; it does not claim empirical validation across a statistical sample of organizations.

Organizations may differ in their required functions and results, constituent and contributing Quality Objects, Boundaries, Interfaces, Contexts, temporal bases, and applicable conditions.

The Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods used in a particular Quality Determination may also differ.

The Core Factors should remain stable while these application details vary.

Cross-context testing therefore examines whether the four Factors continue to represent necessary dimensions of Organization Function Realization across materially different organizational conditions.

If a Factor becomes meaningful only in a particular type of Organization, or if a necessary determination function appears outside the four-Factor architecture in another context, the proposed Core architecture would require reconsideration.

### 11.2 Different Types of Organizations

Organizations may differ substantially in purpose, structure, size, activities, ownership, technologies, and operating conditions.

They may produce products, provide services, perform public functions, conduct research, operate infrastructure, or realize other required results.

These differences change what must be examined in a particular Organization Quality Determination, but they do not change the basic determination functions represented by the four Core Factors.

Performance remains concerned with actual Function and Result realization.

Capability remains concerned with whether what is necessary for realization is sufficient.

Integration remains concerned with whether the necessary relationships support realization as an organizational whole.

Continuity remains concerned with whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods may differ substantially among organizations.

The four Core Factors can therefore remain stable while their application reflects the particular Organization being examined.

Different types of organizations do not reveal a need to change or add to the proposed four-Factor architecture at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **11.3 Different Required Functions and Results**

Organizations may be required to realize very different functions and produce very different results.

These differences do not require different Core Quality Factors.

Performance examines whether the particular required functions and results are actually realized.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for their realization is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support their realization as an organizational whole.

Continuity examines whether their realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The content of the required functions and results therefore varies, while the determination functions represented by the four Factors remain stable.

Different required functions and results may require different Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods, but they do not reveal an additional Core determination function.

The proposed four-Factor architecture therefore remains applicable across different required organizational functions and results.

### **11.4 Different Constituent and Contributing Quality Objects**

Organizations may depend on very different constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

These may include people, organizational units, Management Systems, processes, facilities, infrastructure, technologies, information systems, external providers, or other Quality Objects relevant to organizational realization.

The particular Quality Objects involved do not change the Core determination functions.

Performance examines whether the Organization actually realizes its required functions and results.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for that realization is sufficient.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization as an organizational whole.

Continuity examines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Individual constituent and contributing Quality Objects may also have their own Quality Determinations. Their Quality States, however, do not automatically determine Organization Quality.

The proposed four-Factor architecture therefore remains applicable when the constituent and contributing Quality Objects differ among organizations.

### **11.5 Different Boundaries and Interfaces**

Organizations may operate within very different Boundaries and Interfaces.

Boundaries determine what is included within the Organization Quality Determination. Interfaces identify relevant relationships across those Boundaries or between constituent and contributing Quality Objects.

These differences may change what must be examined, but they do not change the Core determination functions.

Performance examines required Function and Result realization within the applicable Boundaries and Interfaces.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for that realization is sufficient.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships and Interfaces support realization as an organizational whole.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Boundaries and Interfaces must therefore be defined for the particular Organization, while the four Core Factors can remain stable.

Different Boundaries and Interfaces do not reveal an additional Core determination function at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

#### **11.6 Different Contexts and Applicable Conditions**

Organizations may operate under very different Contexts and applicable conditions.

These may include legal, regulatory, economic, social, environmental, technological, physical, operational, or other conditions relevant to Organization Function Realization.

Such differences may change what is required and how realization must be examined.

They do not, however, change the Core determination functions.

Performance examines actual Function and Result realization under the applicable conditions.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for realization is sufficient under those conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support organizational realization within the applicable Context.

Continuity examines whether required realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The applicable Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods may therefore vary with Context and conditions while the four Core Factors remain stable.

Different Contexts and applicable conditions do not reveal an additional Core determination function at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

#### **11.7 Different Temporal Bases and Conditions of Change**

Organizations may be examined over different temporal bases and under different conditions of change.

Some required functions and results may need to be realized continuously. Others may be required periodically, at defined times, or in response to particular conditions or events.

Organizations may also experience changes in requirements, Context, resources, technologies, relationships, or other relevant conditions.

These differences do not change the Core determination functions.

Performance examines whether the required functions and results are actually realized.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for realization is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships support organizational realization.

Continuity examines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

The applicable temporal basis and conditions of change must therefore be defined for the particular Organization, while the four Core Factors can remain stable.

Different temporal bases and conditions of change do not reveal an additional Core determination function at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

### **11.8 Cross-Context Finding**

Cross-context testing supports the applicability of the four proposed Core Quality Factors across different organizational conditions.

The analysis considered differences in:

- types of organizations;
- required functions and results;
- constituent and contributing Quality Objects;
- Boundaries and Interfaces;
- Contexts and applicable conditions; and
- temporal bases and conditions of change.

Across these differences, Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity retain their distinct determination functions.

The subjects examined beneath the Factors may change substantially. The applicable Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, and methods may also change.

These differences do not require the Core Factors themselves to change.

The cross-context analysis also does not identify an additional determination function that must be represented by another Core Quality Factor.

Within this conceptual cross-context test, the four-Factor architecture remains applicable across the materially different organizational conditions examined at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

## **12. WHY FOUR — AND NOT FEWER OR MORE**

### **12.1 Why Fewer Factors Would Reduce Determination Capability**

The preceding analysis shows that each of the four Core Quality Factors preserves a distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization.

Reducing the architecture below four Factors would require removing or combining at least one of these dimensions.

Without Performance, actual Function and Result realization would not remain separately visible.

Without Capability, the sufficiency of what is necessary for realization would not remain separately visible.

Without Integration, the relationships necessary for realization as an organizational whole would not remain separately visible.

Without Continuity, maintenance of Function and Result realization through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change would not remain separately visible.

Combining these determination functions would also reduce their separate visibility and could allow a favorable condition in one dimension to obscure a weakness in another.

The four Factors therefore represent the minimum architecture presently supported by the analysis without loss of a distinct Core determination function.

## **12.2 Why Additional Factors Are Not Presently Required**

The analysis also examined whether the four-Factor architecture requires an additional Core Quality Factor.

No additional Factor is presently supported at the same Core Methodological Resolution.

Requirements establish what must be realized but do not represent a separate dimension of Organization Function Realization.

Management, governance, resources, organizational means, relationships, Interfaces, change, adaptability, resilience, recovery, improvement, and other relevant subjects may be important to Organization Quality.

However, their applicable effects can be examined within Performance, Capability, Integration, or Continuity, or at a more detailed Methodological Resolution.

Adding separate Core Factors for these subjects would therefore either duplicate an existing determination function or introduce application detail into the Core architecture.

An additional Factor would be justified only if it represented a necessary and distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization that could not be adequately represented by the existing four Factors.

The analysis has not identified such a missing dimension.

Additional Core Quality Factors are therefore not presently required.

## **12.3 Why Four Is the Presently Supported Core Resolution**

The analysis supports four Core Quality Factors at the present Core Methodological Resolution:

1. Performance
2. Capability
3. Integration
4. Continuity

Each Factor represents a necessary and distinct dimension of Organization Function Realization.

Fewer than four Factors would remove or combine a distinct determination function and reduce determination visibility.

More than four Factors are not presently justified because the additional subjects examined can be represented within the existing Factors or at a more detailed Methodological Resolution.

The four-Factor architecture therefore provides the smallest sufficiently complete set presently supported by the analysis.

This conclusion is bounded rather than absolute. It reflects the present methodological analysis and remains subject to controlled revision if later analysis or application identifies a necessary determination function that cannot be adequately represented within the four-Factor architecture.

Four Factors are therefore supported as the present Core Methodological Resolution for Organization Quality Determination.

## **13. STABILITY AND CONDITIONS FOR CONTROLLED REVISION**

### **13.1 Need for Core Stability**

A Core Quality Factor architecture must be sufficiently stable to support consistent Organization Quality Determination.

The four Core Factors should not change simply because organizations differ in structure, activities, technologies, resources, Context, or other application details.

Such differences should normally be addressed through Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, methods, and application-specific analysis.

Frequent changes to the Core Factors would weaken comparability, traceability, and consistent application of the Organization Quality architecture.

Stability, however, does not mean that the architecture can never change.

The four-Factor architecture should remain stable while it continues to represent the necessary and distinct dimensions of Organization Function Realization at the Core Methodological Resolution.

Revision should occur only when a methodological reason demonstrates that the existing architecture is no longer sufficiently complete or distinct.

### **13.2 Conditions That Could Justify Revision**

Revision of the Core Quality Factor architecture should require a clear methodological basis.

Revision could be justified if later analysis or application demonstrates that:

- a necessary dimension of Organization Function Realization is not adequately represented by Performance, Capability, Integration, or Continuity;
- two or more existing Factors do not remain sufficiently distinct at the Core Methodological Resolution;
- a Factor can be removed or absorbed without reducing determination visibility;
- the architecture does not remain applicable across materially different organizational contexts; or
- a change in the WQI foundational methodology requires reconsideration of the Organization Quality architecture.

Application-specific differences alone do not justify revision of the Core Factors.

A proposed revision should therefore be tested against the same methodological principles used to derive the present architecture.

Revision is justified only when the analysis demonstrates that the existing architecture no longer provides a sufficiently complete and distinct basis for Organization Quality Determination.

### 13.3 Controlled Revision Principles

Any revision of the Core Quality Factor architecture should preserve methodological continuity and traceability.

A proposed revision should clearly identify:

- the methodological problem requiring revision;
- the determination function that is missing, redundant, or insufficiently represented;
- why the existing four-Factor architecture cannot adequately address the problem; and
- how the proposed revision resolves the problem without introducing unnecessary Core-level detail.

The revised architecture should then be subjected to the same necessity, removal, distinctness, absorption, missing-function, cross-context, and collective architecture tests used in this justification.

Changes should also remain traceable to the previous architecture so that their methodological basis and effects can be understood.

Controlled revision therefore allows the Core architecture to develop when justified while protecting it from changes driven only by application-specific preferences or organizational differences.

### 13.4 Stability Finding

The analysis supports stability of the four-Factor architecture at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

Performance, Capability, Integration, and Continuity have remained distinct through the individual Factor tests, horizontal testing, missing-factor testing, and cross-context stress testing.

No Factor has been shown to be unnecessary or adequately absorbed by another Factor.

No additional necessary determination function has been identified at the same Core Methodological Resolution.

The four-Factor architecture should therefore remain stable unless later analysis or application provides a clear methodological basis for revision.

Any revision should be controlled, traceable, and subjected to the same methodological tests used in this justification.

The present finding therefore supports the four-Factor architecture while preserving the possibility of future revision when methodologically justified.

## 14. CONCLUSION

This article examined whether Organization Quality requires a distinct Core Quality Factor architecture and, if so, what that architecture should contain at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

The analysis began with the Organization as the Quality Object and with its Intended Function and Intended Result.

From this basis, four Core Quality Factors were derived and tested:

1. Performance
2. Capability
3. Integration

#### 4. Continuity

Performance examines actual Function and Result realization.

Capability examines whether what is necessary for realization is sufficient under the applicable conditions.

Integration examines whether the necessary relationships among relevant constituent and contributing Quality Objects support realization as an organizational whole.

Continuity examines whether required Function and Result realization is maintained through the applicable temporal basis and relevant change.

Each Factor was examined for necessity, removal, distinctness, possible absorption or combination, and cross-context applicability. The architecture was also subjected to horizontal testing, missing-factor testing, and the Collective Architecture Test.

The analysis supports the four Factors as necessary and distinct at the present Core Methodological Resolution.

Fewer Factors would reduce determination visibility. Additional Factors are not presently required because the other candidate subjects examined can be represented within the existing Factors or at a more detailed Methodological Resolution.

The resulting architecture is therefore:

- Performance — actual realization
- Capability — sufficiency for realization
- Integration — relationships supporting realization as an organizational whole
- Continuity — maintenance of realization

This conclusion is methodological and bounded. It does not establish that the architecture can never change.

It supports the four-Factor architecture as the presently justified basis for the WQI Organization Quality Standard — Core, subject to controlled revision if later analysis or application identifies a necessary determination function that is not adequately represented.

## **COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE**

© 2026 Whole Quality Institute. All rights reserved.

This article is part of the Whole Quality Institute (WQI) methodological framework.

It may be cited for academic, professional, educational, and research purposes with appropriate attribution to the Whole Quality Institute and identification of the document as WQI\_OFJ1.

Reproduction, modification, republication, or incorporation of substantial portions of this article into another standard, methodology, commercial product, or derivative work requires authorization from the Whole Quality Institute.

Reference to this article does not constitute endorsement, certification, or approval by the Whole Quality Institute of any organization, product, service, Management System, Quality Determination, or other application.

Document: WQI\_OFJ1

Justification of the WQI Core Organization Quality Factors

Article — September 2026