The Alignment Angle: Quantifying the Distance between the Personal Will and the Personal Blueprint

J. Konstapel — *Constable Research ., Leiden, June 9 2026*

Abstract

*Competent individuals repeat the same failures, and what people will rarely coincides with what their constitution carries. This paper argues that these are two descriptions of a single, measurable phenomenon: the misalignment between the **Personal Blueprint** — a birth-fixed structural prior over an individual's irreducible cognitive orientations — and the **personal will** — the directive function that steers expressed behavior. Drawing on three independently grounded frameworks (Schank's script theory of learning, Friston's free-energy principle, and Assagioli's psychology of the will), we show that each predicts the misalignment, names it differently, and assigns it the same functional role: it is not a defect of the person but the engine of all genuine learning. We then formalize the misalignment as the **alignment angle**: the angular distance, computable per life domain, between the Blueprint prior and a behavioral posterior estimated by precision-weighted exponential smoothing over observed actions. The construct yields falsifiable predictions — most centrally, that a large and stable alignment angle predicts repeated, same-domain expectation failure (uncompleted learning cycles), whereas a small angle predicts failure that occurs but does not recur. We situate the construct against self-discrepancy theory, person–environment congruence, and self-determination theory, argue that it captures a polarity none of these contains (constitution versus volition, rather than self-representation versus self-representation), and recover Assagioli's "skillful will" as the precise behavioral strategy the metric prescribes. The Blueprint is treated throughout in the strict Bayesian sense — as a prior with an explicit confidence weight, displaced by observation — so that the framework's empirical commitments remain separable from any particular derivation of the prior.*

Keywords: *volition, structural priors, expectation failure, free-energy principle, psychosynthesis, self-discrepancy, learning cycles*

1. Introduction: Two Puzzles, One Phenomenon

Every practitioner of human development — coach, therapist, organizational consultant, educator — confronts two stubborn observations.

The first is the repetition puzzle: intelligent, competent individuals repeat the same failures across contexts and decades. The project leader underestimates systemic resistance for the fifth time; the visionary cycles once more through inspired launch and structural collapse; the relational impasse that ended one partnership reappears, with different actors, in the next. Classical psychoanalysis named the phenomenon repetition compulsion; contemplative traditions named it karma. Both names describe; neither measures.

The second is the volition puzzle: what people will for themselves seldom coincides with what their constitution appears to carry. The person built for sustained, responsive craftsmanship wills herself

into visionary leadership; the person constituted for perceptive guidance wills himself into relentless initiation. The mismatch is felt as chronic friction — effort that produces exhaustion rather than traction — yet it persists, often for a lifetime, because the will does not consult the constitution before setting its course.

*This paper's central claim is that these two puzzles are one phenomenon viewed from two sides. The repetition puzzle is the output of a misalignment whose input is the volition puzzle: when the will steers persistently against the constitution, the same expectation failure is generated again and again, and — for reasons the paper develops — the learning cycle that would resolve it is systematically aborted. The phenomenon has been described before, most precisely by Roberto Assagioli (1973) as the distance between the personal and the transpersonal will. What has been missing is a measurement. We supply one: the **alignment angle**, the angular distance between a birth-fixed structural prior (the Personal Blueprint) and a behaviorally estimated posterior (the will as expressed in action).*

The argument proceeds in five steps. Section 2 defines the Personal Blueprint and fixes its epistemological status. Section 3 reconstructs the psychology of the will, with Assagioli as its most rigorous twentieth-century theorist. Section 4 shows that three independent frameworks — script theory, the free-energy principle, and the constitutional account — converge on the misalignment and assign it the same functional role. Section 5 formalizes the alignment angle and states its falsifiable predictions. Section 6 situates the construct against neighboring constructs in mainstream psychology and states its limitations.

2. The Personal Blueprint: A Birth-Fixed Structural Prior

2.1 Definition

*We define the **Personal Blueprint** as a hypothesized, birth-indexed structural configuration that constrains how an individual characteristically perceives, decides, relates, and — critically — fails to learn. The Blueprint is not a personality profile in the trait-psychometric sense: traits describe the statistical surface of behavior, whereas the Blueprint is posited one level deeper, as the generative constraint from which behavioral regularities, including their characteristic breakdowns, follow.*

*Formally, the Blueprint is expressed as a normalized vector over four irreducible cognitive orientations, following McWhinney's (1997) demonstration that organizational and personal change processes reduce to four worldviews that cannot be derived from one another: the **Unitary** orientation (coherence through rule, system, and institutional integrity), the **Sensory** orientation (coherence through direct physical and material feedback), the **Social** orientation (coherence through relational consensus), and the **Mythic** orientation (coherence through narrative and vision). Writing the weights as a unit quaternion,*

$$\boldsymbol{q} = w_U \cdot 1 + w_S \cdot \boldsymbol{i} + w_{So} \cdot \boldsymbol{j} + w_M \cdot \boldsymbol{k}, \quad |\boldsymbol{q}| = 1,$$

preserves a property that flat vector representations lose: the composition of orientations is non-commutative, matching the empirical observation that the same two relational moves in opposite order produce different outcomes. For the purposes of this paper, however, only the vector reading is required.

*The Blueprint's central theoretical commitment is its **failure topology**: the claim that the dominant component of $\boldsymbol{q}$ fixes where in the learning cycle the individual characteristically breaks down*

(Section 4.1), and that this breakdown pattern is self-similar across the scales of a life — recurring in personal, professional, and communal domains in structurally identical form.

2.2 Epistemological status

The Blueprint's derivation is deliberately bracketed in this paper. Candidate sources for a birth-indexed constitutional configuration range from the well-evidenced (genetic and epigenetic contributions to temperament; chronobiological individuality; early-fixed attachment organization) to the contested (traditional constitutional typologies of various provenances). The framework does not require adjudicating among these, because the Blueprint enters the formalism ***in the strict Bayesian sense: as a prior with an explicit confidence weight****, to be displaced by observation.*

Concretely: a Blueprint estimate obtained at intake — by whatever instrument — is assigned a confidence weight quantifying how strongly it resists displacement by behavioral evidence. Under the update rule of Section 5, the prior's contribution to the posterior falls below five percent after approximately five behaviorally meaningful observations. The prior must therefore earn its keep: its epistemic warrant is its predictive performance on held-out first observations against a uniform-prior baseline, not its provenance. This commitment separates the framework's empirical content from any particular intake instrument and makes the Blueprint construct falsifiable at the level where falsification matters — prediction.

What the framework does require is the structural claim: that some birth-proximal configuration constrains the learning cycle, that this configuration is stable across the lifespan while its behavioral expression drifts, and that the distance between configuration and expression is psychologically consequential. Sections 4 and 5 unpack each clause.

A reviewer will ask: why should the prior be birth-indexed rather than acquired in early conditioning? Two replies. First, the formalism requires less than birth-fixity: it requires ***developmental precedence*** *(the configuration is in place before the will's script-formation begins) and* ***lifespan stability*** *(the configuration does not drift with the posterior). Birth-indexing is the operationalization that guarantees both by construction — not an ontological commitment; a configuration fixed in the first years of life would leave P1–P5 intact and alter only the intake derivation. Second, the residual question is empirically separable rather than metaphysical: early conditioning covaries with the rearing environment and is shared by siblings raised together, whereas a birth-fixed constitution is not (beyond genetic resemblance). Standard behavioral-genetic designs — twin, sibling, and adoption studies — therefore discriminate the two readings, and the framework survives either outcome.*

3. The Will: Assagioli's Rehabilitation of a Banished Faculty

3.1 The banishment

Twentieth-century psychology dismantled the will from two directions. Psychoanalysis reduced it to epiphenomenon: apparent volition as the rationalized surface of drive and defense. Behaviorism eliminated it outright: a folk-psychological fiction with no place in a science of contingencies. Later cognitive science readmitted "executive function" but as machinery, not as a faculty with a phenomenology and a development of its own. The result is a century of psychological science in which the single function laypeople consider most central to their agency received the least systematic attention.

3.2 Assagioli's reconstruction

*The major exception is **Roberto Assagioli** (1888–1974), the Italian psychiatrist who founded psychosynthesis. Two features of his account matter here.*

***First, the will is a directive function, not a force.** In The Act of Will (1973), Assagioli dismantles the Victorian picture of will-as-muscle. The will does not push; it steers. In his star diagram of psychological functions, the will occupies the center — adjacent to the "I" — surrounded by thinking, feeling, imagination, intuition, impulse, and sensation, which it directs but does not replace. The will, in our vocabulary, is the **navigator**, not the engine.*

***Second, the personal will and the transpersonal will are distinct, and their alignment is the developmental task.** Assagioli distinguishes the will of the everyday self from the will of what he calls the Higher Self — the deeper organization of the person that the person did not choose but nonetheless is. Psychosynthesis names its entire program after the progressive alignment of these two: the personal will learning to express, rather than override, the deeper design. Structurally, this is precisely the polarity this paper formalizes: Assagioli's Higher Self is a phenomenological description of the Personal Blueprint; his personal will is the script-holding, course-setting function whose expressed direction the behavioral posterior estimates.*

***Third — and operationally decisive — the strong will and the skillful will are different instruments.** The strong will forces: it overrides the constitution and harvests resistance. The skillful will steers with the grain of the person's own nature, achieving with minimal force what the strong will fails to achieve with maximal force. Assagioli's six stages of the volitional act — purpose and evaluation, deliberation, decision, affirmation, planning, execution — describe a completed cycle; his clinical material documents the characteristic ways each stage is aborted. Section 4.1 shows that these abortion points map onto an independent taxonomy from cognitive science.*

What Assagioli lacked was an instrument. He could describe, train, and teach the alignment of personal and transpersonal will; he could not measure it. Sections 5 and 6 argue that the measurement is now constructible — and that constructing it converts a contemplative insight into an empirical research program.

4. Three Frameworks, One Misalignment

Three theoretical traditions, developed independently and for different purposes, each contain the will–Blueprint polarity and each assign the misalignment the same functional role.

4.1 Script theory: the will as script-holder

*Schank's theory of dynamic memory (Schank & Abelson, 1977; Schank, 1982) holds that human understanding is organized by scripts — standardized event sequences that prescribe what should happen — and that learning is triggered not by repetition but by **expectation failure**: the moment when reality diverges from the script. The healthy response is a repair sequence: failure → retrieval of similar prior cases → comparison → script revision. Learning is the completed sequence; the failure to learn is its systematic abortion.*

*In this vocabulary, the will is the **script-holder**: the function that maintains the person's narrative about who they are and what should happen next. The Blueprint, by contrast, determines where the script will fail — the failure topology of Section 2.1. The four orientations map onto the four sub-processes of the repair cycle: the Unitary-dominant individual aborts at retrieval (intensifying the failing script rather than revising it); the Mythic-dominant at revision (revising the narrative but not the structure); the Social-dominant at registration (preventing the failure from being owned);*

the Sensory-dominant at expectation (preempting failure by force and externalizing it when it arrives). Expectation failure, on this reading, is nothing other than the moment the will steers its script into the Blueprint — and the Blueprint wins.

This mapping is stated as a structured conjecture, but it is not arbitrary: it follows from crossing each orientation's ***coherence criterion*** *with each repair stage's* ***characteristic demand****. Each stage demands something specific — registration demands ownership of the failure; retrieval demands treating the cherished script as one case among comparable cases; revision demands structural rather than merely narrative change; expectation demands deliberation before action. Each demand is maximally expensive for exactly one orientation: ownership threatens relational coherence (Social); comparability strips the script of its privileged systemic status (Unitary); structural change threatens narrative identity (Mythic); deliberation taxes the primacy of direct engagement (Sensory). The abortion point is the stage whose demand collides with the orientation's coherence criterion. The mapping thereby carries its own falsifiable content — stated as P6 in Section 5.3 — and its full derivation warrants separate treatment.*

4.2 The free-energy principle: misalignment as chronic surprise

Friston's free-energy principle (Friston, 2010; Friston et al., 2017; Parr, Pezzulo & Friston, 2022) holds that any self-maintaining system minimizes long-run surprise by maintaining and updating a generative model of its world, and by acting to bring observations into line with predictions. Applied to the person as a whole: the ***will is the generative model with its preferences*** *— the predicted and preferred trajectory of one's own life — while the* ***Blueprint is the structural prior****: the fixed parameterization within which the model must operate.*

A person whose will steers persistently against their Blueprint is, in these terms, a system whose free energy is chronically elevated: its generative model predicts a self that its own structure consistently fails to produce. The phenomenology is exactly the "resistance" the clinical and contemplative literatures describe — effort without traction, achievement without nourishment, a life lived in continuous low-grade surprise about itself. Active inference adds the corollary: such a system will either revise the model (the skillful will), coerce the observations (the strong will, temporarily), or — most commonly — sustain the elevation indefinitely by aborting the revision step (the repetition puzzle).

4.3 The constitutional account: misalignment as the engine

The third framework is the Blueprint theory itself, and here the decisive reframe occurs. If the Blueprint fixes the failure topology, and the will sets courses without consulting it, then misalignment is the normal condition — and this is not a design flaw. ***It is the engine.*** *Without the collision between will and Blueprint there is no expectation failure; without expectation failure there is no retrieval, no comparison, no revision — no learning. A person whose will coincided perfectly with their Blueprint would have nothing left to complete.*

This dissolves the apparent conflict between constitutional determinism and volitional freedom by noticing that the two operate on different questions. The Blueprint fixes what the characteristic failure mode is; that is given. The will determines how the person relates to it: flight (the defensive abortion of the cycle), force (the strong will overriding the design), or completion (the skillful will navigating the failure through to revision). The will is neither the adversary of the Blueprint nor its servant. It is the ***navigator of a vessel it did not choose*** *— and freedom, on this account, is not freedom from the vessel but freedom in the manner of sailing.*

The traditional name for the recurring collision — karma — thereby receives a structural definition: karma is the deterministic recurrence of the dominant expectation-failure mode under a will that has not yet learned its vessel. Resolution is not the avoidance of the failure but the completion of the cycle it initiates.

5. The Alignment Angle: Formalization and Predictions

5.1 Construction

Let $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $|\mathbf{q}| = 1$, be the Blueprint prior over the four orientations, with confidence weight $c_0 \in (0,1]$ assigned at intake.

*Let observations arrive as behaviorally meaningful acts — decisions, commitments, role choices, sustained engagements — each codable as an observation vector $\mathbf{o}_t$ in the same orientation space, weighted by the strength of the act. The **behavioral posterior** $\mathbf{p}_t$ — the will as expressed — is estimated by precision-weighted exponential smoothing:*

$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}_t + (1-\alpha) \cdot \mathbf{o}_t$, *with* $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{q}$ *and* $\alpha \approx 0.85$.

The smoothing constant is formally a discount factor in the West–Harrison (1997) sense, appropriate because the parameter being estimated — the expressed direction of a will across an adult life — is itself non-stationary (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2021, §8.1). Under this rule a single anomalous act registers but does not flip the estimate; a sustained pattern converges within roughly twenty meaningful observations; and the prior's contribution falls below five percent after approximately five.

Three remarks on α. First, the asymptotic direction of $\mathbf{p}_t$ under a stationary behavioral pattern is the pattern's mean direction regardless of α; the constant governs convergence lag and variance, not the limit. The classification of Section 5.2 is therefore asymptotically α-invariant, and α-sensitivity concentrates where it should: in the detection of transitions. Second, α is as much definitional as statistical — it fixes the timescale of "the will as expressed" (at $\alpha = 0.85$ the effective memory half-life is ≈ 4 meaningful observations); reporting θ at two timescales (a fast and a slow α) separates mood from course. Third, validation commits to a sensitivity sweep over $\alpha \in [0.70, 0.95]$ and, subsequently, to per-domain discount learning in the West–Harrison sense; both are stated here as commitments, not options.

*The **alignment angle** is then*

$\theta_D = \arccos\left(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p} / |\mathbf{q}||\mathbf{p}| \right)$,

*computed **per life domain** D (vocational, relational, communal, civic, …), since the will may sail with the grain in one domain and against it in another. The cosine rather than the Euclidean distance is deliberate: it captures the qualitative orientation of the expressed will relative to the constitution, not the magnitude of activity.*

*Two derived quantities complete the construct: the **stability** of θ_D (its variance over a trailing window — distinguishing a will in transition from a will entrenched against the grain), and the **trajectory** of $\mathbf{p}_t$ (the stored sequence of posteriors, which records not merely where the expressed will is but the path by which it arrived — two persons with identical current angles but opposite histories are in different developmental positions).*

5.2 Interpretation

- ***Small θ_D**: the person lives their design in domain D. Failures occur — the engine never stops — but they complete: the same failure does not recur in the same form.*
- ***Large, unstable θ_D**: a will in transition; the angle is information about a reorganization in progress.*
- ***Large, stable θ_D**: the will steers structurally against the Blueprint in this domain. Here the framework predicts the repetition signature: the same expectation failure, in the same domain, in structurally identical form, with the learning cycle aborted at the stage the failure topology specifies.*

*The angle is not a verdict. A large angle is the most personal information a measurement can return: here is where your will fights your design. What follows from it is Assagioli's prescription, now with coordinates: not the strong will forcing the posterior back to the prior (determinism as self-coercion — it always fails), not the dismissal of the prior (voluntarism — the collision merely repeats), but the **skillful will**: knowing the angle, locating the friction, and directing volitional effort at the manner of movement rather than the destination.*

5.3 Falsifiable predictions

The construct stakes its scientific standing on the following predictions, each testable in any longitudinal environment that records behaviorally meaningful acts and codes them in orientation space.

***P1 (Repetition).** Individuals with large, stable θ_D exhibit significantly more recurrent same-domain expectation failures — operationalized as structurally similar failure events separated in time without intervening behavioral reorganization — than individuals with small θ_D, controlling for activity level.*

***P2 (Completion asymmetry).** Following a failure event, the probability of cycle completion (observable as a durable shift in **p**_t consistent with script revision) is a decreasing function of θ_D at the time of the failure.*

***P3 (Prior validity).** A Blueprint prior earns admission only if it outperforms the uniform prior in predicting held-out first observations. This renders the intake instrument itself an empirical question inside the framework rather than an assumption beneath it.*

***P4 (Intervention signature).** Interventions in the skillful-will mode (reorienting the manner of engagement within the Blueprint's grain) reduce the recurrence rate of P1 without necessarily reducing activity, whereas strong-will interventions (goal restatement, effort intensification) reduce neither — and may transiently widen θ_D's stability, entrenching the pattern.*

***P5 (Domain dissociation).** θ is domain-specific: within persons, recurrence rates track the domain-wise angles rather than a global trait, dissociating the construct from general conscientiousness or negative affectivity.*

***P6 (Topology).** The stage at which the repair cycle aborts is distributed non-uniformly conditional on the dominant Blueprint orientation, in the pairing of Section 4.1 (Social → registration, Unitary → retrieval, Mythic → revision, Sensory → expectation). Failure of P6 falsifies the mapping without falsifying the angle construct — the two claims are deliberately separable.*

A design note on causal direction. *P1 as stated is correlational, and the reverse pathway is coherent: accumulated failures may shift the expressed will and thereby widen θ. Identification therefore proceeds in two steps. Longitudinally, θ at time t must predict new failure events in (t, t+Δ] controlling for prior failure history — a cross-lagged panel design, for which the trajectory store of Section 5.1 provides the data structure. Experimentally, P4 carries the causal burden: randomized assignment of skillful-will versus strong-will interventions manipulates the hypothesized mechanism directly. The framework's causal claim stands or falls with P4, not with P1 alone.*

6. Relation to Existing Constructs, Limitations, and Conclusion

6.1 Neighboring constructs

Self-discrepancy theory *(Higgins, 1987) is the nearest mainstream relative: discrepancies among actual, ideal, and ought self-representations predict distinct emotional syndromes. The alignment angle differs in kind, not merely in metric: Higgins's discrepancies hold between self-representations — all of them products of the will's own scripting — whereas θ holds between a representation-independent structural prior and the will's expressed direction. A person can exhibit zero self-discrepancy (actual and ideal selves coincide) at maximal alignment angle: the entire self-narrative, ideal included, may be built against the grain.*

Person–environment congruence *(Holland, 1997) measures the fit between vocational personality and work environment, with congruence predicting satisfaction and stability. The alignment angle generalizes the congruence intuition in two directions: from the vocational domain to all domains, and from person-versus-environment to will-versus-constitution — locating the misfit, when it exists, inside the person's own volitional economy rather than in the job market.*

Self-determination theory *(Deci & Ryan, 2000) identifies autonomy — acting from the self rather than from introjected pressure — as a basic need. The present framework specifies what "from the self" can mean when the self contains two poles: action can be autonomous with respect to external pressure yet still misaligned with the Blueprint. SDT's autonomy is necessary but not sufficient for a small θ.*

Individuation *(Jung, 1969) is the developmental telos closest in spirit: the conscious personality coming into right relation with a deeper, given totality. The alignment angle may be read as a proposed operationalization of one axis of individuation — with the caveat that operationalization always narrows what it measures.*

6.2 Limitations

Four limitations bound the claims. First, the Blueprint's derivation remains the framework's open flank; the prior-with-confidence architecture quarantines but does not resolve it, and P3 is the discipline that keeps the quarantine honest. Second, the orientation space is a modeling choice; the four-worldview basis has organizational-theoretic but limited psychometric validation, and the predictions of Section 5.3 are conditional on its adequacy. Third, coding behavioral acts into orientation space introduces rater or model dependence; classification provenance must be versioned and calibrated if longitudinal angles are to be trusted. Fourth, the framework's calibration populations are Western and educated; Henrich's (2020) caution applies with full force, and cross-cultural transfer of both the orientation basis and the volitional phenomenology is an empirical question, not an assumption.

6.3 Conclusion

The will and the Blueprint do not coincide, are not supposed to coincide, and the distance between them is not a philosophical embarrassment but the most consequential variable a psychology of development can measure. The contribution, then, is not the formula but the polarity it measures: where the existing instruments of psychology hold self-representation against self-representation — actual against ideal, perceived against ought — the alignment angle holds ***constitution against volition****, a dimension orthogonal to the existing axes. Three independent frameworks — script theory, the free-energy principle, and the constitutional account — converge on the misalignment and assign it the same role: the engine of learning, whose output is growth when the cycle completes and repetition when it aborts. Assagioli saw the polarity clearly half a century ago and prescribed the skillful will as its resolution; what he lacked was the instrument. The alignment angle is that instrument: a per-domain, longitudinally tracked, falsifiably consequential quantity that converts the oldest question of practical psychology — why do I keep doing this? — into a coordinate.*

Annotated References

Assagioli, R. (1965). Psychosynthesis: A Manual of Principles and Techniques. Hobbs, Dorman. *The founding text of psychosynthesis. Introduces the "egg diagram" (lower, middle, and higher unconscious surrounding the field of consciousness and the "I") and the star diagram of psychological functions with the will at its center. The Higher Self — the given organization of the person, distinct from and deeper than the everyday self — is the phenomenological forerunner of the Personal Blueprint as used here.*

Assagioli, R. (1973). The Act of Will. Viking Press. *The only major twentieth-century monograph that treats the will as a primary psychological function with its own anatomy and development. The distinctions among strong, skillful, good, and transpersonal will, and the six stages of the volitional act, supply the interpretive vocabulary for the alignment angle: θ measures what Assagioli described as the distance between the personal and the transpersonal will. Section 5.3's P4 is, in effect, Assagioli's clinical claim restated as a testable contrast.*

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding. Erlbaum. *The founding statement of script theory: the vocabulary of script, plan, goal, and theme on which the account of the will as script-holder rests. Essential background for reading expectation failure as a structural event rather than a misfortune.*

Schank, R. C. (1982). Dynamic Memory: A Theory of Reminding and Learning in Computers and People. Cambridge University Press. *The cognitive backbone of the paper. Chapters 2–4 establish that learning is triggered by expectation failure and proceeds through retrieval, comparison, and script revision; the abortion points of that sequence supply the failure topology onto which the four Blueprint orientations are mapped. The uncompleted cycle is the operational definition of the repetition puzzle.*

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11(2), 127–138. *The canonical statement of the free-energy principle. Grounds the reading of the will as generative model and the Blueprint as structural prior, with chronic misalignment as chronically elevated free energy. Dense; readers new to variational formulations should begin with Parr, Pezzulo & Friston (2022).*

Friston, K., FitzGerald, T., Rigoli, F., Schwartenbeck, P., & Pezzulo, G. (2017). Active inference: a process theory. Neural Computation, 29(1), 1–49. *Extends the principle from perception to action and supplies the formal distinction between revising the model and coercing the observations — the strong-will/skillful-will contrast in variational dress. The treatment of epistemic value motivates P2's completion asymmetry.*

Parr, T., Pezzulo, G., & Friston, K. (2022). Active Inference: The Free Energy Principle in Mind, Brain, and Behavior. MIT Press. *The accessible textbook development. Chapters 1–4 give the conceptual apparatus assumed in Section 4.2; open access via MIT Press Direct.*

McWhinney, W. (1997). Paths of Change: Strategic Choices for Organizations and Society. Sage. *Source of the four-worldview basis (Unitary, Sensory, Social, Mythic) used as the orientation space for both prior and posterior. McWhinney's argument that most organizational failure arises from the dominance of one worldview at the expense of the others is the organizational-scale expression of the failure-topology claim.*

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. Psychological Review, 94(3), 319–340. *The nearest mainstream construct. Discrepancies among actual, ideal, and ought selves predict distinct affective syndromes. Cited here to mark the difference in kind: Higgins's poles are both self-representations; the alignment angle holds between a representation-independent structural prior and expressed volition. The zero-discrepancy/maximal-angle case of Section 6.1 is the discriminating prediction.*

Holland, J. L. (1997). Making Vocational Choices (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources. *The congruence tradition in vocational psychology, with the strongest psychometric pedigree among the neighboring constructs. The alignment angle generalizes congruence from person–environment fit in the vocational domain to will–constitution fit across all domains.*

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. *The autonomy construct against which Section 6.1 differentiates: autonomy with respect to external pressure is necessary but not sufficient for alignment, since an autonomously chosen course can still run against the constitutional grain.*

Jung, C. G. (1969). The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious (2nd ed., Collected Works Vol. 9i). Princeton University Press. *The individuation literature as developmental telos: the conscious personality coming into right relation with a given totality it did not author. The alignment angle is offered as an operationalization of one axis of this process, with the standard caveat that operationalization narrows.*

Hyndman, R. J., & Athanasopoulos, G. (2021). Forecasting: Principles and Practice (3rd ed.). OTexts. *Open-access. Section 8.1 gives the formal treatment of exponential smoothing and its equivalence to the optimal filter for a drifting parameter — the justification for estimating a non-stationary expressed will by EMA.*

West, M., & Harrison, J. (1997). Bayesian Forecasting and Dynamic Models (2nd ed.). Springer. *The deep treatment of the discount-factor reading of the smoothing constant, and the natural home of the per-person, per-domain generalization of α flagged as future work.*

Henrich, J. (2020). The WEIRDest People in the World. Farrar, Straus and Giroux. *The standing caution on cross-cultural transfer: both the orientation basis and the phenomenology of volition are calibrated on Western populations, and Section 6.2 treats their generalization as an open empirical question.*

Correspondence: J. Konstapel, Constable Research B.V., Leiden, The Netherlands.