



[Home](#) [Licensing](#) [Patents](#) [Articles](#)

Disruption Modeling for Workplace Burnout Detection

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published March 27, 2026 | [PDF](#)

Burnout is not sudden exhaustion. It is a progressive phase shift from promoted cognitive functioning, characterized by flexibility, engagement, and adaptive problem-solving, toward contained functioning, characterized by rigidity, cynicism, and defensive minimalism. Disruption modeling detects this phase shift on the promotion-containment continuum, identifying burnout trajectories weeks or months before they reach the clinical exhaustion that current workplace surveys measure only after the damage is done.

The survey lag in burnout detection

Organizations measure burnout through periodic surveys: the Maslach Burnout Inventory, engagement pulse surveys, and annual wellbeing assessments. These instruments measure burnout after it has developed. An employee who scores high on emotional exhaustion has already been burning out for

months. The survey confirms what the employee and their colleagues already know. It does not detect the trajectory early enough to intervene.

Between surveys, burnout develops invisibly to the organization. An employee whose coherence is progressively deteriorating, whose problem-solving is becoming rigid, whose relational engagement is narrowing, generates no signal in the organizational monitoring system until the next survey captures the accumulated damage.

Why productivity metrics miss the coherence signal

Some organizations monitor productivity metrics as burnout proxies: response times, task completion rates, communication frequency. But burnout often maintains productivity until late in the trajectory. An employee in early burnout may maintain output through containment strategies: rigid routines, reduced scope of engagement, and defensive task prioritization. Productivity appears stable. The coherence underneath is deteriorating.

When productivity finally declines, the burnout is advanced. The early intervention window has passed. Productivity metrics are lagging indicators of a coherence problem that disruption modeling can detect as a leading indicator.

How disruption modeling addresses burnout detection

Disruption modeling tracks the employee's position on the promotion-containment continuum through behavioral signals available in workplace systems: communication pattern diversity, problem-solving approach flexibility, meeting engagement patterns, and relational breadth. An employee shifting from promoted to contained functioning shows characteristic patterns: communication becomes more formulaic, problem-solving narrows to familiar approaches, meeting engagement becomes passive, and relational connections narrow to essential contacts.

Phase-shift detection identifies the transition between states. An employee whose behavioral patterns show increasing containment over weeks is approaching a phase shift toward burnout. The five-axis diagnostic evaluates the disruption across multiple dimensions: professional engagement, relational connection, emotional regulation, cognitive flexibility, and narrative coherence about work meaning.

Coping intercept identification distinguishes between productive coping and defensive containment. An employee who temporarily narrows focus to manage a deadline is coping adaptively. An employee whose focus narrowing persists beyond the triggering demand is moving into defensive containment. The disruption model tracks the temporal dynamics that distinguish adaptive coping from burnout trajectory.

The model operates on aggregate behavioral patterns, not on content surveillance. Communication diversity is measured by pattern metrics, not by reading messages. The system detects that communication is becoming more formulaic without examining what is being communicated.

What implementation looks like

An organization deploying disruption modeling for burnout detection integrates behavioral pattern analysis from existing workplace systems: email and messaging metadata, calendar patterns, and collaboration tool engagement metrics. The system maintains a coherence trajectory for each employee without accessing content.

For HR teams, disruption modeling provides early warning when employees or teams are approaching burnout phase shifts, enabling proactive intervention through workload adjustment, support resources, or structural changes before burnout becomes clinical.

For managers, disruption modeling provides team-level coherence assessment that reveals when team dynamics are shifting toward containment, enabling management adjustments that address the systemic conditions producing burnout rather than treating individual cases after they manifest.

[Disruption Modeling All 21 steps →](#)

Recognize cognitive disruption before it stabilizes.

Primary Technical Disclosure

[◦ AQ-DSM: Diagnosing Cognitive Disruption as Loss of Coherence](#)

Secondary Technical

[◦ Cognitive Disruption as Architectural Phase-Shift](#)◦ [The Promotion-Containment Continuum](#)◦ [Attention Fragmentation: Reward-Biased Over-Promotion of Speculative Branches](#)◦ [Containment Collapse: Loss of the Speculation-Verification Boundary](#)◦ [Channel-Locked Promotion With Tolerance Escalation](#)◦ [Five-Axis Disruption Diagnostic Framework](#)◦ [Computable Therapeutic Dosing for Cognitive Disruption](#)◦ [Intergenerational Coherence Burden in Agent Lineages](#)◦ [Agent Self-Diagnosis and Autonomous Coherence Monitoring](#)◦ [Phase-Shift Early Warning System for Cognitive Disruption](#)◦ [Coherence Restoration Protocol Library](#)◦ [Positive and Negative Symptom Analogs in Containment Failure](#)◦ [Coherence Authorization Failure: Self-Disabling Execution](#)◦ [Pathological Verification Loop: Recursive Containment Audit Failure](#)◦ [Dissociation as Simulation Bypass: Acting on Unverified Planning](#)◦ [Affective Gradient Collapse: Self-Esteem Floor Lock](#)◦ [Resilience as Structural Capacity for Coherence Restoration](#)◦ [Personality Configuration Analogs From Stabilized Coping Regimes](#)◦ [Structural Dependency Patterns Between Agents](#)◦ [Destabilizing Attachment: Mutual Disruption Amplification](#)◦ [Resource-Depletion Pattern: Cognitive Operation Under Scarcity](#)◦ [Therapeutic Agent Interaction Through Behavioral State Recognition](#)◦ [Companion AI Relational Safety Constraints](#)◦ [Multi-Agent Group Coherence Dynamics](#)

Applications (General)

[◦ Coping Under Empathic Pressure: HSP, Narcissism, and Psychopathy as Control-Loop Intercepts](#)◦ [Two Faces of Codependency: Structural Entrapment vs. Emotional Entrapment Under Empathic Pressure](#)◦ [Starving for Each Other: Anxious-Avoidant Attachment as a Semantic Starvation Loop](#)◦ [Intimacy Collapse: A Structural Model of Trauma and Resilience](#)◦ [Structural Diagnosis: How Reward-Modulated Cognition Phase-Shifts Into ADHD and Schizophrenia](#)◦ [Clinical AI Therapeutic Monitoring Through Phase-Shift Detection](#)◦ [Autonomous Agent Fleet Health Through Coherence Diagnostics](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Workplace Burnout Detection](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Military Operator Resilience](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Financial Trader Monitoring](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Student Mental Health](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Caregiver Fatigue Detection](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for First Responder Resilience](#)

Applications (Specific)

[◦ BetterHelp Cannot Detect When Therapy Is Making Things Worse](#)◦ [Talkspace Has No Model of Therapeutic Destabilization](#)◦ [Headspace Cannot Detect When Mindfulness Destabilizes](#)◦ [Noom Tracks Behavior Without Modeling Cognitive Disruption](#)◦ [Spring Health Matches Therapists, Not Disruption Patterns](#)◦ [Lyra Health Measures Outcomes, Not Coherence Trajectories](#)◦ [Ginger.io Detects Behavioral Signals Without a Disruption Model](#)◦

[Cerebral Prescribes Medication Without Modeling Disruption Dynamics](#)◦ [Modern Health Offers a Care Spectrum Without Disruption Diagnostics](#)◦ [Calm Business Offers Relaxation, Not Disruption Detection](#)
[Disruption Modeling overview →](#)

AQ
deterministic
autonomy

Legal

Subject to one or more pending U.S. and international patent applications, see [Patents](#) for the current list and status. No license, express or implied, is granted. Any use requires a separate written agreement—see [Licensing](#). Patent applications referenced on this site are pending. Claim scope, if any, is subject to examination and may issue in altered form or not at all. See [Legal](#) for terms and conditions.

Adaptive Query™ is a trademark of Nicholas Clark. U.S. federal registration is pending. federal registration. AQ™, AQ Inside™, Adaptive Index™, Adaptive Network™, Semantic Agent™, @AQ™, AQID™, and Adaptive Coin™ are used as trademarks in connection with the Adaptive Query platform and brand. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

Platform operated by Adaptive Query LLC, which provides patent and trademark licensing services. Copyright © 2025-2026 Nicholas Clark. All rights reserved.

Last updated: 2026-03-03



- [Inventive Steps](#)

- [Licensing](#)
- [Patents](#)
- [Articles](#)
- [Legal](#)
- [Opportunities](#)
- [Sitemap](#)



-
- nick@qu3ry.net
- 72 28 14 36 01



[Invented by Nick Clark](#) | Founding Investors: Devin Wilkie