



Justification of the Eight Invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors

***Methodological justification of the eight invariant Core Quality Factors established by
the Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Whole Quality Standard — Core (VRJ1)***

First Edition, August 2026

AMERICAN SUPPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE

Introduction

The Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Whole Quality Standard — Core (VRJ1) establishes eight invariant Core Quality Factors for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

This paper examines why the VRJ Core resolves into these eight Factors and whether they provide an appropriate methodological resolution for Support Service Quality State determination.

The analysis begins with the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object, its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Function Realization, Support Service Realization Pathways, and principal Failure-Mode Families.

VRJ1 defines the invariant Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators that must remain visible across different job types, industries, worksites, employment-support models, funding arrangements, technologies, Worker populations, and jurisdictions. Context Guides provide bounded Context-Specific Interpretation without creating a different Core.

The paper therefore asks whether each of the eight established Factors preserves a necessary and distinguishable major quality-relevant dimension of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization, and whether the complete eight-Factor Core provides sufficient collective coverage at the selected Core-level resolution.

The eight Factors examined are:

Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm;
Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards;
Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance;
Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy;
Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;
Workplace Integration and Social Navigation;
Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;
and
Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.

VRJ1 derives these Factors from the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object, its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, its Boundaries and Interfaces, and the Failure-Mode Families that may prevent, weaken, interrupt, distort, or misdirect employment-maintenance Function Realization.

The purpose is not to defend the number eight because it already exists in VRJ1.

It is to determine whether eight is presently justified as the Core methodological resolution for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

The analysis therefore tests:

the necessity of each Factor;
the distinguishability of neighboring Factors;
whether apparent overlap represents interaction or redundancy;
whether any Factor could be removed or merged without material loss of determination capability;
whether the eight Factors collectively leave an evident Core-level gap;
and
whether the same Factor structure remains meaningful when Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization is interpreted in different employment Contexts.

The paper also preserves an important boundary established by VRJ1.

Continued employment, employer satisfaction, task completion, documentation, funding authorization, or the presence of a Job Coach do not by themselves establish the Support Service Quality State of the Job

Coaching Support Service Quality Object. The determination concerns the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object as a whole and must be supported through its Support Work, Support Results, Boundaries, Interfaces, employment Context, Evidence, and actual conditions of service realization.

The current VRJ Context Guide work provides practical application Evidence for this testing. For example, the Cleaning Services Employment Context Guide preserves all eight invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors and thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators while developing cleaning-specific Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, and Evidence considerations.

Such applications are useful not merely because they reproduce the Core in another document.

They test whether materially different workplace conditions can be interpreted without removing, merging, renaming, or adding a Core Quality Factor.

The conclusions of this paper are therefore intentionally bounded.

The study may support the necessity, distinguishability, collective adequacy, and present invariance of the eight established VRJ Core Quality Factors.

It does not claim that eight is a permanently fixed number or that future Evidence can never justify controlled revision.

The appropriate question is whether the present eight-Factor structure preserves the major quality-relevant dimensions that must remain separately visible for responsible determination of Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
1. Purpose and Scope	7
1.1 Purpose of This Paper	7
1.2 What Is Being Justified	7
1.3 What This Paper Does Not Claim	8
2. From the Whole Quality Methodology to the VRJ Core	8
2.1 Methodological Resolution	8
2.2 The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object Comes First	9
2.3 The Determination Task Comes First	10
2.4 Why the Number of Factors Is a Result, Not a Starting Assumption	11
3. The VRJ Job Coaching Support Service Determination Task	12
3.1 The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object	12
3.2 Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results	13
3.3 Job Coaching Support Work, Support Results, and Function Realization	13
3.4 Boundaries, Interfaces, Service Period, and Employment Context	14
3.5 Occupational Reference, Functional Scope, and the Reference Layer	14
3.6 What a Responsible Support Service Quality State Determination Must Be Able to See	15
4. Method for Deriving the Core Quality Factors	16
4.1 Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results	16

4.2 Function Realization	16
4.3 Job Coaching Support Service Realization Pathways.....	17
4.4 Failure-Mode Families	18
4.5 From Failure-Mode Families to Major Quality-Relevant Dimensions	19
4.6 Test for a Separate Core Quality Factor	19
5. Why the VRJ Core Resolves into Eight Factors	21
5.1 Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm.....	21
5.2 Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards.....	21
5.3 Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance	22
5.4 Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy	22
5.5 Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk	23
5.6 Workplace Integration and Social Navigation	23
5.7 Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information.....	24
5.8 Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope	24
5.9 The Eight Factors as One Core	25
6. Factor-by-Factor Justification	26
6.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm.....	26
6.2 Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards	28
6.3 Factor 3 — Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance	29
6.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy	30
6.5 Factor 5 — Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk	31
6.6 Factor 6 — Workplace Integration and Social Navigation	32
6.7 Factor 7 — Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information.....	33
6.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope	35
6.9 Factor-by-Factor Conclusion	36
7. Collective Testing of the Eight-Factor Core	36
7.1 Collective Coverage.....	36
7.2 Removal Test.....	37
7.3 Merger and Redundancy Test	38
7.4 Overlap Does Not Necessarily Mean Redundancy	38
7.5 Support Service Non-Substitutability, Non-Compensability, and Critical Service Conditions.....	39
7.6 Possible Gaps at the Factor Level.....	39
7.7 Interim Conclusion — Collective Testing	40
8. Reference Layer, Functional Scope, Employer Authority, and External Requirements	41
8.1 Reference Layer as Part of the Determination Basis.....	41
8.2 Functional Scope and Occupational Boundaries.....	41

8.3 Worker Direction, Employer Authority, Vocational Rehabilitation, Organizational, Payer, and Other External Requirements	42
8.4 External Requirements May Affect More Than One Factor	43
8.5 Compliance, Continued Employment, and Employer Satisfaction Do Not by Themselves Establish Support Service Quality	43
8.6 Reference-Layer Detail Does Not Automatically Require Another Core Quality Factor	44
8.7 Interim Conclusion — Reference Layer Coverage	44
9. Testing the Eight-Factor Core Across VRJ Employment Contexts.....	45
9.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing.....	45
9.2 Existing VRJ Context Guides as Practical Evidence	45
9.3 Cleaning Services Employment.....	46
9.4 Additional Employment Contexts Identified by VRJ1.....	47
9.5 Horizontal Comparison Across the VRJ Context Guide Family.....	47
9.6 Different Failure Modes Within the Same Invariant Factors	48
9.7 Different Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria Within the Same Core	48
9.8 What the Existing Applications Do — and Do Not — Demonstrate.....	49
9.9 What Would Constitute a Factor-Level Core Gap	49
9.10 Interim Conclusion — Cross-Context Testing.....	50
10. Why Eight — and Not Fewer or More	50
10.1 The Central Question.....	50
10.2 Eight Is a Methodological Resolution, Not a Numerically Predetermined Truth	51
10.3 Why Fewer Factors Could Appear Attractive.....	51
10.4 The Cost of Excessive Consolidation	51
10.5 Why Employment Harm and Job Performance Should Remain Distinguishable	52
10.6 Why Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance Should Remain Separately Visible	52
10.7 Why Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy Should Remain Separately Visible	52
10.8 Why Recognition and Response to Employment Risk Should Not Be Absorbed Completely into Harm Prevention	53
10.9 Why Workplace Integration and Social Navigation Should Remain Separately Visible	53
10.10 Why Employment-Relevant Information Continuity Should Remain Separately Visible.....	53
10.11 Why Functional Scope and Judgment Should Remain Separately Visible.....	54
10.12 The Removal Test Supports the Need for Eight	54
10.13 Why More Factors Could Also Appear Attractive	55
10.14 A New Job Type, Worker Population, Workplace, Technology, or Employment Risk Is Not Automatically a New Quality Factor.....	55
10.15 Test for a Possible Additional Core Quality Factor	56
10.16 Employment-Context Diversity Does Not Require More Core Quality Factors.....	56

10.17 The Eight Factors Are Interrelated, Not Eight Independent Silos	56
10.18 Support Service Non-Substitutability and Non-Compensability Support the Eight-Factor Core... 57	57
10.19 The Eight-Factor Core Should Remain Testable	57
10.20 Why the Present Answer Is Eight	57
10.21 Direct Answer to the Title Question	58
11. Stability and Revision of the Eight-Factor VRJ Core	58
11.1 Why the VRJ Core Must Be Stable.....	58
11.2 Stability Does Not Mean Rigidity	59
11.3 Provisional Core-Revision Findings.....	59
11.4 Horizontal Comparison Before Revision	60
11.5 Cross-Factor Concepts Should Not Automatically Become Core Quality Factors	60
11.6 Revision Must Preserve Factor Meaning	61
11.7 Revision Must Preserve the Core Level of Resolution	61
11.8 Evidence Required for Revision	62
11.9 Stability Supports Comparison Across Employment Contexts and Time	62
11.10 Controlled Revision Principle.....	62
12. Conclusions	63
12.1 Purpose of the Analysis	63
12.2 Derivation Result	63
12.3 Necessity of the Eight Factors	64
12.4 Distinguishability Without Isolation	64
12.5 Why Fewer Factors Are Not Presently Supported.....	65
12.6 Why More Factors Are Not Presently Supported.....	65
12.7 Support from Context-Specific Application	66
12.8 Bounded Conclusion on Invariance	66
12.9 Final Determination.....	67
REFERENCES	68
REFERENCE USE	68
Copyright and Use Notice.....	68

1. Purpose and Scope

1.1 Purpose of This Paper

The purpose of this paper is to provide a methodological justification for the eight invariant Core Quality Factors established by VRJ1 for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

The paper examines whether these Factors represent the major quality-relevant dimensions that must remain visible for responsible determination of Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

The justification is based on the relationship among:
the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object;
its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results;
Function Realization;
Support Service Realization Pathways;
Failure Modes and Failure-Mode Families;
Core Quality Factors;
Core Quality Indicators;
Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria;
Evidence;
and
Support Service Quality State determination.

The analysis therefore begins with what the Job Coaching Support Service is intended to realize and the principal ways in which that realization may be prevented, weakened, interrupted, distorted, or misdirected.

VRJ1 expressly uses Failure-Mode Families as the methodological bridge between the declared Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results and the invariant Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators.

The paper then tests whether each established Factor is necessary, distinguishable from the other Factors, and appropriate at the invariant Core level.

1.2 What Is Being Justified

The subject of justification is the following eight-Factor structure established by VRJ1:

Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm;
Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards;
Factor 3 — Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance;
Factor 4 — Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy;
Factor 5 — Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;
Factor 6 — Workplace Integration and Social Navigation;
Factor 7 — Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;
and
Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.

VRJ1 establishes a Core Quality Factor as a dimension of Function Realization that must remain visible and controllable. A Core Quality Indicator makes that Factor observable without itself constituting quality.

Accordingly, this paper does not ask simply whether each Factor describes something important in employment support.

It asks a more specific methodological question:

If a Factor were removed, merged into another Factor, or made insufficiently visible, would a major and distinguishable dimension needed to determine Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization be lost?

The paper also examines the Factors collectively.

The question is therefore not only whether each individual Factor can be justified, but whether the eight Factors together provide an appropriate present Core-level resolution for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

1.3 What This Paper Does Not Claim

This paper does not determine the quality of any particular Job Coach, Worker, employer, provider organization, workplace, vocational rehabilitation program, or Job Coaching Support Service Arrangement.

It does not treat continued employment, employer satisfaction, completed job tasks, service hours, documentation, funding authorization, or absence of reported incidents as substitutes for Support Service Quality State determination.

It does not redefine the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object, Support Intended Functions, Support Intended Results, Core Quality Factors, Core Quality Indicators, or other WQI Root Concepts or AMSI Applied Concepts established by the governing documents.

AMSI VOC1 is the authoritative source for the Applied Concepts used by VRJ1, and VRJ1 requires preservation of traceability among the Root Vocabulary, Applied Vocabulary, Core Standard, Context-Specific Interpretation, determination, verification, and bounded claims.

The paper also does not convert employer requirements, workplace rules, vocational rehabilitation requirements, service authorizations, payer requirements, laws, professional requirements, or other external sources into Core Quality Factors merely because they may affect Job Coaching Support Work.

Such requirements enter through the applicable Reference Layer and external Interfaces and must be considered within the declared Support Service Quality Object and Functional Scope.

Finally, the paper does not claim that the number eight is permanently closed to future Evidence.

Its purpose is to determine whether the present eight-Factor structure is justified at the current methodological resolution.

Possible future Factor-level findings should be tested through continued application, Context Guide development, horizontal comparison, and controlled Core review rather than being introduced automatically whenever a new job type, workplace condition, technology, Worker population, or employment risk appears.

This paper provides a methodological justification of the eight-Factor structure; it does not constitute statistical or population-level empirical validation of the VRJ Core.

2. From the Whole Quality Methodology to the VRJ Core

2.1 Methodological Resolution

The Whole Quality methodology requires quality analysis to begin with a declared Quality Object and its Intended Function rather than with a predetermined list of desirable characteristics.

At the AMSI applied level, VRJ1 applies this methodology to the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object and its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results.

The Core Quality Factors provide the major dimensions through which Function Realization of that object is examined.

They therefore occupy a particular level of methodological resolution.

A Factor must be broad enough to remain meaningful across different employment Contexts, job duties, worksites, Worker needs, technologies, support arrangements, funding conditions, and jurisdictions.

At the same time, it must remain sufficiently distinct to preserve a major quality-relevant dimension that would otherwise become materially less visible in Support Service Quality State determination.

The Core Quality Indicators provide the next level of resolution by identifying what must be examined to make each Factor observable. VRJ1 expressly distinguishes the role of Factors, Indicators, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, findings, Factor interpretation, and Quality State determination.

The methodological relationship can therefore be expressed as:

Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object

→ Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results

→ Function Realization

→ Support Service Realization Pathways

→ Failure Modes and Failure-Mode Families

→ Core Quality Factors

→ Core Quality Indicators

→ Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria

→ Evidence

→ Evidence-Supported Findings

→ Quality Factor Interpretation

→ Support Service Quality State determination.

The question addressed in this paper concerns the Core Quality Factor level of this relationship.

2.2 The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object Comes First

The derivation of the VRJ Core begins with the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

The object must be understood as one coherent Quality Object rather than as a collection of separately evaluated participants, activities, or outcomes.

Within the AMSI Support-Service Quality Object framework, the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object brings together:

the Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support;

the Support Worker or Support Workers, including the Job Coach where included within the declared object;

Job Coaching Support Work;

Support Results;

Service Conditions;

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results;

internal Boundaries and internal Interfaces;

the external Boundary and external Interfaces;

the employment Context;

and

the Evidence basis required for Support Service Quality State determination.

These constituent parts are considered together within the declared external Boundary of the Quality Object.

The Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support contributes the Worker's abilities, needs, preferences, goals, rights, actual job role, functional presentation, and other conditions material to the declared Job Coaching Support Service.

The Support Worker or Support Workers contribute the knowledge, skills, judgment, communication, role performance, well-being, accountability, and other characteristics relevant to the Support Work performed within the declared Functional Scope.

Job Coaching Support Work concerns what is actually performed through tasks, activities, interactions, observation, prompting, instruction, communication, coordination, decisions, assistance, adjustment, and other actions included within the declared support service.

Support Results concern what is achieved, changed, maintained, stabilized, prevented, enabled, or otherwise realized in material relation to that Support Work.

Service Conditions include the Service Period, Support Service Arrangement, roles and responsibilities, Assumptions, Uncertainty, and Evidence basis under which the support service is realized and later determined.

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results are shared across the whole declared Quality Object. They provide the functional basis against which Function Realization is examined.

Boundaries make the object whole.

Internal Boundaries and Interfaces connect the constituent parts within the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

External Interfaces connect the Quality Object with relevant elements of the external environment.

The employment Context establishes the real-life conditions within which Job Coaching Support Work and Support Results are realized.

The Evidence basis supports responsible determination of the Support Service Quality State.

AMSI VOC1 establishes the Support Service Quality Object as the primary reference point for support-service quality and places Support Intended Functions, Support Intended Results, Support Work, Support Results, Support Service Realization, Factors, Indicators, criteria, Evidence-supported findings, and Support Service Quality State within one conceptual dependency.

Accordingly, the eight VRJ Core Quality Factors cannot be derived responsibly from a list of Job Coach tasks, Worker characteristics, employer requirements, workplace hazards, or employment outcomes considered separately.

They must preserve the major quality-relevant dimensions of Function Realization of the whole declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

2.3 The Determination Task Comes First

Once the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object has been declared, the next question is what must be determined about that object.

The purpose of the VRJ Core is not simply to establish that Job Coaching Support Work occurred.

Nor is it sufficient to establish that the Worker remained employed, completed assigned tasks, received authorized service hours, or had a Job Coach present.

VRJ1 expressly states that the quality of Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching support services cannot be represented by service hours, Worker presence, documentation, funding authorization, employer satisfaction, or continued employment alone. It must be determined for the declared Support Service Quality Object through Support Work, Support Results, Boundaries, Interfaces, employment Context, Evidence, and the conditions under which the service is performed and experienced.

The determination task must therefore examine whether the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object realizes its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results.

For the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment, responsible Support Service Quality State determination must be capable of seeing whether the service:

protects against foreseeable employment-related harm;
supports sustained performance of the actual job at employer-acceptable standards;
supports Functional Independence and an appropriate balance between Worker performance and Job Coaching support;
preserves Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and ordinary employee participation;
recognizes and responds appropriately to changing or emerging employment risk;
supports workplace integration and ordinary social navigation;
preserves continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information;
and
keeps Support Work, decisions, judgment, assistance seeking, and escalation within the applicable Support Role, Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries.

These questions correspond to the principal Failure-Mode Families identified in VRJ1. Those families include failures involving foreseeable employment harm, sustained job performance, mismatch between support and Worker/job conditions, over-support or substitution, loss of dignity or employee role, failures of recognition and response, workplace isolation, employment-relevant information failure, and Support Work outside applicable Functional Scope or responsibility boundaries.

The determination task therefore comes before the Factor count.

If one of these major dimensions were not separately visible, favorable performance elsewhere could conceal a material weakness in Function Realization.

A Worker may remain employed while the Job Coach unnecessarily performs parts of the Worker's assigned job functions.

A Worker may meet production expectations while becoming unnecessarily dependent on continuous support.

A Worker may perform assigned tasks correctly while being separated from ordinary workplace relationships.

A Job Coach may document activities thoroughly while important employment-relevant information is delayed, distorted, or lost across an Interface.

Support may produce an immediately favorable result while being performed outside the authorized Functional Scope.

The Core must therefore preserve separate visibility where materially different determination questions cannot responsibly substitute for one another.

2.4 Why the Number of Factors Is a Result, Not a Starting Assumption

VRJ1 presently establishes eight invariant Core Quality Factors.

The methodological justification cannot begin with the proposition that there must be eight and then search for reasons to preserve that number.

Instead, the number must emerge from the level of resolution required to determine Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

Too few Factors could combine materially different determination functions and allow an unfavorable condition in one dimension to disappear inside a broader favorable interpretation.

Too many Factors could elevate Context-specific job tasks, workplace hazards, technologies, employer requirements, Worker characteristics, individual Failure Modes, or particular service arrangements into separate Core dimensions and thereby fragment the invariant VRJ Core.

The appropriate Factor structure therefore lies between excessive consolidation and excessive fragmentation.

A separate Core Quality Factor is justified where a major quality-relevant dimension:
arises from the Support Intended Functions, Support Intended Results, and Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object;

is supported by a distinguishable Failure-Mode Family or sufficiently coherent group of Failure Modes;
can fail while other dimensions remain comparatively satisfactory;

would become materially less visible if removed;

cannot be preserved by another existing Factor without material loss;

remains meaningful across materially different employment Contexts;

and

is genuinely Core-level rather than detail that belongs to a Core Quality Indicator, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion, Failure Mode, Critical Service Condition, Boundary, Interface, Functional Scope condition, Reference-Layer requirement, or other Context-specific element.

VRJ1 itself establishes that its Core is derived from the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object, its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, its Boundaries and Interfaces, and the Failure-Mode Families that may prevent or distort employment-maintenance Function Realization.

The eight Factors must therefore be treated as a methodological result of the present Core resolution rather than as a numerically predetermined classification.

The task of the following Sections is to reconstruct and test that result.

The next step is to examine the VRJ Job Coaching Support Service determination task in greater detail before deriving the eight Factors from Function Realization, Support Service Realization Pathways, and the principal Failure-Mode Families.

3. The VRJ Job Coaching Support Service Determination Task

3.1 The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object

The subject of determination under VRJ1 is the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

For the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment, the Quality Object brings together, within its declared external Boundary:

the Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support;

the Support Worker or Support Workers;

Job Coaching Support Work;

Support Results;

Service Conditions;

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results;

Boundaries and Interfaces;

the employment Context;

and

the Evidence basis required for Support Service Quality State determination.

These constituent parts are not separate Quality Objects merely because they can be observed separately.

They form one coherent Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object for the declared determination.

Accordingly, the determination does not ask only whether the Worker performs well, whether the Job Coach performs assigned activities, whether the employer is satisfied, or whether employment continues.

It asks about Function Realization of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object as a whole.

This distinction establishes the frame within which the eight Core Quality Factors must be derived and justified.

3.2 Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results

VRJ1 establishes the Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results that give the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object its functional meaning.

The service is directed toward supporting the Worker in maintaining competitive integrated employment through appropriate support for sustained job performance, Functional Independence, workplace participation, adaptation to changing employment conditions, and other employment-maintenance needs within the applicable Support Role and Functional Scope.

The Support Intended Results concern the conditions and outcomes that the Job Coaching support-service is intended to achieve or maintain for the Worker through realization of those functions.

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results are therefore not attributes of the Job Coach alone.

They are shared across the declared Quality Object and are realized through interaction among the Worker, Support Workers, Support Work, Support Results, Service Conditions, Boundaries, Interfaces, employment Context, and applicable Evidence basis.

The quality question is consequently not:

Did a Job Coach perform an activity?

It is:

Did the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object realize its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results under the actual conditions of the service?

This distinction is fundamental to Factor derivation.

3.3 Job Coaching Support Work, Support Results, and Function Realization

Support Work and Support Results must remain distinguishable.

Job Coaching Support Work concerns what is performed through the service.

Depending on the declared Support Service Arrangement and employment Context, it may include observation, instruction, prompting, demonstration, communication, coordination, adaptation of support, reinforcement, assistance with workplace navigation, recognition of changing conditions, escalation, and other actions within applicable Functional Scope.

Support Results concern what is achieved, changed, maintained, stabilized, prevented, or enabled through that Support Work.

Neither Support Work nor Support Results alone establishes Function Realization.

A support action may be performed without producing the intended result.

An intended result may occur even where the quality of the Support Work is unfavorable.

For example, a Worker may complete assigned tasks because the Job Coach performs part of the Worker's job.

Task completion is present.

But the realization pathway may be unfavorable because the support substitutes for Worker performance and may undermine Functional Independence.

Likewise, a Worker may remain employed despite inaccurate or incomplete employment-relevant information being transferred across a critical Interface.

The favorable employment result does not erase the information failure.

Function Realization must therefore be examined through the relationship among Support Work, Support Results, the constituent parts of the Quality Object, and the actual Service Conditions under which realization occurs.

3.4 Boundaries, Interfaces, Service Period, and Employment Context

The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object must have a declared external Boundary.

The Boundary identifies what is included in the object being determined and what remains in the external environment.

Within that Boundary, internal Boundaries and Interfaces exist among the Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support, Support Workers, Support Work, Support Results, Service Conditions, and other constituent parts of the object.

External Interfaces connect the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object with elements outside the declared Boundary.

Depending on the employment Context, these may include:

- the employer;
- supervisors and managers;
- coworkers;
- vocational rehabilitation agencies;
- service-provider management;
- funding and payer systems;
- training and education systems;
- other support-service providers;
- professional or regulatory systems;
- technology and communication systems;
- and other relevant external parties or systems.

An Interface matters because Function Realization may depend on what passes across it.

Instructions may be communicated accurately or inaccurately.

A workplace change may be recognized but not transferred to the appropriate party.

A concern may be escalated but no response may return through the Interface.

Responsibility may become unclear between the Job Coach and employer supervisor.

The same Quality Object may therefore have satisfactory internal Support Work while Function Realization is weakened at an Interface.

The Service Period is also part of the declared Service Conditions.

A determination must identify the period to which the Support Service Quality State applies because Job Coaching support needs, workplace conditions, Worker performance, risks, and support arrangements may change over time.

The employment Context provides the real-life conditions within which the Support Intended Functions are realized.

Different jobs may involve different tasks, schedules, production expectations, physical environments, social structures, technologies, supervision arrangements, hazards, communication pathways, and Worker-support needs.

These Context differences affect how the invariant Core Quality Factors are expressed.

They do not by themselves establish different Core Quality Factors.

3.5 Occupational Reference, Functional Scope, and the Reference Layer

The Job Coaching Support Service does not operate independently of external requirements.

Its Function Realization occurs within an applicable Reference Layer.

Depending on the declared Context, the Reference Layer may include employer policies and job requirements, workplace safety procedures, vocational rehabilitation requirements, service authorizations, payer requirements, organizational requirements, professional requirements, applicable laws and regulations, and other governing sources recognized by VRJ1.

These sources may affect what Support Work is permitted, required, prohibited, or expected.

They may also establish job-performance requirements, workplace rules, safety conditions, reporting pathways, role boundaries, service limitations, or other conditions relevant to determination.

The Reference Layer, however, does not replace the Quality Object.

Nor should each external requirement automatically become a Core Quality Factor.

External requirements enter the determination through the relevant constituent parts, Boundaries, Interfaces, Functional Scope, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, and other applicable methodological elements.

Functional Scope is particularly important in Job Coaching.

The Job Coach may support the Worker in performing the Worker's job, but the Job Coach is not thereby authorized to assume every employer, supervisor, coworker, clinician, safety professional, rehabilitation counselor, or other external role.

A favorable immediate result does not justify Support Work outside applicable authority, Competence, responsibility, or Functional Scope.

The Factor structure must therefore preserve visibility not only of what the support achieves, but also of whether the support is realized within appropriate role and responsibility boundaries.

3.6 What a Responsible Support Service Quality State Determination Must Be Able to See

The preceding analysis defines the determination task from which the Core Quality Factors must be derived.

A responsible determination must be able to see whether the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object is realizing its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results and, where realization is weakened, where and how the weakness occurs.

This requires visibility of materially different questions.

Can the support expose the Worker, employment, workplace participation, or employment stability to foreseeable harm?

Can the Worker sustain required job performance at employer-acceptable standards with the support provided?

Does the support promote Functional Independence, or does it create unnecessary dependence, over-support, under-support, or substitution?

Does the support preserve the Worker's role as an employee, including dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and ordinary workplace participation?

Are changing or emerging employment risks recognized and responded to in time?

Does the support enable appropriate workplace integration and social navigation rather than unnecessary separation or interference with ordinary workplace relationships?

Is employment-relevant information accurate, continuous, appropriately transferred, and usable across the Service Period and relevant Interfaces?

Is Job Coaching Support Work performed with appropriate judgment and within applicable Functional Scope, authority, Competence, and responsibility boundaries?

These questions are related.

They are not interchangeable.

A favorable answer to one cannot automatically compensate for an unfavorable answer to another.

For example:

satisfactory task performance does not establish appropriate Functional Independence;
Functional Independence does not establish protection from foreseeable employment harm;
continued employment does not establish preservation of Worker dignity and employee role;
good workplace relationships do not establish accurate employment-relevant information;
accurate information does not establish timely response to an emerging employment risk;
and

a favorable Support Result does not establish that the Job Coach acted within applicable Functional Scope.

The determination task therefore requires a Core structure that preserves these major dimensions separately while allowing their interactions to be examined as part of one coherent Quality Object.

The principal Failure-Mode Families provide the methodological bridge from this determination task to the Core Quality Factors.

The next Section therefore examines how Support Intended Functions, Function Realization, Support Service Realization Pathways, and Failure-Mode Families lead from the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object to the eight invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors.

4. Method for Deriving the Core Quality Factors

4.1 Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results

The derivation of the VRJ Core Quality Factors begins with the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object and its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results.

The Factors are not derived from a list of Job Coach duties, employment problems, regulatory requirements, or desirable outcomes considered separately.

They are derived from what the whole Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object is intended to realize and from the principal ways in which that realization can fail.

For the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment, the Support Intended Functions establish what the support service is intended to do through the interaction of the constituent parts of the Quality Object.

The Support Intended Results establish what the support service is intended to achieve or maintain through realization of those functions.

This creates the first methodological relationship:

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results
→ Function Realization.

The Factor question begins only after this relationship has been established.

4.2 Function Realization

Function Realization concerns whether and how the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object actually realizes its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results under the conditions of the declared Service Period and employment Context.

Function Realization therefore cannot be reduced to the presence of Support Work.

Nor can it be reduced to Support Results considered separately.

It depends on the interaction of the constituent parts of the Quality Object:

the Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support;
the Support Worker or Support Workers;
Support Work;
Support Results;
Service Conditions;
Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results;
Boundaries and Interfaces;
employment Context;
and
the Evidence basis required for determination.

Function Realization may be favorable in one respect and unfavorable in another.

For example, a Worker may complete the required work while receiving more direct assistance than is necessary.

The immediate Support Result may appear favorable because the work is completed.

At the same time, the realization of Functional Independence may be weakened because the Job Coach is substituting for functions the Worker could perform.

Similarly, a Worker may maintain employment while becoming increasingly isolated from coworkers because ordinary workplace communication is unnecessarily routed through the Job Coach.

Continued employment is present.

But another dimension of Function Realization may be unfavorable.

The derivation method must therefore identify the major ways in which Function Realization can materially fail even when other parts of the Quality Object appear satisfactory.

4.3 Job Coaching Support Service Realization Pathways

Support Intended Functions are realized through actual pathways within the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

A Support Service Realization Pathway may involve, for example:

a Worker condition, job demand, or workplace condition;
observation or recognition by the Job Coach;
interpretation of what the condition means for Support Work;
a decision about the appropriate support response;
communication or coordination where required;
performance, adjustment, reduction, continuation, or interruption of Support Work;
interaction with an internal or external Interface;
and

a resulting effect on Worker performance, Functional Independence, workplace participation, employment stability, or another Support Intended Result.

The exact pathway varies by employment Context.

A cleaning-services pathway may concern safe use of equipment, completion of assigned areas, response to a changed cleaning procedure, or communication with a supervisor.

Another employment Context may involve materially different job tasks and workplace conditions.

The Core-level question is not whether these Context-specific pathways are identical.

It is whether they reveal recurring major dimensions of Function Realization that must remain visible regardless of the particular job.

A realization pathway can fail at different points.

The relevant condition may not be recognized.

The wrong support response may be selected.

Support may be excessive or insufficient.

The Job Coach may substitute for Worker performance.

An employment risk may be recognized but not communicated.

Information may be transferred inaccurately.

A Worker may perform successfully while being unnecessarily separated from ordinary workplace relationships.

A Job Coach may take action outside applicable Functional Scope.

These are different forms of realization failure.

Their recurrence and relationship provide the basis for identifying Failure-Mode Families.

4.4 Failure-Mode Families

A single Failure Mode describes a particular way in which Function Realization may fail.

At the Core level, however, the derivation cannot be organized around every possible individual Failure Mode.

Job Coaching can occur across many job types, industries, worksites, Worker conditions, support arrangements, technologies, and jurisdictions.

Individual Failure Modes may therefore be numerous and highly Context-specific.

The Core requires a higher level of resolution.

Related Failure Modes are grouped into Failure-Mode Families where they represent a recurring major way in which Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization may be prevented, weakened, interrupted, distorted, or misdirected.

VRJ1 identifies principal Failure-Mode Families involving:

foreseeable employment harm;

failure to sustain job performance at employer-acceptable standards;

mismatch among Worker abilities, support needs, job demands, and support provided;

over-support, under-support, unnecessary dependence, or substitution for Worker performance;

loss of Worker dignity, autonomy, rights, privacy, employee role, or ordinary workplace participation;

failure to recognize, communicate, escalate, or respond appropriately to changing employment risk;

workplace isolation or failure of appropriate social navigation;

loss, distortion, discontinuity, or inappropriate handling of employment-relevant information;

and

Support Work, decisions, or judgment outside applicable Functional Scope, authority, Competence, or responsibility boundaries.

These families are not themselves the Core Quality Factors.

They provide the analytical bridge between Function Realization and Factor derivation.

The methodological relationship is:

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results

→ Function Realization

→ Support Service Realization Pathways

→ Failure Modes

→ Failure-Mode Families

- major quality-relevant dimensions
- Core Quality Factors.

4.5 From Failure-Mode Families to Major Quality-Relevant Dimensions

A Failure-Mode Family supports a separate Factor only where it reveals a major quality-relevant dimension that must remain visible in determination.

This distinction prevents the Core from becoming a catalog of possible problems.

For example, many individual workplace hazards may exist:

- a wet floor;
- moving equipment;
- a hot surface;
- an unsafe lifting condition;
- a chemical exposure;
- a traffic pathway;
- or
- another job-specific hazard.

These do not require separate Core Quality Factors for wet-floor safety, equipment safety, lifting safety, chemical safety, or traffic safety.

At the Core level, they may express the broader quality-relevant dimension of protection from foreseeable employment harm.

Similarly, many individual performance problems may occur:

- incorrect sequence;
- incomplete task performance;
- unacceptable work pace;
- failure to meet required quality;
- difficulty adapting to changed work instructions;
- or
- inconsistent performance over time.

These may express a broader dimension concerning sustained job performance at employer-acceptable standards.

The same derivation logic applies throughout the VRJ Core.

Context-specific manifestations are consolidated only to the point at which a major determination dimension remains clearly visible.

Consolidation should stop where further merger would make a materially different quality question disappear.

This is the methodological level at which a Core Quality Factor emerges.

4.6 Test for a Separate Core Quality Factor

A candidate major dimension should not become a separate Core Quality Factor merely because it is important.

It should satisfy a stronger test.

A separate Core Quality Factor is supported where the candidate dimension:

- arises from Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object;
- is supported by a coherent Failure-Mode Family or recurring group of material Failure Modes;
- represents a major quality-relevant question rather than a narrow job-specific issue;

remains meaningful across materially different employment Contexts;
can be unfavorable while other major dimensions remain comparatively satisfactory;
would become materially less visible if removed;
cannot be merged into another Factor without material loss of determination capability;
and
cannot be represented adequately at a lower methodological level through Core Quality Indicators, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence, Boundaries, Interfaces, Functional Scope, or the Reference Layer.

Three related tests are therefore especially important.

The first is the removal test:

If the candidate Factor is removed, what major determination capability is lost?

The second is the merger test:

If the candidate Factor is absorbed into another Factor, does its distinct quality-relevant question remain sufficiently visible?

The third is the level-of-resolution test:

Does the issue genuinely require Factor-level visibility, or can it be represented adequately through an existing Factor and its lower-level methodological elements?

These tests prevent both excessive consolidation and excessive fragmentation.

They also explain why interaction among Factors does not automatically establish redundancy.

The same Job Coaching event may activate several Factors because one event can affect several dimensions of Function Realization.

For example, suppose a Worker begins having difficulty performing a changed job procedure.

The situation may involve:

job-performance requirements;
the amount and type of support provided;
recognition of an emerging employment risk;
communication of changed information;
and

the Job Coach's judgment about whether additional assistance or escalation is required.

The event is one.

The determination questions are several.

The existence of interaction therefore does not justify merger unless the supposedly separate Factor can be removed without material loss of visibility.

Applying this derivation method to the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object produces the eight major dimensions established in VRJ1:

Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm;
Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards;
Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance;
Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy;
Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;
Workplace Integration and Social Navigation;
Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;
and
Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.

The next Section examines why the derivation resolves into these eight Factors before each Factor is subjected to detailed individual justification.

5. Why the VRJ Core Resolves into Eight Factors

5.1 Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm

The first major dimension concerns whether Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization protects against foreseeable employment-related harm.

Employment maintenance cannot be treated as favorable Function Realization where the manner in which support is provided exposes the Worker to foreseeable harm or fails to respond appropriately to foreseeable conditions affecting safe employment participation.

This dimension may arise through different employment Contexts and different realization pathways.

The particular hazard may change.

The Core-level determination question remains:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service protect against foreseeable employment harm within the applicable Support Role and Functional Scope?

This question cannot be reduced to job performance.

A Worker may perform assigned tasks at employer-acceptable standards while the support arrangement exposes the Worker to a foreseeable unsafe condition.

It also cannot be reduced completely to timely recognition and response under Factor 5.

Factor 5 concerns whether changing or emerging employment risk is recognized and appropriately acted upon.

Factor 1 preserves the broader determination of whether foreseeable employment harm is being prevented or controlled in Function Realization.

The distinction therefore supports separate Factor-level visibility.

5.2 Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards

Maintaining competitive integrated employment requires more than isolated completion of a task.

The Job Coaching Support Service must support the Worker in sustaining the performance required by the actual job under applicable employer expectations.

This includes the ability to perform assigned work with the required quality, completeness, consistency, pace, sequence, reliability, and adaptation appropriate to the job and employment Context.

The Core-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service support sustained Worker job performance at employer-acceptable standards?

This dimension cannot be inferred merely from continued employment.

Employment may continue temporarily despite deteriorating performance.

Nor can satisfactory performance alone establish the quality of the other dimensions of the support service.

A Worker may meet employer expectations because the Job Coach performs part of the Worker's assigned work.

The performance result may appear favorable while Functional Independence and appropriate support balance are unfavorable.

Job-performance realization must therefore remain separately visible.

5.3 Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance

Job Coaching exists to provide support.

The presence of support is therefore not itself evidence of an unfavorable condition.

The quality question concerns whether the amount, type, timing, and manner of support are appropriate to the Worker, job demands, actual conditions, and Support Intended Functions.

Too little support may leave the Worker unable to perform or adapt effectively.

Too much support may create unnecessary dependence.

Support may also cross a more significant boundary and substitute for job functions that belong to the Worker.

The Core-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service provide the support needed for Function Realization while preserving and developing Functional Independence to the extent appropriate to the Worker and actual employment conditions?

This dimension is distinguishable from Factor 2.

A Worker may demonstrate satisfactory job performance while receiving unnecessary support.

Conversely, reducing support merely to increase independence may produce an unfavorable condition if the Worker requires that support to sustain the job.

The determination must therefore see both:

whether the job is being performed;

and

how the relationship between Worker performance and Job Coaching support is being realized.

This produces a separate major quality-relevant dimension.

5.4 Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy

The Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support remains an employee participating in competitive integrated employment.

Job Coaching Support Work should not unnecessarily displace that employee role.

Support may affect how the Worker makes choices, communicates, interacts with supervisors and coworkers, performs assigned responsibilities, exercises privacy, and participates in ordinary workplace life.

A service may therefore produce satisfactory task results while still realizing support in a manner that diminishes Worker dignity, autonomy, rights, privacy, or employee role.

For example, a Job Coach may routinely answer a supervisor's questions for a Worker who is able to answer independently.

The immediate communication may be completed successfully.

However, the manner of support may unnecessarily replace the Worker's own employee role.

The Core-level question is:

Does Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization preserve the Worker's role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate participation as an employee?

This cannot be inferred from job performance, independence, or employment continuation alone.

It therefore requires separate Factor-level visibility.

5.5 Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk

Employment conditions are not static.

Worker performance may change.

Job duties may change.

A supervisor may introduce a new procedure.

Workplace expectations may shift.

A previously effective support strategy may stop working.

A conflict may emerge.

A transportation, attendance, communication, behavioral, safety, performance, or other employment-related concern may develop during the Service Period.

The Job Coaching Support Service must therefore be capable not only of operating under known conditions but also of recognizing materially changing conditions and responding appropriately.

The Core-level question is:

Are emerging or changing employment risks recognized, interpreted, communicated, escalated, and responded to in time to support continued Function Realization?

This dimension interacts strongly with Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 6, Factor 7, and Factor 8.

But interaction does not eliminate distinguishability.

A risk can exist even where information is accurate.

Information can be communicated accurately while the significance of the condition is not recognized.

A condition can be recognized while no appropriate response follows.

Factor 5 therefore preserves the dynamic recognition-and-response capability of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

5.6 Workplace Integration and Social Navigation

Competitive integrated employment takes place within a workplace social environment.

The Worker does not perform only a technical sequence of assigned tasks.

Employment also involves supervisors, coworkers, workplace communication, ordinary employee relationships, informal practices, workplace expectations, requests for assistance, feedback, conflict, and other social Interfaces.

Job Coaching Support Work can strengthen the Worker's ability to navigate these conditions.

It can also unintentionally interfere with them.

For example, routing ordinary coworker communication through the Job Coach may make immediate communication easier while increasing the Worker's separation from normal workplace relationships.

Similarly, continuous Job Coach presence may sometimes support task performance while unnecessarily limiting direct Worker interaction with supervisors or coworkers.

The Core-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service support appropriate workplace integration and social navigation without unnecessarily substituting for ordinary Worker participation in workplace relationships?

This dimension cannot be represented completely through job performance or Functional Independence.

A Worker may perform the job independently in a technical sense while remaining unnecessarily isolated from the workplace community.

Workplace integration therefore remains a separate major dimension of Function Realization.

5.7 Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information

Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization depends on information.

Relevant information may concern:

job duties;
work instructions;
schedule changes;
performance expectations;
Worker support needs;
recognized employment risks;
support strategies;
supervisor feedback;
changes in the workplace;
service decisions;
and
other conditions material to employment maintenance.

Information may move among constituent parts of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object and across external Interfaces.

A determination must therefore consider not merely whether information exists, but whether employment-relevant information remains accurate, sufficiently complete, appropriately transferred, available when needed, and continuous across the applicable Service Period.

The Core-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service preserve the continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information required for Function Realization?

This dimension cannot be absorbed completely into Factor 5.

Factor 5 concerns recognition and response to changing employment risk.

Factor 7 concerns the broader integrity and continuity of employment-relevant information, including information needed during ordinary Support Work where no emerging risk has yet been identified.

A service may therefore perform satisfactorily in other dimensions while operating on incomplete, distorted, outdated, or discontinuous information.

The information dimension must remain separately visible.

5.8 Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope

Job Coaching Support Work requires decisions.

The Job Coach may need to decide:

whether assistance is required;
what form of support is appropriate;
whether prompting should be increased or reduced;
whether the Worker should first attempt a task independently;
whether a condition requires communication;
whether additional guidance is needed;
whether the Job Coach has sufficient information to act;
whether Support Work should pause;
and
whether a matter should be referred or escalated to another responsible party.

The ability to act does not establish authority to act.

Nor does a favorable immediate result establish that the decision was appropriate.

The Core-level question is:

Is Job Coaching Support Work performed with appropriate judgment and within applicable Functional Scope, Support Role, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries?

This dimension is distinguishable from the other seven Factors because each of those Factors can involve a condition that the Job Coach is not authorized or competent to resolve independently.

For example, a Job Coach may correctly recognize an employment risk under Factor 5 but then take action outside applicable Functional Scope.

Likewise, a Job Coach may attempt to improve job performance under Factor 2 by assuming an employer supervisory function that does not belong to the Job Coaching Support Role.

Factor 8 therefore preserves visibility of the conditions governing how Job Coaching judgment and action are exercised.

5.9 The Eight Factors as One Core

The derivation produces eight major quality-relevant dimensions:

Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm;

Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards;

Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance;

Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy;

Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;

Workplace Integration and Social Navigation;

Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;

and

Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.

These Factors should not be interpreted as eight independent Quality Objects.

They are eight dimensions through which Function Realization of the same declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object becomes visible.

Their relationships can be illustrated through a single practical situation.

Suppose a Worker has successfully performed a job for several months. The employer then changes part of the work procedure.

The changed procedure may raise a performance question under Factor 2.

The Worker may temporarily require additional Job Coaching support, raising the support-balance question under Factor 3.

The change must be communicated accurately, raising Factor 7.

The Job Coach must recognize whether the change creates a material employment risk and respond appropriately, raising Factor 5.

Any new foreseeable harm must remain visible under Factor 1.

The Job Coach's involvement should preserve the Worker's employee role and autonomy under Factor 4 and ordinary workplace relationships under Factor 6.

If the condition exceeds the Job Coach's Functional Scope, Competence, authority, or responsibility, Factor 8 becomes material.

The employment event is one.

The Quality Object is one.

The eight determination dimensions are distinguishable.

This is why interaction among Factors should not be mistaken for redundancy.

The present derivation therefore supports eight as the major Factor-level dimensions established by VRJ1.

That conclusion, however, is not sufficient by itself.

Each Factor must first be justified separately before the complete Factor set is subjected to collective testing.

The next Section therefore examines each of the eight Factors individually through its determination function, Failure-Mode basis, removal test, distinguishability, and separate Core-level justification.

6. Factor-by-Factor Justification

The preceding derivation identified eight major quality-relevant dimensions of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

This Section tests each Factor separately.

For each Factor, the analysis asks:

What major determination question does the Factor preserve?

What Failure-Mode Family supports its separate visibility?

What becomes materially less visible if the Factor is removed?

Can another Factor adequately preserve the same determination function?

The purpose is not to show that the Factors never interact.

They frequently do.

The purpose is to determine whether each Factor preserves a major dimension that cannot be removed or merged without material loss of determination capability.

6.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm

Determination Function

Factor 1 preserves visibility of whether Function Realization of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object protects against foreseeable employment-related harm.

The relevant harm is not limited to one type of workplace hazard.

Depending on the employment Context, foreseeable harm may arise from work activities, equipment, workplace conditions, unsafe support practices, failure to follow applicable safety conditions, inappropriate Job Coach intervention, or other conditions within the declared Quality Object and its Interfaces.

The Factor-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service protect against foreseeable employment harm within the applicable Support Role and Functional Scope?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family concerns realization pathways in which foreseeable employment harm is introduced, permitted, insufficiently controlled, or not appropriately addressed through the Job Coaching Support Service.

Individual Failure Modes may vary substantially among jobs.

A cleaning-services Context may involve wet surfaces, cleaning equipment, chemicals, lifting, or movement through occupied work areas.

Another employment Context may involve entirely different physical or operational conditions.

The specific hazards are Context-dependent.

The need to preserve visibility of foreseeable employment harm is Core-level.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 1 is removed.

The remaining Factors could still examine:

job performance;

Functional Independence and support balance;

Worker role and autonomy;

recognition and response to changing employment risk;

workplace integration;

employment-relevant information;

and

practice within Functional Scope.

But none of these necessarily requires a direct determination of whether the realization of the Job Coaching Support Service exposes the Worker or employment participation to foreseeable harm.

For example, a Worker might meet employer-acceptable performance standards.

The support level might be appropriate.

Information might be accurate.

The Job Coach might remain within Functional Scope.

Yet a foreseeable harmful condition associated with how the support is being realized could remain insufficiently visible.

Removal would therefore create a material determination gap.

Distinguishability

Factor 1 interacts particularly strongly with Factor 5.

The distinction is:

Factor 1 asks whether foreseeable employment harm is being prevented or controlled.

Factor 5 asks whether changing or emerging employment risk is recognized and appropriately responded to.

A known foreseeable condition may require protection even where no new risk is emerging.

Conversely, an emerging condition may require recognition and response before its eventual consequences are fully known.

The two Factors therefore interact but do not substitute for one another.

Conclusion

Factor 1 preserves a necessary and distinguishable major dimension of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.2 Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards

Determination Function

Factor 2 preserves visibility of whether the Job Coaching Support Service supports sustained performance of the Worker's actual assigned job at employer-acceptable standards.

The relevant question is not merely whether an isolated task can be completed.

Competitive integrated employment requires performance over time under the actual conditions of the job.

The Factor-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service support sustained Worker job performance at the standards applicable to the actual employment?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes inability to establish, maintain, recover, or adapt job performance sufficiently to meet applicable employer expectations.

Individual Failure Modes may involve:

- work quality;
- completeness;
- pace;
- sequence;
- reliability;
- attendance-related performance;
- adaptation to changed duties or instructions;
- or

other Context-specific performance requirements.

These manifestations differ among jobs.

The major dimension of sustained job performance remains common.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 2 is removed.

The remaining Factors might establish that:

- the support is safe;
- the Worker is not over-supported;
- the Worker's dignity and autonomy are preserved;
- employment risks are recognized;
- workplace relationships are satisfactory;
- information is accurate;
- and
- the Job Coach acts within Functional Scope.

Yet the Core would no longer require a direct determination of whether the support enables the Worker to sustain the actual performance required by the job.

A service could therefore appear favorable while the Worker repeatedly fails to meet material job requirements.

That would be a substantial loss of determination capability for a support-service whose intended function concerns maintenance of competitive integrated employment.

Distinguishability

Factor 2 must remain especially distinguishable from Factor 3.

Factor 2 asks:

Is the required job performance being sustained?

Factor 3 asks:

What is the relationship between Worker performance and the support being provided?

A Worker may meet all performance requirements because the Job Coach is performing part of the assigned work.

Factor 2 may appear favorable.

Factor 3 may be unfavorable.

Conversely, a Worker may be performing with a high degree of Functional Independence but still not meet a material employer performance requirement.

Factor 3 may appear favorable while Factor 2 remains unfavorable.

Conclusion

Factor 2 preserves a necessary and distinguishable major dimension concerning sustained realization of the actual employment requirements.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.3 Factor 3 — Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance

Determination Function

Factor 3 preserves visibility of the relationship between what the Worker can and should perform and what Job Coaching support is actually provided.

Job Coaching support may be necessary for successful employment maintenance.

The determination question is therefore not whether support exists.

It is whether support is appropriately matched to actual need and promotes Functional Independence to the extent appropriate to the Worker and employment conditions.

The Factor-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service provide neither insufficient nor unnecessary support, while avoiding inappropriate substitution for Worker performance?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes:

under-support;

over-support;

unnecessary dependence;

failure to reduce support where appropriate;

failure to increase or adapt support where needed;

mismatch between Worker ability, job demand, and support provided;

and

substitution by the Job Coach for functions belonging to the Worker.

These Failure Modes share a common quality-relevant dimension: the balance between Worker Function Realization and Job Coaching support.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 3 is removed.

The Core could still determine whether the Worker performs the job at employer-acceptable standards.

But it would lose explicit visibility of how that performance is being achieved.

For example, a Worker may complete an assigned cleaning area correctly and on time because the Job Coach routinely completes the more difficult portion of the Worker's assignment.

The Support Result appears favorable.

The employer may be satisfied.

Employment may continue.

Yet the Job Coaching Support Service is substituting for Worker performance rather than supporting the Worker to perform the assigned job to the appropriate extent.

Without Factor 3, that distinction could become materially less visible.

Distinguishability

Factor 3 also interacts with Factor 4.

Excessive support can affect Worker autonomy or employee role.

But the questions remain different.

Factor 3 asks whether the support balance appropriately supports Functional Independence.

Factor 4 asks whether the manner of support preserves Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation.

A support arrangement may be overly intensive without being overtly disrespectful.

Conversely, support may be quantitatively appropriate while being delivered in a manner that unnecessarily displaces Worker choice or employee role.

Conclusion

Factor 3 preserves a necessary and distinguishable major dimension of the relationship between Worker Function Realization and Job Coaching support.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy

Determination Function

Factor 4 preserves visibility of how the Worker is positioned and treated within the Job Coaching Support Service and the employment environment.

The Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support remains an employee.

The presence of disability-related or vocational support does not remove the Worker's role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, preferences, or appropriate participation in workplace decisions and relationships.

The Factor-level question is:

Does Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization preserve the Worker's role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate participation as an employee?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes realization conditions in which Job Coaching support:

unnecessarily displaces Worker choice;

diminishes the Worker's employee role;

speaks or decides for the Worker where this is not required;

unnecessarily exposes private information;

creates demeaning or stigmatizing conditions;

or

otherwise weakens appropriate Worker autonomy, dignity, rights, or participation.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 4 is removed.

A service might still be:

safe;

effective in supporting job performance;

appropriately balanced in amount;

responsive to employment risks;

supportive of workplace integration;

informationally accurate;

and

within Functional Scope.

Yet the manner in which the Worker is treated could still be unfavorable.

For example, a Job Coach may consistently answer a supervisor's routine questions on behalf of a Worker who can answer independently.

The Worker may continue performing the job successfully.

The communication may even be accurate.

But the Worker's ordinary employee role is being unnecessarily displaced.

Without Factor 4, this major dimension would become materially less visible.

Distinguishability

Factor 4 interacts with Factor 3 and Factor 6.

Functional Independence can support autonomy.

Workplace integration can support ordinary employee participation.

But neither substitutes for the broader determination of Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, and rights.

A Worker may be functionally independent but treated disrespectfully.

A Worker may have good coworker relationships while the Job Coach unnecessarily discloses private information.

Factor 4 therefore preserves a separate quality-relevant dimension.

Conclusion

Factor 4 is necessary to prevent favorable employment or performance findings from concealing an unfavorable realization of Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, or rights.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.5 Factor 5 — Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk

Determination Function

Factor 5 preserves the dynamic capability of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object to recognize and respond to changing conditions that may threaten employment maintenance or other Support Intended Results.

The Factor-level question is:

Are material changes and emerging employment risks recognized and responded to within the time and manner required by the actual situation?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes:

failure to observe a material change;
failure to recognize its significance;
delay in response;
failure to communicate a concern;
failure to escalate where required;
inappropriate response;
and
failure to follow through after a concern has been raised.

The particular risk may concern performance, safety, attendance, workplace relationships, changed duties, Worker functioning, support effectiveness, or another employment-maintenance condition.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 5 is removed.

The remaining Factors might describe the state of job performance, support balance, workplace integration, information, Functional Scope, and other conditions.

But the Core would lose a dedicated determination of whether the service can detect and respond to a developing change before that change materially weakens Function Realization.

For example, a Worker who previously performed reliably begins repeatedly missing one step of a changed work procedure.

The current performance problem may be visible under Factor 2.

But the service must also recognize that the pattern represents a developing employment risk and determine what response is required.

Merely recording the unfavorable performance state does not establish an adequate recognition-and-response pathway.

Distinguishability

Factor 5 is distinguishable from Factor 1 because it concerns the dynamic recognition-and-response pathway rather than the broader state of protection from foreseeable employment harm.

It is distinguishable from Factor 7 because accurate information can exist without its significance being recognized or acted upon.

It is distinguishable from Factor 8 because a need for response may be recognized correctly even though the subsequent decision exceeds Functional Scope.

Conclusion

Factor 5 preserves a necessary dynamic dimension of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.6 Factor 6 — Workplace Integration and Social Navigation

Determination Function

Factor 6 preserves visibility of the Worker's participation in the ordinary social and relational environment of competitive integrated employment as affected by Job Coaching support.

The workplace includes more than assigned production tasks.

It includes supervisors, coworkers, communication, feedback, requests for assistance, informal practices, conflict, collaboration, and ordinary employee relationships.

The Factor-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service support appropriate workplace integration and social navigation without unnecessarily replacing or obstructing ordinary Worker participation?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes:

- unnecessary workplace isolation;
- Job Coach substitution in ordinary workplace communication;
- failure to support appropriate interaction with supervisors or coworkers;
- interference with natural workplace supports;
- difficulty navigating workplace expectations or relationships;
- and
- other support-related conditions that weaken appropriate integration into the workplace.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 6 is removed.

The Worker might:

- perform all assigned tasks satisfactorily;
- receive an appropriate amount of support;
- be treated respectfully;
- have accurate employment-relevant information;
- and
- remain employed.

Yet the Worker might still be unnecessarily separated from ordinary workplace relationships because most communication is routed through the Job Coach.

Technical job performance would not reveal this condition.

Functional Independence in task performance would not necessarily reveal it either.

Without Factor 6, an important dimension of competitive integrated employment could become materially less visible.

Distinguishability

Factor 6 interacts with Factors 3 and 4.

However:

Factor 3 concerns the balance between Worker performance and support.

Factor 4 concerns Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, and rights.

Factor 6 concerns participation and navigation within the workplace social environment.

A Worker can perform independently and be treated respectfully while still remaining unnecessarily isolated from coworkers.

The Factor therefore preserves a distinguishable determination question.

Conclusion

Factor 6 preserves a necessary dimension of Function Realization associated with workplace integration and social navigation.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.7 Factor 7 — Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information

Determination Function

Factor 7 preserves visibility of the information conditions required for Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

Employment-relevant information may concern the Worker, job duties, support needs, work instructions, performance expectations, workplace changes, risks, feedback, support strategies, decisions, and other conditions material to employment maintenance.

The Factor-level question is:

Is the employment-relevant information used by the Job Coaching Support Service accurate, sufficiently complete, appropriately transferred, available when needed, and continuous across the relevant Service Period and Interfaces?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes:

inaccurate information;

missing information;

outdated information;

failure to transfer information;

distortion during transfer;

loss of continuity across workers, shifts, service arrangements, or Interfaces;

failure to act on relevant information;

and

inappropriate handling or disclosure of information.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 7 is removed.

A Job Coach might perform competently based on the information available.

The Worker might currently perform satisfactorily.

No immediate employment risk might be apparent.

Yet a material change in the Worker's assignment may have been communicated inaccurately to the Job Coaching service.

The resulting Support Work would then be based on an incorrect information state.

Other Factors may eventually reveal consequences.

But they would not necessarily reveal the information failure itself.

Without Factor 7, the determination could confuse apparently competent action based on defective information with favorable Function Realization.

Distinguishability

Factor 7 interacts with Factor 5 because recognition and response often depend on information.

But the functions are not identical.

Factor 7 asks whether relevant information is accurate, continuous, transferred, and usable.

Factor 5 asks whether a material changing condition or employment risk is recognized and responded to appropriately.

Accurate information may be available but ignored.

Conversely, a Job Coach may respond appropriately to the information received even though that information was incomplete or distorted before reaching the Job Coach.

The information pathway therefore requires separate visibility.

Conclusion

Factor 7 preserves a necessary and distinguishable information dimension of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope

Determination Function

Factor 8 preserves visibility of whether Job Coaching Support Work and judgment remain within the applicable Support Role, Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries.

The Factor-level question is:

Does the Job Coaching Support Service act appropriately within its authorized and competent scope, including seeking assistance, pausing, referring, or escalating when independent Job Coaching action is no longer appropriate?

Failure-Mode Basis

The supporting Failure-Mode Family includes:

acting outside Functional Scope;

assuming employer or supervisory authority not assigned to the Job Coach;

making decisions outside Competence;

continuing action despite insufficient information or authority;

failing to seek assistance;

failing to refer or escalate;

and

inappropriate assumption of responsibilities belonging to another person, profession, organization, or external Interface.

Removal Test

Assume Factor 8 is removed.

The remaining Factors might show that:

a risk was recognized;

job performance improved;

the Worker remained employed;

support was well intentioned;

and

an immediate favorable result occurred.

But the Core would lose explicit visibility of whether the Job Coach was authorized and competent to take the action that produced that result.

For example, a Job Coach may recognize a workplace performance problem correctly but independently alter an employer-established work procedure without authority to do so.

The immediate performance result might improve.

Nevertheless, the realization pathway crosses a responsibility boundary.

A favorable outcome therefore cannot substitute for determination of appropriate Functional Scope.

Distinguishability

Factor 8 interacts strongly with Factor 5.

The distinction is particularly important.

Factor 5 is triggered by the need to recognize and respond to a changing employment risk.

Factor 8 concerns the boundary of what the Job Coach may appropriately decide or do in responding.

A Job Coach may correctly recognize a condition under Factor 5 but be required under Factor 8 to pause, seek guidance, refer, or escalate rather than resolve it independently.

Factor 8 also interacts with Factor 3 because excessive Job Coach action may substitute for Worker performance.

But substitution for the Worker and acting outside the Job Coach's Functional Scope are not identical conditions.

Both may occur together, or either may occur separately.

Conclusion

Factor 8 preserves a necessary and distinguishable dimension concerning the legitimacy and appropriateness of Job Coaching action and judgment within the declared Support Service Arrangement. Its separate Core-level retention is justified.

6.9 Factor-by-Factor Conclusion

The individual removal and distinguishability tests support retention of all eight VRJ Core Quality Factors.

Each Factor preserves a major determination question:

Factor 1 — Is foreseeable employment harm being prevented or controlled?

Factor 2 — Is sustained job performance at employer-acceptable standards being supported?

Factor 3 — Is the balance between Worker Functional Independence and Job Coaching support appropriate?

Factor 4 — Are Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation preserved?

Factor 5 — Are changing or emerging employment risks recognized and responded to appropriately and in time?

Factor 6 — Is appropriate workplace integration and social navigation supported?

Factor 7 — Is employment-relevant information accurate, continuous, appropriately transferred, and usable?

Factor 8 — Is Job Coaching Support Work and judgment exercised within applicable Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries?

The analysis also shows why overlap does not establish redundancy.

One employment situation may activate several Factors because Function Realization of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object is multidimensional.

The critical question is whether one Factor can be removed while its determination function remains adequately preserved elsewhere.

The Factor-by-Factor analysis does not support such removal.

Nor does it presently support merger of any two Factors without loss of visibility.

The eight Factors therefore survive the individual necessity and distinguishability tests.

Section 7 turns from individual justification to collective coverage, merger, redundancy, non-compensability, and possible Core-level gaps.

7. Collective Testing of the Eight-Factor Core

7.1 Collective Coverage

Collective testing asks whether the eight Factors, considered together, provide appropriate Core-level coverage for determination of Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

Collective coverage does not require every possible job task, workplace condition, Worker characteristic, employment risk, support activity, or external requirement to appear as a separate Factor.

The Core operates at a higher methodological resolution.

Its purpose is to preserve the major quality-relevant dimensions through which Function Realization can be examined across materially different employment Contexts.

The eight Factors collectively make visible:

foreseeable employment harm;

sustained job performance;

the balance between Functional Independence and support;

Worker role, dignity, and autonomy;

recognition and response to changing employment risk;

workplace integration and social navigation;

continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information;

and

practice and judgment within Functional Scope.

Together, these dimensions address materially different ways in which the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment may succeed, weaken, or fail.

The collective-coverage question is therefore not:

Does every possible employment issue have its own Factor?

It is:

Can a major Core-level weakness in Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization occur without becoming meaningfully visible through at least one of the eight Factors?

The present derivation does not identify such an evident gap.

7.2 Removal Test

The collective removal test asks what happens to the Core if one Factor is removed while the other seven remain.

Removing Factor 1 would weaken direct visibility of protection from foreseeable employment harm.

Removing Factor 2 would weaken direct visibility of sustained job performance at employer-acceptable standards.

Removing Factor 3 would weaken visibility of whether Worker performance is being appropriately supported rather than under-supported, over-supported, or substituted for.

Removing Factor 4 would weaken visibility of Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation.

Removing Factor 5 would weaken visibility of the service's capability to recognize and respond to changing or emerging employment risk.

Removing Factor 6 would weaken visibility of workplace integration and social navigation.

Removing Factor 7 would weaken visibility of continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information.

Removing Factor 8 would weaken visibility of whether Job Coaching Support Work and judgment remain within applicable Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries.

In each case, some related conditions might remain visible indirectly through other Factors.

Indirect visibility, however, is not equivalent to preserving the same determination function.

The removal test therefore supports retention of all eight Factors.

7.3 Merger and Redundancy Test

A Factor may appear related to another Factor without being redundant.

The merger test asks:

If two Factors are combined, can both major determination questions remain sufficiently visible?

Several possible mergers may initially appear attractive.

Factor 1 and Factor 5 both concern risk.

Factor 2 and Factor 3 both concern Worker job performance.

Factor 3 and Factor 4 both concern the relationship between the Worker and Job Coaching support.

Factor 4 and Factor 6 both concern the Worker's position within the workplace.

Factor 5 and Factor 7 both involve information and communication.

Factor 5 and Factor 8 both involve decisions and response.

However, each proposed merger would combine questions that can produce different findings.

A service may control known foreseeable employment harm while responding poorly to a newly developing employment risk.

A Worker may meet employer performance standards while receiving unnecessary Job Coach substitution.

A support arrangement may be appropriately balanced in amount while unnecessarily diminishing Worker autonomy.

A Worker may be treated respectfully while remaining unnecessarily isolated from ordinary workplace relationships.

Employment-relevant information may be accurate while its significance is not recognized.

A Job Coach may correctly recognize the need for action while lacking authority or Competence to take that action independently.

These combinations show that neighboring Factors can vary independently enough to require separate visibility.

The present analysis therefore does not support merger of any two established Factors.

7.4 Overlap Does Not Necessarily Mean Redundancy

The eight Factors interact because they concern Function Realization of one coherent Quality Object.

A single event may therefore be relevant to several Factors.

Consider a Worker who begins having difficulty after an employer changes a work procedure.

The changed procedure may affect sustained job performance under Factor 2.

The Worker may temporarily require more support, activating Factor 3.

The Job Coach must preserve the Worker's employee role and appropriate participation under Factor 4.

The developing condition may need timely recognition and response under Factor 5.

Communication with supervisors or coworkers may involve Factor 6.

Accurate transfer of the changed procedure and related information activates Factor 7.

If the Job Coach reaches the limit of authorized independent action, Factor 8 becomes material.

If the changed procedure introduces foreseeable employment harm, Factor 1 is also relevant.

The event is one.

The determination questions are different.

Overlap therefore demonstrates interaction among dimensions of the same Quality Object.

It establishes redundancy only where one Factor can be removed without material loss of determination capability.

The removal and merger tests do not support that conclusion for any of the eight Factors.

7.5 Support Service Non-Substitutability, Non-Compensability, and Critical Service Conditions

Collective Factor testing also requires attention to non-substitutability and non-compensability.

A favorable condition under one Factor does not automatically correct an unfavorable condition under another.

Strong job performance does not compensate for foreseeable employment harm.

Continued employment does not compensate for unnecessary Job Coach substitution for Worker performance.

Functional Independence does not compensate for loss of Worker dignity or rights.

Positive workplace relationships do not compensate for materially inaccurate employment-relevant information.

Accurate information does not compensate for failure to respond to a recognized employment risk.

A favorable immediate Support Result does not compensate for Job Coaching action outside applicable Functional Scope.

This does not mean that every unfavorable finding under every Factor automatically determines the whole Support Service Quality State.

The significance of a finding depends on the applicable Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, Critical Service Conditions, Uncertainty, and the relationship of the finding to Function Realization.

Some conditions, however, may be non-compensable.

A Critical Service Condition may be so important to Function Realization that failure cannot responsibly be offset by favorable findings elsewhere.

For example, if a Job Coaching realization pathway exposes the Worker to a serious foreseeable employment harm, excellent documentation or satisfactory workplace integration cannot make that condition acceptable.

The eight-Factor structure therefore supports a multidimensional determination rather than an averaging model in which favorable Factors simply cancel unfavorable ones.

7.6 Possible Gaps at the Factor Level

Collective testing must also ask whether an important major dimension is missing.

A possible gap should not be inferred merely because a new subject appears in a particular employment Context.

Examples might include:

transportation;

attendance;

technology;

behavioral support;

communication devices;

workplace accommodations;

schedule changes;
new equipment;
remote Job Coaching;
employer-specific procedures;
or

a particular workplace hazard.

Each may be highly important.

But importance alone does not establish a new Core Quality Factor.

The first question is whether the issue can be represented through the existing Core.

For example, a transportation problem affecting reliable arrival at work may involve sustained job performance, changing employment risk, employment-relevant information, external Interfaces, Service Conditions, or Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria.

A remote Job Coaching technology failure may involve information continuity, recognition and response, Functional Scope, Evidence, and an external Interface.

A workplace accommodation issue may involve job performance, Functional Independence, Worker autonomy, employer Interfaces, the Reference Layer, or several of these simultaneously.

A new Factor is warranted only if a recurring major quality-relevant dimension remains materially underrepresented after the existing Factors and lower-level methodological elements have been fully considered.

The present analysis has not identified such a residual Factor-level dimension.

7.7 Interim Conclusion — Collective Testing

The collective analysis supports the eight-Factor VRJ Core at the present methodological resolution.

The eight Factors provide separate visibility of major dimensions that cannot be removed or merged without material loss of determination capability.

Their interaction does not establish redundancy.

Their collective use also prevents a favorable condition in one dimension from automatically concealing or compensating for a material weakness in another.

At the same time, collective coverage should not be interpreted as permanent closure.

Future VRJ Context Guides may expose conditions not yet strongly represented in the present applications.

Such findings should first be tested against:

the existing eight Factors;
Core Quality Indicators;
Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria;
Failure Modes and Failure-Mode Families;
Critical Service Conditions;
Evidence;
Boundaries and Interfaces;
Service Conditions;
Functional Scope;
and
the Reference Layer.

Only a recurring major determination dimension that remains materially underrepresented after those tests would support consideration of an additional Core Quality Factor.

The present result is therefore bounded:

the eight established Factors provide an appropriate current Core-level structure for determining Function Realization of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

The next Section examines an important part of that determination environment: the Reference Layer, Functional Scope, employer authority, and other external requirements, and why those requirements may affect the eight Factors without automatically becoming additional Core Quality Factors.

8. Reference Layer, Functional Scope, Employer Authority, and External Requirements

8.1 Reference Layer as Part of the Determination Basis

The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object exists and functions within an external environment.

Its Function Realization may depend on requirements, expectations, limitations, and conditions established outside the declared Quality Object.

VRJ1 places such sources in the applicable Reference Layer.

Depending on the employment Context and Support Service Arrangement, the Reference Layer may include:

employer policies and job requirements;

workplace safety procedures;

vocational rehabilitation requirements;

service authorizations;

payer requirements;

organizational requirements;

professional requirements;

applicable laws and regulations;

and

other external requirements relevant to the declared Job Coaching Support Service.

These sources may provide important reference points for determining what is required, permitted, prohibited, expected, or limited in the actual service.

The Reference Layer therefore contributes to the basis for Support Service Quality State determination.

It does not, however, replace the Quality Object or determine its Quality State by itself.

Compliance with an external requirement may provide relevant Evidence.

Noncompliance may reveal a material Failure Mode.

But the determination remains directed to Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

8.2 Functional Scope and Occupational Boundaries

Functional Scope defines the bounded range of Support Work, decisions, actions, and responsibilities included within the declared Job Coaching Support Role.

This is particularly important because Job Coaching takes place in an employment environment containing multiple roles.

The Worker has an employee role.

The Job Coach has a support role.

The employer and supervisors exercise employment and supervisory authority.

Coworkers have their own workplace roles.

Vocational rehabilitation personnel, provider management, clinicians, safety personnel, benefits specialists, transportation providers, and other external participants may have additional responsibilities.

These roles may interact through external Interfaces.

They should not be treated as interchangeable.

For example, a Job Coach may support the Worker in understanding and performing an assigned job procedure.

That does not automatically authorize the Job Coach to change the employer's procedure.

A Job Coach may help the Worker understand supervisor feedback.

That does not automatically make the Job Coach the Worker's supervisor.

A Job Coach may recognize a condition that appears to affect the Worker's health, safety, behavior, or employment stability.

That recognition does not automatically authorize the Job Coach to make decisions belonging to another professional or responsible party.

Functional Scope therefore establishes an important boundary around Job Coaching Support Work.

Factor 8 preserves this dimension at the Core level, while the applicable Reference Layer and Context-Specific Interpretation help establish what the relevant scope and responsibility boundaries mean in the actual employment Context.

8.3 Worker Direction, Employer Authority, Vocational Rehabilitation, Organizational, Payer, and Other External Requirements

The Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object may operate at the intersection of several legitimate sources of direction or requirement.

The Worker may express preferences, goals, choices, concerns, and support needs.

The employer may establish job duties, performance expectations, schedules, workplace rules, supervisory instructions, safety procedures, and other employment requirements.

Vocational rehabilitation systems may establish service purposes, authorizations, plans, or program requirements.

Provider organizations may establish Job Coaching procedures, supervision arrangements, documentation requirements, or other service conditions.

Payers may establish authorization and reporting requirements.

Applicable laws, regulations, professional requirements, and other external sources may establish additional conditions.

These sources do not necessarily have the same function.

Nor should they automatically be collapsed into one general category of "requirements."

Their relevance depends on the declared Quality Object, Support Service Arrangement, Functional Scope, employment Context, and applicable Interfaces.

A Job Coach may therefore need to operate within several intersecting conditions while preserving the distinction among:

what the Worker directs or chooses;

what the employer requires within the employment relationship;
what the Job Coaching Support Service is authorized to provide;
what the provider organization requires;
and
what other applicable external sources require.

The quality determination must examine how these external conditions affect Function Realization without confusing the external sources themselves with the Support Service Quality State of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

8.4 External Requirements May Affect More Than One Factor

An external requirement does not necessarily belong to only one Core Quality Factor.

The same requirement may affect several dimensions of Function Realization.

For example, an employer introduces a new procedure for performing an assigned job task.

That requirement may affect:

Factor 1 if the procedure introduces or controls foreseeable employment harm;

Factor 2 because the Worker must perform the changed task at employer-acceptable standards;

Factor 3 because the change may alter the amount or type of Job Coaching support required;

Factor 4 if implementation affects Worker choice, role, privacy, or autonomy;

Factor 5 if difficulty adapting to the change creates an emerging employment risk;

Factor 6 if the changed procedure requires different interaction with supervisors or coworkers;

Factor 7 because the new procedure must be communicated accurately and continuously;

and

Factor 8 because the Job Coach must remain within Functional Scope when supporting adaptation to the change.

The external requirement is one.

Its possible effects on Function Realization are multidimensional.

This is another reason why the Factor structure should not be organized as a catalog of external requirements.

The Factors preserve major dimensions of Function Realization through which those requirements become quality-relevant.

8.5 Compliance, Continued Employment, and Employer Satisfaction Do Not by Themselves Establish Support Service Quality

External reference points are necessary, but they cannot substitute for determination of the Support Service Quality State of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object Quality Object.

A service may comply with documentation requirements while providing unnecessary Job Coach substitution for Worker performance.

A Worker may remain employed while employment-relevant information is inaccurate or discontinuous.

An employer may be satisfied with completed work while the Job Coach routinely performs part of the Worker's assigned job.

Required service hours may be delivered while the Worker becomes unnecessarily dependent on support.

All required forms may be completed while a developing employment risk is not recognized.

Similarly, employer dissatisfaction does not by itself establish unfavorable Job Coaching Support Service quality.

The dissatisfaction may arise from a condition outside the declared Quality Object, from an employer expectation not applicable to the Support Service Arrangement, or from another cause requiring Evidence-supported interpretation.

The same principle applies to continued employment.

Continued employment is highly relevant to the Support Intended Function of the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

But it is not, by itself, a complete determination of Support Service Quality State.

The determination must remain directed to the whole declared Quality Object and its Function Realization.

8.6 Reference-Layer Detail Does Not Automatically Require Another Core Quality Factor

The Reference Layer may contain extensive detail.

Different industries may have different workplace rules.

Different employers may use different performance systems.

Different vocational rehabilitation programs may impose different service requirements.

Different jurisdictions may establish different legal or regulatory conditions.

Different jobs may involve different safety procedures, technologies, credentials, schedules, communication systems, or organizational structures.

This diversity does not by itself justify additional Core Quality Factors.

Suppose a particular job requires use of a new digital scheduling and task-reporting system.

The system may be important to employment maintenance.

But "digital-system use" does not automatically become a ninth Core Quality Factor.

The relevant quality questions may already concern:

sustained job performance under Factor 2;

appropriate support balance under Factor 3;

recognition of problems created by the system under Factor 5;

accurate employment-relevant information under Factor 7;

appropriate Job Coach judgment and Functional Scope under Factor 8;

and

the technology Interface, Evidence basis, and applicable Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria.

Likewise, a new employer safety requirement does not automatically create a new safety-related Factor.

Its effect may already be representable through Factor 1, Factor 5, Factor 7, Factor 8, the applicable external Interface, and Context-Specific Interpretation.

The methodological question is therefore not whether the new external detail is important.

It is whether that detail exposes a major quality-relevant dimension that cannot be adequately represented through the existing eight Factors and the other established elements of the methodology.

Only the latter condition could support a possible Factor-level Core gap.

8.7 Interim Conclusion — Reference Layer Coverage

The Reference Layer is necessary to responsible determination of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization because the service operates within actual employment, organizational, vocational rehabilitation, payer, professional, legal, and other external conditions.

Functional Scope and external Interfaces establish where Job Coaching Support Work meets those external conditions and where authority and responsibility may change.

However, the Reference Layer is not an additional Core Quality Factor.

Nor should its individual requirements be converted automatically into separate Factors.

The eight established Factors provide the major dimensions through which the quality relevance of external requirements can be examined.

The present analysis therefore finds no additional Factor-level dimension arising solely from the existence or diversity of the Reference Layer.

The next test is practical.

If the eight Factors are genuinely invariant at the VRJ Core level, they should remain meaningful when the same Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object is interpreted across materially different employment Contexts, while Context-specific Failure Modes, criteria, Evidence, job demands, workplace conditions, and external requirements change.

Section 9 therefore tests the eight-Factor Core across the developed VRJ employment Contexts.

9. Testing the Eight-Factor Core Across VRJ Employment Contexts

9.1 Purpose of Cross-Context Testing

The preceding Sections derived and tested the eight VRJ Core Quality Factors primarily at the Core methodological level.

A further question concerns invariance.

If the Factors are genuinely Core-level dimensions of Function Realization for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment, their relevance should not depend on one particular occupation, worksite, employer, Worker, or support arrangement.

The employment Context may change substantially.

Assigned job functions may change.

Worksite conditions, employer expectations, task sequence and pace, communication and supervision patterns, Worker functional presentation, workplace-integration conditions, role-boundary questions, Critical Service Conditions, and available Evidence may also change. VRJ1 expressly identifies these as matters that may affect Context-Specific Interpretation.

The cross-Context test therefore asks:

Can materially different employment Contexts be interpreted through the same eight Core Quality Factors without forcing the meaning of those Factors, leaving a material Factor-level gap, or creating a need for a different Core?

This is a practical test of the derivation developed in the preceding Sections.

9.2 Existing VRJ Context Guides as Practical Evidence

VRJ1 establishes the Context Guide as the mechanism through which the invariant Core becomes observable in a defined employment-maintenance Context.

A Context Guide begins with the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object, its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Core Quality Factors, and Core Quality Indicators established by VRJ1. It then defines the employment Context, Boundaries and Interfaces, interprets Function Realization, applies the Core Factors and Indicators, develops Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, addresses Evidence, identifies Critical Service Conditions, and supports bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statements.

This architecture makes Context Guide development useful for testing Factor invariance.

If a new employment Context can be described responsibly by retaining the eight Factors while developing different Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence considerations, Boundaries, Interfaces, and Reference-Layer applications, that result supports the Core-level character of the Factors.

If repeated Context Guide development instead reveals an important major dimension that cannot be represented through the eight Factors, that finding may indicate a possible Factor-level Core gap.

The Context Guide family therefore serves two purposes:

application of the VRJ Core;

and

practical testing of the VRJ Core.

9.3 Cleaning Services Employment

The developed Cleaning Services Employment Context Guide provides the clearest current practical test.

Cleaning-services employment is materially Context-sensitive.

It may involve:

assigned routes and work areas;

different surfaces and cleaning requirements;

cleaning products;

tools and equipment;

task sequence;

work pace;

inspection requirements;

movement through occupied workplaces;

interaction with supervisors, coworkers, customers, or building occupants;

and

changing workplace conditions.

The Cleaning Services Context Guide nevertheless retains the eight invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors and thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators.

It develops cleaning-specific Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence considerations, Failure-Mode Families, Critical Service Conditions, and claim limitations rather than creating an alternative Core Standard.

This provides a useful test of the Factor structure.

Factor 1 remains relevant because cleaning employment can involve foreseeable employment harm associated with actual work and workplace conditions.

Factor 2 remains relevant because assigned cleaning work must be sustained at employer-acceptable standards.

Factor 3 remains relevant because Job Coaching support may be insufficient, excessive, or may substitute for cleaning functions assigned to the Worker.

Factor 4 remains relevant because support must preserve the Worker's role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation.

Factor 5 remains relevant because cleaning conditions, instructions, performance, workplace arrangements, or other employment risks may change during the Service Period.

Factor 6 remains relevant because the Worker performs within an actual workplace social environment and must navigate ordinary interactions appropriately.

Factor 7 remains relevant because routes, assignments, product instructions, work changes, supervisor feedback, support information, and other employment-relevant information must remain accurate and continuous.

Factor 8 remains relevant because the Job Coach must exercise judgment within applicable Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries.

The Context changes how the Factors become observable.

It does not presently require a different Factor structure.

This is precisely the relationship expected between an invariant Core and Context-Specific Interpretation.

9.4 Additional Employment Contexts Identified by VRJ1

At present, the materials examined for this paper provide a developed VRJ Context Guide for Cleaning Services Employment.

VRJ1 also identifies other illustrative employment Contexts, including:

retail;

food service;

office support;

warehouse work;

landscaping;

hospitality;

transportation support;

production work;

and

other competitive integrated employment settings.

These examples are useful for prospective testing, but they should not be represented as completed Context Guides unless separate developed Guides exist.

They nevertheless illustrate the degree of employment variation that the invariant Core is expected to accommodate.

A retail Context may emphasize customer interaction, changing assignments, stocking, transactions, or workplace communication.

A food-service Context may emphasize sequence, pace, sanitation-related requirements, equipment, coordination, and rapidly changing work conditions.

Office-support employment may emphasize information handling, task organization, technology use, communication, scheduling, and confidentiality.

Warehouse or production work may emphasize pace, sequence, equipment Interfaces, material handling, safety conditions, and coordinated workflow.

Landscaping may involve outdoor conditions, changing worksites, equipment, physical demands, and team coordination.

These differences may substantially change Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria and Failure Modes.

They do not, by themselves, demonstrate a need for different Core Quality Factors.

9.5 Horizontal Comparison Across the VRJ Context Guide Family

As additional VRJ Context Guides are developed, their value for Core research will increase through horizontal comparison.

The appropriate research question will not be simply whether each Guide contains the same eight Factor names.

A stronger comparison should ask:

Does each Factor retain a meaningful determination function in each Context?

Do materially different Failure Modes continue to resolve under the same Factors?

Does a Factor become artificially stretched to accommodate conditions that do not genuinely belong within it?

Does a recurring quality-relevant dimension appear across several Contexts but remain poorly represented by all eight Factors?

Do some Factors repeatedly collapse into one another in practical application?

Or does Context Guide development continue to show that the same major dimensions remain distinguishable while their specific manifestations change?

This horizontal research is important because apparent invariance based on one Context is weaker than invariance demonstrated across materially different applications.

The current Cleaning Services application therefore provides supporting Evidence, but not final proof of universal invariance.

9.6 Different Failure Modes Within the Same Invariant Factors

One important expectation of the Core/Context architecture is that individual Failure Modes may change substantially while the Factor remains stable.

Consider Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards.

In cleaning employment, a Failure Mode might concern incomplete assigned areas, incorrect task sequence, unacceptable cleaning quality, or inability to maintain the required work pace.

In office-support employment, the same Factor might become observable through inaccurate task completion, missed administrative steps, inability to maintain workflow, or difficulty adapting to changed instructions.

The Failure Modes differ.

The major determination question remains:

Is the Job Coaching Support Service supporting sustained performance of the actual job at employer-acceptable standards?

The same principle applies to the other Factors.

Factor 1 may involve different foreseeable harms.

Factor 3 may involve different forms of over-support, under-support, or substitution.

Factor 6 may involve different workplace relationships.

Factor 7 may involve different employment-relevant information pathways.

Factor 8 may involve different Functional Scope questions.

Variation at the Failure-Mode level therefore does not contradict Factor invariance.

It is one of the reasons the Core requires a higher level of methodological resolution.

9.7 Different Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria Within the Same Core

Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria provide another important level of variation.

VRJ1 establishes that these criteria are derived from the Core Quality Indicators and interpreted within the declared employment-maintenance Context.

They are not intended to create new Core Quality Factors or Core Quality Indicators.

This allows the same Factor and Indicator to become observable differently in different jobs.

For example, employer-acceptable performance cannot be expressed identically for a cleaner, retail worker, office-support worker, warehouse worker, or food-service worker.

The actual job functions, worksite conditions, sequence, pace, quality expectations, communication arrangements, and Evidence differ.

The Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria must therefore differ.

The Factor does not need to differ merely because its observable expression changes.

This distinction protects both sides of the architecture:

Core invariance;

and

Context sensitivity.

9.8 What the Existing Applications Do — and Do Not — Demonstrate

The current VRJ application Evidence supports several conclusions.

First, Cleaning Services Employment can be interpreted without changing the eight Core Quality Factors.

Second, substantial Context-specific detail can be developed below the Factor level through Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence considerations, Boundaries, Interfaces, and Reference-Layer interpretation. The Cleaning Services Guide expressly retains the eight Factors and thirty-two Indicators while developing these Context-specific elements.

Third, the application supports the methodological separation between the invariant Core and Context-Specific Interpretation.

The existing application does not demonstrate that no future employment Context can ever expose a Core-level gap.

Nor does the illustrative list of other employment Contexts in VRJ1 constitute Evidence equivalent to completed Context Guide applications.

The present conclusion must therefore remain bounded.

9.9 What Would Constitute a Factor-Level Core Gap

A new Context-specific issue does not automatically establish a Factor-level gap.

A possible gap should first be tested against the existing architecture.

The question should be whether the issue can be represented adequately through:

one or more of the eight existing Core Quality Factors;

the Core Quality Indicators;

Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria;

Failure Modes or Failure-Mode Families;

Critical Service Conditions;

Support Service Realization Pathways;

Service Conditions;

Boundaries and Interfaces;

Functional Scope;

the Reference Layer;

and

the applicable Evidence basis.

Only after these possibilities have been examined should a new Factor be considered.

A stronger Factor-level gap would exist where a recurring major quality-relevant dimension: arises from Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object; is material to responsible Support Service Quality State determination; appears across more than one employment Context or has strong reason to be considered Core-level; cannot be represented adequately by the existing eight Factors; cannot be resolved merely through an additional Indicator or Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion; and would remain materially invisible without separate Factor-level treatment.

That is a substantially higher threshold than discovering a new job task, hazard, technology, Worker condition, or employer requirement.

9.10 Interim Conclusion — Cross-Context Testing

The current cross-Context Evidence supports, but does not permanently close, the eight-Factor VRJ Core.

The developed Cleaning Services Employment Context demonstrates that a materially specific employment setting can retain the eight invariant Factors while developing its own Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence considerations, Boundaries, Interfaces, and Reference-Layer interpretation.

VRJ1 anticipates application across substantially different employment settings and expressly states that such Contexts affect interpretation of Quality Outcome Criteria without changing the invariant Core Standard.

The appropriate conclusion at this stage is therefore not that eight has been proven immutable.

It is that the available application Evidence has not identified a Factor-level reason to remove, merge, rename, or add to the eight established Core Quality Factors.

Continued development of materially different VRJ Context Guides should remain part of the research and validation process.

The next Section addresses the resulting central question directly:

Why does the present methodological resolution support eight Core Quality Factors — and not fewer or more?

10. Why Eight — and Not Fewer or More

10.1 The Central Question

The preceding analysis supports the necessity and distinguishability of the eight VRJ Core Quality Factors.

The remaining question is more direct:

Why should the VRJ Core contain eight Factors rather than fewer or more?

The answer cannot be based on convenience, symmetry, or the fact that VRJ1 already contains eight.

The number must follow from the methodological resolution needed to preserve the major quality-relevant dimensions of Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

VRJ1 establishes that the Core is derived from the Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results together with the principal Failure-Mode Families that may prevent, weaken, interrupt, distort, or misdirect employment-maintenance Function Realization.

The question is therefore whether eight provides an appropriate present balance between: too much consolidation, which can hide materially different determination questions; and

too much fragmentation, which can turn Context-specific detail into unnecessary Core-level Factors.

10.2 Eight Is a Methodological Resolution, Not a Numerically Predetermined Truth

Nothing in the Whole Quality methodology requires every support-service Core to contain eight Factors. Nor does the existence of eight Factors in another AMSI Core establish that VRJ must also contain eight. The present number arises from the VRJ determination task.

The derivation identifies eight major dimensions that remain separately relevant to determining Function Realization of the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

A smaller number could be produced by combining dimensions.

A larger number could be produced by dividing existing dimensions into narrower subjects.

Either is structurally possible.

The methodological issue is whether such restructuring would improve or weaken determination capability.

The present analysis supports eight because each Factor preserves a major question that becomes materially less visible if removed, while additional detail can generally be represented below the Factor level.

10.3 Why Fewer Factors Could Appear Attractive

A smaller Core may initially appear simpler.

For example, several Factors could be grouped under broader headings such as:

Safety and Risk;

Employment Performance;

Worker-Centered Support;

Workplace Participation;

Information and Communication;

or

Professional Practice.

Such consolidation could reduce the number of headings.

But fewer headings do not necessarily produce a better determination structure.

A broad category may contain several conditions that can vary independently.

If those conditions are merged too far, a favorable condition in one part of the category may obscure an unfavorable condition in another.

The question is therefore not whether the eight Factors can be described in fewer words.

They can.

The question is whether the major determination distinctions remain sufficiently visible after consolidation.

10.4 The Cost of Excessive Consolidation

Excessive consolidation can weaken determination in several ways.

First, it can make important Failure-Mode Families less visible.

Second, it can encourage overly broad Factor interpretation.

Third, it can increase the risk that unlike conditions are treated as though they were interchangeable.

Fourth, it can weaken non-compensability analysis.

For example, if Factors 2 and 3 were merged into one broad “Employment Performance” Factor, the resulting category could combine:

whether the Worker performs the job at employer-acceptable standards;
and

whether that performance is achieved with an appropriate balance between Worker Functional Independence and Job Coaching support.

These are not the same question.

A Worker may perform very well because the Job Coach is doing too much.

A broad combined Factor could conceal that distinction.

The same problem appears in several other possible mergers.

10.5 Why Employment Harm and Job Performance Should Remain Distinguishable

Factors 1 and 2 both concern successful employment maintenance.

But their determination functions are different.

Factor 1 asks whether foreseeable employment harm is prevented or controlled.

Factor 2 asks whether sustained job performance at employer-acceptable standards is supported.

A Worker can meet all performance expectations while being exposed to a foreseeable harmful condition.

Conversely, work may be safe while performance remains materially below what the job requires.

Merging these dimensions would therefore weaken visibility of both.

Safety cannot be inferred from performance.

Performance cannot be inferred from safety.

The separate Factors should remain.

10.6 Why Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance Should Remain Separately Visible

One possible consolidation would be to absorb Factor 3 into Factor 2.

This may appear reasonable because both involve Worker job performance.

But the distinction is fundamental.

Factor 2 concerns whether the job is being performed at employer-acceptable standards.

Factor 3 concerns how the relationship between Worker performance and Job Coaching support is realized.

Consider a Worker who completes all required tasks because the Job Coach routinely performs the most difficult part of the assignment.

Factor 2 may appear favorable.

Factor 3 may be unfavorable.

If support balance were absorbed into job performance, the Worker could appear to be succeeding while the Job Coaching service is actually substituting for Worker performance.

Factor 3 therefore requires separate visibility.

10.7 Why Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy Should Remain Separately Visible

Factor 4 could also appear capable of being absorbed into Factor 3 or Factor 6.

Functional Independence can support autonomy.

Workplace integration can support employee participation.

But neither fully represents Worker role, dignity, privacy, rights, choice, or autonomy.

A Worker can be technically independent while being treated disrespectfully.

A Worker can be well integrated socially while private information is disclosed inappropriately.

A Worker can receive an appropriate amount of assistance while the Job Coach routinely speaks for the Worker when this is unnecessary.

These conditions demonstrate that Factor 4 preserves a distinct major dimension of Function Realization.

10.8 Why Recognition and Response to Employment Risk Should Not Be Absorbed Completely into Harm Prevention

Factors 1 and 5 both concern risk.

This is one of the strongest apparent merger possibilities.

However, the two Factors preserve different determination functions.

Factor 1 concerns the state of protection from foreseeable employment harm.

Factor 5 concerns the capability to recognize and respond to changing or emerging employment risk.

A service may have appropriate established safety controls while failing to recognize a new risk.

Likewise, a new employment risk may concern performance, attendance, workplace relationships, changed duties, or another condition that is not simply a physical safety issue.

Factor 5 therefore cannot be reduced to harm prevention alone.

It preserves the dynamic observation-to-response pathway of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

10.9 Why Workplace Integration and Social Navigation Should Remain Separately Visible

Factor 6 could be viewed as part of Factor 4 because both concern the Worker's place within the workplace.

But the distinction is important.

Factor 4 concerns Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation.

Factor 6 concerns the Worker's integration into the ordinary workplace social environment and navigation of relationships with supervisors, coworkers, and other workplace participants.

A Worker may be treated respectfully and retain autonomy while still being unnecessarily isolated from coworkers.

Likewise, the Worker may have substantial social contact while the Job Coach unnecessarily dominates ordinary workplace communication.

Workplace integration and social navigation therefore remain a distinct quality-relevant dimension.

10.10 Why Employment-Relevant Information Continuity Should Remain Separately Visible

Information affects nearly every Factor.

This might suggest that Factor 7 could be distributed across the other seven Factors.

That approach would weaken determination.

Employment-relevant information can fail even where the Job Coach's actions appear otherwise appropriate.

Information may be:
accurate but delayed;

available but incomplete;
transferred but distorted;
current at one point and outdated later;
or
correctly received but inappropriately disclosed.

These are quality-relevant conditions of the Job Coaching Support Service itself.

Their effects may eventually appear through job performance, risk response, support balance, or another Factor.

But waiting for downstream consequences would make the information failure insufficiently visible.

Factor 7 therefore requires separate Core-level treatment.

10.11 Why Functional Scope and Judgment Should Remain Separately Visible

Factor 8 could appear to be a general requirement applicable across every other Factor rather than a separate Factor.

It does interact with all other Factors.

However, that does not make it redundant.

A Job Coach can act:

safely;
with good intentions;
in support of job performance;
with accurate information;
and
with a favorable immediate Support Result,

while still acting outside applicable Functional Scope, Competence, authority, or responsibility boundaries.

For example, correctly recognizing a performance problem does not authorize the Job Coach to assume employer supervisory authority.

Recognizing a health-related concern does not authorize clinical decision-making.

Identifying a workplace issue does not authorize the Job Coach to change an employer procedure independently.

Factor 8 preserves the separate question of whether Job Coaching action and judgment are legitimate within the declared Support Role and Functional Scope.

That question cannot be inferred from the favorability of the outcome.

10.12 The Removal Test Supports the Need for Eight

The removal test directly supports the present Factor count.

If Factor 1 is removed, foreseeable employment harm becomes less directly visible.

If Factor 2 is removed, sustained employer-acceptable performance becomes less directly visible.

If Factor 3 is removed, the distinction between Worker performance and Job Coaching substitution becomes materially weaker.

If Factor 4 is removed, Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, and rights become less directly visible.

If Factor 5 is removed, dynamic recognition and response to changing employment risk become less directly visible.

If Factor 6 is removed, workplace integration and social navigation become less directly visible.

If Factor 7 is removed, employment-relevant information integrity and continuity become less directly visible.

If Factor 8 is removed, Functional Scope, authority, Competence, and responsibility boundaries become less directly visible.

In every case, related conditions may remain partly visible through another Factor.

But none of the remaining Factors preserves the complete lost determination function.

The removal test therefore supports eight rather than seven or fewer.

10.13 Why More Factors Could Also Appear Attractive

The opposite problem is also possible.

VRJ employment Contexts can generate many important subjects.

Examples include:

attendance;

transportation;

workplace technology;

communication devices;

behavioral support;

workplace accommodation;

employer feedback;

job-task learning;

remote Job Coaching;

schedule changes;

workplace safety;

benefits concerns;

social conflict;

and

specific Worker functional conditions.

Each may be highly important.

It may therefore seem useful to create additional Core Quality Factors for them.

But Core importance is not determined by subject importance alone.

The question is whether the subject represents a new major dimension of Function Realization that cannot be represented adequately within the existing Factor structure.

10.14 A New Job Type, Worker Population, Workplace, Technology, or Employment Risk Is Not Automatically a New Quality Factor

A new Context does not automatically require a new Factor.

A warehouse job may introduce material-handling risks and different production demands.

A retail job may introduce customer interaction.

An office-support job may rely heavily on information systems.

Remote Job Coaching may introduce communication-technology Interfaces.

A particular Worker population may require different communication or cognitive supports.

These differences affect application.

They may require new Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Evidence sources, Critical Service Conditions, or Interface analysis.

VRJ1 expressly allows employment Contexts to affect interpretation while preserving the invariant Core. The existence of new detail therefore does not establish a new Factor-level dimension.

10.15 Test for a Possible Additional Core Quality Factor

A possible ninth Factor should be considered only where a candidate dimension satisfies a demanding test.

The candidate should:

- arise from Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object;
- be materially relevant to Support Service Quality State determination;
- represent a major quality-relevant dimension rather than a narrow Context-specific issue;
- be supported by a coherent Failure-Mode Family;
- remain meaningful across materially different employment Contexts;
- be capable of unfavorable realization while the existing eight Factors remain comparatively satisfactory;
- become materially less visible if omitted;
- not be adequately represented through an existing Factor;
- not be resolvable merely through a Core Quality Indicator, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion, Failure Mode, Critical Service Condition, Boundary, Interface, Service Condition, Functional Scope condition, Reference-Layer requirement, or Evidence issue;

and

survive removal, merger, distinguishability, and cross-Context testing.

Only after these conditions are satisfied would a possible additional Factor warrant controlled Core review.

10.16 Employment-Context Diversity Does Not Require More Core Quality Factors

VRJ1 anticipates substantial variation across employment-maintenance Contexts.

Illustrative Contexts include cleaning services, retail, food service, office support, warehouse work, landscaping, hospitality, transportation support, production work, and other competitive integrated employment settings.

These Contexts may differ greatly in:

- job tasks;
- physical conditions;
- performance expectations;
- work pace;
- social environment;
- technology;
- information flows;
- risks;
- and
- required support.

But Context diversity is precisely why the Core must remain at an invariant level of resolution.

If every Context difference created a new Factor, the VRJ Core would become a collection of job-specific subjects rather than an invariant Job Coaching support-service Core.

10.17 The Eight Factors Are Interrelated, Not Eight Independent Silos

The eight Factors should not be interpreted as isolated compartments.

Function Realization occurs through one Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

A single event may therefore affect several Factors simultaneously.

For example, a changed job requirement may affect:

job performance;
support balance;
Worker autonomy;
employment risk;
workplace communication;
information continuity;
and
Functional Scope.

This interaction is expected.

The Factors separate determination questions, not physical events.

Their value lies in allowing one event to be examined from several major quality-relevant dimensions without treating one favorable dimension as a substitute for another.

10.18 Support Service Non-Substitutability and Non-Compensability Support the Eight-Factor Core

The eight-Factor structure is also supported by non-substitutability of essential conditions of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

VRJ1 states that favorable documentation, relationships, or continued employment cannot compensate for unresolved serious safety risk, coercive conduct, Support Work outside Functional Scope, substitution for the Worker's assigned job functions, or an insufficient Evidence basis.

This principle supports separate Factor visibility.

If all dimensions were merged into a smaller number of broad categories, there would be greater risk that favorable conditions would obscure materially unacceptable ones.

Separate Factors make non-compensable weaknesses easier to identify and preserve in determination.

10.19 The Eight-Factor Core Should Remain Testable

Supporting eight Factors at the present methodological resolution does not mean that the structure should be insulated from future Evidence.

The VRJ Core should continue to be tested through:

new Context Guides;
different employment Contexts;
different Worker support needs;
new technologies;
different Support Service Arrangements;
new Failure Modes;
and
horizontal comparison across applications.

A recurring finding that one Factor is unnecessary, that two Factors cannot be distinguished reliably, or that a major quality-relevant dimension remains consistently unrepresented should be preserved for controlled Core review.

Stability and testability are therefore complementary rather than contradictory.

10.20 Why the Present Answer Is Eight

The present answer is eight because the analysis identifies eight major quality-relevant dimensions that:

arise from the Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object;

are supported by material Failure-Mode Families;
remain separately relevant to Function Realization;
survive removal and merger testing;
cannot presently be represented adequately at a lower methodological level;
and
are supported by the available Context-specific application Evidence.

The current Evidence does not support reducing the Core below eight.

It also does not identify a sufficiently demonstrated residual major dimension requiring a ninth Factor.

The eight-Factor structure therefore represents the presently supported Core-level methodological resolution.

10.21 Direct Answer to the Title Question

Why eight?

Because responsible determination of Function Realization of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object presently requires separate visibility of:

foreseeable employment harm;
sustained employer-acceptable job performance;
Functional Independence and support balance;
Worker role, dignity, and autonomy;
timely recognition and response to employment risk;
workplace integration and social navigation;
continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information;
and
practice and judgment within Functional Scope.

Fewer Factors would materially weaken one or more of these distinctions.

More Factors are not presently justified because additional employment detail can be represented through the existing Factors and the lower-resolution elements of the VRJ methodology.

The conclusion is therefore bounded but direct:

The present eight-Factor VRJ Core is justified as the appropriate current methodological resolution for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

The next Section addresses how this Core should remain stable while still allowing controlled future revision where sufficiently supported Evidence demonstrates a genuine Core-level need.

11. Stability and Revision of the Eight-Factor VRJ Core

11.1 Why the VRJ Core Must Be Stable

The purpose of an invariant Core is to provide a stable methodological structure across different applications.

VRJ1 therefore establishes the same eight Core Quality Factors across different employment Contexts, job types, worksites, support arrangements, technologies, Worker populations, and jurisdictions. Context Guides interpret the Core without redefining it.

Stability is necessary because Support Service Quality State determinations must remain comparable across time and Contexts.

If the Core changed whenever a new job type, workplace condition, technology, Worker need, or employer requirement appeared, comparison would become weak and the distinction between Core-level structure and Context-specific interpretation would disappear.

A stable Core therefore supports:

- consistent application;
- traceability across Context Guides;
- comparison among different employment Contexts;
- comparison across Service Periods;
- controlled development of Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria;
- and
- accumulation of Evidence relevant to future Core research.

Stability is therefore a methodological requirement rather than resistance to development.

11.2 Stability Does Not Mean Rigidity

An invariant Core should remain stable under ordinary application.

It should not, however, be treated as permanently immune from Evidence.

The present eight-Factor structure is justified at the current methodological resolution and through the available application Evidence.

Future Context Guide development may reveal:

- a recurring major dimension that is not adequately represented;
- an existing Factor whose meaning becomes repeatedly difficult to distinguish from another;
- a Factor whose content proves too broad or too narrow;
- or

a systematic interaction that suggests the present Core-level resolution should be reconsidered.

Such findings should not be ignored simply because VRJ1 already establishes eight Factors.

The appropriate principle is therefore:

stable application

+

continued testing

+

controlled revision where sufficiently supported.

This preserves both consistency and methodological openness.

11.3 Provisional Core-Revision Findings

A possible Core-level issue should not immediately change VRJ1.

It should first be preserved as a provisional Core-revision finding.

A provisional finding may arise where application suggests that:

- a major quality-relevant dimension may be insufficiently visible;
- an existing Factor may be materially redundant;
- two Factors may not remain sufficiently distinguishable in practice;
- a Factor boundary may be repeatedly unclear;
- or

Context Guide applications expose a recurring problem that cannot be resolved through lower-level methodological elements.

The finding should describe the determination problem rather than merely propose a new Factor title.

For example, a future Context Guide might repeatedly show that an important employment-maintenance condition does not fit adequately within any of the existing eight Factors.

The first research question should be:

What necessary determination capability appears to be missing?

not:

What should the ninth Factor be called?

This distinction keeps Core revision evidence-driven.

11.4 Horizontal Comparison Before Revision

A finding from one employment Context should normally be compared horizontally with other VRJ applications before Core revision is considered.

The purpose is to determine whether the finding is:

Context-specific;

Worker-specific;

technology-specific;

employer-specific;

jurisdiction-specific;

or

genuinely Core-level.

Suppose a new Context Guide identifies a recurring difficulty involving a digital workplace system.

The condition may initially appear to require a new “Technology” Factor.

Horizontal comparison should first ask whether the issue is already represented through:

Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance;

Factor 5 — Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;

Factor 7 — Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;

Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope;

or

the applicable technology Interface, Reference Layer, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, and Evidence.

Only a residual major determination dimension that remains inadequately represented across materially different applications would support stronger Core-level consideration.

Horizontal comparison therefore protects the Core from premature expansion.

11.5 Cross-Factor Concepts Should Not Automatically Become Core Quality Factors

Continued VRJ research may identify concepts that recur across several Factors.

Examples may include:

time-critical response;

information integrity;

Worker participation;

authority to intervene;

adaptation to changing conditions;

or

Interface reliability.

The recurrence of such a concept does not automatically justify a separate Core Quality Factor.

A cross-Factor concept may instead describe a horizontal function that operates through several existing Factors.

For example, information integrity is strongly visible in Factor 7 but may also affect recognition of employment risk, performance, support balance, and Functional Scope.

Likewise, time-critical response may affect Factors 1, 2, 5, and 8.

Creating a new Factor for every recurring cross-Factor concept could duplicate existing determination functions and distort the present Core resolution.

Such concepts should therefore first be studied horizontally across the established Factors.

11.6 Revision Must Preserve Factor Meaning

Any future revision should preserve clear Factor meaning.

A Factor should continue to represent a major quality-relevant dimension of Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization.

Revision should not create Factors that are merely:

- lists of Job Coach tasks;
- external compliance categories;
- employer departments;
- documentation fields;
- Worker diagnoses;
- technologies;
- particular industries;
- or

single Failure Modes.

Nor should revision make Factor titles so broad that materially different determination questions become indistinguishable.

The same removal, merger, and distinguishability tests used in this paper should therefore apply to any proposed revised Factor structure.

11.7 Revision Must Preserve the Core Level of Resolution

The Core should remain at the major-dimension level.

Many important findings belong below that level.

A new issue may be represented more appropriately through:

- a Core Quality Indicator;
- a Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion;
- a Failure Mode;
- a Failure-Mode Family;
- a Critical Service Condition;
- a Support Service Realization Pathway;
- a Boundary or Interface;
- a Service Condition;
- Functional Scope;
- the Reference Layer;
- or

the Evidence basis.

Core revision is justified only where these lower-level mechanisms are insufficient to preserve the necessary major determination dimension.

This resolution test is essential to prevent fragmentation of VRJ1.

11.8 Evidence Required for Revision

A Core revision should be supported by more than plausibility.

Relevant Evidence may include:

- repeated findings across multiple Context Guides;
- consistent difficulties in applying an existing Factor structure;
- recurring Failure Modes that remain poorly represented;
- Evidence from materially different employment Contexts;
- demonstrated loss of determination capability under the present structure;
- or

clear inability to distinguish or apply existing Factor boundaries reliably.

A proposed addition should also survive the removal and merger tests.

A proposed deletion should demonstrate that no material determination function is lost.

A proposed merger should demonstrate that the combined structure preserves the full determination capability of the existing separate Factors.

Revision should therefore be justified by accumulated Evidence rather than drafting preference.

11.9 Stability Supports Comparison Across Employment Contexts and Time

Core stability has research value as well as application value.

If the eight Factors remain stable while different VRJ Context Guides are developed, horizontal comparison becomes possible.

Researchers and practitioners can ask:

How does Factor 2 appear in cleaning services, retail, warehouse work, or office support?

Which Failure Modes recur under Factor 3 across different employment Contexts?

How do different Contexts express Factor 6?

Where do information failures under Factor 7 recur?

Which Factors most often interact when employment risk changes?

Such comparisons become much less meaningful if the Core structure changes from one Context Guide to another.

Stability therefore creates the basis for learning from application.

It allows Context Guides to function not only as application documents but also as research/test cases for continued VRJ Core development.

11.10 Controlled Revision Principle

The appropriate governance principle for the VRJ Core is:

Apply the present eight-Factor structure consistently.

Preserve Context-specific differences at the appropriate lower methodological level.

Record possible Core-level gaps or redundancies as provisional Core-revision findings.

Compare those findings horizontally across materially different employment Contexts.

Require removal, merger, distinguishability, resolution, and Evidence tests before revision.

Revise the Core only where the accumulated Evidence supports a genuine improvement in determination capability.

This approach protects the stability of VRJ1 without treating the present eight-Factor structure as permanently closed.

The current conclusion is therefore:

the eight established VRJ Core Quality Factors should remain invariant for present application while continued Context Guide development and horizontal research remain available to support controlled future Core revision where justified.

The final Section summarizes the overall justification and states the present conclusion concerning why the VRJ Core resolves into eight invariant Core Quality Factors.

12. Conclusions

12.1 Purpose of the Analysis

This paper examined the methodological basis for the eight invariant Core Quality Factors established by VRJ1 for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

The analysis did not begin with the assumption that eight Factors must be preserved because VRJ1 already contains eight.

Instead, it began with the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object and examined the level of resolution required for responsible determination of its Function Realization.

Within the AMSI framework, the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object is treated as one coherent Quality Object bringing together:

the Worker Receiving Job Coaching Support;

the Support Worker or Support Workers;

Support Work;

Support Results;

Service Conditions;

Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results;

Boundaries and Interfaces;

the employment Context;

and

the Evidence basis required for Support Service Quality State determination.

The eight Factors were therefore examined as dimensions of Function Realization of this whole Quality Object rather than as separate subjects, separate Quality Objects, or a list of desirable Job Coaching characteristics.

12.2 Derivation Result

The derivation followed the methodological relationship:

Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object

→ Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results

→ Function Realization

→ Support Service Realization Pathways

→ Failure Modes

→ Failure-Mode Families

→ major quality-relevant dimensions

→ Core Quality Factors.

The analysis showed that individual Failure Modes may vary substantially among employment Contexts.

The Core does not need a separate Factor for every job task, workplace hazard, Worker condition, technology, external requirement, or Failure Mode.

Instead, related Failure Modes can be examined at a higher level to identify recurring major dimensions of Function Realization.

At the present methodological resolution, this derivation resolves into eight dimensions:

Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Employment Harm;

Factor 2 — Sustained Job Performance at Employer-Acceptable Standards;

Factor 3 — Functional Independence and Appropriate Support Balance;

Factor 4 — Respect for Worker Role, Dignity, and Autonomy;

Factor 5 — Timely Recognition and Response to Employment Risk;

Factor 6 — Workplace Integration and Social Navigation;

Factor 7 — Continuity and Accuracy of Employment-Relevant Information;

and

Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.

12.3 Necessity of the Eight Factors

The removal test supports the necessity of each Factor.

Without Factor 1, the Core would lose direct visibility of whether Job Coaching Support Service Function Realization protects against foreseeable employment harm.

Without Factor 2, it would lose direct visibility of whether the support enables sustained performance of the actual job at employer-acceptable standards.

Without Factor 3, it would lose the necessary distinction between successful Worker performance and performance achieved through under-support, over-support, unnecessary dependence, or Job Coach substitution.

Without Factor 4, it would lose direct visibility of Worker role, dignity, autonomy, privacy, rights, and appropriate employee participation.

Without Factor 5, it would lose direct visibility of whether changing or emerging employment risks are recognized and responded to appropriately and in time.

Without Factor 6, it would lose direct visibility of workplace integration and social navigation.

Without Factor 7, it would lose direct visibility of continuity and accuracy of employment-relevant information.

Without Factor 8, it would lose direct visibility of whether Job Coaching Support Work and judgment remain within applicable Functional Scope, Competence, authority, and responsibility boundaries.

Each removal therefore produces a material loss of determination capability.

12.4 Distinguishability Without Isolation

The analysis also supports the distinguishability of the eight Factors.

Distinguishability does not mean that the Factors operate independently.

They concern one coherent Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object and therefore necessarily interact.

A single employment condition may activate several or all of the Factors.

A change in a Worker's assigned procedure, for example, may affect job performance, support balance, Worker autonomy, employment risk, workplace relationships, employment-relevant information, Functional Scope, and protection from foreseeable employment harm.

The event is one.

The Quality Object is one.

The quality-relevant determination questions are several.

The analysis therefore distinguishes interaction from redundancy.

A Factor is redundant only if its determination function can be removed without material loss because another Factor adequately preserves that function.

The removal and merger tests performed in this paper do not support such a conclusion for any of the eight Factors.

12.5 Why Fewer Factors Are Not Presently Supported

Fewer Factors could be created by combining neighboring dimensions.

Such consolidation would simplify the number of Factor headings but would weaken important determination distinctions.

Combining job performance with Functional Independence could conceal Job Coach substitution behind favorable task completion.

Combining Worker role and autonomy with workplace integration could obscure unfavorable treatment of the Worker despite satisfactory workplace relationships.

Combining protection from foreseeable harm with timely recognition and response could obscure the distinction between an existing protective state and the capability to recognize and respond to changing conditions.

Combining information continuity with recognition and response could obscure the difference between defective information and failure to interpret or act on accurate information.

Combining Functional Scope with other Factors could allow favorable outcomes to obscure inappropriate Job Coaching action outside applicable authority, Competence, or responsibility.

The present analysis therefore does not support reducing the eight-Factor Core without material loss of determination capability.

12.6 Why More Factors Are Not Presently Supported

The analysis likewise does not presently identify a demonstrated need for an additional Core Quality Factor.

Job Coaching occurs across highly diverse employment Contexts.

New applications may introduce different:

job tasks;

workplace hazards;

technologies;

Worker support needs;

employer requirements;

communication arrangements;

service-delivery methods;

worksite conditions;

or

external Interfaces.

These differences can be highly important to Support Service Quality State determination.

They do not automatically represent new Core-level dimensions.

The VRJ architecture provides lower-resolution mechanisms for representing such differences through:

Core Quality Indicators;
Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria;
Failure Modes and Failure-Mode Families;
Critical Service Conditions;
Support Service Realization Pathways;
Service Conditions;
Boundaries and Interfaces;
Functional Scope;
the Reference Layer;
and
the Evidence basis.

A ninth Factor would be justified only if a recurring major quality-relevant dimension of Function Realization remained materially underrepresented after these existing mechanisms had been fully considered.

The present analysis has not identified such a residual dimension.

12.7 Support from Context-Specific Application

The developed Cleaning Services Employment Context Guide provides practical support for the present Factor structure.

The Guide retains all eight invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors and thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators while developing cleaning-specific Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence considerations, Boundaries, Interfaces, and Reference-Layer interpretation.

This application demonstrates an important distinction.

Employment Context changes how the Core becomes observable.

It does not necessarily change the Core itself.

At the same time, one developed employment Context cannot establish permanent invariance across every possible application.

The present Context-specific Evidence therefore supports the eight-Factor structure but does not close it to future testing.

12.8 Bounded Conclusion on Invariance

The term invariant should be understood within the present VRJ Core architecture.

The eight Factors are invariant in the sense that they are intended to remain the Core-level quality-relevant dimensions across different VRJ employment Contexts while Context-specific interpretation occurs below the Core level.

Invariance does not mean that the Factors are immune from future evidence-supported revision.

Additional Context Guides should continue to test whether:

each Factor remains meaningful;
Factor boundaries remain distinguishable;
the same Failure-Mode Families continue to resolve appropriately;
new Failure Modes can be represented without artificially stretching existing Factors;
and
any recurring major quality-relevant dimension remains materially invisible.

The present conclusion is therefore intentionally bounded.

Available derivation, removal testing, merger testing, collective coverage analysis, and current Context-specific application support the eight-Factor structure at the present methodological resolution.

12.9 Final Determination

The analysis supports the conclusion that the eight invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors are presently justified for the Job Coaching support-service in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

They are justified not because the number eight was predetermined, but because eight distinguishable major dimensions remain necessary for responsible determination of Function Realization of the declared Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object.

Each Factor preserves a determination capability that would become materially weaker if the Factor were removed.

No two Factors have been shown to be mergeable without meaningful loss of visibility.

No additional major Factor-level dimension has presently been demonstrated that cannot be represented through the existing Core and its established lower-resolution methodological elements.

The present methodological resolution therefore supports:

eight Factors — not because eight is intrinsically preferable, but because the current derivation resolves into eight necessary and distinguishable major quality-relevant dimensions.

Accordingly, the eight established VRJ Core Quality Factors should remain invariant for current application and Context Guide development.

Future Evidence may justify controlled reconsideration.

Until such Evidence demonstrates a genuine Factor-level gap, redundancy, or required change in methodological resolution, the eight-Factor structure provides the presently supported Core basis for determining the Support Service Quality State of the Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object in maintaining competitive integrated employment.

REFERENCES

1. Whole Quality Initiative (WQI). Whole Quality Core Standard. Current applicable edition.
2. Whole Quality Initiative (WQI). Vocabulary and methodological publications establishing the Whole Quality concepts applied in this study, including Quality Object, Intended Function, Function Realization, Quality State, Quality Factor, Quality Indicator, Quality Outcome Criterion, Evidence, Boundary, Interface, and related terms.
3. American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI). AMSI Vocabulary (VOC1). Current applicable edition.
4. American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI). VRJ1 — Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Whole Quality Standard — Core. Current applicable edition.
5. American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI). VJC1 — Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Context Guide: Cleaning Services Employment. Current applicable edition.

REFERENCE USE

VRJ1 provides the established Job Coaching Support Service Quality Object framework, eight invariant Core Quality Factors, and thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators examined in this study.

VJC1 provides the current developed Context Guide application used to test the eight Core Quality Factors in the Cleaning Services Employment Context.

The WQI and AMSI vocabulary and methodological publications provide the terminology and methodological relationships used for interpretation of Quality Object, Intended Function, Function Realization, Quality State, Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, Boundaries, Interfaces, and related Whole Quality concepts.

External laws, regulations, occupational requirements, employer requirements, vocational rehabilitation requirements, service authorization, organizational requirements, professional guidance, payer requirements, and other Reference Layer sources may govern particular Job Coaching Support Service Arrangements or employment Contexts.

Such external sources are not used in this study to redefine the invariant VRJ Core.

Their requirements enter the analysis through the applicable Reference Layer, Functional Scope, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, Boundaries, Interfaces, Failure Modes, Critical Service Conditions, or other established VRJ1 methodological elements.

Accordingly, this study remains a methodological justification of the invariant VRJ Core Quality Factor structure rather than a jurisdiction-specific legal, occupational, employer-performance, vocational rehabilitation, or regulatory standard.

Copyright and Use Notice

Copyright © American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI), 2026. All rights reserved.

This document, Justification of the Eight Invariant VRJ Core Quality Factors, First Edition, August 2026, is a publication of the American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI).

Permitted use (non-commercial). This document may be used, reproduced, and distributed, in whole or in part, for informational and non-commercial purposes, provided that reproductions include this notice and acknowledge AMSI as the source.

Restrictions. No part of this document may be modified or incorporated into another standard, specification, regulation, certification scheme, audit protocol, procurement requirement, or contractual document in a manner that alters its meaning without prior written permission of AMSI.

No endorsement; no certification. Reference to this document does not imply AMSI certification, endorsement, approval, accreditation, conformity assessment, legal compliance, or continuing conformity of any person, provider, service, organization, claim, or activity.

Non-substitution. This document does not replace applicable laws, regulations, contracts, program rules, professional judgment, service responsibilities, or regulatory duties.