Halden Studios

HOME TRUTHS REPORT

SAMPLE

by **Chock Hoss**
Home Truths: a House Rules diagnostic
chockhoss.com
houserules@chockhoss.com

Confidential. Prepared for Halden Studios and the people it chooses to share it with. It describes what the answers support without showing who took part or exposing anyone's answers.

HOME TRUTHS

Halden Studios: Stat Block

Foundation · 14-Nov-2026 · RPS-9

36 people finished the questionnaire.

PATTERNS FOUND

Answers matched these Conditions' patterns. The read in brief, overleaf, says how.

EVIDENCE FOR

Trust Debt

Trust Debt is what happens when an organisation runs out of the ordinary good faith that lets work get done without everyone checking everyone else.

Meeting Inflation

Meeting Inflation is when meetings become the default way to coordinate, and the calendar fills faster than the work gets done.

THE REST OF THE PICTURE

Other Conditions	Picture clear: **Onboarding Debt**. The answers gave a consistently positive picture of the relevant parts of the system and what happened next. It could still be present. Four Conditions weren't settled by this read.
Trait results	**7** Sound · **2** Mostly positive · **2** A varied picture These results summarise answers for the read as a whole. Experiences may differ across the organisation.

SAMPLE

GENERATED BY HOME TRUTHS

The read in brief

Home Truths' own summary of the results, in plain English. Chock Hoss's commentary follows it.

What the read found

Answers matched routes under two Conditions: **Trust Debt** and **Meeting Inflation**.

What sits behind those results

Under **Trust Debt**, answers matched 'Broken promises nobody puts right' ('Candidate'). Answers matched in Code.

Under **Meeting Inflation**, answers matched 'Meetings are the only way to coordinate' ('Candidate'). Answers matched in Design (thin evidence there).

Teams are named only where the reporting rules allow it.

What the results mean

- **Candidate**: at least three people's answers matched the route, out of six or more who answered enough of its questions to give it a proper look.

Capabilities connected to the patterns

In the House Rules model, the routes found depend on three Capabilities.

- **Discuss** – Getting the right people talking while there's still time to resolve something.
- **Deliberate** – Thinking things through together over time, and capturing that thinking so it can be examined and come back to.
- **Decide: Memory and legibility** – Making decisions clear and recording what was agreed so people can find it and act on it.

Home Truths can't assess how well these Capabilities are working, or say which matters most. In the model, they form part of the organisational machinery involved in the patterns found.

The broader picture

Onboarding Debt had a clear picture: the answers gave a consistently positive picture of the relevant parts of the system and what happened next. It could still be present. Four Conditions weren't settled by this read: it flagged no route for them, which leaves open whether they're present. The full report sets out every Condition in turn.

Of the read's Trait results: seven 'Sound', two 'Mostly positive' and two 'A varied picture'.

These results summarise answers for the read as a whole. Experiences may differ across the organisation.

> **What this does and doesn’t say**
>
> Home Truths is a screen, not a full diagnosis. It identifies patterns worth paying attention to. It doesn't by itself establish their causes, decide what should be tackled first or prescribe a remedy.

SAMPLE

Chock Hoss perspective

What stands out

Chock Hoss commentary

Two patterns stand out, and they share a thread. In Code, answers matched a route about commitments being broken and never put right. In Design, answers matched a route where meetings are the only way anything gets coordinated, though fewer people there had a proper look, so that evidence is thinner. Both are about what happens to an agreement after it's made: in one, promises aren't repaired; in the other, nothing outside the room is trusted to carry them.

The rest of the picture makes them more striking, not less. Most Traits read as Sound or Mostly positive, and Onboarding Debt had a clear picture. Principle Coherence and Process Elasticity are the two Traits with a varied picture, and the Trust Debt route depends on Principle Coherence, so those two are worth reading together. These look like patterns in particular parts of a studio whose answers are otherwise mostly positive, which makes them easier to tackle, and easier to overlook.

What still needs establishing

Chock Hoss commentary

The read supports this much: for each pattern, at least three people's answers matched it, out of six or more who had a proper look, and the team named is one where answers matched. In Design, fewer than six people in the team had a proper look, so treat that one as a lead rather than a settled finding. The read also gives a clear picture for Onboarding Debt among the people who could answer.

It doesn't show how widespread either pattern is, how long it has been running or what's causing it, and it isn't a measure of how serious either one is. Documentation Debt, Firefighting Mode, Accountability Vacuum and Analysis Paralysis weren't settled either way: they haven't been found, and they haven't been ruled out.

Where a fuller diagnosis should look next

Chock Hoss commentary

Three things I'd want to find out.

In Code: which commitments are people thinking of, and what happened afterwards? A handful of conversations, and a look at how recent decisions were announced and then applied, would show whether this is about promises from leadership, rules applied unevenly, or something narrower.

In Design: does it hold up? The evidence there is thin, so the first job is to find out whether it's real: talk to more of the team, and look at where Design's decisions actually get recorded and how work

SAMPLE

passes to and from other teams.

Across both: how the studio discusses, records and revisits what it decides. Between them, the two patterns depend on Discuss, Deliberate and Decide, so that's the hypothesis to test: not whether people talk, but whether what they agree survives the conversation.

SAMPLE

The full report

The rest of the report shows the evidence behind the Stat Block.

Home Truths: Halden Studios

Prepared for Halden Studios by Chock Hoss.

A Foundation read. It opened on 14-Nov-2026 and closed on 14-Nov-2026. There were 44 people on the list.

This report follows Reporting Protection Standard RPS-9. It governs when teams can be named and which exact figures can be shown. Each report is checked against it before release. The Standard is fixed before invitations go out.

36 people finished the questionnaire.

How to read this

Home Truths is a screening questionnaire. A read is one run of it. A Condition is a pattern of trouble that tends to keep itself going, and a route is one way that can happen. This report shows what the answers point to. A closer look is needed to establish cause, severity and how widespread a pattern is.

A route is reported as 'Candidate' or 'Thin candidate' only when at least three people each gave a set of answers that matched it. One or two matches never produce either result, which helps protect the people who answered.

A proper look means someone gave a usable answer to every question in one full set for a route. An answer saying they hadn't come across it often enough to say doesn't count towards that set. With fewer than six proper looks, there's less evidence to go on.

In 'four of eleven', eleven people had a proper look and four gave answers that matched the route. That's a count of answers, not an estimate of how common the pattern is.

The descriptions explain how each route can work. Look under the route's name for what this read found. A route with no candidate isn't one this report is saying happens here, but it hasn't been ruled out either.

A named team is one where people gave answers that matched the route. The report leaves out exact team counts and names teams only where the reporting rules allow it.

SAMPLE

Candidate
three or more people gave answers that matched the route, out of six or more who had a proper look.

Thin candidate
three or more people gave answers that matched the route, but fewer than six had a proper look.

No candidate found
six or more people had a proper look, and fewer than three gave answers that matched the route.

Thin reach
fewer than six people had a proper look, and fewer than three gave answers that matched the route. Too little to say either way.

Not included
not part of this edition.

Trust Debt

Trust Debt is what happens when an organisation runs out of the ordinary good faith that lets work get done without everyone checking everyone else. People work defensively. Announcements meet cynicism before the details are out, and well-meant gestures get read as spin. The mood is closer to exhaustion than hostility.

How it behaves. It builds up from small breakdowns – a missed commitment here, a policy applied unevenly there – none of which would matter much on its own. It pays back slowly, too. The usual responses to low trust, more sign-off and closer watching, tend to add to the debt, and fixing what caused it doesn't pay the debt back straight away.

TD-A Broken promises nobody puts right

Candidate

The organisation says one thing and does another – a promise broken, a rule applied to some people and not others – and nobody goes back to explain or put it right. The longer each breach goes unaddressed, the more room it has to colour what people expect. When there's no record of what was decided or why, the next commitment gets a little harder to believe.

8 of the 26 people who had a proper look gave answers that matched this route. 18 of them didn't. 5 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

Appeared in Code.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Principle Coherence, Discuss and Decide (memory and legibility).

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Trust Default, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 29. Of those, 20 gave at least one answer describing it as strong. 6 of those 20 were among the people whose answers matched this

SAMPLE

route.

TD-B Tighter control that feeds the distrust

No candidate found

Suspicion arrives as process – more monitoring, more approvals, more sign-off – and nobody feels able to question it openly. People with less room to use their judgement do exactly what's asked and no more, and that withdrawal is then taken as proof the controls were needed. Each turn of the loop tightens it.

19 people had a proper look at it. 12 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Trust Default and Discuss.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Trust Default, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 29. Of those, 20 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

TD-C Missed commitments nobody talks through

No candidate found

Deadlines and promises slip often enough that people treat them as forecasts. When a miss isn't talked through – why it happened, what it cost, what changes – the next promise is received with more suspicion. People also get warier of saying early that something's going to slip, which makes the next miss more likely.

17 people had a proper look at it. 14 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Follow-Through and Discuss.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Trust Default, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 29. Of those, 20 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

Documentation Debt

Documentation Debt is the running cost of decisions nobody wrote down, context nobody captured and reasoning that lived only in the room. Like technical debt, it compounds: the longer it goes on, the more of the people who knew have moved on, and the more often the organisation finds itself relearning things it already knew. Light records aren't automatically debt – in fast-moving or low-risk work, or work that can only really be learned by doing, sparse writing can be the right call. It becomes debt when the missing pieces keep costing people time.

How it behaves. It builds up when decisions people will need later go unrecorded. The cost stays out of

SAMPLE

sight until it lands somewhere else – a slow start for a new hire, an argument run again, a process only one person can operate. Recording new decisions slows the build-up. Clearing existing debt means recovering the missing context or finding another way to make it available.

DD-A Under pressure, the why never gets written down

No candidate found

When delivery is under pressure, writing down why something was done is easy to drop. It can wait, or so it seems. Later, someone has to work the reasoning out again. That eats into the same scarce time and makes it even less likely anyone writes the next one down.

23 people had a proper look at it. 10 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Slack and Deliberate.

In the same model, strength in Information Flow could get in the way of this route.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Information Flow, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 36. Of those, 32 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

DD-B Decisions that live only in the heads of those who were there

No candidate found

A decision gets made, but its reasoning never travels beyond the people who were there. Anyone else who needs to understand or apply it has to go back and ask, and because those people can usually reconstruct it well enough, the next undocumented decision looks survivable too.

28 people had a proper look at it. 4 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Information Flow and Decide (memory and legibility).

In the same model, strength in Deliberate could get in the way of this route.

DD-C A cost that never shows up under its own name

No candidate found

The cost of lost context is real, but it never shows up under its own name. It turns up as onboarding time, decisions argued over again, interruptions and mistakes, so nobody connects it to the record that was never kept – and the organisation makes the same trade-off again.

30 people had a proper look at it. 2 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Resource Visibility and Decide (memory and legibility).

SAMPLE

In the same model, strength in Information Flow or Deliberate could get in the way of this route.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Information Flow, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 36. Of those, 32 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

Meeting Inflation

Meeting Inflation is when meetings become the default way to coordinate, and the calendar fills faster than the work gets done. The people most needed in the room end up with the least time left for anything else. A full diary that helps people get things done is just a busy diary. It's inflation when meetings keep generating more meetings and crowd out the work they were meant to help.

How it behaves. It feeds itself. A meeting that settles nothing can spawn a follow-up. People who missed it need briefing, often in another meeting. Decisions nobody recorded get argued again. Cutting meetings can free up time, but the same pressures can fill the diary again.

MI-A Meetings are the only way to coordinate

Candidate

The organisation has no workable way to coordinate other than getting people together – no written channel people trust, no clear way for teams to hand things to each other, no shared sense of what needs a live conversation and what's better written down and thought over – so every coordination problem, whatever its shape, becomes a meeting. More and more decisions and context then exist only in rooms, which means more meetings to get at them.

4 of the 25 people who had a proper look gave answers that matched this route. 21 of them didn't. 6 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

Appeared in Design – thin evidence there: fewer than 6 people in that team had a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Response Variety and Deliberate.

MI-B Meetings that leave nothing behind

No candidate found

A meeting seems to settle something, but there's no usable record of what was decided, why or who will do what. Anyone who missed it, or needs the decision later, has to ask around or argue it through again. Often that takes another meeting.

27 people had a proper look at it. 4 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Information Flow and Decide (memory and legibility).

SAMPLE

MI-C Each unresolved meeting books the next

No candidate found

A meeting ends without settling what it was called to settle: the disagreement is still open and nobody has committed to a next step. So another is booked to deal with much the same problem, often with more people in it, and with each repeat, convening again comes to feel safer than changing how the issue gets handled.

18 people had a proper look at it. 15 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Discuss and Decide (commitment).

Firefighting Mode

In Firefighting Mode, most of the organisation's energy goes on responding to crises rather than preventing them. The reactive work has crowded out the preventive work that would mean fewer fires, and the team has become very good at firefighting and steadily less able to do anything else. A burst of unfamiliar incidents that the organisation then learns from and prevents doesn't count. The mode is when the way each crisis gets handled makes the next one more likely.

How it behaves. Firefighting starts to feel like the job. Each emergency can take time away from prevention, leaving the same causes in place and giving the next fire room to grow. The thing to look for after a post-mortem is what gets time, money or attention next.

FM-A Urgent work crowds out prevention

No candidate found

Capacity is fully committed, so whenever something urgent arrives it wins – over investigation, over maintenance, over the work that would stop it happening again. The causes stay in place and produce more urgent work, which leaves even less room for prevention next time.

27 people had a proper look at it. 7 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Slack and Deliberate.

FM-B Lessons learned, nothing changed

No candidate found

Incidents get acknowledged, reviewed and explained, sometimes very well, but the lesson never turns into a finished structural change. When the same kind of incident comes back, it reinforces the sense that responding to incidents is the real job rather than an interruption to it.

25 people had a proper look at it. 7 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Digest and Follow-Through.

SAMPLE

FM-C Problems seen late, rescue costs never counted

No candidate found

Problems only become visible once they're urgent, and the effort spent rescuing them is treated as unavoidable instead of being counted as the recurring cost it is. Without a decision to protect time for prevention, the next faint warning is left to grow into the next emergency.

24 people had a proper look at it. 7 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Detect, Resource Visibility and Decide (commitment).

Accountability Vacuum

In an Accountability Vacuum, nobody is clearly on the hook for outcomes. Decisions get made, but ownership of what happens next spreads across so many people that when something goes wrong there's nobody to take it up with, and when it goes right the credit is just as hard to place. Shared ownership works fine where decision rights are explicit and the obligations stick. The vacuum is when you can't find anyone with both the authority to act and a real obligation to answer for the result.

How it behaves. It's held in place by how decisions are structured more than by anyone's reluctance, which is why naming an owner doesn't fill it on its own. The owner needs both the authority to act and a real obligation to answer for the result, at the same time.

AV-A Responsible, but without the authority

No candidate found

People are told to own outcomes they can't meaningfully control, because the decisions that shape those outcomes sit somewhere else. Sensibly enough, they hedge – contributing, consulting and seeking approval rather than committing – and that makes ownership look shared, which hides even further who can actually act.

23 people had a proper look at it. 10 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Ownership Clarity and Decide (commitment).

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Ownership Clarity, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 34. Of those, 28 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

AV-B Owning it is too risky, so nobody does

No candidate found

SAMPLE

Owning this outcome would put someone personally or politically on the line, so people join the discussion without taking responsibility for what happens next. The group leaves with a shared intention and nobody with both the authority and the willingness to carry it through. That makes it feel safer to spread ownership thin next time.

24 people had a proper look at it. 9 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Psychological Safety and Ownership Clarity.

In the same model, strength in Decide could get in the way of this route.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Ownership Clarity, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 34. Of those, 28 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

AV-C Hedging pays, and vagueness lets it

No candidate found

People get credit for taking part while keeping clear of the downside of owning anything. Vague records let that work – later, nobody can say who committed to what – so hedging becomes the sensible strategy, and steadily more normal across later work.

25 people had a proper look at it. 6 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Incentive Alignment, Deliberate and Decide (memory and legibility).

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Ownership Clarity, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 34. Of those, 28 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

Onboarding Debt

Onboarding Debt builds up when new starters keep having to work out things the last lot already learned. They piece the job together by watching, trying things and interrupting colleagues for answers. A long apprenticeship can work well when it's deliberately supported. The debt is the time and effort each new arrival could have been spared.

How it behaves. It repeats with every intake. One difficult arrival is just a difficult arrival; the debt shows in each new cohort paying the same tax, while the people who could fix it are too busy doing the work – and every newcomer who gets there the hard way becomes one more person too busy to fix it for the next.

SAMPLE

OD-A Every newcomer works it out alone

No candidate found

New starters learn the same things by trying, watching and asking around. They do get there in the end, which makes onboarding look adequate. The time spent working it all out stays out of sight, and the next group pays for it again.

25 people had a proper look at it. 6 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Information Flow, Deliberate and Resource Visibility.

OD-B Nobody owns the cost of onboarding

No candidate found

Every manager or team absorbs the cost of bringing someone up to speed on their own, out of their own time. Nobody can see what it adds up to across the organisation, and nobody owns fixing it, so the next newcomer repeats the same discovery work.

25 people had a proper look at it. 6 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Resource Visibility and Decide (commitment).

In the same model, strength in Information Flow or Deliberate could get in the way of this route.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.
>
> For Information Flow, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 36. Of those, 32 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

OD-C Too busy to write it down for the next one

No candidate found

A newcomer asks an experienced colleague, gets the answer, and both go back to their current work, so the explanation never becomes part of how things are done. Because the improvised handover worked, the next newcomer has to buy the same answer again from people who are still too busy to write it down.

22 people had a proper look at it. 9 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Slack and Deliberate.

In the same model, strength in Information Flow could get in the way of this route.

> **Evidence the other way**
>
> These don't change the route's result.

SAMPLE

> For Information Flow, the number of people who gave a usable answer was 36. Of those, 32 gave at least one answer describing it as strong.

> No route for Onboarding Debt reached 'Candidate' or 'Thin candidate'. The answers also gave a consistently positive picture of the relevant parts of the system and what happened next. The Condition could still be present.

Analysis Paralysis

Analysis Paralysis is when a decision keeps receding as more information is gathered, more options are modelled and more people are consulted. The cost of waiting grows in the background. A decision that's hard to undo may need real care. The trouble starts when the analysis keeps expanding without ending in a timely commitment people can stand behind.

How it behaves. It gets heavier the longer it runs. Each round of analysis turns up new considerations, the time already invested makes stopping harder, and the world moves on around a decision that hasn't been made. How much analysis there is matters less than the repeated failure to bring it to a close that people will stand behind.

AP-A Nobody with the authority to call it

No candidate found

The evidence is in and the disagreements are visible, but nobody has accepted authority to close the question. So more people and more analysis get added, to build the legitimacy a clear decider would have provided, and each addition brings new considerations and new stakeholders, making the close harder and more politically exposed.

20 people had a proper look at it. 11 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Ownership Clarity, Decide (commitment) and Deliberate.

AP-B Being wrong is costly; delay belongs to nobody

No candidate found

No amount of evidence will make this decision risk-free, and being wrong would be personally costly, while delay belongs to nobody. So the people deciding ask for more evidence, which spreads the responsibility out instead of concentrating it. The extra analysis is praised as diligence, and the safer non-decision lasts while the opportunity, or the situation, moves on.

12 people had a proper look at it. 21 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Psychological Safety and Decide (commitment).

SAMPLE

AP-C Every review adds more reviewers

No candidate found

Disagreement survives the first review, and each attempt to make the decision safer adds another reviewer or another perspective. The cost of coordinating grows faster than discussion can resolve anything, and the mounting uncertainty is taken as proof that still more control is needed before anyone commits.

26 people had a proper look at it. 5 more said they hadn't come across part of it often enough to say, so they didn't count as having a proper look.

In the House Rules model, this route depends on weakness in Trust Default, Discuss and Decide (commitment).

Traits

Traits describe features of how work is set up, such as how information moves or who can make a decision. These results summarise the answers for the read as a whole. People in different parts of the organisation may have had quite different experiences.

Process Elasticity	A varied picture
Follow-Through	Sound
Incentive Alignment	Sound
Information Flow	Sound
Ownership Clarity	Mostly positive
Principle Coherence	A varied picture
Psychological Safety	Sound
Resource Visibility	Sound
Response Variety	Mostly positive
Slack	Sound
Trust Default	Sound

Capabilities

Capabilities describe what an organisation does to keep work moving – spotting what needs attention, talking, thinking things through, deciding, delivering and learning from what happened. The routes show which Capabilities the House Rules model links to each pattern. Home Truths can't assess how well those Capabilities are working; a full House Rules engagement can.

Not in this edition

These Conditions weren't part of this edition: Commitment Inflation, Competence Concentration, Delivery Decoupling, Hero Dependency, Hidden Burnout, Learned Helplessness, Politics, Process Worship and Silo Formation.

SAMPLE

How sensitive this read was – modelled, not measured

The planner estimates how likely the read was to get at least six proper looks and at least three matches for a route, assuming that route was running. These estimates use the plan and its assumptions, independent of the answers received.

The plan assumed that 70% of people would finish and that someone who had a proper look at a running route had a 50% chance of giving answers that matched it. The range comes from testing different assumptions about turnout, proper looks and matches.

The estimates for every route in this read round to the same range, from 53% to 99%.

This report doesn't establish cause, show how widespread or serious a pattern is, or rule a Condition out. Use it to decide what to look at more closely. It's what people described, counted carefully.

SAMPLE