HUMAN ATTENTION: THE MOST VALUABLE RESOURCE ON THE PLANET

Know Your True Worth

The Employee Attention Playbook

John Rector

Fall 2026 Series · First Working Draft

Manifesto

Human attention is the most valuable resource on Earth.

You carry a finite supply of it. Every day the planet turns once and hands you the same gross allocation it hands everyone. You will spend all of it. You cannot save a single unit for tomorrow.

The system is sacred because it is finite. But the price of any one unit is not sacred, and it is not fixed, and it is not stored inside you. The price appears on the demand side — in someone else's uncertainty, and in how fully your attention makes that uncertainty go away.

Your employer is only one demander. A boss, a customer, a coworker, a spouse, a child, a friend, a parent, a client, a community — all of them approach the same finite system you carry. Each is uncertain about something. Each is willing to pay, in money or in love or in loyalty or in trust, to have that uncertainty resolved.

This is not a call to work harder. Working harder is not the same as knowing what you carry.

Know your true worth. Not your wage — your worth. Begin by making an honest, fair-market assessment of the finite attention system you own, and of the demand that surrounds it.

Preface

This playbook exists for one reason. You carry something finite and enormously valuable, and almost no one has ever asked you to account for it honestly.

You have been asked to work harder. You have been asked to be more productive, more engaged, more efficient. You have been measured, reviewed, and ranked. But you have probably never sat down and taken a clear-eyed inventory of the actual resource underneath all of that: the finite human attention system you carry through every hour of every day.

That is what this playbook asks of you. Not more effort. An honest accounting.

The accounting is unusual because the thing being counted behaves strangely. Your attention is finite, like money. But unlike money, its value is not stored inside it. A single unit of your attention has no fixed worth. Its worth appears only when someone else needs it — and needs it badly enough, specifically enough, and at the right moment.

So this is not a book that will tell you that you are priceless, or that you are undervalued, or that you deserve more. It will not flatter you and it will not shame you. It will hand you a way to see the demand that surrounds your attention, and to assess — soberly, without resentment or fantasy — what that attention is actually worth, to whom, and why.

You are not being asked to become someone else. You are being asked to know what you already carry.

That is the whole project. Know your true worth.

Know Your True Worth

Your wage is not your worth.

Your wage is a number that a particular employer, in a particular market, at a particular moment, is willing to pay for a particular slice of your attention. It is real, and it matters, but it is narrow. It is one demander's price for one kind of access. It tells you almost nothing about the full value of the system you carry.

Your human worth is not priced at all. Your worth as a person is not for sale, and this playbook will not pretend to measure it. Keep that separate and keep it safe. Nothing here touches it.

What can be assessed — honestly, like a fair-market appraisal — is the value of the finite attention system you carry, across the different demand contexts you live inside. That value is not one number. It changes depending on who needs your attention, how specific their need is, how uncertain they are that they can get it, and how much hangs on the outcome.

To **Know Your True Worth** is to make that assessment without flinching.

That means no excuses. You do not get to inflate the value of your attention with the story of how hard you try.

It means no justifications. The reasons your attention is hard to reach are not the same as the value it delivers when it arrives.

It means no resentment. The market for your attention is not a verdict on your dignity, and treating it as one will only blur the numbers.

And it means no fantasy. The point is not to imagine what your attention should be worth in a fairer world. The point is to see what it is worth, to whom, right now.

This is an appraisal, not a sentence. An appraiser who lies to spare your feelings is no use to you. Neither is one who lies to wound you. You want the true figure, because only the true figure tells you where you actually stand and what you might actually do.

So begin the way an honest appraiser begins. Quiet the story. Look at the asset. Look at the demand around it. And start counting.

Attention Is Not Time

It is easy to believe you sell time. You clock in, you clock out, you are paid for the hours between. But time is only the container. It is not what is being bought.

Time is uniform and indifferent. An hour passes whether you are present in it or absent from it, whether you are sharp or exhausted, whether you notice everything or nothing. No one actually wants your hours. They want what can happen inside them.

What happens inside them is attention. Attention is the finite conscious pointer you bring to bear on the world — the narrow, moving place where you are actually present. You do not sell time. You sell access to a human attention system, and time is merely the unit in which that access is scheduled.

To account for that system, this playbook uses one practical unit.

One attention unit (AU) equals 200 milliseconds.

This is an accounting convention, not a claim that attention arrives in exact 200-millisecond blocks. It is a human-scale grain that lets us count.

From it:

- 5 AU per second
- 300 AU per minute
- 18,000 AU per hour
- 432,000 gross AU per 24-hour rotation of the Earth

Every human receives the same gross daily allocation. The planet turns once and the same 432,000 units are issued to everyone alive. In duration, we are equals.

This is where most thinking about time goes wrong, and where this playbook turns. The unit standardizes duration. It does not standardize value. Two AU are identical as units of measure and completely different as economic objects. One may be worth nothing. One may be worth a great deal. The difference is not in the unit. The difference is in the demand that meets it.

So hold both facts at once. The supply is finite and equal: 432,000 gross units, no more, the same for all. The value is neither finite-in-the-same-way nor equal at all. It is set elsewhere, by someone else, for reasons we will spend the rest of this playbook making clear.

Equal duration. Unequal value. That gap is your subject.

Attention Is Not Controlled Directly

Everyday language says you *pay* attention, as if it were a coin you hand over by choice. The theory says something more precise, and more useful.

Here is the formal definition this playbook works from:

> *Human attention is the finite conscious pointer produced when the human system integrates, normalizes, and resolves the microtime stream of complex Reality-surprise into a second-scale object of consciousness.*

That sentence is dense. Unpack it slowly, because it changes what you think you are managing.

Beneath your awareness, reality is being compared, constantly and at enormous speed, against what you expected. The Reality Equation names the relationship. Reality is a quotient — what is actual, divided by what you expected:

```
R(t) = A(t) / E(t)
```

Where reality matches expectation, there is nothing to notice. Where it diverges, there is surprise. Surprise is the logarithm of reality:

```
S(t) = Log(R(t))
```

You do not experience this raw stream. It is far too fast and far too much. Your system accumulates surprise across a short window and weighs it:

```
C_W(t) = accumulated surprise over the attention window
```

And then it normalizes that accumulation into the single conscious pointer you actually experience:

```
Attptr(t) = Nrm(C_W(t))
```

That pointer is attention. (The full ladder, with every term defined, is in the notation appendix.)

Read the order of operations carefully. Attention is the **last** step, not the first. It is the output of the system, not an input you supply. It appears where accumulated surprise resolves — where reality has diverged enough from expectation to cross the threshold into consciousness.

This is why the strict claim of the theory is that attention **resolves**. It is not simply given, pointed, aimed, or trained into place by an act of will. You cannot reach into the mechanism and set the pointer down where you would like it. By the time you are conscious of attending to something, the resolving has already happened.

This sounds, at first, like bad news. If you cannot control the one thing this playbook is asking you to account for, what is left to you?

A great deal. But not where most people look for it. The next chapter is about exactly that.

Your Agency Is In The Conditions

You cannot command the pointer. That is settled. But look again at the equation, because it tells you precisely where your agency does live.

```
R(t) = A(t) / E(t)
```

Attention resolves toward unresolved surprise — toward places where reality `R` still diverges from expectation. You cannot move the resolving directly. But you sit upstream of two things that the resolving depends on: the numerator and the denominator.

The numerator is `A`, the actual — what genuinely happens. This is the work you actually deliver, the outcome that actually lands, the thing that is actually true by the end of the day. You have real influence here. What you actually do is the largest lever you hold.

The denominator is `E`, expectation, and it is not simple. Expectation has two parts. One is prediction: what a person has come to expect from you, built up over time from everything they have seen you do. The other is the ideational field: the larger ideas a person carries — fairness, growth, security, belonging — against which they measure what happens. You influence prediction every time you deliver, or fail to deliver, against what someone expected. You engage the ideational field every time your work meets, or misses, an idea that matters to the person in front of you.

So restate your agency carefully, in the theory's own terms. You do not command the pointer, yours or anyone else's. What you shape are the **conditions** under which attention resolves:

- The actual outcomes you produce — the numerator of reality.
- The predictions others hold about you — the steadier half of their expectation.
- The ideational field in play — the ideas a demander carries into the situation.
- The specificity of the attention you are positioned to offer.
- The relationships that consume your attention, and the contexts you work inside.
- The uncertainties your attention is able to convert into certainty.

None of these is the pointer. All of them set the stage on which the pointer resolves — yours and everyone else's.

This is the difference between a fatalist and an appraiser. The fatalist says: I cannot control my attention, so I am powerless. The appraiser says: I cannot control the pointer, but I can read and shape the entire field of conditions around it — and that field is where worth is actually made.

The rest of the playbook is a study of that field.

Price Is The Cost Of Certainty

Now to the engine of the whole playbook.

Price equals marginal value — the worth of the next unit to the person who wants it. That much is ordinary economics. But here is the part that is easy to get wrong, and that this playbook insists you get right:

Price is not uncertainty.

Uncertainty is not the price. Uncertainty is what creates the *need*. Price is what comes next: the amount someone is willing to pay to make the uncertainty go away. Demand-side uncertainty creates value. Price is the cost of converting that uncertainty into certainty.

Say it as a sequence, because the order matters. Someone faces an outcome they are unsure of. The uncertainty creates a need. Resolving the need is worth something to them. The amount they will pay to resolve it is the price. Human attention becomes expensive exactly when it can do that resolving — when it can convert uncertainty into certainty.

Four examples make this concrete.

Pizza. You are hungry. Right now you are uncertain you can resolve that hunger, and the uncertainty is high, so the next slice has high value. You eat. With each slice the hunger resolves and the uncertainty falls, and the value of the next slice falls with it. When you are full, the uncertainty is zero, and the price you would pay for the next slice is zero. Eat past full and the next slice has negative value — you would pay to *not* have it. The slice never changed. Your uncertainty did.

Water before a hurricane. The bottle does not change. The SKU does not change. On an ordinary day you are certain water is available, so uncertainty is low and price is low. A hurricane warning appears and suddenly you are uncertain you can get water at all. The uncertainty jumps, you have a compelling reason to act now, and your willingness to pay climbs. Nothing inside the bottle moved. The uncertainty on the demand side did.

Diamonds and lab-grown diamonds. Resist the reflex to explain this with scarcity. Natural diamonds long carried uncertainty — about access, quality, origin, grading, and trust. That bundle of uncertainty held the price up. Lab-grown diamonds reduce it: production is more predictable, access is easier, quality is more consistent. As the uncertainty falls, the price falls. Scarcity is not the first principle here. Uncertainty is.

The employer. An employer is uncertain about an outcome. Will this project get done? Will it be done correctly? Will it be done on time? Will I have to manage every detail? Will this person notice what matters without being told? Each question is a unit of uncertainty around a result. The wage is not paid for attention in the abstract. It is paid to make those uncertainties go away.

That is the engine. Hold it. Everything else in the playbook runs on it.

The Value Is On The Demand Side

The previous chapter gave you the engine. This one locates the value precisely, so you stop looking for it in the wrong place.

The value is not inside the attention unit itself. The value appears on the demand side.

This is the sentence to memorize, in full:

> *Attention becomes valuable when someone else is uncertain they can get the exact kind of attention they need, at the exact level of specificity they need, at the moment they need it.*

Read what is carrying the weight in that sentence. Not "attention." The words doing the work are *exact kind*, *exact level of specificity*, and *the moment they need it*. Value is not produced by attention in general. It is produced by the fit between a specific need and the specific resolution your attention provides.

This is why specificity is the hinge of price.

Low-specificity attention is attention almost anyone could supply. Because almost anyone could supply it, a demander is rarely uncertain about getting it. Low uncertainty means low willingness to pay. Low specificity tends toward low price.

High-specificity attention is attention only a few could supply, fitted exactly to a need that matters. Now the demander has real reason to doubt they can get it from just anyone, at the right level, at the right time. That doubt is demand-side uncertainty, and it is precisely what they will pay to resolve. High specificity tends to raise uncertainty, and higher uncertainty raises willingness to pay for resolution.

Trace the chain plainly:

- Low specificity → the need is easy to meet → low demand-side uncertainty → low price.
- High specificity → the need is hard to meet exactly → higher demand-side uncertainty → higher willingness to pay for resolution.

Notice what this does to a familiar complaint. "I work just as hard as she does." Effort is on the supply side — it is something you bring. But price is set on the demand side. Two people can spend the same units, with the same effort, and command very different prices, because their attention

resolves very different amounts of someone else's uncertainty, at very different levels of specificity, at very different moments of need.

So when you want to understand the worth of your attention, stop inspecting the unit. Turn around and look at the demand. Ask who is uncertain, about what, how specifically, and how badly. The answer to the value question was never inside you. It was always on the other side.

Three Categories Of Attention Value

With the engine and the location settled, the value your attention carries in any given context falls into one of three categories. Learn the exact definitions. You will use them in every worksheet that follows.

Low-value attention

Low-value attention: easy to find, easy to replace, low specificity.

It resolves little uncertainty because the demander was never uncertain they could get it. Anyone could supply it; the need is generic; the stakes are small.

- *Employer:* showing up and being physically present while the actual work could be done by many others.
- *Spouse:* being in the same room, half-listening, while the conversation could be had with anyone.
- *Child:* a distracted "uh-huh" that acknowledges sound but resolves nothing.
- *Customer:* a generic greeting that any employee on any shift would deliver identically.
- *Friend:* a reply that could have been sent to a group chat without changing a word.

Toxic attention

Toxic attention: creates uncertainty around itself.

This is the category most people miss, so be precise. Toxic attention is not merely low-value. It can have *negative* marginal value, because it *increases* uncertainty rather than resolving it. After receiving toxic attention, the demander needs more attention than before, not less, to get back to where they started.

- *Employer:* work delivered carelessly, so now every output must be checked twice and the manager is less sure of you than before you started.
- *Spouse:* attention given with resentment or contempt, so the relationship is more uncertain after the exchange than before it.
- *Child:* attention that arrives as criticism at the wrong moment, leaving the child more anxious about whether they are safe and seen.

- *Customer:* a confident answer that turns out to be wrong, so the customer now distrusts everything else they were told.
- *Friend:* "support" that competes, one-ups, or makes the friend's problem about you, so they leave less settled than they came.

The test is simple. Did the uncertainty go down, or up? If it went up, the attention was toxic, regardless of how much effort went into it.

High-value attention

High-value attention: resolves uncertainty for someone with a specific, high-stakes need.

It fits an exact need, at the level of specificity required, at the moment it is needed, where the consequence of non-resolution is large.

- *Employer:* a project delivered correctly and on time, where you noticed what mattered without being told, so the manager no longer has to wonder.
- *Spouse:* full presence during a hard decision, exactly when it counts, so a real uncertainty in the partnership is settled.
- *Child:* steady, undivided attention at the moment a child is frightened or proud, answering the unspoken question of whether they matter.
- *Customer:* the precise resolution to the exact problem that brought them in, the first time.
- *Friend:* showing up specifically, at the moment of crisis, in the particular way that only someone who knows them could.

Three categories, one question underneath all of them: did your attention leave the other person more certain, no different, or less? That is the appraisal. Carry it forward.

Resolving Versus Manufacturing Uncertainty

A careful reader reaches this point and sees a tempting shortcut. If demand-side uncertainty raises price, why not raise your price by raising the uncertainty? Become hard to reach. Keep people guessing. Let them wonder whether the work will land, whether you will show up, whether they can count on you. Uncertainty is the lever — so pull it.

Stop. That shortcut walks you directly into the toxic category you just learned to name.

There are two completely different ways your attention can stand in relation to someone's uncertainty, and the playbook draws a hard line between them.

Resolving uncertainty is high-value attention. The demander is unsure about an outcome that matters, and your attention makes the uncertainty go away. They are more certain after you than before. This is the worth you are trying to build.

Manufacturing uncertainty is toxic attention. Here you do not resolve a demander's uncertainty — you *create* it, on purpose, so that resolving it later looks valuable. You introduce doubt where there was none, so your eventual reassurance can be sold back. By the definition in this playbook, that is toxic attention: it raises uncertainty rather than lowering it. The price it appears to command is borrowed against trust, and trust is the account it drains.

Consider a neutral case. A genuinely in-demand specialist is hard to book because many people have a real, specific need that only a few can meet. The scarcity is downstream of real value; the uncertainty about getting them is honest. Their attention, when it arrives, resolves the need. That is high-value attention, and the difficulty of booking it is a true signal.

Now the counterfeit. Someone who is not especially in demand manufactures the *appearance* of being hard to reach — delaying, going quiet, becoming unpredictable — to imitate the signal without the substance. The difficulty is manufactured, not earned. When the attention finally arrives, it resolves no more than it ever did. The signal was the product, and the signal was false.

A brief illustration from outside work, kept strictly as a mechanism. In the old "bad boy" story, one figure is not actually more valuable; he generates uncertainty, and the price others pay is whatever it takes to convert that uncertainty into certainty — commitment, reassurance, exclusivity. Meanwhile the "nice guy" sometimes offers total certainty far too early, so there is nothing left for the demand side to resolve, and the price collapses. This is not a claim about men or women, and it is not advice to withhold. It is a clean view of the mechanism — and a warning. Trading on manufactured uncertainty is a strategy of toxic attention. It can move a price briefly. It cannot build worth.

So keep the line bright. Raise your worth by resolving more uncertainty, more specifically, at higher stakes. Never by manufacturing uncertainty you intend to charge to remove. The first builds an asset. The second spends one.

Know Your Demand-Side Players

You are the accounting subject. That never moves. You are not one role among many — you are the single finite attention system being appraised, and everyone else stands on the demand side of it.

So set the frame correctly. It is not "if you are an employee, a spouse, a parent, a friend." It is this: you carry a finite attention system, and the employer, the boss, the customer, the coworker, the spouse, the child, the friend, the parent, the client, and the community are all demand-side players approaching that same system.

These are your demanders. Demanders are people or human institutions. Each one approaches with a need, and each one wants the next unit of your attention for the same underlying reason — receiving it either increases their own perceived value or converts an uncertainty they carry into certainty.

- The **employer** is uncertain about outcomes and pays to resolve them.
- The **boss** carries the uncertainty down to specific projects and moments.
- The **customer** is uncertain their problem will actually be solved.
- The **coworker** is uncertain whether your part will hold up theirs.
- The **spouse** carries uncertainties about partnership, security, and being known.
- The **child** carries uncertainties about safety, belonging, and mattering.
- The **friend** carries uncertainties that surface exactly when they reach for you.
- The **parent**, the **client**, the **community** — each arrives with their own.

Now a distinction that the rest of your accounting depends on.

Mechanisms are not demanders

Your phone does not want your attention. Your phone is a mechanism. It is a channel through which demanders reach you.

Email, meetings, social media, notifications, calendars, and messaging apps are all mechanisms. They deliver demand. They are not the demanders themselves. Behind every notification is a person or an institution — a boss, a client, a friend, a company — carrying an actual need. The mechanism is just the road the demand travels on.

This matters because mechanisms are designed to feel like demanders. A buzzing phone imitates urgency it does not own. If you treat the mechanism as the demander, you will spend your attention

answering the road instead of the traveler, and your ledger will fill with units that resolved no one's real uncertainty.

Keep the two separate. When attention is being pulled, ask the diagnostic question: *who* is actually demanding here, and *what* are they uncertain about? The phone is never the answer. Some person or institution always is. Find them, and you can appraise the demand. Mistake the mechanism for the demander, and you cannot appraise anything at all.

Ideas On The Demand Side

This chapter goes one layer deeper. Take it slowly, and keep it concrete; it is easy to make this mystical, and it does not need to be.

So far the demand side has been made of people and institutions. Add one more kind of demander, carefully: ideas.

The framing is deliberately reversed from the usual one. We say a person "has" an idea, as if the person owned it and could put it down. The more useful reversal is this: **ideas have people.** People and institutions often carry idea-demands — large, persistent ideas that move through them and press on whoever stands nearby.

Recall the structure of expectation from the equation. Expectation is not just moment-to-moment prediction. It also includes an ideational field — the larger ideas a person measures reality against. When you meet a demander, you are never only meeting the person. You are also meeting the idea they carry, because that idea is part of the expectation your attention will be weighed against.

This is why two bosses with identical job titles can want completely different things from the same unit of your attention. They carry different ideas.

- A **boss** may carry Growth. Or Profit. Or Survival. Or Service. Your attention is measured against whichever idea has that boss.
- A **spouse** may carry Love. Or Partnership. Or Security.
- A **child** may carry Belonging. Or Safety. Or Recognition.
- A **customer** may carry Fairness. Or Trust. Or Resolution.
- A **company**, as an institution, may carry Survival, Profit, Service, Status, or Control.

When your attention resolves the uncertainty that an idea creates in the person carrying it, its value rises sharply — because you are not just answering the person, you are answering the idea that has them. The manager who carries Growth is not finally uncertain about whether a task got done; they are uncertain about whether the thing is *growing*. Attention that speaks to Growth resolves more than attention that merely completes a task.

And it is why mismatches feel so strange. You can complete the work perfectly and still leave a demander unsettled, because the work answered the task but not the idea. You resolved the wrong uncertainty.

Use this layer with discipline. You are not reading minds or assigning people secret essences. You are noticing, from evidence, which large idea seems to be carrying a demander — and recognizing that the highest-value attention resolves uncertainty not only for the person, but for the idea that has them.

Attention Simulations

This chapter is an accounting exercise, not a moral one. It is built on a single fact about the pointer: attention resolves to only one object at a time. Whatever it is resolving toward, it is not resolving toward everything else.

That fact has consequences, and the way to see them is to run the simulation all the way to its limit. For each case below, imagine that all of your attention resolved toward one demander — not for an hour, but as a standing condition. Then follow what happens. The point is not to feel guilty. The point is to see the shape of the trade.

If all your attention resolved toward your employer. The work would reach a level few could match. The employer's uncertainty about you would fall close to zero. And the other demanders would receive nothing. The spouse, the child, the friend would face a system that has gone dark to them. Watch what grows and what decays, and watch whose certainty you bought with whose uncertainty.

If all your attention resolved toward your spouse. One relationship might reach a depth that is rare. And the employer's uncertainty would climb, the work would slip, the friends would fade. Notice that even a beautiful concentration is still a concentration — it is still everything else going unattended.

If all your attention resolved toward your child. The child's deepest question — am I safe, do I belong, do I matter — would be answered without pause. And every other account would run unattended, possibly including the income that keeps the child safe in the first place. See how even the most defensible total claim still has a full cost on the other side.

If all your attention resolved toward your friends. The social world would be rich and immediate. And the employer, the spouse, the child would be standing in a room you have left. Notice how quickly a pleasant default becomes an expensive one when it runs without limit.

If all your attention resolved toward one idea. A single idea — a project, a cause, a vision — would receive the kind of undivided resolving that produces real work. And every person in your life would become, to that idea, an interruption. Notice what it is like to be on the demand side of someone who has been wholly taken by an idea.

After each, ask the ledger's questions, not the conscience's: What improved? What decayed? Whose uncertainty fell, and whose rose to pay for it? What would this cost if it continued for a year?

No one resolves all their attention toward a single object, and the exercise is not telling you to choose one. It is showing you, in stark form, that every unit that resolves toward one demander is a unit that did not resolve toward another. That is not a guilt. It is the budget. Knowing the budget is the beginning of spending it on purpose.

AI As A Secondary Mechanism

AI appears now, and not before, on purpose. AI is secondary. This playbook is not about AI. It is about knowing the worth of the finite attention system you carry. AI matters here only because it changes the economics of that system — and it is a mechanism, not a demander. It does not want your attention. It changes the conditions under which your attention has value.

It does so along three lines.

Accessibility. The same class of AI tools is now available to people who historically lacked access to elite tutors, advisors, analysts, programmers, and institutional support. Capabilities that once required money, credentials, or connections are reachable by far more people. For your attention's worth, this cuts two ways: the uncertainties that used to be resolvable only by a scarce few are now resolvable more widely, which lowers the price of resolving them — and at the same time, you can now resolve uncertainties you previously could not touch.

Autonomy. AI can work while your conscious attention is somewhere else. It does not need you present, watching, for its output to be produced. Work that once required your pointer to be on it can now proceed while your pointer is elsewhere.

Answers. AI can supply explanations, drafts, analysis, tutoring, planning, coding, simulation, and decision support at the moment of need. The gap between having a question and having an answer narrows toward zero, which directly changes how much demand-side uncertainty a human is paid to resolve.

These three together produce a new condition worth naming.

Parality. Parality is the AI-era capacity for work to continue in parallel with your conscious attention. Mobility once freed work from a fixed place; you no longer had to be in the building. Parality frees work from one-at-a-time human presence; the work no longer has to wait for your single pointer to arrive.

Here is the guardrail, and it is the whole point. Parality does **not** give you a second attention pointer. Nothing in this playbook claims the human gains multiple pointers. The human pointer remains singular — it still resolves to one object at a time, exactly as before. What changes is that AI systems can produce work in parallel while your attention resolves elsewhere. The parallelism lives in the machines, not in your consciousness.

For your appraisal, the consequence is direct. When a demander's uncertainty can be resolved by a tool they could run themselves, the price of your attention for that uncertainty falls. Your worth

concentrates wherever resolution still genuinely requires *you* — the specific, high-stakes uncertainties that the accessible, autonomous, answer-giving mechanism cannot make go away on its own. Bad uses of these tools capture attention. Good uses return it. Either way, the tool is a mechanism. You are still the one being appraised.

The Employee's Fair-Market Assessment

Everything to here was preparation. Now turn the appraisal inward. These questions are not a quiz with right answers. They are the structured way to assess the fair market value of the attention system you carry. Answer them about yourself, in your actual situation, with the honesty of an appraiser who has nothing to gain from a flattering number.

Work through them slowly. The worksheets in this kit give you space to write; this chapter gives you the questions and what each one is really asking.

What kind of uncertainty does my employer currently believe my attention resolves? Not what you hope. What they actually behave as if you resolve. Watch what they stop checking when your name is on it, and what they keep checking.

What uncertainty does my attention create? Be willing to find some. Does anything about your attention leave a demander less sure than before — about quality, reliability, or what you will do next? This is the toxic column, and pretending it is empty is the fastest way to misprice yourself.

What uncertainty does my attention fail to resolve? Different from creating uncertainty. Where do people still have to wonder, follow up, or fill a gap because your attention stopped short of resolving the thing fully?

Is my attention easy to replace? Honestly, how many others could resolve the same uncertainty at the same level? The answer sets how much demand-side uncertainty surrounds getting *you* in particular.

How specific is the attention I provide? Generic and substitutable, or fitted exactly to a particular need at a particular level? Recall that specificity is the hinge of price.

Who currently has a compelling reason to seek my next attention unit? A compelling reason means real uncertainty plus real stakes plus the right moment. Name the actual people and institutions, not a vague sense of being needed.

Who treats my attention as low-value? Where is it taken as easy to find and easy to replace? Their behavior is data, not insult.

Who treats it as high-value? Where do people wait for you specifically, protect your access, or pay a premium to get it? That is where your worth is already concentrated.

Where does my attention produce certainty? Map the places where, after you, people are more settled, more sure, more able to move.

Where does my attention produce uncertainty? Map the places where, after you, people are less settled. Then decide what to do about each one.

Two disciplines while you answer. First, stay the accounting subject — every question is about your system and the demand around it, never a referendum on your worth as a person. Second, prefer evidence to story. Behavior over intention; what demanders actually do over what you meant. An honest fair-market assessment is built from observable demand, not from how hard the day felt.

Closing

Return to where this began, now that you have the whole picture.

Know your true worth.

Your wage is not your worth. It is one demander's price for one kind of access, set in one market, at one moment. It is real, and it is narrow, and it was never the measure of what you carry.

Your attention is finite. The planet turns once and hands you the same gross allocation it hands everyone, and you spend all of it, every day, with nothing carried over. The supply is fixed and equal.

Its value is not. The value of your attention is not stored inside the unit. It appears on the demand side — in someone else's uncertainty, and in how fully your attention makes that uncertainty go away.

So the fair market value of your attention depends on exactly one thing: the uncertainty it can convert into certainty. The more specific the need, the higher the stakes, the harder you are to replace, and the more completely your attention resolves the doubt — the more your attention is worth. Not because you tried harder. Because, on the demand side, you made more uncertainty go away.

This is why your first responsibility is not to work harder. Working harder spends more units without telling you what they are worth. Your first responsibility is to know what you carry: the finite system, the demand around it, the uncertainties you can resolve and the ones you cannot, the places you create certainty and the places you create doubt.

Know what you carry. Appraise it honestly. Spend it on purpose.

That is what it means to know your true worth.

Appendix — The Reality Equation Notation

This appendix defines the formal ladder the playbook draws on. It is reproduced from John Rector's *The Reality Equation* (2026) and the accompanying attention series. It is presented as a formal model of how attention resolves. It is not offered as a settled biological claim, and the model does not depend on pretending the final biological function is already known.

Read this once if the symbols in Chapters 03 and 04 were unfamiliar. You do not need to manipulate the equations to use the playbook; you need to understand what each term is.

The ladder

```
E(t) = P(t) + iI(t)

R(t) = A(t) / E(t)

S(t) = Log(R(t))

C_W(t) = ∫  K_W(t − τ) · Log(R(τ)) dτ      (integral over the window t−W to
t)

Attptr(t) = Nrm(C_W(t))
```

Term by term

Expectation is complex: `E(t) = P(t) + iI(t)`. Expectation has two components. `P(t)` is the subconscious prediction machine — the always-on system forecasting what comes next. `I(t)` is the ideational field — the larger ideas against which experience is measured. Because expectation has these two parts, it is modeled as a complex number, with prediction on the real axis and the ideational component on the imaginary axis. This is the formal home of "ideas on the demand side."

Reality is a quotient: `R(t) = A(t) / E(t)`. `A(t)` is the Actual — what actually happened. Reality is not identical to what happened. Reality is what results when the Actual is divided by Expectation. Where the actual matches expectation, the quotient sits near 1.

Surprise is the logarithm of reality: `S(t) = Log(R(t))`. Reality by itself is not yet surprise. Surprise is the (complex) logarithm of reality — the mathematical distance between reality and expectation. In the simplified scalar case, `S = ln(R)`: when `R = 1`, surprise is 0; when `R > 1`,

surprise is positive; when `R < 1`, surprise is negative. In the full model, surprise is complex: `S(t) = ln|R(t)| + i·Arg(R(t))`, carrying both magnitude and orientation.

Accumulated surprise: `C_W(t).` The human does not experience instantaneous surprise. The system accumulates surprise across an attention window `W`, weighted by a kernel `K_W` that integrates to 1. This is the first normalization: it keeps a single conscious second from becoming a raw explosion of microtime updates.

The attention pointer: `Attptr(t) = Nrm(C_W(t)).` The system renormalizes accumulated surprise into the finite conscious pointer. The pointer has an intensity, `D_att(t) = |Attptr(t)|`, and a direction, `θ_att(t) = Arg(Attptr(t))`. Mapping that direction to a named object of consciousness — hunger, threat, beauty, an insult, an opportunity — requires an additional semantic layer. The equation gives the pointer; the semantic layer names what it points toward.

Scale separation

```
ε = 10⁻¹² seconds      (microtime update scale, one picosecond)
W = 1 second           (default conscious attention window)
N = W / ε = 10¹²        (microtime updates per conscious second)
```

Reality updates at microtime. Attention appears at conscious time. The enormous ratio between them is why attention must be accumulated and renormalized rather than experienced raw. These specific values define the formal model's scale; they are not presented as established physiology.

Why this matters for the playbook

Three consequences carry directly into the chapters.

First, **attention is the output of the ladder, not the input.** It is the final, renormalized object. This is the formal basis for the claim that attention resolves rather than being directly controlled.

First-principles agency follows from the same ladder. You cannot set `Attptr` by will, but you sit upstream of `A` (the actual outcomes you produce) and of `E` (the predictions and ideas others hold). Shaping those conditions is where your agency lives.

And the demand-side reading of value follows too. High-value attention drives a demander's reality toward their expectation — `R → 1`, `S → 0` — which is the formal way of saying it makes their uncertainty go away.

Source

John Rector, *The Reality Equation* (2026). Companion materials at reality-equation.com, including "Expectation Is Complex," "Surprise Is The Logarithm Of Reality," and "Attention Is Normalized Accumulated Surprise."