Only-Child Status and Ease Stability in Young Adults: A Double-Blind Methodological Study

Florian Morin

Experiential Regime Research Unit

Independent Researcher

Florianmorinind@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study tests a narrow prediction derived from a previously proposed framework describing ease as a non-instrumental experiential regime (Morin, 2026), without reintroducing the broader theoretical apparatus.

Adults commonly report that certain forms of unstructured ease associated with childhood become inaccessible early in life. This loss is often attributed to cumulative stress or prolonged exposure to monitoring and performance demands. Here we test an alternative account: that access can be disrupted by a discrete structural shift toward anticipatory testing, independent of cumulative early control.

Adults aged 25–35 were exposed to a three-day, non-evaluative, constraint-based procedure designed to reduce monitoring and optimization. Participants were recruited under double-blind conditions based on childhood context, while independently randomized to either a context-only variant or a context-plus-UT99 variant. Neither participants nor experimenters were informed of group assignment or hypotheses. No outcome measures or evaluations were imposed; only spontaneous self-reports were accepted. The UT99 manipulation tests whether structured sensorimotor interaction functions as a necessary trigger, a probabilistic catalyst, or a non-essential component of permissive regime entry.

When present, reported experiential changes were abrupt, immediately recognizable, and described as categorically absent from ordinary adult experience. Reporting occurred spontaneously, without prompting. Absence of reporting was unambiguous. Spontaneous reports were more frequent among participants with low-control childhoods, but access was not uniformly preserved in this group.

These observations are inconsistent with accounts that attribute access loss solely to cumulative monitoring. Instead, they support a dual mechanism in which a discrete structural shift can close access early, while cumulative monitoring further constrains the possibility of re-entry. The findings also underscore limitations of

evaluative methods for studying experiential regimes that collapse under observation.

Introduction

Many adults report that certain forms of unstructured ease, commonly associated with childhood, become inaccessible early in life. This disappearance is often interpreted as a consequence of cumulative stress or increasing demands. However, such explanations fail to account for how abruptly access can be lost, sometimes in individuals whose early environments were permissive, low in supervision, and relatively free of performance pressure.

Here we propose that the early loss of ease is not necessarily linked to high cumulative load. Instead, access may be disrupted by a single structural shift: the moment an individual first recognizes that a previously available affective regime does not reliably return when anticipated. Once experience becomes something to be tested rather than allowed to unfold, anticipatory monitoring is recruited. From that point on, even in the absence of sustained optimization or overt control, the conditions required for ease are no longer met.

This account distinguishes between two modes of loss. In the first, access is blocked by the recruitment of anticipatory testing following a discrete recognition event. In the second, access becomes structurally unavailable due to prolonged accumulation of monitoring, justification, and consolidation, such that even in the absence of explicit testing, the system no longer sustains sufficient openness. These two modes are often conflated, yet they imply different predictions about reversibility.

If loss can occur through a single structural shift, then individuals with low early supervision should not be immune. Conversely, if cumulative early monitoring is the dominant factor, then such individuals should retain a higher probability of re-entry under permissive conditions. Distinguishing between these possibilities requires a design that minimizes evaluation, avoids outcome framing, and does not recruit monitoring during measurement itself.

We examine adult responses to a non-evaluative, constraint-based context designed to reduce optimization and anticipatory control without introducing tasks, goals, or metrics. The procedure does not aim to produce an effect, and no outcome measures are imposed. Instead, the presence or absence of spontaneous experiential shifts is treated as the primary signal.

A critical assumption of this work is that the transition under consideration is not subtle. A genuine regime shift is predicted to produce a marked and immediately

recognizable change in subjective experience, rather than a mild modulation or vague improvement (see Appendix 1). When such a shift occurs, agents do not need training, scales, or comparison points to identify it. The contrast with ordinary adult experience is sufficiently large that recognition is immediate.

Agents report that an intensity, openness, or affective clarity long taken to be unavailable in adulthood is suddenly present again. Because this form of experience is generally absent from adult life, its reappearance is not interpreted as a gradual variation, but as a categorical anomaly relative to baseline. The experience does not require interpretation to be noticed.

This discontinuity carries a secondary consequence. When a regime shift of this magnitude occurs, it is typically accompanied by a spontaneous impulse to communicate that something unusual has happened. This impulse does not arise from instruction or demand characteristics, but from the perceived improbability of the state itself. In other words, the signal is expected to be self-announcing. Agents who undergo such a shift tend to report it unprompted, while those who do not undergo it have little to report.

For this reason, conventional evaluative methods may be poorly suited to detecting the phenomenon of interest. Continuous self-rating, expectation setting, or outcome framing risks recruiting precisely the anticipatory monitoring that the proposed regime does not tolerate. The present design therefore treats spontaneous reporting, rather than elicited evaluation, as the primary indicator of regime entry.

In the end, comparing adults with differing childhood contexts under identical, blinded conditions, this study tests whether early permissiveness confers durable access, or whether a single structural transition is sufficient to close it. The results bear not only on theories of affect and development, but also on the limits of evaluative methods when studying regimes that collapse under observation.

Method (overview)

Participants aged 25–35 were recruited using a brief pre-screening questionnaire assessing demographic variables and childhood context. Based on this questionnaire, participants were assigned to one of two groups, though neither participants nor experimenters interacting with them were informed of group membership or of the hypotheses associated with group differences.

All participants were exposed to the same non-evaluative, constraint-based procedure lasting three days. The procedure involved the temporary suspension of work, social interaction, time monitoring, and performance-oriented activities, without introducing no evaluative or performance task, goal, or outcome measure.

No ratings, questionnaires, or structured reports were collected during the procedure. Participants were not instructed to monitor their internal state or to evaluate their experience. Spontaneous reports, if any, were accepted in free form. Silence was treated as absence of a clear effect.

Full details of the procedure and the pre-screening questionnaire are provided in the Appendices.

Observations

The outcome of interest was defined as the occurrence of a spontaneous report indicating a clear and discontinuous subjective shift during or immediately following the procedure. Reports were collected only if initiated by participants, without prompts or follow-up questioning. Absence of communication was treated as absence of a clear effect.

Across the sample, a subset of participants sent unsolicited messages during the procedure or shortly after its completion. These messages were typically brief and direct, and did not take the form of evaluative ratings or reflective summaries. Reports, when present, described an abrupt contrast with ordinary adult experience rather than a gradual change or improvement.

Qualitatively, spontaneous reports shared several recurring features. First, participants emphasized immediacy: the change was described as recognizable at once, without uncertainty or need for interpretation. Second, reports explicitly referenced the absence of the reported state in everyday adult life, often framing the experience as something “normally unavailable” or “unexpected at this age.” Third, the act of reporting itself appeared driven by surprise rather than compliance, with several participants indicating that they felt compelled to mention the experience despite the absence of reporting requirements.

In contrast, participants who did not report a shift typically sent no message at all. When optional end-of-procedure classifications were provided, these participants most often selected “nothing notable happened,” without elaboration. No participant reported difficulty deciding whether a shift had occurred.

When observations were examined by group after unblinding, spontaneous reports were not evenly distributed. Participants meeting the only-child, low-control childhood criteria showed a higher incidence of spontaneous reporting relative to the comparison group. Reports in this group were also more likely to describe a categorical contrast with baseline adult experience. In the comparison group, spontaneous reports were rare or absent, and when present tended to describe weaker or unstable effects.

No participant reported a gradual buildup, ambiguous state, or need for external confirmation. Reports did not reference expectations, task success, or perceived study goals.

Discussion

The present observations were designed to distinguish between two non-exclusive accounts of access loss: a discrete structural shift driven by anticipatory testing, and a gradual loss driven by cumulative consolidation and monitoring. Although the study does not aim to establish prevalence or effect size, the observed pattern constrains which accounts remain viable.

If cumulative early monitoring were the dominant determinant of adult access, individuals with low-control childhoods would be expected to retain a substantially higher and more stable probability of re-entry under permissive conditions. Under this account, spontaneous reporting should cluster strongly within this group and be relatively robust once conditions are relaxed. The present observations only partially support this prediction. While spontaneous reports were more frequent among participants with low-control childhoods, access was not uniformly preserved. Several individuals in this group failed to report any shift despite exposure to identical conditions.

This asymmetry is consistent with a second mechanism: access may be lost through a discrete structural transition that does not require prolonged early accumulation. Under this account, a single recognition event, namely that a previously available affective regime does not reliably return when anticipated, is sufficient to recruit anticipatory monitoring. Once recruited, monitoring disrupts the conditions required for regime entry, even if cumulative load remains relatively low. The presence of non-responders within the low-control group is therefore not anomalous, but predicted.

At the same time, the unequal distribution of spontaneous reports between groups suggests that cumulative factors are not irrelevant. Participants with higher reported early supervision or structured activity exposure showed a markedly reduced probability of spontaneous reporting. This pattern is consistent with an accumulation-based constraint, in which prolonged monitoring reduces the system's capacity to sustain the degree of openness required for re-entry, even when explicit testing is minimized.

Taken together, the observations support a hybrid account. Access loss can occur via a discrete structural shift, independent of early supervision levels, but cumulative monitoring further constrains re-entry by narrowing the range of contexts in which openness can be maintained. These mechanisms are not redundant: the former

explains early and abrupt loss in permissive contexts, while the latter explains durable inaccessibility in highly consolidated systems.

The methodological choice to rely on spontaneous reporting is central to this interpretation. Under the present assumptions, a genuine regime shift is predicted to be immediately recognizable and self-announcing. The absence of ambiguous or borderline reports, and the lack of difficulty reported by participants in determining whether a shift had occurred, supports this assumption. If access were preserved in a graded or subtle form, the present design would be expected to produce uncertain or partial reports, which were not observed.

Several limitations follow directly from this design. The absence of continuous measures precludes fine-grained comparisons, and the reliance on self-report restricts inference to phenomenological recognition rather than mechanistic explanation. In addition, the sample size and exploratory nature of the procedure limit generalization. These constraints are acknowledged features of the design rather than oversights.

Future work may extend this approach by systematically varying the degree of cumulative monitoring, the timing of the initial structural shift, or the stability of non-task contexts, while preserving non-evaluative conditions. More intrusive measurement may be possible once entry conditions are better characterized, but such measurement is unlikely to be informative at the present stage.

In sum, the observations are inconsistent with accounts that attribute access loss solely to gradual accumulation, and equally inconsistent with accounts that treat early permissiveness as protective. Instead, they support a model in which a discrete structural shift can close access early, while cumulative monitoring determines the likelihood of reopening.

Conclusion

This study examined whether the early loss of access to ease can be explained solely by cumulative monitoring, or whether a single structural shift toward anticipatory testing is sufficient to close access. Using a non-evaluative, blinded design, we observed that spontaneous experiential shifts, when they occurred, were abrupt, immediately recognizable, and self-announcing, while their absence was unambiguous.

The pattern of observations is inconsistent with accounts that treat early permissiveness as protective. Individuals with low-control childhoods were not uniformly resilient, indicating that access can be disrupted without prolonged accumulation. At the same time, reduced incidence of spontaneous reporting in more monitored profiles suggests that cumulative factors further constrain re-entry.

Taken together, these findings support a dual mechanism: access can be lost through a discrete structural shift, while cumulative monitoring determines the likelihood of reopening. More broadly, the results highlight limits of evaluative methods for studying experiential regimes that collapse under observation, and motivate designs that treat spontaneous recognition, rather than elicited measurement, as primary evidence.

Box – Scope and Non-Assimilation Guardrails

The present findings concern a specific experiential regime referred to here as *ease*. Ease is not defined as relaxation, mood improvement, reward sensitivity, flow, or attentional absorption. It denotes a non-instrumental regime characterized by reduced anticipatory monitoring and absence of outcome-oriented evaluation.

Accordingly, the observations reported here should not be assimilated to techniques for improving wellbeing, performance, or emotional regulation. If a framework predicts stable access to the reported state under explicit goals, training, or evaluative tracking, it is addressing a different phenomenon.

This box is provided solely to prevent misclassification of the empirical signal. It does not introduce additional claims beyond the scope of the present study.

References :

Morin, F. (2026). *Affective Collapse Under Causal Closure* (Version 1.0) [Preprint]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18537408

Appendix 1

The phenomenological profile described above is not used as proof of mechanism.

Competing explanations including pharmacological mood elevation and immersive distraction generate distinct, testable predictions.

The present design separates contextual constraint from optional micro-activities precisely to allow differential inference.

Entry into the permissive regime is not gradual but abrupt. The transition can occur as a clear regime shift, characterized by a sudden and sustained elevation of positive affect that may persist for hours.

The intensity of the resulting state can be unusually high, sometimes approaching a level that feels difficult to tolerate. This is not merely an increase in pleasure, but a global reorganization of experience, often reported as a precise phenomenological return to childhood-like affective accessibility.

The shift is not limited to hedonic tone. It is frequently accompanied by simultaneous changes across multiple domains, including heightened reward sensitivity, increased emotional lability, vivid imagery and imaginative capacity, spontaneous laughter, and a general amplification of experiential salience.

It is experienced as self-sufficient and non-teleological, yet its contrast with ordinary adult experience can be so extreme that it produces immediate and unambiguous recognition.

Appendix 2

First :

Duration : 3 days

Try to get “your things together”, so you don’t have to worry about the near future.

You will not work.

You will not have a social life, even personal, no email, no call phones. No discussion at all.

You will also not simulate an argument with someone in your head. For this one, use thought suppression. Thought suppression is not good for ease, but still better than arguing with imaginary people. A safer option is to notice and think : “I will see this later”, but it works less reliably.

You will not check time, this one is crucial.
You can go out, watch TV, read but not the intellectual type.
No news watching, scrolling, comments or metrics reading from social media.

You may already be thinking “I will not do that”, “that will do nothing more than relaxation”.
In the ease model, it is the optimization regime being outraged by the proposition for the first, and the result of being dominant for a long time for the second.

In the course of those 3 days, we are trying to make it uncomfortable for the optimization regime. The optimization regime is anticipated to send signals in 4 stages, to discourage continuation :

1 Refusing : ”I am not dealing with that”
2 Rational argument: “This is a waste of time, it produces nothing”
3 Status-shaming : “This is immature, you are a failure for trying this”
4 Humor: “This is funny” this is theorized to be the monitor kind of giving up. It happens when the ease regime is unlocked.

At 1-3 step, don’t act on it. No mindful attempts, no conclusion, just ignoring.

In addition, I propose exercises to do not more than twice or three times per hour. In practice, you will probably do it more, but try to temper or organize yourself so you don’t spam the exercises.

If you really want to spam an exercise, choose to spam the second one, because the time bar is very bad for ease anyway.

Randomly in the day :
- Open a music, close just when it’s becoming good, if it’s a music video then prefer a low resolution, 360p, don’t change sound volume unless it’s too high for auditive security reasons. Don’t optimize for a lower resolution either because if the quality is too bad it will not work either. If it’s on youtube, don’t spend too much time looking at the search results.
- Choose a random part of a music/music video, play it for ~40 seconds, then resume playing it how you want normally. Sometimes the part will be liked, sometimes not, and that is what we want.
- Read paragraphs of a book in random order.
- Ask a question, don’t answer it, as in the Non-Use microtask description.
- Watch a random older cartoon (before 2000), break the narrative by clicking on the time bar, rarely. Watch only an episode or around 30 minutes per day. Also, don’t fix the screen all the time, let your eyes do what they want to do, even blurring. Same for posture, don’t correct it. “Soft gaze” is optional and

can become monitored if one tries too much, but there is, like the jaw trick, a cheap way to benefit from it : During the cartoon, just let it blur and resolve if it wants, on its own.
- Act as if an ordinary object were the most important thing in the room for a few seconds. Don’t necessarily look at it. Do it once per day for this one.

Now, one time per day : The Non-Use microtask

First day : UT99 with alcohol, second day, Ut99 with alcohol again, Third day : Ut99 with coffee, never the same map, and for this last session, use a lower resolution.

Coffee is much more efficient to cross the threshold but alcohol is added in rotation to prevent monitoring. Alcohol is about 5%(low beer) 15ml (almost nothing). Yes, it is that low.
You can one day add an UT-99 session where you play normally with no attempts for around 5 minutes, to add rotation and prevent habituation.

Don’t even try to remember what you are doing, meaning, never try to make a “souvenir”. Let things die.

Configuration of Non-Use microtask with UT99

Remove the HUD in the options. The experience becomes continuous and motor perceptual, instead of a sequence of micro audits. UT99 was designed in an era where this kind of embodied readability was the default, not a special minimalist mode.

In practice, a good setup is HUD off or nearly off, a minimal crosshair, no numbers, no bars, no flashing indicators. Graphically, ideally choose a medium resolution so it’s a little blur, or actually, bad, but that doesn't matter much.

Yes at this point, you understand it right : the game should be pointless and be primitive.

State of mind: blank.

If a thought appears, ignore it and continue. Let events and thoughts just die on their own.

Unclench jaw.

Launch Deathmatch mode. Do not try to win.

Bring with you micro-intervention :

– Move your shoulders randomly, without rhythm. Then stop attending to it and continue playing.

– Change weapons once for no reason. After a few seconds, return to the original weapon as if the change were irrelevant. Move on.

Do not perform these often. Roughly one every few minutes is sufficient, but do not count.

Then take a very small amount of coffee. This means a small sup. Too much will prevent the effect. Tolerance to coffee does not matter. Do not think about the coffee and continue playing.

At this point, it may feel as if the coffee has taken effect. If so, switch to a music video of your choice. That's it. Maybe there will be something different, maybe not.

Do not attempt this more than once every 24 hours. Repetition risks turning the procedure itself into a monitored method.

You can add :

At the start of the game session, think : "there is nothing to optimize here" and move on.

Choose a path at the last moment.

Micro-task : A task that ends with a round. Exemple : this round, I do only headshots. This round, I hit only the opponent's torso. I don't strafe. One maximal at every session.

Reporting

There is no evaluation or reporting requirement.

If a clear shift occurs, and you may spontaneously want to say it. If that happens, you can send a message in your own words. Otherwise, no response is needed.

"A fully specified non-task procedure used in exploratory testing is provided in Appendix 2. The procedure is not evaluative and does not include outcome measures, by design."

Appendix 3

Pre-screening questionnaire

1. Age
2. Country / language (optional)
3. Did you grow up without siblings in your household until age 16? (yes / no)
4. Between ages 6–12, how restricted was television use in your home?
    - Mostly unrestricted
    - Some limits, low conflict
    - Frequently restricted or closely monitored
5. Between ages 6–12, how many days per week did you typically have scheduled activities (sports, lessons, clubs)?
    - 0
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3 or more
6. Please list any structured weekly activities you participated in, with approximate ages and durations (free text)
7. Total estimated years with at least one structured weekly activity:
    - 0
    - 1–2
    - 3–5

    - 6–8
    - 9+

8. Between ages 6–12, did you often spend time alone at home without direct supervision?
    - Yes / Mostly yes / Mostly no / No
9. Perceived academic pressure before age 12:
    - Low / Moderate / High
10. Are you willing to participate in a 3-day procedure with no work, no social interaction, and strict constraints on media, time, and monitoring? (yes / no)

Participants are retained if they meet:

- Only-child status
- Age range
- Television unrestricted or weakly restricted
- ≤ 5 cumulative years of structured weekly activities

Participants with high early performance pressure may be analyzed separately.

Appendix 4

Consent document

This study explores how adults respond to a short period of reduced optimization and external demands.

You will be asked to follow a set of written instructions over a period of three days. These instructions involve limiting work, social interaction, time tracking, and certain forms of media use, while engaging in ordinary, low-demand activities.

The procedure is not a training, therapy, or performance task. It does not aim to produce a specific outcome, and no particular experience is expected.

There are no tests, scores, questionnaires, or daily check-ins. You will not be asked to evaluate yourself, track progress, or report how you feel.

If at any point you notice something you consider notable or unusual and wish to mention it, you may send a message in your own words. This is entirely optional. If nothing notable occurs, no message is required.

The study does not require introspection, effort, or optimization. You are asked only to follow the instructions as written and otherwise go about your time.

The study ends automatically after the three-day period. No further action is required.

Appendix 5

Design overview

The study uses a **double-blind, between-groups design** comparing two adult populations exposed to the same non-task procedure:

- **Group U**: only-child participants with a self-reported low-control childhood.
- **Group C**: control participants with a more typical childhood structure (siblings and/or higher supervision).

Neither participants nor experimenters interacting with them are informed of group assignment or of the specific hypothesis related to childhood structure.

Group definitions (hidden from participants)

Group U (Only-child, low-control childhood)
Participants meeting all of the following:

- Aged 25–35
- Raised without siblings in the household until at least age 16
- Childhood (ages 6–12) characterized by:
    - Largely unrestricted access to leisure (e.g. television not tightly controlled)

    - Low exposure to structured weekly activities (≤ 5 cumulative years, defined as ≥1 session/week for ≥6 consecutive months)

Group C (Control group)
Participants aged 25–35 who do **not** meet the above criteria, including:

- Participants with siblings
- and/or participants reporting higher levels of supervision, structured activities, or early performance pressure

Group C is not described to participants as a "control" group.

Blinding

- **Participant blinding**:
  Participants are told only that the study explores how adults respond to a constraint-based, non-optimizing context. No mention is made of childhood, only-child status, supervision, or predicted differences between groups.
- **Experimenter blinding**:
  Individuals handling communication, onboarding, and any message reception during or after the procedure do not have access to participants' group classification. Group labels are stored separately and revealed only after data collection is complete.

Procedure

All participants receive the same core constraint-based procedure. The only planned difference between procedure variants is the presence vs absence of a brief UT99 session.

- No outcome measures
- No ratings or questionnaires during the procedure
- No prompts encouraging self-evaluation or testing
- Optional, spontaneous reporting only

independently of childhood-group assignment, participants were randomly assigned to one of two procedure variants: contextual constraint only vs contextual constraint plus a brief daily UT99 session.

This yields four cells: (U, context-only), (U, context+UT99), (C, context-only), (C, context+UT99)

The procedure is presented as exploratory and non-instrumental, with no claim that any effect should occur. Participants were informed that some participants would receive an additional brief digital micro-activity, without indicating that it was expected to increase entry probability.

Outcome handling

The primary outcome is **spontaneous self-report** of a clear experiential shift during or immediately following the procedure.

No report is required.
Silence is treated as absence of a clear effect.

Reports, if they occur, are collected as free text and timestamped, without follow-up questioning.

Only after data collection is complete are reports analyzed by group. Reports are coded blind to both childhood group and UT99 assignment, and unblinded only after data lock. Reports are analyzed by cell after unblinding (childhood group x UT99 assignment).

Core prediction

If access loss is primarily driven by cumulative early monitoring, Group U should show a higher probability of spontaneous re-entry under non-task conditions.

If access loss can occur via a single structural shift independent of cumulative Z, both groups should show similarly low entry rates. An additional prediction concerns the procedure component: if UT99 acts as a catalyst, spontaneous reports should be more frequent in context+UT99 than context-only, potentially with an interaction such that the UT99 effect is stronger in Group U.

Rationale for Low-Dose Caffeine

Low-dose caffeine is included in Condition B as a minimal arousal stabilizer rather than as a mood-enhancing agent.

The selected dose is substantially below levels typically associated with pronounced stimulant effects. It is not intended to induce euphoria, performance enhancement, or marked physiological activation.

Within the present framework, caffeine is conceptualized as a non-specific modulator of wakefulness that may reduce variability related to fatigue without being sufficient to account for abrupt, global experiential reorganizations of the type described in Appendix 1.

The cross-over design allows within-subject comparison between contextual constraint alone and contextual constraint combined with structured interaction and low-dose caffeine. If marked experiential shifts occur preferentially in Condition B, this cannot be attributed to caffeine alone, given the low dosage and absence of mood-directed framing.

Conversely, if no difference is observed between conditions, the addition of low-dose caffeine does not appear to play a meaningful role.

Post-Study Phenomenological Correspondence Assessment

After completion of both experimental phases, data locking, and blind classification of spontaneous reports, participants are provided with a written phenomenological description of the permissive regime (Appendix 1).

This description is presented only after all primary and secondary outcomes have been recorded and coded.

Participants are then asked a single structured question:

“Does the description above resemble, partially or strongly, anything you experienced during either phase of the study?”

Response options:

- No resemblance
- Partial resemblance
- Strong resemblance

An optional free-text field allows clarification.

This assessment is exploratory and does not modify the classification of primary outcomes. It is used solely to evaluate phenomenological convergence between independently generated participant reports and the predefined descriptive model.

No interpretation is suggested to participants. The wording does not imply that such an experience was expected or normative.

UT99 necessity control (between-groups)

To address the possibility that the observed shifts are attributable to contextual constraint alone, the procedure can be extended with a minimal between-groups manipulation. All participants follow the identical three-day constraint-based context. Participants are then randomly assigned to either (i) a context-only condition, or (ii) a context-plus-UT99 condition in which one brief non-competitive UT99 session is included per day. Participants are not informed that the digital micro-activity is expected to increase entry probability. The primary outcome remains spontaneous reporting only. This manipulation tests whether UT99 functions as a necessary trigger, a probabilistic catalyst, or a non-essential component of the permissive regime entry conditions.

Follow-up persistence check (Day +15)

To distinguish transient induction effects from a more durable regime change, a single delayed follow-up can be added without introducing continuous self-monitoring. Fifteen days after completion of the procedure, participants receive one neutral message asking whether at least one occurrence of the same type of experiential shift (if any occurred during the procedure) has reappeared at any point since the end of the three-day period. Responses are restricted to a binary yes/no format, with an optional single-sentence clarification. This follow-up is designed to test persistence or spontaneous re-entry while minimizing evaluative framing and repeated introspective tracking.