

Human Advantage Compounds

Build a Career That Gets Stronger as AI Improves

Ngo Trung Kien

Contents

Copyright and publication notice	1
Introduction: the promise and the boundary	3
Visual frontispiece	4
0.1 Who this book is for	4
0.2 Thesis and falsification condition	4
1 Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles	7
1.1 In plain terms	7
1.1.1 Chapter contract	7
1.2 The decision at stake	7
1.3 Working model	8
1.3.1 See the chapter in practice	8
1.3.2 Chapter-specific operating protocol	10
1.3.3 Operating workflow	12
1.3.4 Evidence and control graph	13
1.4 Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	14
1.4.1 Scenario trace	15
1.4.2 Artifact handoff	16
1.4.3 Evidence application	16
1.4.4 Transfer test	16
1.5 Measurement and recovery decision	17
1.6 Practice lab	17
1.7 Limits and judgment	18
1.8 Takeaways	18
1.9 Reflection	18
2 Find Problems Worth Owning	19
2.1 In plain terms	19
2.1.1 Chapter contract	19
2.2 The decision at stake	19
2.3 Working model	20
2.3.1 See the chapter in practice	20
2.3.2 Chapter-specific operating protocol	22
2.3.3 Operating workflow	24
2.3.4 Evidence and control graph	25
2.4 Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	26
2.4.1 Scenario trace	27
2.4.2 Artifact handoff	28
2.4.3 Evidence application	28
2.4.4 Transfer test	28

2.5	Measurement and recovery decision	29
2.6	Practice lab	29
2.7	Limits and judgment	30
2.8	Takeaways	30
2.9	Reflection	30
3	Build Domain Compression	31
3.1	In plain terms	31
3.1.1	Chapter contract	31
3.2	The decision at stake	31
3.3	Working model	32
3.3.1	See the chapter in practice	32
3.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	34
3.3.3	Operating workflow	36
3.3.4	Evidence and control graph	37
3.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	38
3.4.1	Scenario trace	39
3.4.2	Artifact handoff	40
3.4.3	Evidence application	40
3.4.4	Transfer test	40
3.5	Measurement and recovery decision	41
3.6	Practice lab	41
3.7	Limits and judgment	42
3.8	Takeaways	42
3.9	Reflection	42
4	Practice Accountable Judgment	43
4.1	In plain terms	43
4.1.1	Chapter contract	43
4.2	The decision at stake	43
4.3	Working model	44
4.3.1	See the chapter in practice	44
4.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	46
4.3.3	Operating workflow	48
4.3.4	Evidence and control graph	49
4.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	50
4.4.1	Scenario trace	51
4.4.2	Artifact handoff	52
4.4.3	Evidence application	52
4.4.4	Transfer test	52
4.5	Measurement and recovery decision	53
4.6	Practice lab	53
4.7	Limits and judgment	54
4.8	Takeaways	54
4.9	Reflection	54

5	Learn to Work With AI Transparently	55
5.1	In plain terms	55
5.1.1	Chapter contract	55
5.2	The decision at stake	55
5.3	Working model	56
5.3.1	See the chapter in practice	56
5.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	58
5.3.3	Operating workflow	60
5.3.4	Evidence and control graph	61
5.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	62
5.4.1	Scenario trace	63
5.4.2	Artifact handoff	64
5.4.3	Evidence application	64
5.4.4	Transfer test	64
5.5	Measurement and recovery decision	64
5.6	Practice lab	65
5.7	Limits and judgment	65
5.8	Takeaways	66
5.9	Reflection	66
6	Create Proof of Work	67
6.1	In plain terms	67
6.1.1	Chapter contract	67
6.2	The decision at stake	67
6.3	Working model	68
6.3.1	See the chapter in practice	68
6.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	70
6.3.3	Operating workflow	72
6.3.4	Evidence and control graph	73
6.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	74
6.4.1	Scenario trace	75
6.4.2	Artifact handoff	76
6.4.3	Evidence application	76
6.4.4	Transfer test	76
6.5	Measurement and recovery decision	77
6.6	Practice lab	77
6.7	Limits and judgment	78
6.8	Takeaways	78
6.9	Reflection	78
	Midpoint visual synthesis	79
7	Invest in Explanation	81
7.1	In plain terms	81
7.1.1	Chapter contract	81
7.2	The decision at stake	81
7.3	Working model	82

7.3.1	See the chapter in practice	82
7.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	84
7.3.3	Operating workflow	86
7.3.4	Evidence and control graph	87
7.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	88
7.4.1	Scenario trace	89
7.4.2	Artifact handoff	90
7.4.3	Evidence application	90
7.4.4	Transfer test	90
7.5	Measurement and recovery decision	90
7.6	Practice lab	91
7.7	Limits and judgment	91
7.8	Takeaways	92
7.9	Reflection	92
8	Build Trust Through Service	93
8.1	In plain terms	93
8.1.1	Chapter contract	93
8.2	The decision at stake	93
8.3	Working model	94
8.3.1	See the chapter in practice	94
8.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	96
8.3.3	Operating workflow	98
8.3.4	Evidence and control graph	99
8.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	100
8.4.1	Scenario trace	101
8.4.2	Artifact handoff	102
8.4.3	Evidence application	102
8.4.4	Transfer test	102
8.5	Measurement and recovery decision	103
8.6	Practice lab	103
8.7	Limits and judgment	104
8.8	Takeaways	104
8.9	Reflection	104
9	Run Career Experiments	105
9.1	In plain terms	105
9.1.1	Chapter contract	105
9.2	The decision at stake	105
9.3	Working model	106
9.3.1	See the chapter in practice	106
9.4	Career-experiment decision card	108
9.4.1	Chapter-specific operating protocol	108
9.4.2	Operating workflow	110
9.4.3	Evidence and control graph	111
9.5	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	112

9.5.1	Scenario trace	113
9.5.2	Artifact handoff	114
9.5.3	Evidence application	114
9.5.4	Transfer test	114
9.6	Measurement and recovery decision	114
9.7	Practice lab	115
9.8	Limits and judgment	115
9.9	Takeaways	116
9.10	Reflection	116
10	Diversify Without Fragmenting	117
10.1	In plain terms	117
10.1.1	Chapter contract	117
10.2	The decision at stake	117
10.3	Working model	118
10.3.1	See the chapter in practice	118
10.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	120
10.3.3	Operating workflow	122
10.3.4	Evidence and control graph	123
10.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	124
10.4.1	Scenario trace	125
10.4.2	Artifact handoff	126
10.4.3	Evidence application	126
10.4.4	Transfer test	126
10.5	Measurement and recovery decision	126
10.6	Practice lab	127
10.7	Limits and judgment	127
10.8	Takeaways	128
10.9	Reflection	128
11	Use Credentials Strategically	129
11.1	In plain terms	129
11.1.1	Chapter contract	129
11.2	The decision at stake	129
11.3	Working model	130
11.3.1	See the chapter in practice	130
11.3.2	Chapter-specific operating protocol	132
11.3.3	Operating workflow	134
11.3.4	Evidence and control graph	135
11.4	Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	136
11.4.1	Scenario trace	137
11.4.2	Artifact handoff	138
11.4.3	Evidence application	138
11.4.4	Transfer test	138
11.5	Measurement and recovery decision	139
11.6	Practice lab	139

11.7 Limits and judgment	140
11.8 Takeaways	140
11.9 Reflection	140
12 Write a Two-Year Compounding Plan	141
12.1 In plain terms	141
12.1.1 Chapter contract	141
12.2 The decision at stake	141
12.3 Working model	142
12.3.1 See the chapter in practice	142
12.3.2 Chapter-specific operating protocol	144
12.3.3 Operating workflow	146
12.3.4 Evidence and control graph	147
12.4 Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence	148
12.4.1 Scenario trace	149
12.4.2 Artifact handoff	150
12.4.3 Evidence application	150
12.4.4 Transfer test	150
12.5 Measurement and recovery decision	151
12.6 Practice lab	151
12.7 Limits and judgment	152
12.8 Takeaways	152
12.9 Reflection	152
Closing: keep the evidence visible	153
A compact implementation workbook	155
Decision register	156
Evidence scorecard	157
Exception log	158
Ninety-day plan	159
Control and test matrix	160
Workflow map	161
13 References	163

Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles

In plain terms

Occupations contain varied tasks, so useful planning begins below the title level. In a professional capability portfolio, the practical question is **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?** For professionals and early-career workers planning skills, reputation, and opportunity under rapid automation, the answer counts only when **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification** produces reviewable evidence for **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** without normalizing **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**.

Chapter contract

DECIDE

Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?

BUILD

List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification.

MEASURE

task portfolio reviewed quarterly

STOP OR REDESIGN WHEN

declaring an entire profession safe or doomed

The decision at stake

For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, the professional who owns the development decision must decide **which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?** before the professional practice crosses from discussion into consequence for the worker, collaborators, and affected clients. The minimum decision record is the artifact **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification**, the observable **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**, and the explicit hold condition **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**. If any Chapter 1 field is missing, the safe default is to retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim.

The bounded **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** decision advances the book's promise to build a portfolio of judgment, relationships, domain depth, and proof of work that compounds instead of expiring with each tool cycle. It does not endorse a product or predetermine the Chapter 1 answer; it creates a record that another person can challenge after each practice cycle and monthly portfolio review.

Working model

Read the **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** model as four linked fields. **Outcome:** Occupations contain varied tasks, so useful planning begins below the title level. **Boundary:** the design must make **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed** visible rather than convenient. **Evidence:** interpret **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** together with review effort and excluded cases. **Authority:** the professional who owns the development decision may continue, narrow, escalate, or stop the professional practice. For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, Reference [1] from World Economic Forum, *Future of Jobs Report 2025*, informs a Chapter 1 boundary; it is not evidence that the local method or illustrative target will work.

See the chapter in practice

The **analyze tasks, not job titles in practice** maps *Human Advantage Compounds* Chapter 1 into a field scene before its abstract models begin. In one frame, it holds the question **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?**, the artifact **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification.**, the proof signal **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**, and the warning **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**.




Figure 1.1: Chapter 1 field scene for Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles: a boundary view in the book's human skill setting.

Read the scene: For Human Advantage Compounds, Chapter 1, begin with the central human skill scene and scan DECIDE, MAKE, CHECK, and WATCH. Treat the Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles scene as conceptual, then use its cases and evidence records to test whether task portfolio reviewed quarterly actually improves. For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, this explanatory plate is a reasoning prompt—not observed evidence or a universal operating prescription.

Visual field note — Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles:

- 1. Locate the tension.** In this composite situation, A coordinator finds that scheduling is exposed but stakeholder negotiation is not.
- 2. Name the choice.** Answer the chapter question: **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?**
- 3. Produce the record.** Use **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification.**, then retain the professional, assumptions, and case evidence needed to review it.
- 4. Test and return.** Track **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**. If **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**, return to DECIDE and revise the career boundary instead of explaining the warning away.

Chapter-specific operating protocol

Phase	Reader action	Evidence retained	Hold condition
1. Define	Write the exact decision behind Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.
2. Contrast	Apply List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification to one ordinary case.	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.
3. Exclude	Run the same artifact against a countercase shaped by declaring an entire profession safe or doomed.	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.
4. Assign	Name the professional who owns the development decision as the person who may continue, narrow, or stop.	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.

Phase	Reader action	Evidence retained	Hold condition
5. Challenge	Record task portfolio reviewed quarterly and the review effort for the same case.	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.
6. Publish	Release the Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles artifact only when its evidence answers this chapter's question.	Chapter 1 owner, input, output, exception, and timestamp.	Hold Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles if its record cannot be reconstructed.

This sequence is specific to **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**. For that Chapter 1 decision, it is not permission to automate; it is a way for professionals and early-career workers planning skills, reputation, and opportunity under rapid automation to make the reasoning inspectable after each practice cycle and monthly portfolio review.

List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification. This is the chapter's core production artifact. The **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** artifact should fit on one page, use ordinary language, and be reviewed by someone who did not design it. A compact artifact exposes disagreements that a long narrative can conceal.

The chapter's visual tool is the **chapter contract**. For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, it translates explanation into an inspectable decision aid: the reader can see the decision, artifact, evidence, and exact condition that pauses the professional practice.




Figure 1.2: Chapter contract connecting the decision, artifact, measure, and stop condition for Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles.

How to use this page: Move across the four Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles cards; compare the decision with task portfolio reviewed quarterly and stop before declaring an entire profession safe or doomed. The chapter-specific measure is **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**; the principal warning is **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**.

Operating workflow

The **analyze tasks, not job titles workflow** makes the chapter executable. For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, the five stages carry **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification**. from the question **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?** to a test against **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**, with **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed** as an explicit return or stop signal.




Figure 1.3: Five-stage workflow for chapter 1, Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles: frame the decision, set the career boundary, build List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification., test against task portfolio reviewed quarterly, then continue, narrow, or stop before declaring an entire profession safe or doomed.

Read the workflow: Move from FRAME to DECIDE for Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles. The lower return path is mandatory when evidence is missing or the stop signal—declaring an entire profession safe or doomed—appears. For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, record the professional and evidence at every handoff; an arrow is not evidence that the preceding stage passed.

Evidence and control graph

The **analyze tasks, not job titles — evidence network** shows the relationships that must remain inspectable when the workflow runs. In *Human Advantage Compounds*, this qualitative graph asks the reader to record observed evidence for **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** and route **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed** to recovery instead of treating sample numbers as facts.




Figure 1.4: Qualitative evidence network for chapter 1, Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles, linking the question to List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification., the measure task portfolio reviewed quarterly, and the recovery condition declaring an entire profession safe or doomed without invented empirical values.

Read the graph: Trace the evidence for Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles toward the decision. For Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles, empty or weak evidence does not count as zero risk; it routes the professional practice to verification, escalation, or stop. Use this **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** graph beside **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification**, not as a substitute for recorded cases.

Worked composite case file — illustrative, not empirical evidence

This **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** record turns the scenario into an inspectable rehearsal in a professional capability portfolio. Its numbers are worksheet examples for Chapter 1, not observed results or a prediction of benefit.

Record field	Filled illustrative entry
Situation	A coordinator finds that scheduling is exposed but stakeholder negotiation is not.
People affected	the worker, collaborators, and affected clients
Decision	Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?
Artifact excerpt	List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification.
Accountable authority	The professional who owns the development decision.
Measure and unit	task portfolio reviewed quarterly — one dated observation for each eligible case.
Example baseline	7 observations in the baseline window.
Example target / decision rule	a documented improvement plus no severe unresolved exception; move only contextual; the professional must define better before collection.
Named exception	declaring an entire profession safe or doomed.
Safe default	Retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim.

Scenario trace

1. **Preserve the starting state.** For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, record the original request, governing rule, available evidence, and the last safe result before changing anything.
2. **Make the chapter decision.** Answer **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?** and record the Chapter 1 assumption that carries the most consequence for the worker, collaborators, and affected clients.
3. **Use the artifact.** Complete **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification** with a normal case and a countercase; in this chapter, do not infer missing facts merely to finish the form.

4. **Observe the decision rule.** Review **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** after each practice cycle and monthly portfolio review; the **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** record reports exclusions and review effort beside the headline value.
5. **Contain and recover.** If **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**, retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim. Preserve the Chapter 1 failed case, assign a deadline, and require the professional who owns the development decision to authorize any restart.

Artifact handoff

Start **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** from the book-level thesis and boundary. Within *Human Advantage Compounds*, attach the current artifact and exception record, then hand both to Chapter 2, **Find Problems Worth Owning**, which asks: What problems create value beyond producing an artifact?. That recipient may revise the **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** assumption, but must preserve the evidence that made this book's earlier decision reasonable.

Evidence application

Reference [1], World Economic Forum, *Future of Jobs Report 2025*, provides a relevant boundary or design input for **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**. It does **not** prove that the Chapter 1 worked values, local method, or target will succeed. The **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** reviewer must link this book's exact claim to the exact source passage and leave unsupported synthesis marked UNVERIFIED.

Transfer test

- Re-run **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification** with one routine Chapter 1 case that should pass.
- Re-run the **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** artifact with missing evidence and keep the safe default active.
- Re-run it where **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed** appears plausible but not certain.
- Ask a reviewer who did not design this chapter's method to decide whether the retained record supports continuing, narrowing, escalating, or stopping.

Measurement and recovery decision

For **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles**, define **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** as one dated observation for each eligible case. In this **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** worksheet, the Chapter 1 worked baseline is 7 observations in the baseline window and the illustrative target is a documented improvement plus no severe unresolved exception; both must be replaced with evidence from a professional capability portfolio. Review the Chapter 1 result after each practice cycle and monthly portfolio review, preserve excluded and high-consequence cases, and interpret movement as better only when it is contextual; the professional must define better before collection.

The named failure is **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**. Containment means: retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim. Recovery is complete only after the professional who owns the development decision can reconstruct the failed case, explain which assumption changed, and authorize a new test against **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**.

Practice lab

Choose one live but reversible **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** example from a professional capability portfolio. Create the following:

- a one-sentence answer to **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?**;
- a completed first draft of **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification**;
- one routine case, one missing-evidence case, and one case shaped by **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**;
- a locally measured baseline for **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** using the unit one dated observation for each eligible case;
- a stop threshold, the professional who owns the development decision as owner, and the safe default retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim;
- capability evidence packet that will be handed to the next chapter.

Ask a colleague to challenge **List recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification**. They should identify one ambiguous field, one person among the worker, collaborators, and affected clients whose interests are missing, and one reason **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** could reward the wrong behavior. Preserve that challenge in the chapter handoff before revising.

Limits and judgment

Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles supplies a locally testable method, not proof of causal effectiveness or a universal rule. This Chapter 1 method remains inside the book boundary: This book does not predict a specific occupation, guarantee employment or income, or replace individualized career, financial, or educational advice. Readers applying **Analyze Tasks, Not Job Titles** for the worker, collaborators, and affected clients must verify current law, contract, policy, safeguarding, accessibility, security, and professional duties before consequential use. A negative **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** result may mean the question was framed badly, the review cost is too high, or retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim is the responsible decision.

Takeaways

- Occupations contain varied tasks, so useful planning begins below the title level.
- The chapter artifact is: list recurring tasks and score routine, context, consequence, interaction, and verification.
- The primary measure is **task portfolio reviewed quarterly**, paired with review cost and failure severity.
- Watch especially for **declaring an entire profession safe or doomed**.
- In a professional capability portfolio, expand scope only after the professional who owns the development decision can show the evidence and exercise the recovery path.

Reflection

What evidence would let a skeptical reviewer answer **Which parts of your work are exposed, augmented, or newly valuable?** differently from the professional who owns the development decision? Which case involving the worker, collaborators, and affected clients would **task portfolio reviewed quarterly** miss, and would that omission require continuing, narrowing, escalating, or retain the human-produced baseline and narrow the practice claim?