To move from the philosophical intersection of **phenomenology** and **clinical masking** into a mathematical framework, you can apply several statistical tests. These tests help quantify the "gap" between a person's internal truth and the external perception enforced by a counselor.

Here are the mathematical tests you can run to analyze the association between **Authentic Meaning-Making** (Factor 1) and **Clinical Compliance/Hiding** (Factor 2):

1. The Lens Model Equation (LME)

Since you are already working with the **Brunswik Lens Model**, the most robust mathematical approach is the **Lens Model Equation**. It calculates the "achievement" (), which is the correlation between the client's actual state (the "truth") and the counselor's judgment.

The basic version of the equation is:

- **(Knowledge):** The correlation between the counselor's model and the "true" environmental model. If this is low, the counselor is fundamentally misinterpreting the client's cues.
- **and :** The predictability of the environment and the consistency of the counselor.
- **(Unmodeled Knowledge):** This represents the "Clever Hans" factor—judgment based on subtle, non-linear cues that aren't part of the formal diagnostic criteria.

2. Signal Detection Theory (SDT)

This is the best test for the **Clever Hans** phenomenon. You can treat the "Truth" as a signal and "Masking" as noise.

- **Sensitivity ():** Measures how well the counselor can distinguish between the client's authentic self and their "masked" persona.
- **Criterion (Bias/):** Measures the counselor's tendency to assume "health" or "compliance." A high neurotypical bias means the counselor will "miss" the truth because they are only looking for a specific type of social signal.

3. Mediation Analysis (Process Macro)

You can test if the **Neurotypicality of the Counselor** (the Independent Variable) leads to **Hiding the Truth** (the Outcome) through the mediator of **Perceived Lack of Fit** (from your PVEST research).

- **Test:** A regression-based mediation model.
- **Goal:** To see if the "hiding" behavior is caused directly by the counselor's presence or if it is mediated by the client's internal "meaning-making" that the environment is unsafe.

4. Inter-Rater Reliability (Cohen's Kappa)

If you have video data of a session, you can have a Neurotypical (NT) observer and a Neurodivergent (ND) observer code the same behaviors (e.g., a hand twitch).

- **The Test: Cohen's Kappa ()** measures the agreement between the two raters.
- **The Association:** If is low, it mathematically proves that the "Truth" of the behavior is being perceived differently across neurotypes. A low agreement score supports the belief that NT counselors are missing or suppressing the ND truth.

5. Factor Analysis (EFA or CFA)

Using the **HEXACO model** (which you mentioned in your research), you can run a **Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**.

- **Goal:** Determine if "Honesty-Humility" (the truth) and "Social Agreeableness" (the masking) load onto the same factor or separate factors during therapy.
- **The Hypothesis:** For neurotypical clients, these factors may correlate positively. For neurodivergent clients, they may correlate **negatively**—meaning as the person tries to be more "agreeable" to the counselor, their "honesty" score mathematically drops.

Summary of Tests by Research Goal

Research Goal	Recommended Test
Measuring the "Accuracy Gap"	Lens Model Equation (LME)
Detecting Unconscious Mirroring	Signal Detection Theory ()
Testing the "Why" (Process)	Mediation Analysis (Regression)
Comparing Perceptions	Cohen's Kappa
Validating Personality Traits	Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)