

The Builder Leader Transition

Developing domain judgment and organizational mobilization

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual working paper 5 of 5 | Pending empirical validation

Abstract

The builder-leader transition is a proposed developmental process in which a contributor retains relevant domain judgment while learning to mobilize people and resources toward collective outcomes. It is not a mandatory move into management or a universal superior career type. This paper distinguishes individual skill development, social recognition of leadership, organizational opportunity, and actual team performance. It proposes that protected practice, feedback, and explicit work transfer may support development more effectively than adding leadership tasks to unchanged delivery demands. Existing leadership scholarship motivates this process but does not validate the CVT toolkit. The paper specifies observable behaviors, rival explanations, an active-comparison trial, and outcomes that include burdens on colleagues. It rejects certification thresholds and self-report-only claims of transformation. Version 0.1 supplies a developmental hypothesis and a pilot curriculum whose effectiveness remains to be tested.

1 What the transition means

Domain competence helps a contributor judge quality, risk, and feasibility. Leadership work adds responsibility for how others coordinate, learn, and exercise judgment. The transition proposed by CVT is a change in the pattern of contribution, not a replacement of useful technical work with interpersonal performance. Its success depends on better collective outcomes under relevant constraints.

A builder-leader may remain an individual contributor, lead a temporary project, or take a formal management role. Different roles require different levels of hands-on involvement. Continuing to execute every difficult task personally can prevent others from developing, while withdrawing from domain work too quickly can weaken judgment. The appropriate balance is contextual and cannot be expressed as a universal percentage of time.

Some employees will prefer specialist progression and should have credible alternatives. The framework provides no justification for making influence training a condition of receiving fair credit for existing work. Accurate recognition is an organizational responsibility even when an employee does not want to become a leader.

2 Development at several levels

Individual development concerns skills such as framing a decision, evaluating trade-offs, delegating with appropriate support, and giving useful feedback. Relational development concerns whether colleagues trust the participant's judgment and accept their coordination. Organizational development concerns the availability of assignments, authority, time, and resources. These levels can support or obstruct each other.

DeRue and Ashford (2010 [R11]) propose leadership identity as a social process involving claims and grants. This is a theoretical account, not proof that adopting a leader label improves performance. Day et al. (2014 [R10]) review individual and interpersonal development and longitudinal evaluation. Their review

supports taking development seriously as a process, without establishing the effectiveness of this package's exercises.

CVT adds a specific capacity hypothesis: leadership practice requires work conditions that permit the participant to act differently. Training may improve vocabulary while the organization continues to require uninterrupted personal execution. A curriculum that ignores task transfer risks turning development into an additional unpaid obligation. The protocol therefore evaluates protected practice and work redesign together.

3 Proposed developmental mechanisms

The first mechanism is translation. A participant explains a domain issue in terms a decision-maker can act on, including uncertainty, options, and consequences. Translation can create value when it improves a decision. It becomes mere self-presentation if it substitutes persuasive certainty for warranted judgment. The kit asks reviewers to examine the usefulness of the decision, not the polish of a presentation.

The second mechanism is distributed execution. A participant delegates a bounded task with a clear outcome, decision authority, support, and escalation conditions. The recipient practices judgment rather than simply receiving undesirable work. A reduction in the participant's direct output may be appropriate if the team gains durable capability. Evaluation should measure quality and burden across the team.

The third mechanism is ethical mobilization. A participant identifies stakeholders, surfaces constraints, and seeks resources transparently. Political skill research associates interpersonal effectiveness with work outcomes (Munyon et al., 2015 [R04]), so the model does not equate influence with manipulation. The ethical boundary concerns truthful evidence, consent where relevant, appropriate authority, and fair credit for others.

The fourth mechanism is correction through feedback. Participants compare their intentions with observed consequences. Feedback may be incomplete or biased, especially where respondents fear reprisal. Voluntary, concrete, behavior-focused accounts are preferable to an unvalidated leadership score. The process should permit disagreement and should not turn confidential developmental feedback into a selection file.

4 Behaviors and evidence

Development area	Observable practice	Evidence of possible improvement
Decision translation	States a decision, evidence, uncertainty, and alternatives	Stakeholders can explain the trade-off and use the record
Delegation	Specifies authority, support, and a check-in	Recipient completes a bounded task with appropriate autonomy
Coordination	Resolves a documented dependency	Handoff improves without shifting hidden costs elsewhere
Shared credit	Names enabling actions and contributors accurately	Contributors can correct the record and endorse its factual basis
Capability transfer	Provides practice and backup authority	Another person demonstrates the procedure under agreed conditions
Reflection	Revises a practice after concrete feedback	A later episode shows a specific change and its consequences

These are illustrative indicators, not a validated competency model. The same behavior can have different implications in different roles. A leader who asks many questions may support learning or may delay a decision. A successful delegation may reflect a highly capable recipient rather than the participant's skill. Evidence should therefore record baseline context, recipient experience, and what actually changed.

5 A proposed 90 day development cycle

The accompanying kit begins with a voluntary goal and an agreement about capacity. In the first month, participants reconstruct an episode, identify a decision audience, and negotiate one bounded assignment with their manager. They choose work that matters to the team and specify what will be removed, deferred, or transferred to make room.

During the second month, participants practice translation and delegation, request feedback, and review the consequences with a coach or peer. A contribution record makes shared work explicit without becoming a performance ranking. The manager checks that the agreed workload change occurred and that colleagues have support for any transferred responsibilities.

During the final month, participants repeat a practice in another episode, document uncertainty and unintended effects, and review continuation. The cycle ends with a decision about the next assignment or a return to specialist focus. Completion is participation in a pilot learning process, not certification as a builder-leader. Ninety days is a practical planning period, not an empirically established dose.

6 Testing developmental effectiveness

H6 in the protocol proposes a trial comparing the curriculum plus protected practice capacity with an active comparison receiving the same curriculum and ordinary approved capacity arrangements. The contrast estimates the incremental effect of the protected-capacity package. It does not test training against no training. Allocation should occur by team or other unit that limits contamination, with recruitment and consent completed before assignment where feasible.

The primary outcome is quality on a prespecified role-relevant team task at follow-up, judged by reviewers unaware of allocation where feasible. A common rubric can include decision quality and delivery reliability but requires pilot calibration and evidence of comparability. The study should preserve separate dimensions until a defensible composite exists. The protocol selects decision quality as primary and reports reliability separately.

Secondary outcomes include recipient autonomy, demonstrated backup capability, participant workload, colleague workload, and sustained practice after support ends. Self-efficacy and satisfaction can describe the experience but cannot establish improved leadership performance. Promotions during a short follow-up are sparse and heavily conditioned by opportunity. They should not become the primary success criterion.

Randomization balances baseline factors in expectation. It does not solve missing outcomes, noncompliance, or differential manager support after allocation. The primary estimate uses assignment to the condition. Process measures describe uptake separately. A per-protocol comparison is vulnerable to selection and should remain secondary. The study must track whether participants actually receive the promised capacity and whether comparison teams adopt similar practices.

7 Rival accounts and boundary conditions

The attention rival predicts benefits from managerial interest rather than capacity protection. Both conditions should receive comparable contact and learning materials where feasible. The selection rival predicts that motivated volunteers would improve without the intervention. Random assignment among eligible volunteers helps address this issue, while limiting generalizability to people willing and able to participate.

The resource rival predicts improvement simply because teams receive more slack. That is part of the package's practical effect but limits claims about a distinctive developmental mechanism. A later factorial design could separate workload transfer, coaching, and practice assignments. The current trial should not attribute a package effect to an individual exercise.

The role-fit rival predicts that the curriculum suits some jobs and not others. A highly regulated operational role may require different delegation safeguards than a product discovery team. Participants without authority to change assignments may learn but be unable to act. The framework should identify those constraints instead of calling them resistance or weak leadership potential.

8 Falsification and ethical limits

The capacity hypothesis would be weakened by precise negligible differences in the prespecified outcome across adequately implemented replications. It would be contradicted in a setting where protected practice reliably worsens task quality or team burden without compensating benefits. A finding that self-confidence improves while independent outcomes do not would support a narrower interpretation, not a claim of transformation.

The program could also reveal harms: overwork, performative documentation, retaliation after feedback, or involuntary role changes. The pilot must provide a confidential route to pause participation and restore workable assignments. The organization remains accountable for required support. The toolkit must never become a covert promotion screen or a justification for denying specialist careers.

9 Conclusion

The builder-leader transition is a proposed change in how a person contributes to collective work. Domain judgment, social acceptance, and organizational opportunity each matter, and none can be inferred from a short self-report score. The development kit offers structured practice with explicit capacity and feedback arrangements. Its usefulness depends on independent outcomes, manageable burdens, and evidence that can support revision as readily as endorsement.

References

- [R04] Munyon, T. P., Summers, J. K., Thompson, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (2015). Political skill and work outcomes: A theoretical extension, meta-analytic investigation, and agenda for the future. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(1), 143-184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12066>
- [R10] Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 63-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004>
- [R11] DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647. https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/78/ZP_Files/2020/derue_ashford-2010.zp195280.pdf