

Corporate Value Triad Organizational Diagnostic

Pilot questionnaire administration and analysis guide

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Original experimental item pool | Not validated for employment decisions

1 Intended use and limits

This instrument explores reported experiences of work evidence, coordination, visibility, attribution, influence, and evaluation processes. It is designed for cognitive interviews and voluntary organizational research. It does not measure actual contribution, identify a personality type, diagnose unfairness, or establish who deserves promotion. The six content domains are provisional organizing categories, not confirmed psychometric factors.

There are no norms, validated cutoffs, archetype assignments, individual performance rankings, or overall CVT score. No evidence in this package establishes reliability, predictive validity, measurement invariance, or fairness of these items. Do not use responses for hiring, pay, promotion, discipline, redundancy, or personnel files. A reference to established measurement research does not transfer validity to this new instrument.

The preferred pilot output is the distribution of responses to each item, with missingness and context. Exploratory domain summaries are optional and require the restrictions in section 6. Obtain independent review and a locally accurate information sheet before recruitment. The research protocol specifies the broader study requirements.

2 Administration

Invite all eligible participants through an independent channel. Explain who will see responses, whether records will be linked, how to withdraw, and when data become de-identified. Managers should not collect consent or monitor completion. Provide an accessible format and private completion time. Do not publish an estimated completion time as fact until the pilot measures it. A provisional scheduling allowance is 10 to 15 minutes.

Use this reference period consistently: the past three months in your current work setting. If someone has been in the setting for less time, ask them to answer only for their actual time and record the shorter period separately. Avoid names, project identifiers, and confidential client information in free text. Demographic questions require a clear research purpose, optional response, and a disclosure plan.

Participants may skip any question. Select one response for each item. Use NA if the situation was not applicable, NO if there was no opportunity for the event, and DK if you do not know. Keep these distinct from a skipped answer. The frequency anchors describe reported experience and do not imply quality or merit.

3 Response scale

1 Never; 2 Rarely; 3 Sometimes; 4 Often; 5 Consistently. Additional options: NA Not applicable; NO No opportunity; DK Do not know; blank Prefer not to answer or skipped. During cognitive interviews, investigate whether respondents distinguish the anchors and missing-response options as intended.

Write the code or select the option beside each statement. The editable form leaves space for a response. All items are positively worded. No items are reverse-coded. Positive wording may increase acquiescence and must be evaluated during validation.

4 Pilot questionnaire

CE Contribution evidence access

This domain concerns access to evidence and context. It does not quantify contribution.

CE1 I could identify records showing the outcomes of my work. Response: _____

CE2 The records available about my work included the help I provided to others. Response: _____

CE3 The records available about my work included maintenance or prevention that I performed. Response: _____

CE4 The records available about my work described constraints that affected the outcome. Response: _____

CO Coordination experience

Frequency of coordination is not the same as its usefulness or economic value.

CO1 I helped resolve a dependency between people or teams. Response: _____

CO2 I connected someone with information they needed to complete work. Response: _____

CO3 I clarified who would make a decision on shared work. Response: _____

CO4 I helped people reach an agreement needed for work to proceed. Response: _____

VI Evaluator visibility

Answer about the people who evaluated or formally reviewed your work. Use NO if there was no evaluation opportunity.

VI1 A person who evaluated my work saw a relevant work product. Response: _____

VI2 A person who evaluated my work received an update about its outcome. Response: _____

VI3 I had an opportunity to explain my role in an outcome to a person evaluating my work. Response: _____

VI4 A person who evaluated my work heard an account from someone familiar with my contribution. Response: _____

AT Attribution accuracy experience

These items ask about perceived accuracy of credit, which requires comparison with other evidence.

AT1 When my work was discussed, the account accurately described what I had done. Response: _____

AT2 Accounts of shared outcomes acknowledged the people whose work enabled them. Response: _____

AT3 Formal acknowledgments of my work matched the role I had performed. Response: _____

AT4 When credit for shared work was assigned, the account distinguished different people's roles.
Response: _____

IN Decision influence experience

These items describe reported access and action, not an established political-skill scale.

IN1 I could raise relevant evidence before a decision affecting my work was finalized. Response: _____

IN2 I obtained a resource needed for an agreed work objective. Response: _____

IN3 I could discuss a dependency with someone authorized to resolve it. Response: _____

IN4 My input changed a decision about how shared work would proceed. Response: _____

PR Evaluation process experience

These items concern process information and correction access. They do not reproduce a validated justice scale.

PR1 I could find the criteria used to evaluate my work. Response: _____

PR2 A person evaluating my work explained which evidence informed the evaluation. Response: _____

PR3 I had a usable route to request correction of a factual error in an account of my work. Response: _____

PR4 I received an explanation of the criteria for a development opportunity relevant to me. Response: _____

Optional episode questions

E1 Think of one completed work episode. What outcome mattered, and what actions helped produce it? Do not name people or disclose confidential details. Response: _____

E2 How was credit recorded, and what evidence might be missing? Response: _____

E3 Was there a development opportunity you wanted? Was it offered, declined, deferred, unavailable, or still undecided? Describe the reason if known. Response: _____

E4 What would make the evidence or correction process easier to use? Response: _____

5 Supplemental records and source separation

With separate permission, collect role family, level, time in role, actual evaluation opportunity, development eligibility, offers, declines, commencement dates, and available vacancies. Treat organizational records as a source with potential error. Independently assess selected episode evidence. Do not infer promotion from PR4 or actual contribution from CE1 through CE4.

Use pseudonymous linkage handled by an independent custodian. Avoid collecting exact dates, highly distinctive roles, or demographic combinations unless necessary. Employer summaries must not expose

individual responses. No participant should be described as a builder, operator, or leader on the basis of these answers.

6 Exploratory scoring rules

Item-level reporting is the default. For each item, report counts and percentages for all five valid categories, plus the separate NA, NO, DK, and skipped counts. The valid denominator includes only 1 through 5. State the total invited, total responding, and denominator for each item. Do not treat a high frequency of coordination as evidence of superior contribution or a low frequency as failure.

If researchers prospectively choose an exploratory domain summary, calculate the arithmetic mean of its four numeric responses only when at least three are present. With fewer than three, mark the domain missing. This 3-of-4 rule is an arbitrary pilot analysis convention requiring sensitivity checks, not a validated scoring standard. Compare with complete-domain cases and preserve item distributions. Treating ordinal responses as interval quantities is an additional assumption.

Do not impute a missing item for routine diagnostic reports. Do not code NA, NO, DK, or blank as zero, three, or five. Do not average domains, compute a total, subtract visibility from contribution, produce a percentile, or assign a traffic-light category. Do not combine individual domain summaries into an organizational trait without evidence about the measurement and aggregation model.

Worked arithmetic example

The fictional CE responses 4, 3, NO, 5 contain three numeric answers. Their exploratory mean is $(4 + 3 + 5) / 3 = 4.00$. The record still shows one no-opportunity response and the individual item values. A record containing 4, NA, blank, 5 has only two numeric responses and receives no domain summary. These examples illustrate arithmetic only and establish no favorable or unfavorable result.

Higher numbers indicate more frequent reported experience with the wording of that item. They do not necessarily indicate better work or a healthier organization. An employee may have many chances to influence decisions because a process is unstable. A preventive specialist may have few visible outcomes because harm did not occur. Interpretation requires interviews, role context, and independent evidence.

7 Group reporting and confidentiality

Aggregate reporting should use disclosure review and counts. A provisional suppression rule withholds cells with fewer than 10 respondents and complementary cells that permit reconstruction. Larger cells may still identify distinctive people. Check free text, role combinations, repeated releases, and differences between tables. Never promise that a minimum count guarantees anonymity.

Do not rank teams by a provisional mean. Where comparisons are scientifically justified after validation, report uncertainty and role composition and test comparability first. With clustered samples, ordinary independent-observation intervals may be misleading. Nonresponse can bias a whole-team claim even if the responding sample is large. State the population actually represented.

Suggested report language: In this voluntary pilot, responses to item VI1 were distributed as shown, among n valid respondents. Additional respondents selected no opportunity or did not answer. These reports describe perceived evaluator exposure and do not establish individual contribution, unfairness, or cause.

8 Validation plan and stop conditions

Begin with content review and cognitive interviews. Assess whether respondents understand the constructs, period, and missing categories. Examine accessibility across languages and work settings. Next evaluate ordinal item structure in an exploratory sample and confirm it independently. Estimate reliability

with intervals and examine whether the provisional domains are distinguishable. Reliability alone is insufficient [R12, R13].

Use independent contribution evidence and actual records for criterion studies, without assuming that a manager's rating is a flawless standard. Examine response-process evidence, convergent and discriminant relations, stability and change, invariance, and differential item functioning where the sample supports them. Colquitt (2001 [R08]) is a relevant measurement precedent, not validation of these items.

Stop or revise if items cannot distinguish absence of opportunity from negative experience, if domains collapse into general satisfaction, if reports invite identification or retaliation, or if item interpretation changes materially across groups. Record version changes. Translation or major wording changes require new evaluation. No amount of internal consistency permits employment screening without appropriate validity and fairness evidence for that intended use.

9 Companion files

The editable sources include Survey_Item_Bank.csv, Survey_Response_Template.csv, Survey_Analysis_Record.csv, and a data dictionary. These contain item definitions or empty fields, not employee data or an automatic scoring engine. The research protocol governs any actual study. The management audit offers a separate process review that does not require survey scoring.

10 Optional contribution attribution module

The Collective Attribution Paradox proposes lower individual acknowledgment when team-focused framing meets individual evaluation. The Attribution Dilution Effect proposes loss of originating-action credit during adoption. Contribution Signaling concerns explicit communication of personal actions. All three are proposed constructs requiring literature review and empirical validation. The October 19 extension adds eight original pilot items shared verbatim with the Contribution Attribution Assessment. They are supplementary items, not a seventh validated domain, and they do not alter the original 24 item IDs. Use the same three-month reference period, frequency anchors, and distinct NA, NO, DK, and skipped responses. Answer only about opportunities actually available. The extra module and free descriptions require additional completion time to be measured in a pilot.

CA1 When discussing a shared accomplishment, I acknowledged the team's contribution. Response: _____

CA2 When discussing a shared accomplishment, I described the team result without specifying my own actions. Response: _____

CS1 When discussing an accomplishment, I specified an action I had personally completed. Response: _____

CS2 I communicated a specific action I had completed to a person who evaluated my work. Response: _____

CH1 Records available to me identified who performed the originating work on an innovation I knew about. Response: _____

CH2 Later accounts of an innovation distinguished its originating work from subsequent improvements. Response: _____

TN1 People in my work setting encouraged presenting accomplishments as collective achievements. Response: _____

TN2 I felt able to ask for accurate acknowledgment of my own role in a shared accomplishment. Response: _____

CA1 and CS1 can both be frequent. Collective credit and explicit personal roles can coexist. CA2 describes reported framing, not actual omission or a validated paradox. CS2 concerns communication, not proof that an evaluator saw it. CH1 and CH2 are perceptions requiring independent record checks. TN1 and TN2 do not establish a cultural or identity explanation. None directly measures actual contribution or proves a recognition disparity.

Report each item's distribution and missingness separately. The original 3-of-4 exploratory mean convention applies only to the original six four-item groups. Do not calculate new subscale means, a combined 32-item total, a collective attribution index, a dilution score, or an individual risk category. The new module is not reverse-coded. Its content structure and interpretation require cognitive testing, independent evidence, and validation [R12, R13].

Use the companion assessment for a neutral accomplishment description, an independent manager account, and a record-history review. Obtain separate permissions for linkage and record access. Compare sources action by action, retaining uncertainty and unavailable information. Managers must not see employee item responses. No assertion of individual unfairness or intent follows from an item response or a source disagreement. In the originating reported case, no recognition outcome was observed. Do not use the case as a validated scoring example.

References

- [R08] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- [R12] Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281-302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>
- [R13] Flake, J. K., Pek, J., & Hehman, E. (2017). Construct validation in social and personality research: Current practice and recommendations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(4), 370-378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617693063>