

THE CORPORATE VALUE TRIAD

# Contribution, credit and opportunity

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 / Update October 19 2026

Conceptual framework pending empirical validation

# The organizational question

## How does contribution become credit and opportunity?

The proposal separates work outcomes, evidence exposure, credit judgments, acknowledgment, and later allocation.

# Three provisional work patterns

| Archetype              | Main pattern of work                                 |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Builders               | Create or sustain outcomes through domain work       |
| Relationship Operators | Connect, coordinate, negotiate, and influence        |
| Builder-Leaders        | Combine domain judgment with collective mobilization |

Patterns can overlap and change with the assignment.

# The model separates six constructs

| Construct    | Meaning                                                  |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Contribution | What someone helped produce or sustain                   |
| Visibility   | Evaluator exposure to relevant evidence                  |
| Attribution  | Credit assigned to a person or action                    |
| Recognition  | An explicit acknowledgment of contribution               |
| Influence    | Capacity to affect decisions or mobilize resources       |
| Reward       | A specified allocation of pay, authority, or opportunity |

# What prior research supports

| Literature                   | Bounded implication                                       |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Social capital and brokerage | Relationships can matter for careers and useful ideas     |
| Political skill              | Influence can accompany productive performance            |
| Promotion and role matching  | Current performance and managerial suitability can differ |

These findings motivate CVT. They do not validate it.

# One outcome can have many contributors

## A service launch

Priya designed recovery procedures.

Sam resolved a dependency.

Morgan secured resources and set scope.

**The review later credits Morgan with personally designing recovery.**

# The contribution recognition gap

A possible mismatch between relevant contribution evidence and expressed acknowledgment.

The review compares specific claims with evidence and preserves unresolved cases.

A contribution rating minus a recognition rating is not a validated fairness index.

# Attribution styles and recognition

## The Collective Attribution Paradox

Team-focused accounts may leave personal actions less visible in systems that evaluate individuals.

## Contribution Signaling

Explicit communication of verifiable actions may affect recognition, depending on evaluator exposure.

# Contribution histories during adoption

## The Attribution Dilution Effect

Acknowledgment of an originating action may fade as an innovation spreads and changes.

Track original work and later improvements separately.  
A smaller credit share alone does not demonstrate dilution.

# A reported episode raises a question

A specialist created an internal utility. A colleague later improved it.

The colleague reportedly credited the creator while describing the improvements before an evaluator.

No evaluator judgment or recognition outcome was measured.

# The Contribution Attribution Assessment

Collect a neutral employee description and eight separate pilot items.

Obtain an independent manager account, then review contribution histories.

Compare specific actions across sources and preserve uncertainty.

No combined score, cutoffs, employee labels, or employment use.

# The proposed builders paradox

Concentrated capability makes an employee difficult to release.

Continuity concerns delay a chosen development opportunity.

Delay preserves the same operational dependence.

Testable rival accounts include role fit, preference, and scarcity.

# The builder leader transition

## Relevant domain judgment with the ability to mobilize others

Practice requires an agreed assignment, real capacity, and evidence about consequences for the team.

The proposed curriculum has no demonstrated CVT effect.

# The diagnostic is a pilot item pool

| Content domains            | What responses describe                              |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Evidence and coordination  | Reported records and coordination experiences        |
| Visibility and attribution | Reported exposure and perceived credit accuracy      |
| Influence and process      | Reported access to decisions and evaluation criteria |

**24 original items plus 8 separate attribution items.**  
**No total score, norms, types, or employment use.**

# Examples of falsifiable predictions

| ID | Prediction                                                                            |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H1 | Earlier evidence exposure predicts later credit, conditional on contribution evidence |
| H2 | Structured records reduce the credit effect of irrelevant presenter prominence        |
| H4 | Documented operational dependence predicts lower development access                   |

The protocol specifies thirteen hypotheses with a label crosswalk.

# A staged research program

| Study | Design and principal endpoint                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| A     | Longitudinal episodes, credit, recognition, and opportunity    |
| B     | Randomized vignette, assigned credit                           |
| C     | Protected capacity and transfer, development access            |
| D     | Same curriculum in both arms, added capacity, decision quality |

Study E adds an attribution cohort and a factorial experiment.

# Evidence that would change the framework

Better contribution measurement explains away the exposure association.

Structured records show precisely negligible benefit or amplify distortion.

Protected practice adds burden without improving the specified outcome.

# The leadership kit

## A voluntary 90 day practice cycle

A chosen goal with actual work removed or transferred.

Decision briefs, supported delegation, and shared credit.

A review of outcomes, workload, and the participant's preferred next step.

# The management audit

| Review stage           | Output                                                   |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Scope and sample       | A dated charter and defensible selection rule            |
| Evidence and credit    | Specific claims, corroboration, and unresolved questions |
| Opportunity and action | Criteria, dependency plans, owners, and review dates     |

The audit produces process findings and factual corrections.

# Research protections

Private voluntary participation and separate consent for records linkage.

Independent control of identity keys and disclosure-reviewed aggregate reporting.

No individual CVT output in employment decisions. An independent route for concerns.

# Publication and validation pathway

| Stage                 | Required evidence or decision                                         |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Conceptual release    | Author review, scholarly criticism, visible working-paper status      |
| Measurement and pilot | Cognitive interviews, independent validation, ethics and registration |
| Empirical revision    | All registered outcomes, uncertainty, harms, and theory updates       |

# Decision for an executive sponsor

## Commission a bounded, independently reviewed pilot

Name an accountable investigator, define the setting and resources, and complete the protocol's launch conditions before recruitment.

The five papers and companion kits provide the reviewable proposal.