

References and Evidence Boundaries

Verified records and a claim to source register

Proposed framework by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026

Initial records checked October 18 2026

Extension records checked October 19 2026

Research update October 19 2026

Scope of verification

This targeted reference set supports the conceptual package. It is not a systematic review or an exhaustive novelty search. Bibliographic identity and bounded source claims were checked against publisher pages, primary article records, official text, or indexed primary-paper text. Most checks used abstracts and metadata rather than full-text critical appraisal. The access note for each entry states the actual scope. No publisher article or proprietary scale is reproduced.

The stable identifiers R01 to R23 match citations throughout the documents and deck notes. Twenty-one entries have checked DOI metadata. R11 uses a primary-paper URL because DOI variants were not independently reconciled. R18 is an official report with no DOI. R01 to R18 retain their October 18 verification scope. R19 to R23 were checked October 19; R22 is a scholarly contributorship standard, not a journal study. A verified citation does not validate the Corporate Value Triad or its instruments.

Evidence categories

Prior empirical evidence refers to findings in the source's setting, with design limits. Prior theory refers to an argument rather than an established empirical result. Methodological guidance supports a research choice without proving CVT. CVT propositions and H1 to H13 are proposals in this package. The update-label crosswalk preserves the five additions without reusing legacy H7 and H8. Fictional examples illustrate a method. The generalized episode in paper 3 is a participant-reported illustration with no independently verified outcome. Neither supplies evidence of prevalence or effectiveness.

October 19 targeted literature review

The extension sought primary research relevant to self-promotion and performance, combined self and other credit, memory and responsibility in joint work, signaling theory, and structured contributorship. Searches on October 19 used the new construct names and combinations of self-promotion, collective credit, recognition, contribution history, innovation adoption, and attribution dilution. Primary publisher records, a university-hosted article, PubMed article records, and official NISO records were used for the added claims. Secondary search results were not treated as evidence.

R19 to R23 were selected for conceptual relevance and inspectable identity and bounded claims, rather than through a systematic screening process. No exhaustive database strategy, duplicate screening, risk-of-bias appraisal, or coverage claim is made. No directly validating empirical study of the proposed adoption-related Attribution Dilution Effect was identified in this targeted review. That statement describes this search, not the absence of such research. The concepts need a broader review and discriminant and incremental validation before novelty or generality can be claimed.

The prior work justifies combined attribution as a comparator and raises alternative information and memory explanations. It does not prove a collective-attribution penalty, a signaling effect independent of

contribution, or any outcome in the reported case. The package distinguishes impressions, credit judgments, explicit recognition, and rewards.

R01 A social capital theory of career success

[R01] Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 219-237. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069452>

Evidence type: Observational study.

Bounded use: Social capital and network benefits are associated with career success.

Boundary: The reported structural model does not establish CVT or a causal visibility premium.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and bibliographic record inspected through indexed text. Direct open intermittently unavailable.

Checked source: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/3069452?rss=1&ssource=mfc>

R02 Structural holes and good ideas

[R02] Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349-399. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421787>

Evidence type: Observational organizational research.

Bounded use: Brokerage is associated with valued ideas and career outcomes in the studied organization.

Boundary: Associations do not separate productive brokerage from all credit-allocation effects.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/resolve?id=doi%3A10.1086%2F421787>

R03 Political skill in organizations

[R03] Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Perrewé, P. L., Brouer, R. L., Douglas, C., & Lux, S. (2007). Political skill in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 290-320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300813>

Evidence type: Conceptual theory.

Bounded use: Political skill has an existing multilevel theoretical account.

Boundary: A conceptual account is not an empirical validation of CVT.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0149206307300813>

R04 Political skill and work outcomes

[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>

Evidence type: Meta-analysis.

Bounded use: Political skill is positively associated with performance and career outcomes.

Boundary: Associations do not imply that all influence is productive or establish CVT causality.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected. Issue year 2015 retained; online-first date is 2013.

Checked source: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/peps.12066/abstract>

R05 No credit where credit is due

[R05] Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2005). No credit where credit is due: Attributional rationalization of women's success in male-female teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 905-916. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.905>

Evidence type: Three experimental studies.

Bounded use: Ambiguous contribution in the studied mixed-sex team scenarios supported unequal credit judgments.

Boundary: Do not generalize the experiment to every group, role, or workplace decision.

Verification scope: PubMed primary article abstract and bibliographic record inspected.

Checked source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16162063/>

R06 Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability

[R06] Babcock, L., Recalde, M. P., Vesterlund, L., & Weingart, L. (2017). Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability. *American Economic Review*, 107(3), 714-747. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20141734>

Evidence type: Empirical task-allocation research.

Bounded use: The study examines gender differences in volunteering for and receiving requests for low-promotability tasks.

Boundary: It does not establish a general builder disadvantage or that all service work lacks value.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected through AEA mirror swlb1.aeaweb.org.

Checked source: <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.20141734>

R07 Promotions and the Peter Principle

[R07] Benson, A., Li, D., & Shue, K. (2019). Promotions and the Peter Principle. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(4), 2085-2134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz022>

Evidence type: Observational personnel study.

Bounded use: The published sales-firm study examines trade-offs between current performance and managerial matching.

Boundary: A role-specific finding does not establish a universal promotion rule or a builder penalty.

Verification scope: Publisher article sections, abstract, and metadata inspected. Published version used rather than a different working-paper sample.

Checked source: <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/134/4/2085/5550760>

R08 On the dimensionality of organizational justice

[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>

Evidence type: Measurement validation study.

Bounded use: The paper distinguishes dimensions of organizational justice.

Boundary: Its validation does not extend to CVT original items or establish attribution accuracy.

Verification scope: PubMed abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11419799/>

R09 Common method biases in behavioral research

[R09] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

Evidence type: Methodological review.

Bounded use: Shared methods can affect behavioral-research measurements and require design attention.

Boundary: No single diagnostic certifies that CVT observations are free of method bias.

Verification scope: PubMed abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14516251/>

R10 Advances in leader and leadership development

[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>

Evidence type: Research and theory review.

Bounded use: Leadership development involves individual and interpersonal processes and longitudinal evaluation.

Boundary: The review does not establish the effectiveness of the CVT 90 day curriculum.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract, metadata, and available section summaries inspected.

Checked source: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984313001197>

R11 Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations

[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

Evidence type: Conceptual theory.

Bounded use: Leadership identity is proposed as a social process involving claims and grants.

Boundary: This is a theory, not proof of CVT training effectiveness. DOI aliases were not independently reconciled, so no DOI is supplied.

Verification scope: Published primary paper header and abstract inspected through indexed university-hosted PDF. Direct open unavailable; full-text appraisal not claimed.

Checked source: https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/78/ZP_Files/2020/derue_ashford-2010.zp195280.pdf

R12 Construct validity in psychological tests

[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>

Evidence type: Foundational measurement theory.

Bounded use: Construct interpretation requires a program of validity evidence.

Boundary: A reference to this framework does not validate a new scale.

Verification scope: APA primary record summary and PubMed metadata inspected. Full-text review not claimed.

Checked source: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>

R13 Construct validation in social and personality research

[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>

Evidence type: Measurement practice review.

Bounded use: Reliability alone does not supply a sufficient construct-validity program.

Boundary: No reported reliability or validity result exists for CVT items.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1948550617693063>

R14 The study of congruence in organizational behavior research

[R14] Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in organizational behavior research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58(1), 51-100. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1029>

Evidence type: Methodological critique.

Bounded use: Collapsing distinct constructs into congruence indices can create interpretive problems.

Boundary: A statistical alternative does not itself establish a normative fairness benchmark.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1029>

R15 A general approach to causal mediation analysis

[R15] Imai, K., Keele, L., & Tingley, D. (2010). A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 15(4), 309-334. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020761>

Evidence type: Causal methods.

Bounded use: Causal mediation requires explicit identification assumptions and sensitivity analysis.

Boundary: Temporal ordering and a significant indirect association alone do not identify mediation.

Verification scope: Author institutional repository abstract, published-paper opening text, and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://dash.harvard.edu/entities/publication/b1683a2b-3e1c-444e-99c0-75f7e7022d6e>

R16 The preregistration revolution

[R16] Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600-2606.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>

Evidence type: Methodological perspective.

Bounded use: Preregistration distinguishes prospective predictions and analyses from post hoc exploration.

Boundary: Registration does not repair a weak design, invalid measurement, or inadequate ethics.

Verification scope: Publisher abstract, authors, and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>

R17 Sample size justification

[R17] Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1), Article 33267.

<https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267>

Evidence type: Methodological guidance.

Bounded use: Sample-size plans need an explicit justification tied to the study purpose and precision.

Boundary: No sample size or power claim for CVT follows from citing this article.

Verification scope: Publisher article introduction, abstract, and metadata inspected.

Checked source: <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267>

R18 The Belmont Report

[R18] National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (1979). The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>

Evidence type: Ethical principles.

Bounded use: Respect for persons, beneficence, and justice guide research protections.

Boundary: Ethical principles do not constitute local research approval or establish universal regulatory applicability.

Verification scope: Official report text and date inspected.

Checked source: <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>

R19 The gender gap in self-promotion

[R19] Exley, C. L., & Kessler, J. B. (2022). The gender gap in self-promotion. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(3), 1345-1381. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjac003>

Evidence type: Experimental research.

Bounded use: Self-evaluations can differ between equally performing participants in the studied task contexts.

Boundary: Task and gender findings do not establish a collective-attribution penalty, stable employee types, or workplace compensation effects.

Verification scope: Publisher indexed abstract and bibliographic record inspected October 19 2026. Direct opening redirected to an inaccessible CDN; full-text appraisal not claimed.

Checked source: <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/137/3/1345/6513425>

R20 Dual-promotion

[R20] VanEpps, E. M., Hart, E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2024). Dual-promotion: Bragging better by promoting peers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 126(4), 603-623. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000431>

Evidence type: Preregistered studies including experiments.

Bounded use: Combining self-promotion with credit to others improved warmth and competence impressions relative to self-promotion alone in the studied settings.

Boundary: Impressions and behavioral intentions are not actual workplace pay or promotion. The result does not validate CVT or imply that collective and individual credit are opposites.

Verification scope: PubMed primary article abstract and metadata inspected October 19 2026. Issue year 2024 retained; online first August 10 2023. Full text not appraised.

Checked source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37561455/>

R21 Egocentric biases in availability and attribution

[R21] Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(3), 322-336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.3.322>

Evidence type: Five experiments on joint activity.

Bounded use: Availability of personal contributions and responsibility judgments showed egocentric biases in the studied joint activities.

Boundary: Memory and responsibility findings do not show intentional appropriation or validate recognition loss during organizational adoption.

Verification scope: University-hosted primary paper header and abstract inspected October 19 2026. Fifteen-page paper accessible; full-text critical appraisal not claimed.

Checked source:

https://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Negotiation_and_Conflict_Management/Ross_Sicoly_1979_Egocentric_biases.pdf

R22 ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022 CRediT Contributor Roles Taxonomy

[R22] National Information Standards Organization (2022). ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022 CRediT Contributor Roles Taxonomy. NISO. <https://doi.org/10.3789/ansi.niso.z39.104-2022>

Evidence type: Scholarly contributorship standard.

Bounded use: CRediT provides a structured taxonomy for differentiated contributions to scholarly outputs.

Boundary: A scholarly metadata standard does not validate an employment assessment, a CVT score, or a documentation intervention.

Verification scope: Official NISO standard record and CRediT role hub inspected October 19 2026. Approval January 14 2022 and publication February 8 2022 confirmed. Full standard not appraised.

Checked source: <https://www.niso.org/publications/z39104-2022-credit>

R23 Signaling theory

[R23] Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419>

Evidence type: Theoretical review.

Bounded use: Signaling theory distinguishes sender communication, receiver interpretation, and information asymmetry.

Boundary: Using the word signaling does not establish a formal signaling equilibrium, credibility, or a recognition effect.

Verification scope: Publisher indexed abstract, metadata, and relevant displayed note inspected October 19 2026. Issue year 2011 retained; online first December 20 2010. Full-text appraisal not claimed.

Checked source: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0149206310388419>

Claims this package does not establish

No source here establishes that visibility usually predicts reward more strongly than contribution, that three natural employee types exist, that builders generally advance more slowly, or that the 90 day curriculum improves leadership. No evidence here establishes that the three October 19 constructs are distinct, prevalent, causal, or scientifically novel. No measured case outcome establishes recognition, promotion, or compensation disparity. No CVT scale has demonstrated reliability, validity, invariance, or employment-decision fairness. The papers propose mechanisms and rival explanations. The protocol provides tests that may contradict them.

Bibliographic handling notes

Use issue publication years for journal citations. Munyon and colleagues appeared online in 2013 and in volume 68 in 2015; the package cites 2015. Seibert and colleagues is a 2001 article despite a later publisher platform online date. For Benson and colleagues, the package uses the 2019 published article and avoids mixing sample information from a working-paper version. R11 metadata and the conceptual abstract were visible in the primary-paper index, but direct opening failed; no full-text review or reconciled DOI is claimed.

Reference tools can import the companion BibTeX or RIS file. The CSV register preserves support and limits in separate fields. Researchers should inspect the full texts and extend the literature review before submission, replication, or major organizational adoption.