

Corporate Value Triad Publication Package

Readme and publication index

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijean

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual framework and pilot materials | Pending empirical validation

1 Start here

This collection develops the Corporate Value Triad as a testable account of contribution, visibility, attribution, recognition, influence, and reward. The five papers are complete conceptual working manuscripts. They report no original empirical results, carry no claim of peer review, and establish no priority over existing theories. The protocol, survey, and toolkits are proposals for reviewed research and cautious pilot use.

Read the public brief for an introduction, paper 1 for the model, and the research protocol before collecting data. The references companion maps inspected sources to bounded claims. The executive deck presents the proposal and the decision to commission a reviewed pilot. Every substantive document is available as editable Word and PDF. The deck is editable PowerPoint with a PDF and a separate notes handout. Markdown and CSV files support revision and instrument setup.

2 Package index

Folder	Deliverable	Main use
01_Papers	01_Foundational_Theory	Constructs, contribution, propositions, boundaries
01_Papers	02_Contribution_Recognition_Gap	Evidence and acknowledgment without a gap score
01_Papers	03_Value_Attribution	Credit judgments and an information experiment
01_Papers	04_Builders_Paradox	Operational dependence and development access
01_Papers	05_Builder_Leader_Transition	Development mechanisms and evaluation
02_Research	06_Research_Protocol	H1 to H13 with update-label crosswalk, designs, analysis, consent, safeguards
02_Research	07_Organizational_Diagnostic	Original 24 items plus a separate eight-item attribution extension
03_Toolkits	08_Leadership_Development_Kit	90 day program and seven reusable worksheets
03_Toolkits	09_Management_Audit	Charter, evidence, credit, opportunity, action records
03_Toolkits	13_Contribution_Attribution_Assessment	Eight pilot items, independent manager account, history and source review
04_Communication	10_Public_Brief	Accessible explanation and research limits

Folder	Deliverable	Main use
04_Communication	11_Executive_Presentation	Executive deck and speaker notes
05_References	12_References_and_Evidence	Verified records, claim boundaries, source access
06_Editable_Sources	Markdown, CSV, BibTeX, RIS	Revision, survey setup, evidence and action logs

Root files include this index in Word, PDF, and Markdown, a browser-readable Start_Here.html, and MANIFEST_SHA256.txt. File stems remain stable across editable and PDF versions. The executive notes handout is also supplied in Markdown. The blank templates contain no completed employee data. Paper 3 includes a generalized participant-reported illustration with no employee names, screenshots, employer identifiers, product details, or distinctive service history. It is not independently verified or a consented empirical case study. External use requires required company confidentiality clearance and appropriate participant permissions, or removal of the illustration; no such clearance is claimed.

3 Research status and prohibited inferences

All CVT-specific mechanisms, archetypes, and intervention effects remain proposed. Existing studies support selected background claims, not the entire framework. The literature review is targeted and does not claim systematic coverage. Citation verification checks identity, metadata, and the bounded claim visible in inspected primary records or abstracts. It does not amount to an exhaustive critical appraisal of each full text.

There is no validated CVT total score, no established personality classification, no normative benchmark, and no demonstrated employment-decision validity. The six original survey domains are provisional. The eight supplementary attribution items and mixed-source assessment have no combined score or subscale means. Optional means follow an arbitrary pilot missing-data convention and must not become an employee ranking. Contribution evidence requires independent assessment rather than substitution of a self-report survey score.

The research protocol is not an approved study, registration, or completed power analysis. Before recruitment, a named investigator must complete local contacts, permissions, sampling, measurement, precision simulations, data dates, and independent ethics determination. The consent text must match actual procedures. Generic blanks in activation and worksheet fields are intentional fields for local completion, not missing findings.

4 Editing and use

Edit Word files for normal document revision or Markdown files for transparent text changes. Edit slide text and native tables in PowerPoint. The PDF deck is a reading copy and omits speaker notes; use the separate notes handout when presenting. Survey CSVs are instrument definitions and empty templates. Preserve the item IDs, missing-response codes, and version number when piloting. Treat wording changes as a new instrument version.

The evidence log, opportunity log, and audit action register contain empty fields. Do not store identifying employee information in a shared public copy. The research protocol specifies separation of identity keys, consent, analysis data, and employer reporting. Toolkits may be used without scoring people. All practical recommendations remain subject to appropriate local review and judgment.

5 Attribution and suggested citations

Framework attribution: Corporate Value Triad, proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu, version 0.1, October 2026, research update October 19, 2026.

Suggested manuscript citation: Pijeu, J. N. (2026). The Corporate Value Triad: A theory of organizational contribution and influence (Version 0.1, research update October 19) [Conceptual working paper]. Corporate Value Triad publication package. No DOI or public repository has been assigned.

For other papers, substitute the document title and retain version and working-paper status. AI-assisted drafting, source checking, and document production supported preparation of this package. Attribution identifies the proposed framework originator and does not imply that Jean Nickson Pijeu has reviewed, endorsed, or submitted every sentence. Human author review is required before publication. No affiliation, credential, funding, or ethics approval is asserted.

No public reuse license has been selected in this package. Distribution, licensing, and author approval remain decisions for the rights holder. External references retain their own rights. This package supplies citations and original summaries rather than copies of published articles or proprietary questionnaires.

6 Publication roadmap

First, obtain author approval of claims and attribution, substantive review by organizational and measurement researchers, and employee feedback on language and burden. Check novelty more broadly and choose an appropriate preprint or working-paper venue. Release conceptual papers with their status visible and a version history.

Second, develop measures through cognitive interviews and independent validation, then register specific studies with completed ethics and precision plans. Publish null and adverse results as well as favorable ones. Keep pilot organizational use separate from employee selection.

Third, revise CVT in light of evidence. A useful mechanism may survive even if the triad does not form distinct profiles. Only claim validated uses after evidence supports the specific measure, population, decision, and context. Keep earlier predictions accessible rather than rewriting them after results.

7 Version and change history

The initial version 0.1 package was prepared October 18, 2026. This dated revision retains the requested version 0.1 and October 2026 attribution, while identifying the research update as October 19, 2026. The earlier release remains separate. Cite the update date to distinguish these materials.

The update adds three proposed constructs to papers 1 to 3, a generalized reported illustration and its limits to paper 3, Study E and H9 to H13 to the protocol, and eight supplementary pilot items shared with the new Contribution Attribution Assessment. The leadership kit, management audit, public brief, presentation, source records, references, and index reflect the extension. Papers 4 and 5 retain their substantive arguments.

The original H1 to H8 retain their meanings. Update H7 maps to package H9, update H8 to H10, update H9 to H11, update H10 to H12, and update H11 to H13. The protocol and Hypothesis_Crosswalk.csv preserve both identifiers. The original 24 item IDs and exploratory mean convention remain separate from the eight new items, which have item-level reporting only.

Reference IDs R01 to R18 retain their prior October 18 verification records. R19 to R23 were checked October 19 against primary records or source text, with actual access limitations recorded. The updated register distinguishes dates. No direct empirical validation of the new constructs is claimed, and the targeted literature review does not establish scientific novelty.

The Corporate Value Triad

A theory of organizational contribution and influence

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual working paper 1 of 5 | Pending empirical validation

Abstract

The Corporate Value Triad (CVT) proposes that organizations convert contributions into career outcomes through processes of visibility, attribution, and influence. Its three archetypes, Builders, Relationship Operators, and Builder-Leaders, describe patterns of work rather than natural kinds of people. The model distinguishes producing an outcome from being credited for it and distinguishes recognition from subsequent reward. It also treats coordination and relationship work as potentially productive contributions. The proposed contribution is an integrated, episode-based account of how evidence reaches decision-makers and how allocation rules convert that evidence into opportunities, pay, and authority. Existing research motivates components of this account but does not establish CVT as a validated theory. This paper defines the constructs, states directional propositions, identifies rival explanations, and specifies conditions under which the framework should be revised or abandoned. The accompanying protocol separates observational prediction from causal tests and makes measurement development a prerequisite for confirmatory use. A dated extension proposes collective attribution, contribution signaling, and loss of originating credit during organizational adoption as possible mechanisms that require separate tests.

Keywords: contribution, attribution, organizational influence, recognition, career advancement

1 The problem and the proposed contribution

An organization can know that a project succeeded while remaining uncertain about who enabled the result. A customer negotiation, a reliable production system, a carefully prevented failure, and a well-coordinated handoff can all create value. Their contributions leave different evidence trails. People making evaluation and promotion decisions rarely observe those trails equally. CVT asks how this uneven information environment affects credit and career outcomes.

The framework does not presume that technical specialists deserve every available promotion. Promotion can reward past work, recruit skills needed for a different role, retain a scarce employee, or fill a vacancy. These purposes can conflict. The theoretical problem is therefore conditional: when an organization says it allocates recognition or opportunity on a particular basis, what explains divergence between relevant contribution evidence and its decisions?

Social capital already connects organizational relationships to careers (Seibert et al., 2001 [R01]). Brokerage research links network position with ideas and career outcomes (Burt, 2004 [R02]). Political skill scholarship offers a developed account of interpersonal effectiveness (Ferris et al., 2007 [R03]). CVT cannot claim these observations as discoveries. Its potential addition is to specify an intermediate allocation process with observable episodes, competing paths, and explicit opportunities for falsification. It must demonstrate usefulness beyond established constructs rather than rename them.

2 Constructs and units of analysis

The primary unit is a person contributing to a defined work episode within a team and organization. An episode has a stated objective, time window, participants, constraints, and outcome evidence. Individuals can appear in many episodes and change patterns across assignments. Team and organization rules operate at different analytical levels.

Construct	Operational meaning	What it must not stand in for
Contribution C	A person's defensible contribution to an episode's relevant outcomes, including enabling work and adverse effects	Hours, output counts, self-confidence, or visibility alone
Visibility V	Decision-makers' exposure to evidence about an episode and its contributors	Favorable evaluation or deserved credit
Attribution A	Credit assigned to a person for a specified outcome	Whether the outcome occurred or a reward followed
Influence I	Capacity to affect decisions or mobilize resources in the stated setting	Mere access, formal title, or ethical conduct
Recognition N	An observable acknowledgment of contribution, such as documented credit or an evaluation statement	Compensation or managerial suitability
Reward R	A specified allocation such as pay change, promotion, authority, or development access	A single universal measure of career success

Attribution is a judgment. Recognition is an act that expresses or records a judgment. A manager can privately credit someone without mentioning them in a review. An employee can receive a public acknowledgment without receiving a promotion. The contribution-recognition gap in paper 2 concerns this difference between relevant evidence and expressed acknowledgment. The value attribution paper examines the earlier judgment process.

Contribution is not directly observed without error. Work products, customer outcomes, stakeholder accounts, and independent review provide fallible indicators. Evidence should include negative externalities, displaced work, maintenance, and prevention. An outcome can depend jointly on people, tools, inherited systems, and favorable circumstances. A defensible account may acknowledge joint necessity without assigning percentages that sum to 100.

3 The three archetypes and the limits of the triad

Builders primarily create or sustain outcomes through domain work. Relationship Operators primarily connect people, coordinate interdependence, negotiate, or influence allocation. Builder-Leaders combine domain judgment with mobilization of people and resources. These descriptions are provisional and overlap. A relationship operator may produce high economic and social value. A builder may already exercise informal leadership.

The triad is an accessible vocabulary, not an exhaustive taxonomy. A person can perform little observed work of either kind because of onboarding, blocked opportunity, illness, mismatched assignment, or incomplete observation. That possibility does not justify a residual category of deficient employees. The

model represents behaviors and circumstances continuously. It does not divide people at a numerical threshold or infer moral worth from job function.

There is a specific dimensional problem to resolve. Domain execution and relational mobilization are work activities, whereas total contribution is an outcome construct that may include both. Treating relationship work as the low-contribution pole would build the desired conclusion into the measure. CVT instead records execution and mobilization separately, estimates contribution with a role-sensitive evidence rubric, and treats visibility and influence as distinct process variables. Whether three recurring profiles exist is an empirical question secondary to the continuous model.

4 A proposed mechanism

The proposed sequence begins when work produces evidence. Evidence can reach evaluators through direct observation, artifacts, stakeholder testimony, or a spokesperson. Evaluators assign credit using that information and prior expectations. Recognition records some of that credit. Allocation rules then combine recognition with role requirements, budgets, vacancies, and bargaining conditions to determine rewards. Influence can affect both the work itself and these allocation processes.

The sequence is a conceptual ordering, not a proven causal chain. Prior reward can increase authority, access, and subsequent visibility. A manager may give an already favored employee a better assignment. Coordination may improve both outcomes and their observability. A cross-sectional correlation between visibility and pay cannot distinguish these paths.

One useful temporal representation is:

Evidence about C at time 0; exposure V at time 1; attribution A and recognition N at time 2; reward R at time 3. Influence I and organizational rules can affect several transitions. Prior opportunity, role level, task interdependence, evaluator knowledge, and relevant prior outcomes require explicit consideration.

This representation deliberately avoids a weighted CVT equation. No evidence supports universal coefficients or a fungible conversion rate between production and influence. The model is useful only if its components can be measured distinctly and its proposed paths outperform plausible simpler accounts.

Attribution styles and contribution history

The October 19 update adds three proposed constructs. The Collective Attribution Paradox is a conditional prediction: people who habitually describe accomplishments as team achievements may receive less individual acknowledgment in systems that evaluate individuals, even when their relevant contribution is comparable. Team acknowledgment can be accurate and valuable. A collective account can also name individual roles, so collective and individual attribution are not mutually exclusive. The proposed paradox concerns a mismatch between a communication norm and an evaluation process, not a defect in teamwork.

The Attribution Dilution Effect is the proposed loss of identifiable credit for an original contribution as an innovation is adopted, modified, and institutionalized. Later contributors can legitimately earn substantial credit. A falling percentage of total credit as new work accumulates is therefore insufficient evidence of dilution. A stronger test asks whether acknowledgment of an unchanged, corroborated originating action disappears from later accounts. Originating, improving, maintaining, and coordinating adoption are separate actions. No claim about intellectual property ownership follows from this terminology.

Contribution Signaling means the explicit communication of verifiable actions and outcomes to people who evaluate work. It concerns communication behavior, while visibility concerns what an evaluator actually encounters. A message can be sent without being seen. Established signaling theory distinguishes senders

and receiver interpretation [R23]. CVT uses a descriptive communication construct here; it does not assume signal costs, credibility, or an equilibrium model. Signaling can improve the work by securing adoption, which belongs in contribution, as well as change its observability. An association after noisy contribution adjustment does not establish an independent causal premium for signaling.

These constructs extend the information mechanism without adding a fourth employee archetype. Proposed paths run from team-oriented norms to communication behavior, from communication and managerial exposure to credit, and from evolving records to preservation of contribution history. Status, evaluator knowledge, task interdependence, opportunity, and prior recognition can confound those paths. The new concepts require discriminant and incremental validity beyond existing attribution, self-presentation, and information-processing accounts.

Relation to prior work and a reported illustration

Existing research on self-evaluation [R19], combined self and other promotion [R20], and responsibility judgments in joint work [R21] supplies relevant precedents. These literatures concern different constructs and outcomes. They do not establish any of the three proposed CVT effects. The targeted review identifies related work rather than demonstrating novelty or exhaustive coverage. In particular, the proposed adoption-related dilution mechanism lacks direct validation in this package.

A reported episode concerns a specialist who created an internal utility and a colleague who later improved it. The colleague reportedly acknowledged the creator while discussing the improvements before an evaluator. The creator described a preference for collective attribution. This account suggests a possible difference in communication exposure. It contains no measured evaluator judgment or subsequent recognition outcome. Paper 3 gives the generalized account and its source limitations. Neither person's intent, fairness of treatment, nor compensation can be inferred.

5 Propositions

P1 proposes that, among episodes with comparable relevant contribution evidence, greater evaluator exposure predicts more subsequent attribution. P2 proposes that attribution predicts subsequent recorded recognition, while allowing the organization to omit or dilute credit during formal reporting. P3 proposes that recognition predicts specified rewards conditional on the stated allocation purpose, opportunity set, and available resources. These are different propositions and can fail independently.

P4 proposes that a structured evidence record reduces the portion of attribution explained by presentation exposure when exposure carries no new contribution information. P5 proposes that replaceability constraints can delay development access for people with documented operational dependencies. P6 proposes that leadership development accompanied by workload transfer produces better team outcomes than training added to an unchanged workload. The protocol retains H1 through H8 and adds H9 through H13, mapped to the update author's H7 through H11 to avoid identifier collisions. The additional propositions concern collective attribution and individual recognition, exposure as a moderator of signaling, preservation of originating credit during adoption, documentation as a moderator of attribution style, and team-oriented norms as antecedents of communication. None has been tested in this package.

None implies that visibility usually matters more than contribution. Comparing raw coefficients would be invalid when variables have different scales or reliabilities. Relative predictive importance, if studied, requires a prespecified target, comparable measurement, uncertainty estimates, and an independent evaluation sample. A visibility association remaining after noisy contribution adjustment is compatible with omitted productive work.

6 Evidence that constrains the theory

Munyon et al. (2015 [R04]) report positive associations of political skill with both performance and career outcomes. That evidence challenges a model that treats influence only as reward capture. Heilman and Haynes (2005 [R05]) experimentally examine unequal credit under ambiguity in mixed-sex teams, illustrating one bounded attribution problem. Neither source validates the CVT archetypes.

Benson et al. (2019 [R07]) study trade-offs between sales performance and managerial matching. Their work constrains the assumption that excellent current-role performance alone identifies the best manager. CVT consequently distinguishes accurate acknowledgment of past contribution from selection for future responsibility. An equitable system can recognize one employee and choose a different employee for a management vacancy, provided its criteria are relevant, transparent, and consistently applied.

These sources are a targeted foundation, not a systematic review. Their settings, designs, and constructs differ. The references companion documents the checked records and the limited claims supported by inspected abstracts or summaries. The package reports no original participants, estimates, or organizational findings.

7 Boundary conditions and rival accounts

CVT should be most informative where work is interdependent, evidence is distributed, and evaluators lack direct observation. It may add little in settings where contribution and allocation are already directly linked and well measured. Even there, the outcome measure may omit prevention, collaboration, or long-run quality. Institutional settings with strong seniority rules may constrain the recognition-reward path regardless of attribution accuracy.

The productive coordination rival predicts that apparent visibility effects shrink when coordination outcomes and assignment quality are measured adequately. The rational matching rival predicts that advancement follows prospective role requirements rather than missing recognition. The opportunity rival predicts that prior sponsorship explains both more consequential assignments and later reward. The reverse-causality rival predicts that reward precedes increased visibility. The measurement rival predicts that apparent contribution gaps disappear with better outcome evidence.

A useful test must give these accounts a fair chance. CVT loses explanatory value if its measures cannot separate exposure from contribution, if established social capital and role variables explain its predictions equally well, or if preregistered replication repeatedly yields precise effects incompatible with its directional claims. A null result with wide uncertainty is insufficient to settle the question. A rejected archetype model can coexist with a useful attribution mechanism, and the theory should state which part survives.

8 Research and practice implications

The research program begins with cognitive interviews and measurement development, followed by longitudinal episodes and experiments on evidence presentation. Analysts should collect contribution evidence before decision outcomes where feasible and separate raters from decision-makers. The accompanying protocol describes clustering, selection, missingness, multiple testing, and sensitivity analysis. The survey is a pilot item pool about reported experiences, not an independent measure of actual contribution.

Practitioners can use the framework to ask better questions about credit and opportunity. They should not use its language to rank people, deny promotion, or diagnose a workforce. A low-risk application is to

improve the completeness of project records and permit contributors to correct omissions. Such practices still require evaluation because documentation consumes time and can privilege easily recorded work.

9 Conclusion

CVT proposes an account of how organizations make work legible, assign credit, and allocate subsequent opportunity. Its value depends on distinguishing those stages while recognizing that relationship work can be productive. The triad supplies a vocabulary for discussion. The continuous, temporally specified model supplies the research claims. Version 0.1 and its October 19 research update offer a program for criticism and testing, without asserting that the program has already succeeded.

References

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

The Contribution Recognition Gap

Evidence acknowledgment and organizational allocation

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual working paper 2 of 5 | Pending empirical validation

Abstract

This paper defines the contribution-recognition gap as a mismatch between defensible evidence about a person's contribution and an organization's expressed acknowledgment of that contribution within a specified episode. It distinguishes underrecognition from a failure to receive a desired reward. The proposed mechanisms include limited evaluator exposure, evidence compression, communication styles, loss of contribution history during adoption, uneven assignment access, and differences in the rules governing recognition and advancement. Because contribution and recognition are distinct constructs with different scales, their subtraction does not produce a validated fairness index. The paper develops a matched-evidence approach, specifies rival interpretations, and proposes longitudinal and experimental tests. Existing research motivates the problem without establishing its prevalence or validating the Corporate Value Triad. The resulting audit focuses on traceable omissions, contestable judgments, and process correction rather than employee labels.

1 What constitutes a gap

A claim of underrecognition contains at least three judgments: the work mattered, the person contributed, and the acknowledgment failed to reflect that contribution. Each judgment can be contested. A well-liked employee's disappointment is not sufficient evidence. Nor is a manager's assertion that a review was fair. The empirical task is to reconstruct relevant evidence and compare it with what the organization actually recorded or communicated.

The unit of analysis is an employee-episode pair within an evaluation window. Contribution C refers to a defensible contribution to role-relevant outcomes, including enabling and preventive work. Recognition N is an observable acknowledgment such as project credit, a performance narrative, a formal award, or an explicit acknowledgment during a decision. Attribution A is the evaluator's credit judgment that may precede N. Reward R refers to a separate allocation such as a pay change or promotion.

A gap can run in either direction. An organization can omit a contributor, overstate a spokesperson's role, or acknowledge work that independent evidence does not support. It can also correctly recognize joint work without determining each person's counterfactual share. The model therefore permits unresolved cases. It does not require an auditor to manufacture a precise answer where evidence is incomplete.

2 Why reward disappointment is a separate question

Consider a fictional engineer who prevents a serious service failure. A review may accurately acknowledge the prevention while a promotion panel selects another person for a role requiring skills the engineer has not demonstrated. That is not necessarily a contribution-recognition gap. Conversely, a salary increase driven by a retention concern can coexist with an inaccurate project narrative. Reward does not establish attribution accuracy.

The normative benchmark must be stated before inspecting individual cases. An organization might promise to recognize enabling work, distribute development access fairly, and select managers against prospective role criteria. Those promises generate different tests. A mismatch between current-role contribution and management promotion is not inherently unjust. Research on promotions and managerial matching underscores the need to distinguish these purposes (Benson et al., 2019 [R07]).

CVT consequently avoids a universal claim that rewards should be proportional to a single contribution score. Organizations must choose and justify their allocation rules. Researchers can test consistency with those stated rules, compare consequences of alternative rules, and examine whether people have access to a meaningful correction process.

3 Proposed mechanisms

The exposure mechanism proposes that some relevant evidence never reaches an evaluator. Preventive work may leave a quieter trace than a customer presentation. Work performed across shifts or organizational boundaries may have no single observer. This is a hypothesis about information, not a general statement about which occupations are undervalued.

The compression mechanism proposes that lengthy work histories become short narratives. A final presenter, project owner, or formally accountable manager can become the convenient subject of a success story. Compression can be efficient, and the named person may have made a substantial contribution. The predicted problem arises when compression suppresses material enabling work or turns responsibility for a project into a false assertion of sole authorship.

The opportunity mechanism concerns who gets work that creates recognizable evidence. Employees may differ in access to consequential assignments before recognition occurs. Babcock et al. (2017 [R06]) examine gender differences in allocation of tasks with low promotability. Their specific findings do not establish a general builder disadvantage, but they motivate measuring assignments and maintenance burdens rather than attributing every outcome to personal communication skill.

The conversion mechanism concerns organizational rules after recognition. A manager can acknowledge work yet lack promotion authority or budget. A vacancy may never open. An employee can decline relocation or a managerial career. Treating these outcomes as evidence of hidden political capture would be an error. The protocol measures eligibility, available opportunities, and employee preferences where consent permits.

Communication styles as a proposed source of unequal visibility

Contribution Signaling distinguishes the explicit description of one's actions from evaluator exposure to that description. Both can vary while relevant work remains comparable. The Collective Attribution Paradox proposes that a team-focused description may leave an individual's role less legible in an individual evaluation system. The comparison must allow a third possibility: a description that acknowledges the team and specifies each person's actions. Collective credit is compatible with precise individual attribution.

The hypothesized disadvantage is conditional. A knowledgeable manager may already know who did what. A strong team-level evaluation system may reward collective framing. Explicit self-attribution can also be inaccurate or counterproductive. Communication may itself help the outcome. These alternatives make manager knowledge, exposure, role, record quality, and productive communication necessary parts of the design. H9 and H10 in the revised protocol address these distinctions. They correspond to H7 and H8 in the October 19 update.

Recognition over the life of an innovation

The Attribution Dilution Effect concerns whether acknowledgment of a specific originating action is lost as work spreads. It does not presume that the originator deserves permanent dominance in every account. A maintainer's recent improvements can deserve more attention in an operations review than an earlier design. Researchers must define the purpose of the account and test originating-action acknowledgment separately from current value, credit share, and ownership.

The relevant longitudinal comparison follows the same corroborated action across creation, initial adoption, and wider adoption, while accounting for elapsed time and later work. Adoption is selected rather than random: more successful innovations may spread further and attract more contributors. A stage association does not establish that adoption caused forgetting. The protocol's H11 retains this limitation. H12 tests whether a structured history reduces attribution-style differences in a controlled setting. H13 examines team-oriented norms without inferring a person's style from occupation or background.

The reported case in paper 3 contains explicit acknowledgment of the creator. It therefore supplies neither an observed omission nor evidence of a contribution-recognition gap. Its value is to generate questions about information and communication under legitimate shared credit. Prospective corroboration and outcome measurement are required before describing unequal recognition as a finding.

4 A defensible measurement approach

The first stage records an episode's objective, expected benefit, participants, constraints, and outcome. Evidence can include artifacts, changes in quality, customer accounts, risk analyses, and structured stakeholder statements. The second stage records who receives explicit credit and for what action in the same episode. The third stage identifies agreements, omissions, contradictions, and uncertainty. These are records for adjudication rather than inputs to an automatic merit score.

Evidence comparison	Provisional finding	Required follow-up
Relevant contribution corroborated and acknowledged	Apparent correspondence	Check whether the same standard covers less visible work
Relevant contribution corroborated and omitted	Possible omission	Ask evaluator and contributor for context and corrections
Credit recorded without sufficient corroboration	Unverified credit	Seek missing evidence before inferring overclaiming
Sources conflict or coverage is weak	Unresolved	Preserve disagreement and avoid an individual conclusion

Corroboration means that independent sources support the stated action. It does not mean a person has a validated quantity of contribution. Auditors must document the quality and independence of their sources. Two accounts copied from the same project summary are not independent confirmation. An artifact may show authorship without establishing usefulness, and customer praise may omit internal enabling work.

Role-sensitive rubrics should define quality, timeliness, risk, and collective outcomes before cases are reviewed. A maintenance assignment should not be compared with a sales role using revenue alone. Independent reviewers should record uncertainty and disagreements. When reviewers can recognize employees from work artifacts, partial masking should not be described as complete blinding.

5 Why a subtraction score is inadequate

Subtracting a recognition rating from a contribution rating assumes comparable units and a justified equality benchmark. Neither follows from using the same response scale. A value of four on one survey item does not mean the same quantity as four on another construct. Standardizing both variables creates relative positions in a selected sample, not a measure of deserved recognition.

Difference-score problems in congruence research provide a methodological warning (Edwards, 1994 [R14]). CVT therefore keeps contribution evidence and recognition measures separate. The main observational analysis estimates recognition conditional on relevant contribution indicators and the prespecified opportunity context. Residuals describe deviations from a fitted model. They are model-dependent and cannot identify unfair treatment of particular employees.

If commensurate measures are later developed, researchers may evaluate joint surfaces or multivariate models. They must justify the substantive equality line and estimate uncertainty. Selecting a statistical method does not solve the normative question of what recognition should mean. The audit in this package uses documented discrepancies and process findings rather than a numerical gap index.

6 Testable expectations and research designs

The first prediction is temporal: relevant evidence exposure at an earlier wave predicts subsequent credit, conditional on the evidence available at baseline. This is H1 in the research protocol and is an observational association. The alternative is that exposure is a proxy for productive coordination or prior evaluator trust. Measuring these factors does not guarantee that all confounding disappears.

The second prediction concerns information design. In a randomized vignette, equal contributions can appear with different presenter prominence. H2 tests whether a structured contribution record reduces the effect of irrelevant prominence on assigned credit. Randomization supports an inference about that manipulated information environment, not a conclusion about workplace promotion rates.

The third prediction concerns processes. If documentation improves only the measured narrative while leaving opportunity access unequal, recognition can appear more aligned while careers remain constrained. The research should therefore report attribution, recorded recognition, and opportunity outcomes separately. An organization could improve one and worsen another.

A useful field study obtains evidence before an evaluation, captures evaluators' exposure without treating favorability as visibility, and records the final acknowledgment. Team and evaluator clustering matter. Evaluators may see the same employees repeatedly. Analysts should prespecify what enters the model, which stage is the primary endpoint, and how missing episodes affect inference. The accompanying protocol sets out those decisions.

7 Fairness perceptions and attribution accuracy

Employees' perceptions are consequential experiences but do not replace evidence reconstruction. Colquitt (2001 [R08]) distinguishes dimensions of organizational justice, which cautions against collapsing procedure and outcome into a single favorable-attitude measure. CVT's original survey items ask about reported experience and process access. They do not inherit validity from the justice literature.

A person may perceive unfairness despite accurate credit because the allocation rule is opaque or because comparable work receives different treatment. An employee may report satisfaction despite systematic omission. The research should examine these differences rather than treat disagreement as error by one side. Interviews can clarify what participants interpret as contribution, recognition, or an opportunity.

Shared-source measurement creates a further problem. If the same respondent rates their own contribution and recognition at one time, general dissatisfaction may affect both. Method bias is a documented methodological concern (Podsakoff et al., 2003 [R09]). Multiple sources, separated measurement occasions, and concrete episode questions reduce some risks without eliminating them. A single factor check cannot certify the absence of bias.

8 Conditions that would weaken the account

The proposed exposure mechanism would be weakened if adequately powered studies found a precisely negligible exposure association after reliable contribution measurement in the settings specified by CVT. The structured-record proposition would be weakened if it failed to change the prominence effect across well-executed replications. A positive effect accompanied by greater omission of preventive work would also challenge the intervention's usefulness.

Apparent gaps might disappear after including coordination, assignment resources, or prospective role criteria. That would support a rival account rather than justify redefining those contributions out of the analysis. A survey that cannot distinguish process clarity from general satisfaction should not be retained because it yields appealing narratives. Theory revision must remain possible even when the original workplace observation feels compelling.

9 Practical implications and limits

Managers can make evaluation claims more reviewable by naming outcomes, enabling actions, source limitations, and joint contributors. They can explain the difference between acknowledgment of completed work and selection for future roles. They can create a correction route that does not require a contributor to confront a more powerful colleague publicly. These are proposed practices whose effectiveness and burdens need evaluation.

An audit should not retrospectively alter compensation on the basis of CVT alone. It can identify missing evidence or inconsistent process, after which the organization uses its established review procedures. Employees should have access to relevant corrections and be protected from retaliation. The management kit supplies a record template and an unresolved-case route. The Contribution Attribution Assessment adds separate employee, manager, and record-review modules. Its item reports and evidence checks cannot establish individual unfairness or a validated attribution score.

10 Conclusion

The contribution-recognition gap is best treated as an evidence problem with a stated normative benchmark. CVT proposes mechanisms that can generate omissions and misattribution, while allowing rational allocation, productive coordination, and measurement error to explain apparently similar patterns. Separating these possibilities is the research task. A universal gap score would obscure the very distinctions the framework needs to test.

References

- [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>
- [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>

- [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>
- [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>
- [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>

The Value Attribution Problem

How organizations assign credit for collective outcomes

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual working paper 3 of 5 | Pending empirical validation

Abstract

Collective outcomes create an identification problem: observing success does not reveal each participant's contribution. The value attribution account within the Corporate Value Triad separates the production of evidence, evaluator exposure, credit judgments, recorded recognition, and later allocation. It proposes that information structure and narrative control affect credit when contributions are ambiguous, while allowing relational work to improve the underlying outcome. The paper distinguishes inaccurate attribution from legitimate accountability and develops a randomized experiment that holds contribution evidence constant. It also addresses joint production, preventive work, unequal status, and the danger of treating organizational records as ground truth. The proposed attribution record is a governance aid, not an algorithm for distributing merit. A generalized reported episode supplies a hypothesis-generating illustration rather than verified findings. No original empirical study results are reported, and the framework remains open to rejection if information structure adds no explanatory value beyond existing accounts.

1 Collective success and individual inference

An outcome can depend on several complementary actions. A designer makes a process usable, an operator detects a defect, a coordinator secures a dependency, and a manager accepts risk. Removing any one action could change the result. Assigning all of the value to the last visible action is generally an insufficient description, but adding up separate counterfactual claims can also exceed the total outcome. Joint necessity does not supply unique additive shares.

CVT treats contribution attribution as an inference under incomplete information. An evaluator observes selected traces, brings prior beliefs, and makes a judgment about who did what and why it mattered. Attribution can be accurate, incomplete, inflated, or unresolved. Those categories concern the relationship between a claim and its evidence. They do not establish a person's general competence or intentions.

The model distinguishes accountability from authorship. A formally accountable project owner may deserve credit for decisions and coordination while other people deserve credit for execution. Stating that the owner was accountable is not equivalent to claiming that the owner originated every idea or produced every work product. A useful record permits both statements without forcing a single winner.

2 The proposed attribution mechanism

The mechanism has five stages. Work creates traces. Reporting practices select and summarize traces. Evaluators encounter selected information. They assign credit to people and actions. Formal recognition preserves some judgments for future use. Later decisions may rely on these records, creating a feedback loop in which earlier attribution affects subsequent assignment and visibility.

Each stage has an alternative explanation. A sparse trace may indicate missing documentation or little contribution. A summary may omit an action because it is irrelevant, because space is limited, or because its author lacks knowledge. Evaluator exposure may improve accuracy by adding context. The theory predicts

distortion only under specified information conditions. It does not assume that every manager's summary is self-serving.

Narrative control means the practical ability to select, frame, or disseminate the account of an outcome. It can reside with a project spokesperson, a customer-facing employee, or an evaluator. Its productive use makes complex work understandable. Its potentially distorting use obscures material contributors or treats unsupported claims as settled fact. Researchers should measure the reporting process rather than infer narrative control from seniority alone.

Attribution without intentional appropriation

The Collective Attribution Paradox, Attribution Dilution Effect, and Contribution Signaling are proposed extensions. A person can acknowledge a team's success while leaving their own role unspecified. Another can truthfully name both an earlier creator and their own improvements. If an evaluator encounters those accounts differently, unequal visibility may arise even when neither person misrepresents the work. Whether that difference changes actual recognition remains an empirical question.

Intentional appropriation, unintentional omission, legitimate attention to later work, and accurate shared credit are distinct possibilities. The presence of explicit individual attribution does not identify deception. Silence about one's actions does not prove humility, competence, or a deliberate sacrifice. A study must measure statements, available evidence, exposure, and later judgments separately. It should not infer motives from a single exchange.

Reported qualitative illustration and source limits

A specialist reportedly developed an internal information-management utility independently. A colleague subsequently enhanced it and discussed those enhancements in a group setting that included an evaluator. According to the supplied account, the colleague explicitly acknowledged the original developer and described their own improvements. The original developer reported preferring collective attribution, partly shaped by previous team-oriented leadership experience. The colleague was described as favoring more explicit individual attribution.

This is a generalized participant-reported episode, not a completed qualitative case study. It has no independently checked artifacts, interview transcript, consented second perspective, evaluator account, or outcome measures. The description of the colleague's general style is an informant interpretation. It cannot establish stable traits, deliberate manipulation, omitted credit, unfair promotion decisions, actual recognition differences, or compensation disparities. Because the creator was reportedly credited, the episode does not itself demonstrate attribution dilution.

The episode motivates prospective comparison of communication styles under shared credit. It is not evidence of prevalence or causation. Employee names, employer identifiers, screenshots, product names, exact technical functions, dates of the episode, and distinctive career details are omitted. Generalization reduces identification risk but cannot guarantee anonymity. Before any external use, obtain the company's required confidentiality clearance and appropriate participant permissions, or omit the episode. No such clearance or consent is claimed here. Do not publish the underlying internal exchange as supporting data.

3 What existing research permits us to say

Heilman and Haynes (2005 [R05]) show in experimental mixed-sex team scenarios that ambiguous individual contribution can support unequal credit judgments. The setting and manipulated information

matter. The result does not establish that ambiguity always benefits seniority, extroversion, or technical status. These would be additional hypotheses requiring their own tests.

Burt (2004 [R02]) links brokerage with valued ideas and career outcomes. For attribution research, the important constraint is that information access may improve the work itself. An employee who brings a new perspective may earn recognition because the idea is better. Munyon et al. (2015 [R04]) likewise make it untenable to define political skill as proof of low productive contribution. CVT must allow information and relationships to affect both production and credit.

Exley and Kessler (2022 [R19]) document context-dependent differences in self-evaluations, motivating separation of communication from performance. VanEpps et al. (2024 [R20]) study impressions formed when self-promotion accompanies credit to others. This makes combined attribution an essential comparator. Ross and Sicoly (1979 [R21]) examine availability and responsibility judgments in joint work. These findings motivate alternatives to an intent-based explanation. They do not validate the proposed adoption mechanism or workplace reward effects.

These are supporting literatures with different constructs. CVT does not introduce an established scale of narrative control or a validated measure of deserved credit. The proposed contribution is a falsifiable synthesis at the level of an outcome episode. A study must show incremental explanation and practical benefit to justify using new terminology.

4 Attribution records as evidence structures

A contribution record documents actions and dependencies before a final narrative hardens. It names the objective, evidence window, relevant outcome, uncertainty, contributors, and sources. Participants can correct factual omissions. Reviewers distinguish an observed action from an inferred effect. Where sources disagree, the record preserves competing accounts.

Record element	Example of an admissible statement	Inference to avoid
Action	A participant tested the failover procedure on a stated date	The participant caused all subsequent uptime
Outcome	A documented defect did not recur during the observation window	The intervention eliminated every future risk
Coordination	A dependency owner confirmed a handoff that had been blocked	Attendance at the meeting proves value
Joint dependency	Two actions were required before release	Each participant independently created the full outcome
Uncertainty	No reliable record identifies who originated the change	The person who spoke first must have originated it

The record should remain proportionate to the decision. A routine handoff does not justify a burdensome dossier. Where work is sensitive, authorized reviewers can inspect evidence without reproducing it in a general file. The audit must avoid collecting customer secrets, private messages, or personal information simply because more documentation is possible.

The record itself can distort behavior. People may favor documented tasks, spend time writing persuasive accounts, or crowd out contributors less comfortable with the reporting format. A field evaluation must measure administrative burden, omitted work, and access to correction. Documentation is an intervention with costs, not a neutral window onto reality.

Preserving origin and later improvements

A contribution history records the original action and the later actions that changed, maintained, deployed, or coordinated it. Distinguish factual provenance, formal accountability, current stewardship, and legal ownership. A record can preserve who originated a design while recognizing that others created most of its current utility. The scholarly CRediT standard [R22] is a precedent for describing differentiated roles; it is not an employment evaluation standard or a validated CVT instrument.

Use an authorized, minimal record with a study code, stage, broad time window, originating action, later action, corroboration, uncertainty, and correction status. Record unavailable history as unavailable, not as proof that no originator exists. Keep source evidence in authorized systems rather than copying private correspondence. Once an action is corroborated, later narratives can be checked for acknowledgment of that same action without requiring a fixed share of total credit.

The new Contribution Attribution Assessment compares an employee's neutral episode description, a manager's independent account, and this history. Agreement is evidence of consistency, not proof of complete truth. Contradictions require review. No percentage of matched actions can become a fairness score or employee ranking. The protocol's H9 to H13 separates observational questions from a factorial experiment on communication, exposure, and structured records.

5 A randomized test of information structure

The proposed H2 experiment crosses presenter prominence with evidence format. Adult evaluators receive a fictional project in which contributions are explicitly equal in relevant quality and scope. In the prominence condition one participant presents the result, with the script stating that presentation adds no extra work or responsibility. In the control condition neither participant receives distinctive presentation exposure. Within each, evaluators see either a concise narrative or the same facts organized as a structured contribution record.

The primary outcome is credit assigned to the focal participant on a 0 to 100 scale. Because this is a designed judgment outcome with known fictional facts, its interpretation is narrower than an organizational fairness measure. H2 predicts that the prominence-induced difference is smaller under the structured record. Random assignment identifies the effect of presentation and format in this vignette population, subject to implementation, compliance, and missing outcomes.

All substantive facts, word counts as closely as feasible, and outcome quality must remain constant across formats. A pretest checks readability and whether evaluators interpret the presenter as having additional responsibilities despite the script. If they do, the manipulation does not isolate irrelevant prominence and requires redesign before confirmation. An attention failure should not become a post hoc exclusion that changes the result. The primary analysis includes randomized participants with observed outcomes, with exclusions and missing-data sensitivity specified in advance.

The first experiment need not manipulate protected characteristics. A later study of status or demographic expectations would require a separate ethical review, careful stimuli development, and adequate precision for interactions. The current design must not borrow evidence from gender research to assert untested effects for every group.

6 Connecting judgment to workplace recognition

The vignette establishes only a bounded judgment effect. A field study can ask whether contribution records change formal recognition while preserving outcomes and reducing omissions. Teams could receive a

standardized record process or retain usual practice where an independent review permits. Randomization should occur at a level that limits sharing of the process between conditions. The record must supplement normal safeguards and must not withhold required acknowledgment or employee rights.

The principal field endpoint could be the proportion of independently corroborated actions that receive accurate acknowledgment in a review. The denominator requires a prespecified relevance rule and blinded adjudication where feasible. It should be reported with unresolved cases and source coverage. Researchers must not call a reviewer consensus ground truth. Agreement can reflect shared assumptions as well as accuracy.

A further distinction concerns mediation. A record might change both evaluator credit and final recognition, but that pattern alone does not identify a causal indirect effect. Mediation requires additional assumptions about confounding between mediator and outcome and about post-treatment variables (Imai et al., 2010 [R15]). The protocol treats mediation as secondary and assumption-dependent.

7 Rival explanations and disconfirmation

The comprehension rival predicts that a structured record improves general understanding rather than specifically correcting prominence. Measure understanding separately and compare matched formats. The accountability rival predicts that evaluators rationally treat presentation as responsibility. The script and pretest must address this possibility. The demand-characteristic rival predicts that participants infer the experiment's desired response. Neutral instructions and questions about interpretation help evaluate that concern.

The productive communication rival predicts that presentation itself contributes value. That rival is plausible in real organizations and only held constant in the vignette. A field analysis must record communication that secures adoption, clarifies decisions, or prevents rework. Removing that work from contribution would unfairly privilege visible technical artifacts and bias the result.

H2 would receive evidence against its predicted direction if a sufficiently precise interaction showed that the record amplifies the prominence effect. It would receive evidence of practically negligible benefit if an equivalence analysis, justified before results, placed the attenuation within a prespecified negligible range. An imprecise null supports neither conclusion. Persistent failure to separate contribution facts from format effects would undermine the mechanism's testability.

8 Implications for organizational governance

The most defensible immediate application is a correction process. An employee should be able to identify an omitted action, supply appropriate evidence, and receive a documented response. A reviewer should distinguish factual correction from disagreement over the value of the action. The organization can acknowledge shared work without deciding a universal ranking.

Attribution review should also examine who controls the evidence channel. If only managers can submit records, structured documentation may preserve existing asymmetry. If everyone must publicly contest a powerful colleague's claim, nominal access may be unusable. Confidential review, alternative evidence formats, and separation from punitive decisions are proposed safeguards. Their usefulness requires local evaluation.

9 Conclusion

The value attribution problem concerns the inference from collective outcomes to individual credit. CVT proposes that information structure can change this inference even when relevant work remains constant. The test is demanding: contribution evidence, legitimate relational work, comprehension, and role responsibility must remain distinguishable. A structured record offers a testable intervention, while uncertainty and joint production remain part of the result rather than defects to conceal.

References

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

The Builders Paradox

Operational dependence and constrained development access

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Conceptual working paper 4 of 5 | Pending empirical validation

Abstract

The builder's paradox is a proposed organizational condition in which strong current-role contribution creates operational dependence that constrains a contributor's access to development, mobility, or leadership work. This is a narrower and more falsifiable claim than saying technical excellence prevents advancement. The proposed mechanism is a transfer cost: moving a capable contributor exposes the organization to disruption unless capability is shared or replacement capacity exists. The paper distinguishes this mechanism from inaccurate recognition, employee preference, role mismatch, and ordinary resource scarcity. It proposes a longitudinal test using documented dependencies and a trial of protected capacity with knowledge transfer. Existing task-allocation and promotion research constrains the argument but does not establish a general builder penalty. The practical implication is to examine work design and succession capacity without making the individual responsible for correcting every structural barrier.

1 A precise version of the paradox

An organization may value an employee's work while repeatedly postponing that employee's development assignment because the current operation depends on them. The employee's success then increases the immediate cost of releasing their time. This creates a potential conflict between local continuity and longer-term development. The paradox concerns the organization's use of scarce capability, not an inevitable flaw in being technically competent.

CVT defines operational dependence as a documented concentration of tasks, knowledge, approvals, or response capability such that temporary absence would impose a material continuity risk. A title such as expert or indispensable does not establish it. Evidence might include recovery procedures that only one person can execute, unresolved backup coverage, or repeated requests to defer a rotation because no replacement is available.

The outcome is development access, measured as a specific requested or offered opportunity, its eligibility criteria, its decision date, and whether it actually begins. Promotion is a more distant outcome influenced by vacancies and role fit. The primary claim can fail even if some contributors experience delayed promotion, because their delays might arise through a different mechanism.

2 A proposed transfer cost mechanism

The mechanism begins with concentrated capability. A manager anticipates a near-term service or delivery risk if the employee moves. The manager defers an opportunity, perhaps while acknowledging the person's contribution. Deferral preserves the concentration of capability, making the next transfer similarly costly. The feedback loop can persist without any participant intending to suppress a career.

The employee may respond by doing more rescue work, documenting less because of time pressure, or accepting responsibility to protect colleagues. Those responses are hypotheses rather than diagnostic signs.

An employee may also prefer specialist work and reject leadership tasks. A credible study records preference and invitation separately. Declining a managerial role is not evidence of blocked advancement.

Influence could interrupt the loop by securing replacement capacity or an agreement about time. It could also simply redirect burden to a colleague. CVT therefore evaluates the team consequences of development access. An intervention that improves one employee's opportunities while creating unpaid overload for others has not solved the organizational problem.

3 Relationship to adjacent research

Babcock et al. (2017 [R06]) examine unequal allocation of low-promotability tasks. That work motivates tracking the assignment of maintenance and service obligations but does not show that all such work has low value or falls on builders. Task importance and career promotability are separate properties that a study must measure rather than assume.

Benson et al. (2019 [R07]) analyze how current job performance and managerial matching can conflict in promotion. Their findings challenge a simple prescription to promote the best current performer. The builder's paradox instead asks whether a person receives a fair opportunity to develop or demonstrate relevant skills and whether continuity concerns explain a delay. Accurate recognition of current contribution can coexist with a rational decision about a different role.

The novelty claim is limited. Capability concentration, succession planning, and career constraints are familiar organizational concerns. CVT's proposed contribution is to specify a measurable sequence linking dependence to documented opportunity decisions while separating it from attribution errors. Without that separation the paradox would become an unfalsifiable story about every disappointing career outcome.

4 Distinguishing competing explanations

Explanation	Expected observation	Evidence that differentiates it
Operational dependence	Deferrals explicitly cite continuity risk	Coverage records, absence tests, decision timing
Prospective role mismatch	A candidate lacks stated role requirements	Criteria established before reviewing the candidate
Employee preference	The employee declines or does not seek the opportunity	Confidential preference and offer records
General scarcity	Many eligible employees lack access	Vacancy, training capacity, and comparable applicant records
Unequal opportunity	Access differs under inconsistent criteria	Within-role comparisons and documented exceptions
Missing recognition	Contribution evidence is absent from the decision narrative	Episode evidence and evaluation content

These mechanisms can coexist. A manager may cite continuity to conceal a preference, or an employee may express disinterest because prior requests failed. Interviews add context but do not establish motives with certainty. The audit should record what evidence would change its interpretation and should preserve unresolved cases rather than force one explanation.

Operational dependence can itself be endogenous. A favored employee may receive the most important tasks, then gain both dependence and opportunity. A highly capable employee may create better documentation and become less dependent on continued personal involvement. A study that treats dependence as a fixed personal trait would miss both possibilities.

5 Measurement and temporal design

The proposed observational design records relevant contribution evidence, dependencies, backup coverage, workload, employee preferences, and access eligibility at baseline. It then observes opportunity requests and decisions during a fixed follow-up. The primary outcome is commencement of a qualifying development assignment among eligible employees. Explicit deferrals and their stated reasons form secondary process outcomes.

Dependence should combine concrete indicators while retaining their identities. Examples include the number of critical procedures without demonstrated backup coverage and whether a planned absence requires unusual intervention. A composite, if proposed later, requires validation and must not count preventable organizational underinvestment as a defect in the employee. The current protocol favors a prespecified indicator of documented uncovered critical work and reports alternative indicators separately.

The main association compares otherwise similar eligibility contexts while accounting for role family, level, prior opportunity, team capacity, and relevant prior contribution. Team and organization differences matter. Conditioning on post-baseline workload could block part of the mechanism, so controls require a temporal rationale. The observational result cannot eliminate unmeasured manager preferences or assignment selection.

H4 in the protocol predicts lower development access when documented dependence is greater, conditional on the specified baseline factors. H5 examines whether an intervention combining protected capacity and knowledge transfer improves access. H5 estimates the effect of a package. It cannot identify whether documentation, staffing, managerial attention, or time protection is the active ingredient without another design.

6 An intervention that can fail

A feasible pilot offers an agreed block of development time, removes a corresponding operational obligation, and funds or schedules backup practice. Both employee and manager identify a bounded opportunity with observable eligibility and a start date. The comparison condition retains ordinary access and receives the intervention later if the reviewed design permits. No employee loses an existing entitlement or necessary support for research purposes.

The primary outcome is actual commencement of the agreed development assignment within the follow-up. Secondary outcomes include continued service quality, workload for the participant and colleagues, completion of the assignment, and employee preference about continuation. Knowledge transfer is demonstrated through a backup performing a relevant task, rather than by counting documents produced.

The intervention could fail because managers revoke the time, tasks are not genuinely removed, backups lack authority, or the development assignment has little value. It could also have no meaningful benefit because operational dependence was not the binding constraint. A process evaluation records these possibilities. A positive testimonial is insufficient to establish effectiveness.

7 Predictions and disconfirming evidence

The central prediction concerns conditional access, not a universal career penalty. Evidence against the proposed direction would include a precise positive relation between dependence and access in the specified population, especially if high-dependence employees systematically receive more funded transition support. A precise negligible effect would constrain the mechanism's importance. An imprecise estimate should be reported as inconclusive.

If the access disadvantage disappears after accounting for preference, role eligibility, and available opportunities, the data favor those rival explanations. If knowledge transfer reduces dependence but leaves access unchanged, the organizational barrier may lie elsewhere. If protected capacity increases access while team quality deteriorates beyond a prespecified guardrail, the intervention requires redesign even if its primary outcome improves.

The model should also test heterogeneous contexts. A team with established specialist progression may reward expertise without requiring managerial transition. A small organization may have few positions but offer valuable external development. CVT should not treat hierarchy as the only legitimate career. Pay, autonomy, expertise, mobility, and chosen scope are distinct outcomes.

8 Implications for leadership practice

The leadership kit asks participants to document a recurring dependency, select one meaningful learning opportunity, and negotiate a transfer of work with their manager. The management kit assigns responsibility for capacity, backup access, and decision criteria to the organization. Coaching an employee to become more visible cannot substitute for addressing an uncovered critical service.

Managers should explain whether an opportunity decision reflects current continuity, prospective role requirements, budget, or another criterion. Where continuity is the reason, they should identify a review date and an owner for reducing the constraint. Repeated deferral without such action is a process finding that deserves review, even when intent remains uncertain.

The framework must not shame employees who prefer to remain specialists or who cannot take on extra work. Development should occur within agreed capacity. The value of a leadership exercise depends on consequences for the team and on the participant's goals, not on displaying a more managerial identity.

9 Conclusion

The builder's paradox proposes a specific loop: valuable concentrated capability raises transfer cost, transfer cost delays opportunity, and delay preserves dependence. Its plausibility is not proof of prevalence. Separating it from recognition failure, preference, and role matching makes the claim more useful and more vulnerable to evidence. A successful intervention would expand chosen development access while maintaining team welfare and operational quality.

References

- [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>
- [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>

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

Corporate Value Triad Research Protocol

Measurement development and tests of the proposed mechanisms

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijean

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Protocol proposal | Not registered or approved | No data collected

1 Purpose and scope

This protocol tests whether evidence exposure, attribution, and operational dependence explain organizational recognition and development access beyond relevant contribution and role context. It also evaluates bounded interventions. CVT is a conceptual proposal. Its survey, archetypes, rubrics, and development kit have not been validated. No study in this package has recruited participants or produced results.

The program has a measurement phase, a longitudinal observational study, a randomized vignette, two optional field trials, and an attribution extension designated Study E. The extension operationalizes five proposed hypotheses from the October 19 update, with explicit identifier mapping. Investigators may conduct them separately. They must register a study-specific protocol before confirmatory data collection, obtain an independent ethics determination and required organizational permissions, and resolve the activation fields in section 15. This proposal is not evidence of approval or a completed preregistration.

2 Research questions and estimands

Study A asks whether earlier exposure to contribution evidence predicts later attribution and recognition, and whether dependence predicts development access among eligible employees. These are conditional associations. Study B estimates the causal effect of randomized prominence and information format on credit judgments in a fictional project. Study C estimates the effect of protected capacity plus capability transfer on development access. Study D estimates the added effect of protected practice capacity when both conditions receive the leadership curriculum.

The estimands concern specified populations and outcomes. A vignette effect does not establish workplace promotion discrimination. A field package effect does not identify the effectiveness of each component. Observational mediation remains assumption-dependent. Researchers should prefer a narrow interpretable claim over an unsupported universal mechanism.

3 Construct map and measurement sources

Contribution C uses role-relevant episode evidence reviewed independently of reward decisions where feasible. Reviewers record outcome quality, enabling actions, constraints, source coverage, and uncertainty. Retain indicators separately until a composite has a defensible measurement model. Do not use task counts, hours, or self-rated contribution as the sole proxy.

Visibility V records evaluator exposure to specific evidence: whether an artifact was seen, a relevant update received, or an episode discussed. It excludes favorability judgments. Attribution A is credit assigned to a named action in a named episode. Recognition N is whether formal records accurately acknowledge that action. Influence I records demonstrated ability to affect a decision or secure a resource, while documenting authority and task context. Survey reports of access are a separate source.

Operational dependence D is the baseline presence of at least one role-defined critical recurring task without demonstrated backup coverage. Define criticality before reviewing people. Record supporting indicators separately. Opportunity access O is commencement of a qualifying development assignment

during follow-up among employees meeting predeclared eligibility criteria. Promotion P is a distinct authorized-record outcome over 12 months among eligible employees. Voluntary declines, no available vacancy, and missing records remain distinguishable.

The pilot diagnostic supplies 24 original items about experience in six content domains. It does not establish C or validate I. Objective or independent records require separate consent and authorization. Keep the evidence source and timing attached to every observation. The Contribution Attribution Assessment adds eight separate pilot items, an elicited accomplishment description, manager prompts, and history checks. Collective framing, signaling, exposure, credit, and recorded recognition must remain distinguishable. No composite or cutoffs for the new module are authorized.

The Collective Attribution Paradox proposes a conditional association between collective-focused framing and individual recognition. The Attribution Dilution Effect concerns loss of acknowledgment for a fixed originating action during adoption. Contribution Signaling is explicit communication of personal actions, distinct from evaluator exposure. All are proposed constructs. Related literature [R19, R20, R21, R23] motivates alternatives and measurement development, without validating the proposed effects.

4 Falsifiable hypotheses

The directional sign and primary estimand for each hypothesis must remain fixed after registration. Use two-sided intervals and the multiplicity procedure in section 9. A failure to reject a null with wide intervals is inconclusive, not proof of no mechanism.

ID	Prediction and primary estimand	Main design	Evidence against the proposed direction
H1	Earlier V positively predicts later A conditional on baseline C and context; adjusted V slope	A	A precise zero or negative association within the prespecified setting
H2	Structured records attenuate the prominence effect on credit; format by prominence interaction is negative	B	A precise negligible attenuation or amplification
H3	Earlier A positively predicts later N conditional on C, V, and context; adjusted A slope	A	A precise negligible or negative association
H4	Baseline D predicts lower O among eligible employees; adjusted probability contrast D present versus absent	A	A precise negligible or positive contrast
H5	Protected capacity plus transfer increases O versus usual practice; assignment effect on probability	C	A precise negligible or negative effect
H6	Protected practice plus curriculum improves decision quality versus the same curriculum with ordinary capacity; assignment effect	D	A precise negligible or negative effect
H7	I strengthens the N to promotion association; average interaction contrast on probability scale	A	A precise negligible or negative interaction contrast
H8	Independently assessed evaluation transparency weakens the V to N association conditional on C; cross-level interaction	A	A precise negligible or positive interaction

H1 and H3 concern separate stages and do not establish an indirect effect. H7 is conditional on actual eligibility and sufficient promotion events. H8 requires enough organizations and variation in policy, not merely many employees in a single organization. If those conditions are absent, register them as exploratory or omit them before observing outcomes. Do not quietly substitute an employee perception item for an organizational transparency measure.

October 19 hypothesis identifiers

The initial package already used H7 and H8. Their meanings remain unchanged. To preserve an unambiguous registry, the five additions receive H9 through H13. The update author's original labels remain visible in this crosswalk. This is an editorial identifier mapping, not a change to an existing registration. No version of this protocol has been registered.

Update label	Stable package ID	Proposed relationship
H7	H9	Collective attribution and lower individual recognition conditional on contribution
H8	H10	Managerial exposure moderates signaling and recognition
H9	H11	Originating-action acknowledgment declines during adoption
H10	H12	Explicit contribution documentation reduces attribution-style disparities
H11	H13	Team-oriented norms relate to accomplishment communication and recognition seeking

H9 predicts a negative adjusted recognition contrast for a collective-focused account versus an account specifying the person's action. H10 predicts a nonzero exposure by signaling interaction; the update does not specify its direction. H11 predicts a negative contrast in originating-action acknowledgment at wider adoption versus creation. H12 predicts a smaller positive role-explicit versus collective-focused recognition contrast under structured documentation. H13 predicts a nonzero association between reported team-oriented norms and attribution style, with recognition seeking as a secondary outcome. These are proposed tests, not findings. If the no-documentation contrast in H12 is reversed, report that result and do not describe a more negative contrast as improved equity.

5 Phase 0 measurement development

Recruit a varied pilot including technical, coordination, operational, customer-facing, and managerial work. Use approximately 12 to 20 cognitive interviews as a planning range, continuing until major interpretation problems are resolved. This is a practical target, not a guarantee of content validity. Ask participants to explain each item, identify its reference period, and distinguish no opportunity from a negative experience.

Have subject-matter reviewers and employee representatives assess coverage and potential bias. Record item revisions and reasons. Pilot the evidence rubric with double-rated episodes, including prevention and joint production. Quantify agreement with appropriate uncertainty and examine disagreement qualitatively. High agreement does not establish truth.

Use separate exploratory and confirmatory samples for latent measurement work. Analyze ordinal items appropriately, examine missingness, item distributions, factor structure, reliability with intervals, test-retest behavior over a justified interval, and convergent and discriminant relations. Assess differential item functioning and measurement invariance where sample sizes permit. Cronbach and Meehl (1955 [R12]) and Flake et al. (2017 [R13]) motivate a broader validation program than reliability alone. No arbitrary reliability threshold licenses employment use.

Lock measures and the primary model before the confirmatory phase. If contribution indicators behave as formative evidence rather than interchangeable reflective items, do not force them into an internal-consistency scale. If visibility and attribution cannot be separated, redesign before claiming a test of the mechanism.

6 Study A longitudinal observational design

Recruit consenting adult employees through an independent research team across multiple organizations, roles, and levels. Obtain organization-level recruitment counts and eligible sampling frames where authorized. Managers must not select only favored employees or receive participation lists. A broad invitation with private opt-in reduces coercion but still permits volunteer bias, which the report must acknowledge.

At month 0 obtain baseline episode evidence, role and level, relevant tenure, prior recognition and opportunity, D, workload, assignment resources, preferences, eligibility, and evaluator context. At month 1 record evaluator evidence exposure. At month 2 collect attribution judgments. At month 3 collect subsequent formal recognition records, preserving actual dates and checking that recognition followed attribution measurement. At month 6 observe development access and workload. At month 12 record promotion outcomes for separately consenting participants. If an organization uses a different cycle, register the actual timing and preserve temporal order before recruitment.

Sample episodes using a predeclared rule such as the most recent completed qualifying assignment, not the employee's most successful example. Define a qualifying episode by duration, outcome relevance, and available evidence before selection. Record excluded and inaccessible episodes. Avoid selecting only people who survived to promotion review. Track departures as outcomes or competing events when appropriate and consent permits.

Use mixed models or fixed effects suited to the estimand and number of clusters. Episodes may be crossed by employee and evaluator and nested within teams and organizations. For H1 model later A from prior V and prespecified C indicators with baseline attribution where available. For H3 model later accurate acknowledgment from prior A. For H4 estimate standardized probability contrasts for O. For H7 use N, I, and their interaction, reporting the prespecified probability-scale difference in the N contrast between higher and lower I values within common support. State those I values before outcome analysis. For H8 use independently double-coded policy evidence and a cross-level V interaction.

Baseline controls include role family, level, tenure, prior outcome, assignment resources, task interdependence, and evaluator relationship where justified. Compensation models would additionally need relevant compensation context and remain optional. Draw a study-specific causal diagram first. Do not add post-exposure controls merely because they improve fit. Policy transparency uses document availability, stated criteria, correction access, and consistency records as separate indicators until justified otherwise.

7 Study B randomized vignette

Recruit adult evaluators with defined supervisory or project-review experience, or explicitly identify a different target population. Use a 2 by 2 between-participant design with equal allocation: prominent focal presenter versus no distinctive presenter, crossed with narrative versus structured contribution evidence. Hold contribution facts, project outcome, and role responsibility constant. Use neutral names and counterbalance the focal identity independently.

Primary outcome: credit assigned to the focal contributor on a 0 to 100 scale. Fit a linear model with prominence, format, their interaction, and counterbalance factors. Code format 1 for structured and prominence 1 for prominent. H2 predicts a negative interaction. Report all four cell means and the difference in prominence effects with intervals. A robust or randomization-based sensitivity analysis checks dependence on distributional assumptions.

Pretest whether prominence implies extra contribution or responsibility and whether the formats differ in comprehension. Repair the stimuli before confirmation if the manipulation fails. Measure comprehension after the credit outcome to avoid priming. Exclude ineligible or duplicate respondents by rules established before assignment. Include attention failures in the primary randomized analysis and report a registered sensitivity analysis. Document randomization method, allocation concealment, and attrition by cell.

8 Field trials and the attribution extension

Study C assigns eligible teams to protected development time with actual work transfer and backup practice, or usual approved practice with delayed access where ethical and feasible. Primary endpoint: commencement of a qualifying development assignment within 90 days. Study D gives both conditions the same curriculum and equivalent scheduled contact. Only the intervention condition receives a formal agreement that removes or transfers specified obligations and protects practice time. Primary endpoint: independently rated decision quality on a role-relevant task at day 90, adjusted for baseline task quality.

Use team allocation to limit contamination, stratifying on organization and baseline task context where feasible. Recruit and measure baseline before randomization. Analyze assignment rather than adherence as primary, accounting for clustering and stratification. For small cluster counts, use small-sample corrections or a prespecified randomization analysis. Reviewers should be unaware of allocation where feasible. Report violations of masking. Keep O, task quality, delivery reliability, participant workload, colleague workload, and adverse experiences distinct.

Do not remove required training, ordinary rights, or needed support from a comparison group. The investigator and independent reviewer must approve workload and service-quality guardrails before launch. Pause new assignments for serious retaliation, privacy breach, or safety concerns. Record what happened and obtain independent clearance before restarting. An intervention that improves access but harms service or colleagues requires a qualified interpretation.

Study E measurement and observational cohort

E1 follows consenting employee-innovation episodes prospectively from creation through initial adoption and wider institutional use. Include an eligible comparison cohort that has not yet reached each stage. Specify stage criteria independently of recognition: first use by another authorized work group and later integration into an approved routine process are possible definitions, to be adapted before recruitment. Record actual elapsed time, adoption decisions, new contributors, assignment resources, evaluator turnover, and record accessibility. Do not treat adoption as randomized.

Before evaluative outcomes, ask each participant for the same neutral accomplishment description with the same space allowance. Two trained coders, unaware of later recognition, code whether the account specifies a personal action, acknowledges others, or describes only a team result. These are separate flags. For the primary H9 contrast, collective-focused means team-result language without a specified personal action, while role-explicit includes a specified personal action with or without team acknowledgment. Ambiguous and unclassifiable accounts remain separate. Pronouns alone cannot determine the code. Pilot a detailed codebook, double code, report agreement with intervals, and retain disagreement before adjudication. A description under this prompt does not establish a stable communication trait.

H9's primary estimand is the adjusted probability difference in subsequent accurate acknowledgment of the focal corroborated action, collective-focused minus role-explicit. Define the acknowledgment window and qualifying record before launch. Independently review contribution indicators before measuring recognition. Adjust using a prespecified causal diagram for baseline contribution evidence, task, role, level, prior recognition, evaluator knowledge, and opportunity to communicate. Report the total style association as primary. Exposure can be on the proposed pathway, so add it only in a separately labeled conditional model. Residual confounding and contribution measurement error preclude a causal claim.

For H11, preserve a fixed set of corroborated originating actions as the denominator across stages. Code whether the relevant later account accurately names each originating action, and separately code later improvements. The primary contrast is standardized probability of originating-action acknowledgment at wider adoption minus creation, conditional on elapsed time, contribution context, later work, and evaluator continuity. Use repeated-measure models with employee, episode, evaluator, and organization dependence as appropriate. Model unavailable accounts separately from observed accounts without acknowledgment.

Compare with episodes at the same elapsed time that have not yet advanced, examine selection and departures, and report limitations of the adoption comparison. A declining credit share alone is not evidence for H11.

For H13, obtain baseline TN1 about encouragement of collective framing before eliciting the description. The primary estimand is the adjusted association of the ordinal TN1 response with the probability of a collective-focused description. Specify ordinal coding or category contrasts prospectively, without treating the eight-item module as one scale. The prediction is two-sided. TN2 and interview questions about asking for accurate credit address recognition seeking as secondary outcomes. Do not infer norms from military service, profession, nationality, gender, or any other identity. Prior communication style and selection into teams remain rival accounts.

Study E factorial communication experiment

E2 uses a fictional work episode in a 2 by 2 by 2 between-evaluator design. Randomize attribution framing in a truthful update, evaluator receipt of that update, and contribution-record format. Framing compares a team-focused outcome account with a matched account that specifies the focal person's action while acknowledging others. Receipt means the evaluator sees the update; the comparison receives neutral matched-length material. Record format compares narrative and structured histories containing the same contribution facts. All evaluators initially receive the same baseline contribution facts. Counterbalance identities. No real employee messages or company materials enter the stimuli.

Keep outcome value, originating work, later improvements, formal responsibility, and factual contribution constant. Match length and readability as far as feasible. Pretest whether a role-explicit account implies extra work, whether receipt is understood, and whether structured records change factual content. Redesign failed manipulations before confirmation. The style manipulation necessarily changes communication wording; interpretation is limited to that specified wording. An E2 effect is not evidence of a stable employee characteristic.

The primary endpoint is accurate acknowledgment of the focal originating action in an evaluator's written review, coded yes or no by assessors unaware of assignment using a preregistered rubric. Preserve partial, incorrect, and unavailable responses for secondary and missingness analyses. Elicited credit on a 0 to 100 scale is secondary and distinct from written recognition. Analyze all eight randomized cell probabilities using a prespecified saturated model and marginal contrasts, with randomization-based sensitivity analysis.

For H10, estimate the role-explicit minus collective-focused probability contrast under receipt minus the corresponding contrast without receipt, averaged equally over record formats. Test the exposure by framing contrast two-sided. For H12, within the receipt condition estimate that style contrast under structured documentation minus the contrast under narrative documentation. A negative difference alone does not establish reduced disparity. The predicted attenuation requires an explicit-attribution advantage under narrative documentation and a smaller absolute style difference under structured documentation. Prespecify uncertainty-based interpretation of these component contrasts and a bound for a meaningful reverse disparity. A large reversal is an adverse or contradictory result. Report all component probabilities and contrasts even if the predicted disadvantage never appears. The experiment does not test actual compensation or promotion. Do not merge H12 with legacy H2, which manipulates presenter prominence rather than attribution framing.

Allocate equally across the eight cells, conceal assignment, and register counterbalancing, eligibility, duplicate removal, outcome coding, and missingness rules. Include attention failures in the primary assigned analysis and report prespecified sensitivity analyses. Assessor disagreement is not a missing value to discard. Fix an adjudication procedure before observing condition results. Adequate power for interaction contrasts requires its own simulation, not reuse of a main-effect sample calculation.

Study E safeguards and disconfirmation

The reported episode that prompted the extension is not E1 pilot data, an interview dataset, or evidence for any hypothesis. Do not recruit colleagues through the reporting employee, inspect internal messages, or contact an employer on the strength of this package. Any future qualitative study requires separate consent, independently collected perspectives, company confidentiality clearance where required, and a disclosure plan. Published materials omit real employee names, screenshots, company and product identifiers, and distinctive service histories. External clearance and permission are not established by anonymizing a narrative.

H9 is weakened by a precise negligible or positive collective-focused contrast. H10 and H13 are weakened by precisely negligible moderation or association under justified equivalence bounds. H11 is weakened by stable or increased originating-action acknowledgment with adequate precision. H12 is weakened by precisely negligible attenuation or an amplification of the documented style disadvantage. An imprecise null remains inconclusive. Successful acknowledgment of the originator in both styles would challenge a universal disadvantage claim. Test productive communication, new contribution, recall decay, evaluator knowledge, and selection as alternatives.

9 Precision sample size and multiplicity

No sample in this proposal has demonstrated adequate power. Before recruitment, define the smallest effect of interest with stakeholders and justify it independently of expected statistical significance. Illustrative planning values are a 5-point interaction on the 0 to 100 credit scale, a 5 percentage-point development-access change, and a 0.15 baseline-SD decision-quality difference. These are proposed research design choices, not CVT thresholds, established benefits, or validated norms. Register final values and reasons before data collection.

Simulate the exact models over plausible variance, intraclass correlation, event rates, cluster counts, unequal cluster sizes, measurement error, and attrition. Target at least 90 percent power for the selected smallest effect and inspect expected interval width. Report assumptions and sensitivity rather than a single optimistic N. Study E adds separate requirements for the style, exposure interaction, documentation interaction, adoption contrast, and norms association. Define their smallest effects and equivalence bounds before data collection; the illustrative Study B credit-scale value cannot be transferred to a binary acknowledgment outcome. Include coder error, adoption selection, repeated measures, and cluster counts in E1 simulations and all eight cell sizes in E2 simulations. For rare promotion events, more clusters and longer follow-up may matter more than extra respondents. Lakens (2022 [R17]) provides methodological guidance on explicit sample-size justification.

For a single integrated program, apply Holm adjustment across the thirteen primary hypothesis tests at familywise alpha .05, with two-sided tests and a sign check. If independent registered studies form separate families, state those families prospectively and report all tests without selective regrouping. Report unadjusted estimates, intervals, raw p-values, and adjusted p-values. The five extension tests may form a distinct family only if that choice is registered before outcomes are inspected and all thirteen tests remain visible. H13 recognition-seeking outcomes, secondary mediation, subgroup comparisons, and alternative models remain explicitly exploratory unless separately registered with their own multiplicity plan.

Use equivalence testing only with justified bounds fixed in advance and adequate precision. A nonsignificant test does not show equivalence. Do not compare raw slopes to claim visibility matters more than contribution. A separate predictive analysis may compare cross-validated performance using common outcomes, appropriate scaling, and uncertainty, with no causal interpretation.

10 Missingness selection and robustness

Maintain distinct codes for skipped, not applicable, no opportunity, unavailable record, withdrawal, and lost follow-up. Do not code these as zero or the scale midpoint. Report missingness and retention by condition, role, and permitted group summaries. Prespecify handling for each source. For observational estimates, use multiple imputation under a justified missing-at-random model including cluster and outcome information, with complete-case and departure-from-MAR sensitivity analyses. Imputation does not create unavailable ground truth.

For trials, retain assignment in the primary analysis and describe outcome availability. Use a registered missing-outcome strategy and bounds or sensitivity analyses for differential attrition. Report a separate treatment uptake analysis. Check common support, influential clusters, alternative plausible contribution indicators, evaluator effects, and models that include coordination as productive work. Do not select the version that best supports CVT.

Mediation is secondary. State the exposure-mediator and mediator-outcome identification assumptions, address post-treatment confounding, and conduct sensitivity analysis (Imai et al., 2010 [R15]). A temporal association or bootstrap interval alone does not establish a causal mechanism. Shared-source concerns require design controls, not only a statistical diagnostic (Podsakoff et al., 2003 [R09]).

11 Ethics and participant protections

Use respect for persons, beneficence, and justice as guiding principles (National Commission, 1979 [R18]). Obtain an independent ethics determination appropriate to the jurisdiction and institution. The Belmont Report is an ethical foundation, not a claim that one regulatory regime applies everywhere. Confirm applicable employment, privacy, and research obligations locally before launch.

Recruitment must explain that participation is voluntary, refusal has no employment consequence, and questions may be skipped. Supervisors must not collect consent or watch completion. Offer accessible formats, translation developed through testing, and reasonable paid participation time where approved. Avoid incentives contingent on favorable responses. Separate consent for surveys, records linkage, interviews, and recontact.

The three new constructs and all Contribution Attribution Assessment items remain unvalidated proposals. Managers may not use a communication-style code to reward assertiveness, penalize collective credit, or identify allegedly manipulative colleagues. No individual CVT score or archetype enters hiring, compensation, promotion, discipline, redundancy, or a personnel file. Employers receive only disclosure-reviewed aggregates and process findings. The research team must have authority to refuse identifiable data requests and publish null or adverse findings. State sponsor relationships and conflicts. Participants can withdraw identifiable data until the stated de-identification cutoff, after which removal from pooled data may be impossible.

12 Data governance and disclosure

Assign random study IDs. Keep the identity key with an independent custodian in a separately encrypted location with access logging. Researchers analyzing data use pseudonymous records. Pseudonymity is not anonymity. Do not promise anonymity for linked longitudinal work. Collect no private messages or communication surveillance. Network nominations, if later justified, require a separate review because they reveal information about nonparticipants.

Use a written access matrix. Custodian: identity key and consent. Analysts: minimized pseudonymous research data. Independent safety reviewer: necessary incident information. Employer: approved aggregate outputs only. A proposed default retains the key through linkage plus 90 days, then deletes it, and retains minimized data for five years after final publication, subject to the approved protocol and applicable requirements. Register actual dates and document deletion or justified extension.

Suppress cells with fewer than 10 respondents as a conservative operational starting rule, apply complementary suppression, and withhold larger cells when distinctive roles or combinations remain identifiable. Ten is not a proven anonymity threshold. Review free text, quotations, longitudinal combinations, and differences between tables. Seek explicit quotation permission and remove identifying details. Do not release row-level employee data publicly. Share synthetic demonstrations, code, dictionaries, and disclosure-reviewed aggregate results where feasible.

13 Participant information and consent template

Study title: Corporate Value Triad study of work evidence and recognition. This study asks how organizations acknowledge work and provide opportunities. The framework and questionnaire are experimental. Participation may involve a survey, discussion of a work episode, and follow-up. The local information sheet must state the actual activities, time commitment, compensation, and any randomized assignment.

You may decline, skip questions, or stop without an employment penalty. Your manager will not receive your individual answers or a CVT label. The main risks are discomfort about workplace experiences and accidental identification. The research team will limit access and review reported summaries, but cannot promise absolute confidentiality. Confidentiality limits, including any required disclosures, must be explained before consent.

Choose separately: I agree to the survey []; I agree to authorized organizational-record linkage []; I agree to an interview []; I agree to recontact []. Each choice is voluntary. Consent to one activity does not authorize another. The local sheet must identify the withdrawal cutoff, researcher contact, independent concerns contact, privacy contact, and approved data-retention dates before distribution. These roles cannot be invented in a generic package.

14 Reporting and open research

Register hypotheses, outcomes, exclusions, randomization, sample plan, analysis, and decision rules before inspecting confirmatory outcomes. Keep a dated deviation log with reasons. Preregistration helps distinguish prospective tests from later exploration (Nosek et al., 2018 [R16]). It does not make a weak measure valid or remove ethical responsibilities.

Report recruitment flow, eligible population, missingness, intervention delivery, effect estimates, uncertainty, multiplicity, adverse effects, and all registered outcomes. Separate theory, prior evidence, new results, and practical recommendations. Invite employee review of disclosure risk without giving sponsors veto over unfavorable findings. Publish an explicit statement if the data contradict CVT. Update the framework version rather than rewriting original predictions after results.

15 Activation record and launch gate

Complete before recruitment: named principal investigator and institution; independent ethics decision and identifier; research and privacy contacts; sites and target population; actual sampling frame; approved consent sheet; exact measures and stimuli; eligibility and episode rules; simulation-based sample justification; randomization and analysis scripts; disclosure rules; retention dates; sponsor agreement; safety and workload guardrails; withdrawal cutoff; and timestamped registration link.

Decision: proceed [] revise [] stop []. Decision owner: _____. Date: _____. Unresolved conditions and resolution owner: _____. This record makes the proposal operational without misrepresenting a generic document as an approved study.

References

- [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>
- [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>
- [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>
- [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>
- [R17] Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1), Article 33267. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267>
- [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>
- [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>
- [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>
- [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>
- [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>

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>

Builder Leader Development Kit

A voluntary 90 day practice program with worksheets

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Pilot curriculum | Effectiveness not established

October 19 attribution practice extension

Use the Contribution Attribution Assessment as an optional reflection and evidence exercise. Begin with its neutral description before any coaching. In a later practice session, describe the shared outcome, identify your own verifiable action, acknowledge others' actions, and state uncertainty. This preserves collective credit while making roles inspectable. A fictional practice statement is: Our group delivered the service improvement. I designed the initial workflow. A colleague improved its reliability, and the support team enabled adoption. The statement is an example, not a quotation from the reported case.

Managers should practice reconstructing actions from evidence rather than rating assertiveness. Preserve origin, improvement, maintenance, and adoption work in an authorized history. Ask privately about missing roles, and offer a correction route. Do not coach unsupported self-promotion, require public competition for credit, or treat a participant's service background as a diagnosis. The assessment has no total score and adds no certification. Its proposed benefits require testing.

1 Purpose and participant agreement

This kit helps contributors practice decision communication, delegation, coordination, and shared credit while preserving relevant domain judgment. It supports a chosen development goal and can be used by specialists, project leads, or managers. Completion does not certify leadership ability or predict promotion. The exercises are proposed practices whose effects require evaluation [R10, R11].

Use the kit voluntarily with a participant, a manager who can change assignments, and a coach or peer facilitator. Participation must not become a hidden selection criterion. Confidential reflections remain with the participant unless they choose to share them. Agree on a real task and workable capacity before beginning. If the participant prefers specialist development, adapt the goal accordingly.

Worksheet 1 Development agreement

Participant and role: _____. Development goal in the participant's words: _____. Why this goal matters to the team and to the participant: _____. Relevant work episode or assignment: _____. Start and review dates: _____.

Protected practice time within normal capacity: _____. Work removed, deferred, or transferred: _____. Receiving colleague's agreement and support: _____. Manager responsible for the capacity change: _____. Constraints, escalation route, and pause conditions: _____. Evidence of success and possible harm: _____.

Agreed by participant: _____. Agreed by manager: _____. Date: _____. This is a development agreement, not a waiver of employment rights or a promise of promotion.

2 Program schedule

Period	Main practice	Reviewable output
Days 1 to 15	Choose a goal and reconstruct one work episode	Agreement and contribution evidence record
Days 16 to 30	Translate a domain issue into a decision	One-page decision brief and stakeholder response
Days 31 to 45	Delegate a bounded task with support	Delegation agreement and recipient feedback
Days 46 to 60	Resolve a dependency and share capability	Handoff evidence and backup practice record
Days 61 to 75	Repeat a practice in a second episode	Comparison of intended and actual consequences
Days 76 to 90	Review outcomes and choose the next step	Development review and continuation decision

Ninety days is a planning convention. Adjust timing for the work while retaining explicit reviews. A shorter or longer cycle is not a proven dose difference. Check workload weekly. If no obligations have actually moved, renegotiate before adding exercises.

3 Facilitator session

The opening session lasts approximately 90 minutes as a scheduling proposal. Allow 10 minutes to explain the experimental status and privacy arrangements, 15 for the participant's goals, 20 to reconstruct an episode, 20 to discuss contribution and credit, 15 to choose one practice, and 10 to confirm capacity and review dates. Permit breaks and accessible formats.

Open with this script: We are examining how work becomes understandable and how people coordinate it. The archetypes are discussion terms. We will describe actions and circumstances rather than assign a type. The purpose is a useful development experiment that fits your goals. You may decline an exercise or keep a reflection private.

Ask for concrete actions and consequences. If someone describes a colleague as purely political or invisible, ask which evidence supports the description and what may be missing. Keep relational contributions, preventive work, and shared outcomes in the record. Do not use a participant's difficulty describing their work as evidence of low competence.

4 Contribution evidence exercise

Choose a recent completed episode rather than a career-defining success. Describe the intended outcome, relevant quality standard, constraints, people involved, and actual result. List actions that enabled the result, including coordination and maintenance. Separate observed facts from inferred effects. Record uncertainties and evidence that could contradict the account.

Worksheet 2 Episode reconstruction

Episode and period: _____. Intended outcome: _____. Actual outcome and evidence location: _____. My actions: _____. Other contributors' actions: _____. Joint dependencies and inherited resources: _____. Prevention or maintenance: _____. Constraints and unintended

effects: _____. What remains uncertain: _____. Person authorized to verify factual details: _____.

Create a brief statement that names the collective result and accurately describes your contribution. Ask another contributor to check factual completeness where appropriate. Do not ask them to endorse a ranking. A record that preserves uncertainty can be more useful than a confident but unsupported claim.

5 Decision translation exercise

Select a decision that a real stakeholder needs to make. Explain the domain issue in terms of the decision, alternatives, relevant evidence, uncertainty, and consequences. Avoid overstating certainty to gain attention. The success criterion is whether the brief helps the stakeholder understand and act responsibly, not whether it praises the writer.

Worksheet 3 Decision brief

Decision and decision owner: _____. Deadline and consequence of delay: _____.
Recommended option and reason: _____. Alternatives and trade-offs: _____. Evidence and its limits: _____. Who bears the costs or risks: _____. Dependencies and resources needed: _____. What evidence would change the recommendation: _____. Contributors to credit: _____.

After the discussion, ask the stakeholder to restate the decision and uncertainty. Record what they found useful, what they misunderstood, and what changed. Do not treat agreement with the recommendation as the sole measure of good communication. A well-informed rejection can be a successful outcome.

6 Stakeholder and dependency exercise

Identify people whose work or authority affects the chosen task. For each, record the dependency, what they need, the decision they can make, and an appropriate communication channel. Do not build a popularity list or collect private relationship data. The goal is to understand legitimate coordination requirements.

Worksheet 4 Dependency record

Dependency: _____. Owner or authorized role: _____. What they need from us: _____.
What we need from them: _____. Decision authority: _____. Evidence needed: _____.
Agreed next action and date: _____. Result and burden on others: _____.

In the review, distinguish a useful connection from unnecessary meetings. A relationship creates value when it helps resolve a relevant constraint or improves understanding. Senior access alone is not evidence of productive influence. Record the outcome and any costs.

7 Delegation and capability transfer exercise

Choose a bounded task appropriate to the recipient's role, experience, and consent to the assignment. Explain the desired result, quality constraints, decision authority, resources, and escalation conditions. Preserve support and accountability. Delegation must not become a way to push undesirable work onto someone with less power.

Worksheet 5 Delegation agreement

Task and intended learning: _____. Recipient and agreement: _____. Expected result and quality evidence: _____. Decisions the recipient can make: _____. Decisions requiring

escalation: _____. Resources and coaching: _____. Check-in date: _____. Work removed elsewhere to make capacity: _____. Credit and acknowledgment plan: _____.

After completion, ask the recipient what helped or constrained autonomy. Record rework, errors, and learning without turning the exercise into a punitive review. For capability transfer, have a backup demonstrate a relevant procedure under agreed conditions. Document creation alone does not show that capability transferred. Use operational safeguards appropriate to the task.

8 Shared credit and feedback exercise

Prepare a short project acknowledgment that identifies outcomes and distinct enabling actions. Include relational, technical, preventive, and operational work where supported. Invite factual corrections through a channel that does not require public confrontation. Avoid claims of sole causation when the work was joint.

Worksheet 6 Feedback request

Ask two or more willing colleagues where appropriate: What action of mine helped the work? What made the work harder? Did the account accurately describe your role? What should I do differently in the next episode? Offer a private response route and permission not to answer. Record themes without identifying quotations unless explicitly authorized.

Feedback recipient: participant only ☐ agreed coach ☐ other authorized recipient _____. Retention or deletion date: _____. Developmental feedback must not enter a personnel file without a separate, explicit and appropriate process. Small teams may make anonymity impossible, so explain that limitation rather than promise it.

9 Weekly practice log

Week and episode: _____. Practice attempted: _____. Expected consequence: _____. Observed consequence and evidence: _____. Effect on colleagues: _____. Workload change: _____. What I learned or remain uncertain about: _____. Adjustment for next week: _____.

Use one entry per week as a practical convention. A participant can keep the log privately. Count of entries, meetings, or delegated tasks is not a leadership score. The coach should look for specific changes in behavior and consequences, including instances where the initial approach failed.

10 Worked fictional case

Alex maintains a critical data pipeline and wants to lead a cross-team reliability review. Alex's manager initially proposes adding the review to the existing workload. The agreement instead transfers a recurring report to a supported colleague and allocates a weekly practice block. Alex writes a decision brief about recovery options, credits the operator who identified a failure mode, and delegates a bounded recovery test with appropriate safeguards.

At day 45, the recipient reports that the escalation rule is unclear. Alex revises it. At day 90, the team checks the quality of the resulting decision and whether backup coverage actually improved. The case illustrates a process, not evidence that this program works. If workload rises or quality falls, the review should record that result and revise the arrangement.

11 Day 90 development review

Worksheet 7 Review and next decision

Original goal: _____. Practices actually attempted: _____. Capacity promised and received: _____. Evidence of changes in team decisions or capability: _____. Evidence of harm, workload, or rework: _____. Feedback that challenges my interpretation: _____. What remains uncertain: _____.

Participant's preferred next step: continue [] change goal [] return to specialist focus [] pause [].
Manager's resource commitment: _____. Next review date: _____. Optional participant statement of learning: _____.

Evaluate the goal with role-relevant evidence, not an overall numeric rating. Confidence and satisfaction may describe the experience but do not establish effectiveness. If the program is studied formally, use the protocol's independent outcomes and active comparison rather than testimonials. Keep program evaluation separate from employment decisions.

12 Manager and facilitator responsibilities

The manager supplies real capacity, fair opportunity criteria, and support for people receiving transferred work. The facilitator protects the voluntary nature of feedback and keeps the discussion anchored in evidence. The participant chooses a goal and reports consequences honestly. None should promise a promotion or a transformation that has not been demonstrated.

Pause for retaliation, unmanageable burden, confidentiality concerns, or unsafe assignments. Use the organization's appropriate independent route to resolve them. The kit is an aid to structured practice. It does not replace professional judgment, local obligations, or the employee's own career preferences.

References

- [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

Contribution and Recognition Audit

A management process review with evidence worksheets

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Pilot management method | No validated organizational score

October 19 contribution history extension

Add the Contribution Attribution Assessment when the audit concerns how accomplishments are described or whether an innovation's history has been preserved. Compare an employee's neutral account, a separately collected evaluator account, and authorized records at creation and adoption. Keep originating work, later improvements, maintenance, and coordination distinct. Accurate recognition of one action does not erase another, and recent improvements can legitimately receive substantial attention.

Record whether a specific corroborated action is acknowledged, omitted from an inspected relevant account, inconsistent, or unresolved. Missing access is not omission. Preserve the account's purpose and the evidence window. Do not infer appropriation from explicit individual attribution, collective language, or a discrepancy alone. The reported case in paper 3 establishes no unfair decision or compensation outcome. Published audit material must exclude names, screenshots, internal company details, and identifiable quotations. Company confidentiality requirements and appropriate permissions apply to external use.

1 Purpose and decision boundary

This audit examines whether an organization can explain how it records contributions, acknowledges shared work, and provides development opportunities. It produces process findings, evidence limitations, and corrective actions. It does not determine an employee's worth or prove discrimination from a survey or residual. No overall CVT rating, archetype label, certification, or numerical fairness threshold is authorized by this version.

Separate recognition of completed work from selection for future responsibility. A person may deserve accurate acknowledgment while another person better meets a prospective role's criteria. The audit asks whether those criteria are relevant, stated in advance, supported by evidence, and applied consistently. It also asks whether people can correct factual errors without retaliation.

The organization should use established review routes for any employment decision affected by a factual correction. CVT alone cannot authorize pay changes, promotion reversals, discipline, or legal conclusions. This method is a proposed governance practice. Its usefulness, burden, and unintended consequences require evaluation.

2 Audit charter

Worksheet A Scope and accountability

Sponsor role: _____. Independent audit lead: _____. Employee or worker representative: _____. Decision or process under review: _____. Review period: _____. Population and exclusions: _____. Stated allocation purpose: _____. Policy and criteria in force during that period: _____.

Permitted evidence and access authority: _____. Disclosure and retention plan: _____. Conflicts of interest and recusals: _____. Confidential correction route: _____. Review recipient

and decision authority: _____. Completion date: _____. Resources available for correction: _____.

The sponsor agrees that individual survey answers and developmental reflections will not enter personnel decisions. Audit participants receive an accurate privacy explanation. An independent lead adjudicates contested evidence and controls disclosure. A sponsor who cannot support these conditions should resolve them before the audit begins.

3 Sample selection

Define the sampling frame before inspecting favorable or unfavorable outcomes. A practical initial review can cover one evaluation cycle and a stratified sample of completed episodes across role families, levels, shifts, and types of work. Include maintenance, prevention, coordination, and unsuccessful projects as well as launches and sales. A convenience sample supports only a bounded process review, not a workforce prevalence estimate.

Record the selection rule, available population, sampled cases, inaccessible records, and reasons for exclusion. If the audit oversamples complaints to understand failure modes, state that choice and do not report the resulting proportion as the organization's underrecognition rate. Review opportunity decisions among eligible people, distinguishing offers, declines, deferrals, and absence of vacancies.

Use at least two reviewers for a subset of cases as a planning practice. Compare interpretations before final conclusions. Do not treat agreement as proof of truth. Where feasible, withhold names and outcomes during the first evidence review, while recording whether the work still reveals identity. Full blinding may be impossible.

4 Evidence collection

For each selected episode, gather the objective, relevant outcome evidence, documented actions, dependencies, evaluation narrative, credit statements, and authorized opportunity decision records. Identify independent sources. Multiple copies of one narrative count as one source. Avoid private messages, surveillance data, and unnecessary personal information.

Worksheet B Episode evidence record

Case ID: _____. Episode and period: _____. Outcome and relevant quality standard: _____. Contribution actions and enabling work: _____. Joint dependencies: _____. Sources and access restrictions: _____. Source independence: _____. Constraints and adverse effects: _____. Missing or conflicting evidence: _____. Reviewers and conflicts: _____.

Evidence status: corroborated action ☐ unsupported assertion ☐ conflicting accounts ☐ insufficient coverage ☐. More than one status may apply to different claims. These are workflow descriptions, not validated grades. Separate a documented action from a claim about its causal value.

5 Attribution and recognition review

Compare the evidence record with the organization's actual acknowledgment. Ask who received credit, for what action, in which medium, and at what time. Determine whether the account conflates accountability with execution or presentation with origination. Preserve legitimate managerial and coordination contributions. A technical artifact does not automatically outweigh negotiation or prevention.

Worksheet C Credit comparison

Claim in the formal record: _____. Supporting evidence: _____. Contrary or missing evidence: _____. Contributor account: _____. Evaluator explanation: _____. Relevant policy standard: _____. Proposed factual correction or unresolved question: _____. Authorized reviewer: _____. Response and date: _____.

Classify each issue as apparent correspondence, possible omission, unverified credit, or unresolved evidence. Provide reasons in prose. Do not calculate a contribution-minus-recognition score. Difference scores can obscure separate constructs and measurement problems [R14]. Statistical model residuals, if produced by a qualified research team, are prompts for scrutiny rather than findings of individual unfairness.

6 Opportunity and dependency review

Ask whether a development or promotion decision concerned past contribution, prospective role fit, continuity, available capacity, or another stated criterion. Record the employee's expressed preference where appropriate and privately obtained. Do not infer ambition from who volunteers publicly. Task-allocation research motivates examining who receives less promotable obligations [R06], without assuming that all service work is low value.

Worksheet D Opportunity record

Opportunity and eligibility rule: _____. Available places or vacancies: _____. Application, invitation, or offer date: _____. Employee preference or decline if authorized: _____. Decision and stated reason: _____. Evidence against each relevant criterion: _____. Operational dependency cited: _____. Backup capacity and transfer plan: _____. Review date and owner: _____.

If current continuity blocks access, identify a concrete plan and review date. Repeated deferral without work transfer is a process concern. If role requirements explain the decision, verify that they existed before the candidate was evaluated and were applied to comparable candidates. Current-role performance alone need not establish managerial suitability [R07].

7 Process checks

Review question	Evidence to inspect	Possible corrective action
Do criteria exist before review?	Dated policy and reviewer instructions	Publish relevant criteria and explain changes
Can enabling work enter the record?	Sample narratives and evidence fields	Add a concise enabling-work prompt
Can contributors correct facts?	Correction route and response records	Add independent review with response dates
Does operational dependence block access?	Deferral reasons and backup plans	Fund capability transfer and revisit access
Can people use different evidence formats?	Accessibility and submission options	Permit equivalent oral or written accounts
Does the process shift burden?	Workload and documentation feedback	Reduce unnecessary recording and support recipients

These questions are a review checklist, not a validated maturity scale. A checked box does not establish effective implementation. Inspect examples of actual use and ask whether the process works for people with less access or authority. Perceived procedural fairness and accurate credit are distinct matters [R08].

8 A 75 minute calibration meeting

Use a de-identified or fictional case where feasible. Allocate 10 minutes to scope and conflicts, 15 to independent evidence review, 15 to compare contribution and acknowledgment, 15 to examine alternatives, 10 to agree on factual corrections or unresolved issues, and 10 to assign actions. This is a facilitation schedule, not a demonstrated intervention dose.

Begin with evidence before revealing the final reward decision where practical. Ask each reviewer to name one fact that would change their interpretation. Explicitly test productive coordination, role matching, employee preference, missing information, and prior opportunity. Do not use the meeting to debate which archetype describes a person. Record minority interpretations and the reason for the final process finding.

9 Worked fictional case

A launch summary credits Morgan, the project owner, with delivering a new service. The episode record shows that Priya designed recovery procedures, Sam coordinated a delayed dependency, and Morgan made scope decisions and secured resources. The summary is not necessarily false, but a later review repeats it as evidence that Morgan personally designed recovery. The audit identifies a specific unsupported inference and proposes a corrected account that preserves all documented roles.

Priya also requested a development rotation that was deferred because no backup could operate a recovery procedure. The audit records this separately as an opportunity and continuity issue. It assigns a manager to arrange backup practice and set a new decision date. The case does not establish that Priya should receive a management promotion or that Morgan acted deceptively. The evidence supports narrower factual and process actions.

10 Findings and corrective action report

Worksheet E Finding record

Finding ID and process: _____. Scope and sampling limitations: _____. Evidence and source independence: _____. Stated policy or criterion: _____. Observed discrepancy: _____. Alternative explanations considered: _____. Affected process rather than employee label: _____. Confidence and unresolved evidence in words: _____.

Action: _____. Accountable owner: _____. Resources: _____. Due date: _____. Employee correction route: _____. Follow-up evidence: _____. Possible burden or harm: _____. Decision: open ☐ implemented ☐ unresolved ☐ withdrawn after new evidence ☐.

Report process findings with their limitations. Avoid a percentage called unfairness or reward capture unless a separate validated research design supports that interpretation. Counts of omissions in selected cases describe those cases. An organization-wide claim requires a suitable sample, clear denominator, reliable adjudication, and uncertainty estimates.

11 Follow-up and confidentiality

At 30 days, check whether factual corrections and named actions occurred. At 90 days, review whether people can use the correction route, whether deferred opportunities received decisions, and whether documentation burden increased. Compare like processes and record changes in role mix. A before-and-after improvement alone does not establish causal effectiveness.

Employers receive disclosure-reviewed process summaries. Restrict individual records to authorized reviewers, keep access logs, and apply the agreed retention schedule. Suppress small or identifiable groups and avoid quotations that reveal people. Explain confidentiality limits before collecting accounts. Provide an independent concerns route and pause the audit for retaliation or serious privacy concerns.

12 Audit closeout

Closeout should state what the audit established, what remains uncertain, which corrections were made, who owns unfinished actions, and when the process will be reviewed. Employees should receive an accessible explanation of relevant process changes. Preserve the distinction between an experimental framework, a documented factual correction, and any subsequent formal employment review.

References

- [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>
- [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>
- [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>
- [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>

Contribution Attribution Assessment

Employee descriptions manager accounts and contribution histories

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijean

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Original research toolkit | Not validated for employment decisions

1 Purpose and boundaries

This assessment gathers separate descriptions of how accomplishments are communicated, how evaluators identify individual actions, and whether records retain contribution histories. It operationalizes questions raised by the proposed Collective Attribution Paradox, Attribution Dilution Effect, and Contribution Signaling constructs. It supplies no validated scale, diagnostic threshold, fairness judgment, or employee type. Its first appropriate research use is content review and cognitive interviewing.

The assessment has four parts: a neutral employee description and eight pilot items; an independent manager account; a review of contribution history; and an action-level comparison. Related self-presentation and joint-attribution research [R19, R20, R21] informs the questions without validating these materials. A structured role history has a scholarly precedent [R22], but the templates below are original CVT research aids. Do not infer motive, leadership quality, promotion suitability, or compensation entitlement from communication style.

2 Administration and privacy

Use a consenting adult employee-episode pair as the basic record. An independent facilitator selects episodes using a declared rule, such as the most recent qualifying completed work episode. Selecting only disputed accomplishments cannot estimate prevalence. Record the rule, evidence window, role context, observation opportunities, and unavailable sources. The protocol supplies the study-specific consent and activation requirements. A local process review also needs authorized access, a clear purpose, and an independent correction route.

Assign a random episode code. Keep identities and linkage keys separately with an authorized custodian. Do not enter names, screenshots, company identifiers, customer information, private communications, or distinctive technical details in these reusable forms. Reference authorized evidence by a restricted source code and broad period. Keep internal records in their approved systems. No covert chat collection, monitoring, or retrospective scraping is part of this assessment.

Collect the manager account before showing the employee account. Managers must not receive employee survey responses or a participation list. If a linked procedure makes participation known, disclose that limit during consent and obtain independent approval of the revised workflow. Declining must have no employment consequence. Do not promise anonymity for linked episodes. Provide nonwritten alternatives and accessible formats. Review burden and retaliation risk throughout.

3 Part A employee description

Episode code: _____. Broad reference period: _____. Episode selection rule: _____.
Actual time in setting: _____. Available evaluation opportunity: yes ☐ no ☐ unknown ☐.

Neutral prompt: Describe one completed shared accomplishment. What outcome mattered, what actions produced it, and what remained uncertain? Use only a generalized account appropriate for authorized research. Do not name people or quote internal messages. Use the same prompt and space allowance for

every participant. Facilitators must not coach a more individual or collective style before collecting this first description.

Description: _____

Follow-up after the neutral description: Which actions, if any, did you personally perform? Which actions did others perform? What evidence could an authorized reviewer consult? Was there an opportunity to communicate this information to an evaluator? Which facts are unknown or disputed? Keep the prompted clarification separate from the initial description so the assessment does not mistake coached specificity for an initial style.

Personal actions and uncertainty: _____

Others' actions and joint dependencies: _____

Authorized source codes and access limits: _____

Eight supplementary pilot items

For the past three months in your current setting, select 1 Never, 2 Rarely, 3 Sometimes, 4 Often, or 5 Consistently. Additional options are NA Not applicable, NO No opportunity, DK Do not know, and blank Skipped. Shorter actual observation periods must be recorded. No response is a performance judgment. Skip any item.

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:

Collective credit and specified personal actions can coexist. CA1 is not the opposite of CS1. The items do not establish stable traits or an effect. Use item distributions only, preserving valid denominators and each missing category. No means, sums, reverse scoring, types, cutoffs, percentiles, or employment decisions are authorized for this module.

4 Part B independent manager account

Complete before viewing the employee account. Manager role code: _____. Episode code: _____. Prior familiarity with episode: direct observation [] authorized record [] stakeholder account [] other authorized source [] none []. Record sources separately; this is not a rank of source quality.

M1 Describe the outcome and identify which actions you can attribute to individual contributors. Use participant codes. Mark joint or unknown actions explicitly. Response:

M2 What evidence did you encounter before your evaluation, and when relative to the decision? What did you receive without reading or could not access? Use authorized source codes. Response:

M3 Can you distinguish originating work, later improvements, maintenance, and coordination of adoption? State the basis and confidence in each factual claim, using plain language rather than a numerical certainty score. Response: _____

M4 How did the formal acknowledgment describe those actions? What route allows contributors to correct a factual omission privately? Unknown or unavailable is an acceptable answer. Response:

The facilitator records exposure separately from favorable judgment. An employee report that an update was sent cannot establish that this manager encountered it. A manager's recollection is fallible and does not override a corroborated record by authority alone. Record differences without assigning blame.

5 Part C contribution history review

Select a work innovation or shared deliverable with an authorized evidence trail. Define the action and purpose of the account before inspecting credit. This review concerns acknowledgment of work, not legal ownership. Use the same fixed originating actions across stages and record later contributions separately. A valid recent-operations account may emphasize maintenance without misrepresenting origin.

For every check, use present, absent in an inspected relevant record, unclear, record unavailable, not applicable, or skipped. These are descriptive categories with no numeric weights. Absent requires an accessible record in which the prespecified action was relevant to the stated purpose. Unavailable is not absent.

R1 Is the originating action identifiable, with a source and broad time window? Status: _____. Source code and uncertainty: _____

R2 Do records distinguish later improvements from the originating action and identify their contributors? Status: _____. Source code and uncertainty: _____

R3 Can the history be followed from creation to initial adoption and wider routine use? Status: _____. Missing stages or access limits: _____

R4 In each later relevant account, is the same corroborated originating action acknowledged accurately? Complete one row per action per stage in the history CSV. Status: _____. Uncertainty: _____

R5 Is there a usable correction and version-history process that preserves earlier and later contributions without overwriting them? Status: _____. Evidence and limits:

History worksheet fields: episode code; action code; stage; broad period; action role; contributor code; corroboration code; account purpose; exposure evidence; acknowledgment status; later additions; access limits; correction status. Do not allocate percentages summing to 100. Do not assume the original creator must remain the main recipient of credit after others add value.

6 Part D comparison and descriptive reporting

Two trained reviewers independently code each initial description for a specified personal action, acknowledgment of others, and team-result framing. Allow multiple flags and an ambiguous category. Code meaning rather than counting I and we. Preserve pre-adjudication codes and discuss disagreements under a locked codebook. Interrater agreement with uncertainty is a validation input, not an automatic pass mark.

For each corroborated action, compare the employee clarification, manager account, and relevant record. Classify aligned, omitted from an inspected relevant account, inconsistent, joint, or unresolved. Mark unavailable sources separately. These statuses describe a particular claim, not an employee. A discrepancy can arise from timing, record purpose, incomplete access, memory, later contribution, or genuine omission. Test these alternatives before recommending a factual correction.

Report counts of reviewed episodes and actions, coverage by source and stage, denominators, missingness, coding uncertainty, and burden. A descriptive fraction such as 6 of 10 inspected originating-action records naming the originator is limited to that selected set. It is not a validated dilution rate, organizational fairness index, or prevalence estimate. Preserve repeated-action dependence for inference. Publish no employee-level profiles or ranks.

Suggested finding format: In the selected episodes, the reviewed sources differed on the following action. The available evidence supports this correction or leaves the matter unresolved. The sample and missing records limit inference. No conclusion about intent or reward consequences follows without separate evidence.

7 Pilot validation and safeguards

Test the prompt and items with participants from varied roles. Check whether the neutral prompt induces a preferred style, whether respondents distinguish collective credit from omitted roles, and whether the anchors fit real opportunities. Compare an initial description with later independently corroborated actions. Examine social desirability, language and accessibility, source disagreement, evaluator knowledge, and possible harms from labeling. The new items do not inherit validity from prior scales [R12, R13].

Before any confirmatory use, define the target population, coding rules, outcomes, sample and precision plan, independence of raters, missing-data rules, and discrimination or invariance checks justified by the intended comparison. Do not force the mixed modules into a factor model or internal-consistency scale. They collect different kinds of evidence. Stop or revise if coding collapses collective credit into low contribution, if manager exposure cannot be distinguished from credit, or if linkage creates coercion or identification risk.

The generalized episode in paper 3 is a reported illustration only. No actual names, screenshots, internal exchanges, employer details, or distinctive backgrounds are included here. External use of that episode requires company confidentiality clearance where required and appropriate participant permission, or removal. Anonymization does not itself confer approval. The assessment contains no completed employee responses or findings.

8 Reusable records and follow through

Companion CSVs include the eight-item bank, blank employee response template, manager account template, contribution-history template, and source comparison template. They are editable records without scoring formulas. Use a restricted copy for authorized research; release only disclosure-reviewed aggregates or synthetic examples. The manager template must never become an employee-monitoring form.

Process action: _____. Specific factual correction or unresolved question:

Responsible reviewer code: _____. Authorized evidence location: _____. Review date:

_____.

Employee correction route and response:

Burden or adverse experience and response:

Future review checks whether factual history became more complete and usable, while monitoring burden and unintended effects. It does not certify the new constructs or claim the procedure improves compensation, promotion, or leadership.

References

[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>

[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>

[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>

[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>

[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>

The Corporate Value Triad Explained

Who creates value who receives credit and how organizations decide

Proposed by Jean Nickson Pijeu

Version 0.1 | October 2026 | Research update October 19 2026

Public brief | A proposed framework pending empirical validation

An organization can depend on someone's work without making that work easy to see. It can also reward a person whose most important contribution is connecting people, resolving a dependency, or securing a decision. The Corporate Value Triad asks how organizations distinguish the work, the credit, and the rewards that follow.

The framework uses three provisional archetypes. Builders create or sustain outcomes through domain work. Relationship Operators connect people, coordinate, negotiate, and influence decisions. Builder-Leaders combine domain judgment with the ability to mobilize collective effort. These descriptions can overlap and change with an assignment. They are not personality types or a ranking of human worth.

Relationships can create value

An engineer who prevents a failure, a coordinator who resolves a blocked dependency, and a negotiator who secures a workable agreement may all contribute to the same result. Technical work is not the only productive work. Research already connects social capital and careers [R01], and political skill is associated with performance as well as career outcomes [R04]. CVT's originality cannot rest on claiming that relationships matter.

Its proposed contribution is to examine the steps between an outcome and a career decision. Contribution concerns what a person helped produce. Visibility concerns whether relevant evidence reaches an evaluator. Attribution concerns who receives credit. Recognition makes some of that credit explicit. Reward concerns a later allocation such as pay, authority, or access to development. Influence can affect several of these steps and can also improve the work itself.

Three questions for a real workplace

First, what evidence shows the outcome and the actions that enabled it? Include maintenance, prevention, and coordination where relevant. A task count or a persuasive presentation is an incomplete answer.

Second, does the formal account describe those actions accurately? A project owner can deserve credit for direction while colleagues deserve credit for design and execution. Joint work does not require a single winner. Where evidence is uncertain, the record should say so.

Third, what is the later decision trying to accomplish? Recognizing excellent work and choosing a manager are different decisions. Someone can deserve acknowledgment without being the best candidate for a particular role. The criteria and available opportunities should make that distinction clear.

The proposed builders paradox

Sometimes an organization may repeatedly postpone a capable contributor's development because the current operation depends on them. CVT calls this the builder's paradox. It is a hypothesis about concentrated capability and transfer cost, not a finding that technical excellence usually harms careers. A useful response might combine protected development time with backup practice and actual work transfer. Whether that response works is a research question.

October 19 research extension

Three proposed ideas focus on recognition differences that could arise without deliberate credit taking. The Collective Attribution Paradox asks whether team-focused accounts leave individual work less visible in individual evaluations. The Attribution Dilution Effect asks whether acknowledgment of originating work fades as innovations spread. Contribution Signaling concerns how explicitly people communicate their own verifiable actions to evaluators. Collective credit and clear individual roles can coexist.

These are research questions, not established effects. The new assessment compares employee descriptions, manager accounts, and contribution histories without producing a score. The protocol adds five hypotheses with a crosswalk from the update's labels to the existing registry. A reported episode motivates the questions but establishes no recognition, promotion, or compensation disparity. Its identifying and internal details are excluded from the package.

What can be used now

The accompanying management audit helps teams reconstruct episodes, correct factual omissions, and examine opportunity criteria. The leadership kit supports voluntary practice with a clear workload agreement. These are experimental practices. They do not establish that an organization is fair or that a participant has become a builder-leader.

The diagnostic survey asks about reported experiences. It has no validated overall score, employee categories, benchmarks, or promotion cutoffs. It should not enter hiring, pay, promotion, or discipline. The research protocol explains how to test the framework with independent evidence, comparison conditions, and participant protections.

CVT should change if better measurement explains away an apparent recognition gap, if relational work accounts for the outcome, or if its proposed interventions fail. Version 0.1 is an invitation to examine a specific organizational problem with evidence. It is a conceptual proposal, not a scientific discovery already established by data.

References

[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>

[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>

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.

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.