

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

The evidence behind Originals

Claims, source checks, scoring, and disclosures

Adam Grant; foreword by Sheryl Sandberg · Evidence cutoff: 13 September 2026

Report ID: TBS-ORIGINALS-APPENDIX

65 min read

This is the supporting record for the reader review. It retains the detailed analysis rather than requiring every reader to work through it. Use the claim register to find a finding, then follow its sources and qualifications. The common tables standardize navigation; the original audit designs and identifiers remain distinct.

Overall 58% · Scientific Accuracy 58% · Reference Accuracy 67% · Practical Value 50%.

About This Review

This review combines factual reporting with editorial judgments about the identified book and its evidence. Ratings apply our published rubric; they are not percentages of truth or judgments about an author's honesty. Criticism of support does not itself show that a claim is false. Evidence is assessed through 13 September 2026, with source-access limits disclosed. Preparation used AI, and independent human fact-checking or legal clearance is not documented. Read the methodology, book-specific disclosures, and full editorial notice with the review. Corrections and substantive responses are welcome.

Find the supporting evidence

Claim register

01 The verdict in context

02 Scope and method

03 The strongest fair reading

04 Three central scientific claims

05 Chapter-by-chapter assessment

06 Claim, number, and source audit

07 Practical use, limitations, and safeguards

08 What changes with time—and what should change in the book

09 How the ratings were determined

10 Verification record and remaining limits

11 References and source access

12 Editorial Review Notice, Disclosures, and Corrections

EVIDENCE MAP

Claim register

This common register makes the detailed evidence easier to navigate. Each row identifies a scoped proposition or source relationship, a verdict, and the treatment it warrants. A label applies to that row—not to the whole book or its author. The full wording, sources, qualifications, and original audit identifiers remain in the linked exhibits.

Verdicts: Supported; Partly supported; Overstated; Incorrect; Unresolved; Practical judgment. “Incorrect” requires an identified factual or measurement problem; “unresolved” is an access or verification limit, not a failed claim. “Practical judgment” identifies advice or a safeguard rather than a tested effect. These routing labels add no numerical score. **Definitions.**

ID	Claim or focal issue	Verdict	Treatment and supporting detail
C01	Browser choice as a window into initiative	Partly supported	Use the story to ask whether defaults deserve scrutiny, not to infer that a browser is a validated personality test. In hiring, directly sample initiative through work behavior and examine its incremental predictive value. Full assessment and sources
C02	Keeping a day job and entrepreneurial survival	Partly supported	Preserve runway while testing feasibility, then make commitment contingent on evidence and the cost of divided attention. Financial security can enable exploration; indefinite fragmentation can prevent execution. Full assessment and sources

ID	Claim or focal issue	Verdict	Treatment and supporting detail
C03	Are entrepreneurs unusually risk-averse?	Overstated	Reject the myth that recklessness is a prerequisite. Do not replace it with a temperament rule favoring risk aversion. Evaluate the opportunity, available information, cost of failure, and capacity to recover. Full assessment and sources
C04	More ideas, better chances—not an unlimited free lunch	Partly supported	Generate a diverse portfolio before refining one favorite. Track whether additional ideas improve the best available option, not whether a quota has been reached. Full assessment and sources
C05	Fellow creators as forecasters	Partly supported	Add knowledgeable peers to evaluation; do not substitute them for the intended user. Obtain independent judgments before discussion, distinguish novelty from usefulness, and compare forecasts with later outcomes. Full assessment and sources
C06	Artistic breadth and creative distinction	Partly supported	Seek intellectually useful variety, especially when it changes how a real problem is represented. Treat major travel, career, or educational commitments as decisions with multiple benefits and costs—not as purchased doses of originality. Full assessment and sources
C07	When intuition deserves trust	Practical judgment	Before trusting a gut judgment, ask whether this person has repeatedly encountered comparable decisions, received informative feedback, and faced reasonably stable relationships between cues and outcomes. Full assessment and sources
C08	Voice, credibility, and unequal room to dissent	Partly supported	Individuals should assess audience, sponsorship, and potential retaliation. Leaders should remove barriers to accurate reporting, not make credibility a prerequisite for identifying an urgent risk. Full assessment and sources
C09	Leading with weaknesses	Practical judgment	Disclose material limitations clearly and show how they will be tested or addressed. Do not manufacture token weaknesses as a persuasion technique or assume that placing exactly three flaws first is evidence-based. Full assessment and sources
C10	Familiarity, repetition, and acceptance	Partly supported	Present an unfamiliar idea more than once when the audience needs time to understand it. On each return, add clarification or evidence and ask what remains unresolved. Stop counting exposures as if they were doses of a treatment. Full assessment and sources
C11	Choosing an audience—and knowing when to leave	Practical judgment	Choose audiences by relevant knowledge and demonstrated behavior, not by a pleasant-versus-disagreeable stereotype. For an important proposal, seek a credible sponsor and a small reversible trial. Full assessment and sources
C12	Procrastination or incubation?	Partly supported	Start early enough to understand the problem, generate initial possibilities, and reserve a bounded pause before selecting or finishing. Protect the deadline and measure the final work. The useful mechanism is avoiding premature closure, not accumulating lateness. Full assessment and sources
C13	First movers, “settlers,” and a misleading denominator	Incorrect	The study challenges simplistic pioneer mythology; it does not establish a sixfold causal failure penalty for going first. Grant does mention mixed evidence and advantages involving patents and network effects. Full assessment and sources

ID	Claim or focal issue	Verdict	Treatment and supporting detail
C14	Is there an age limit on originality?	Partly supported	Do not use chronological age as a reason to stop experimenting, or a future age milestone as a reason to postpone. Leverage accumulated domain knowledge while deliberately challenging stale assumptions. Full assessment and sources
C15	Shared tactics, familiar frames, and moderate messages	Partly supported	Identify a specific shared objective and explain the proposal in terms the audience can evaluate. Test comprehension, genuine agreement, and willingness to cooperate separately. Full assessment and sources
C16	uBeam: recruiting collaborators is not technical validation	Unresolved	Breaking a difficult problem into testable components can be productive. But a component that meets its specification does not prove that the assembled system meets its efficiency, range, cost, or safety requirements. Full assessment and sources
C17	Should readers cut frenemies and convert enemies?	Overstated	Judge relationships by the frequency and severity of actual conduct, willingness to repair, and future consequences. Distinguish inconsistent support from persistent sabotage, and a substantive critic from an adversary who acts in bad faith. Full assessment and sources
C18	The “born to rebel” account needs major revision	Overstated	Do not use sibling position as a useful diagnostic of someone’s originality. Evaluate the person’s actual behavior. Full assessment and sources
C19	What the 10.6-fold baseball statistic actually means	Incorrect	Do not carry this number into general personality claims, hiring, or parenting. The book’s visually striking list of exceptional base stealers in ch. 6 is illustrative, not a representative comparison sample. Full assessment and sources
C20	Explaining discipline versus reducing the number of rules	Partly supported	Explain the reason for a boundary and the impact of violating it; leave room for age-appropriate choice. Do not use “fewer rules” as the objective in itself. Safety, consistency, the child’s capacities, and opportunities for repair belong in the implementation. Full assessment and sources
C21	Identity praise: an initial boost can coexist with fragility	Partly supported	Prefer specific, truthful feedback about a choice, strategy, contribution, or improvement, linked to a value that remains available after a mistake. Do not imply that worth or moral identity depends on maintaining an unbroken record. Full assessment and sources
C22	Mentors, stories, and national innovation	Overstated	Offer varied, attainable examples and discuss how people reasoned, practiced, and revised. Stories can expand a child’s imagined options without proving that one reading list produces inventors. Full assessment and sources
C23	Commitment cultures and zero observed failures	Overstated	Build durable commitment to a mission and standards of evidence, not uniformity of background or belief. Measure both coordination benefits and the organization’s ability to change course. No percentage in this cohort can select an optimal culture for every firm. Full assessment and sources
C24	Authentic dissent versus an assigned devil’s advocate	Partly supported	Seek actual disagreement first. When necessary, use a structured alternative-case or premortem exercise, then evaluate its evidence instead of dismissing it because the role was assigned. Full assessment and sources
C25	Bridgewater: a case, not a controlled culture experiment	Practical judgment	Copy the principle that important concerns must surface, not every visible ritual. Check who speaks, whose corrections are adopted, and whether junior people can disagree without humiliation. Full assessment and sources

ID	Claim or focal issue	Verdict	Treatment and supporting detail
C26	Excitement and defensive pessimism	Partly supported	For ordinary anticipatory nerves, an excitement framing is a low-cost option to test. Keep the goal concrete and evaluate behavior, not whether the label feels perfectly convincing. Use a bounded risk review to produce precautions and an action plan. Full assessment and sources
C27	Allies, beneficiaries, and the limits of motivational framing	Partly supported	Recruit an ally for relevant support and independent judgment, not merely agreement. Connect work to genuine beneficiaries without exploiting them as motivational props. Full assessment and sources
C28	Venting anger versus processing it constructively	Partly supported	Do not rehearse retaliation and expect it to remove anger. Create enough distance to choose a response, then address the actual problem. Preserve the option of calm discussion and constructive support. Full assessment and sources

01 The verdict in context

A stimulating source of ideas, with uneven support for turning those ideas into general prescriptions. Its strongest contribution is to challenge the image of the original person as uniformly fearless, certain, and isolated. Its most useful practices invite more ideas, better criticism, and less premature commitment.

The evidence becomes less secure when memorable cases are used to imply causal recipes. A finding about selected entrepreneurs does not make delayed entry generally safer. A laboratory judgment does not necessarily predict success in a real organization. A historical family pattern does not establish an effective parenting intervention.

The first-mover example needs a specific correction: the cited comparison is with early market leaders, not a representative sample of all later entrants. The same source distinguishes all pioneers from surviving pioneers when reporting market share. The general lesson that being first is not enough survives; the advertised numerical case for waiting does not. Reference audit.

Best use: treat the suggestions as candidate interventions to test against real decisions, costs, and feedback. This report retains the full assessment of all 30 closing recommendations, rather than letting the most problematic examples stand in for the whole book.

Recommendation: Useful for generating hypotheses and experiments, not as a dependable recipe for originality.

Confidence: Moderate confidence in the overall appraisal; high confidence in the checked pioneer/early-leader comparison problem.

Ease of application: Many ideas are easy to try; organizational change requires authority and support.

Best use: Best for generating low-cost experiments while keeping success claims provisional.

Rating profile: Overall 58% · Scientific Accuracy 58% · Reference Accuracy 67% · Practical Value 50%. Full rationale.

02 Scope and method

Question: How well do the reviewed book's important scientific claims hold up, how faithfully does it use sources, and what can readers responsibly do with its advice? The intended audience is an interested general reader, with enough detail for researchers and editors to audit the reasoning.

Edition and scope. 2016 Viking ebook; ISBN 9780698405776. Coverage comprises 28 substantive claims; 15 targeted reference–claim pairs; all 30 Actions for Impact; all eight chapters. Book citations identify chapters and named sections of the reviewed edition. The source copies have not been authenticated against publisher–controlled masters.

Preparation. The source basis includes the chapter assessments, source records, every registered claim, additional identifiable named studies, and all nine scoring inputs under the stated rubric. This is a targeted critical narrative review, not an exhaustive systematic review or an independent reproduction of datasets. The shared methodology explains the evidence and scoring rules.

Claim selection. Three central propositions summarize the book's organizing argument, its proposed mechanism or intervention, and important practical extensions. Selection is purposive and retrospective, not random or preregistered. All chapters remain covered to expose peripheral but consequential claims. The three proposition grades are not a sample-based estimate of the truth of the whole book. Narrow existence claims are easier to support than universal superiority claims; the stated proposition must always accompany the grade.

Evidence rules. The analysis distinguishes source identity, what the cited study actually found, the strength of its design, independent corroboration, and transfer to the book's practical claim. A controlled component study does not validate a branded package; an association does not identify an intervention effect; failure to locate evidence is not proof of its absence. Null findings, attrition, selection, selective reporting, measurement limitations, and competing explanations matter where they change an inference. Evidence available at publication and later updates are identified separately.

Ratings. The three categories are Scientific Accuracy, Reference Accuracy and Practical Value. Each uses three explicitly anchored judgments. Category percentages are calculated from the original inputs; the overall rating gives each category equal weight. Final displays use whole-number percentages, with all rounding performed after calculation. Ease of application and consequential cautions are reported separately. Section 09 and the series methodology provide the exact inputs, rules and limits. These are editorial judgments, not probabilities, estimates of the percentage of true content, or validated psychometric measurements.

Reference checks. Targeted source audits are stress tests, not prevalence estimates. The number of discrepancies in a purposive sample cannot estimate the proportion of a book's references that are wrong. The Grit report additionally preserves an explicitly restricted-frame seeded selection, with its missing-source cases and inherited inclusion coding disclosed. It is not the same audit design as the other books.

Relationship to Red Pen Reviews. The series adapts the separation of central scientific claims, reference support and practical consequences from the public Red Pen Reviews process and method, version 2.2. It uses a behavioral-science Practical Value category instead of nutrition-specific Healthfulness. Reference Accuracy is a common three-criterion assessment, not Red Pen Reviews' ten-reference random-sample score. The three category percentages are averaged, but there is no claim of an independent second expert reviewer. These departures mean the scores are not directly interchangeable with official Red Pen Reviews scores. This review is not affiliated with or endorsed by Red Pen Reviews.

Research cutoff: 13 September 2026. Dated source checks are listed in Section 10. Source-access dates are distinct from the papers' publication dates. The search does not guarantee exhaustive database coverage or detection of every notice. This is an evidence date, not a publication date.

Research search record

The passage below describes the documented research. Not every listed search, source read, or assessment was independently repeated; dated retrieval and access limits are listed in Section 10.

What was checked

The review first traced the book's wording and its corresponding reference or endnote. Targeted external searches then sought original papers, accessible author or university copies, later syntheses, and relevant follow-up studies. Searches included the distinctive names and claims concerning hybrid entrepreneurship, creative forecasting, procrastination, first movers, birth order, identity language, dissent, and emotion regulation. Public evidence was searched through 8 September 2026. This is a critical narrative review, not an exhaustive systematic review or a new meta-analysis.

Evidence access varied. Some conclusions rest on inspected article methods and results; others rest on an original abstract or a retrieved results excerpt. The reference list states that distinction for every external item. Material found only in the book is described as **book-reported**, not independently confirmed. Inability to inspect an unpublished dataset is not evidence that its results are false. Conversely, a real publication is not automatically strong evidence for every recommendation attached to it.

03 The strongest fair reading

The strongest version of the book is an argument against fatalism about originality. Meaningful innovation does not require a fearless genius acting alone; people can generate alternatives, invite informed dissent, evaluate uncertainty, and advocate changes within institutions. Its anecdotes aim to make those practices concrete rather than establish that all successful innovators follow one personality profile.

That reading deserves to be evaluated separately from stronger prescriptions about delaying entry, using birth order, increasing idea output by a particular multiple, or interpreting an odds ratio as a behavioral frequency ratio. The book also acknowledges mixed evidence on first-mover advantage. A fair critique should preserve those qualifications while correcting comparisons and practical leaps that they do not resolve. The eight chapter dossiers and the audit of all 30 final actions below retain both the useful practices and their limits. Reviewed book.

04 Three central scientific claims

These are the three rated propositions, stated at the level assessed—not three verbatim quotations or an exhaustive list of the book’s claims.

CLAIM 1 · 75%

**Originality does not require
fearlessness or reckless commitment.**

Evidence and counterexamples support rejecting the heroic necessity claim. That is easier to establish than the stronger proposition that risk aversion itself generally causes success.

CLAIM 2 · 50%

**The recommended techniques reliably
improve the generation, selection,
and communication of original ideas.**

There are credible findings and useful possibilities, but heterogeneous designs and selective historical examples do not establish dependable effects across settings.

CLAIM 3 · 50%

Parents, teachers, and leaders can cultivate originality using the book's prescriptions.

Support varies across practices. Broad prescriptions drawn from birth order, family histories, and identity language require more qualification than the narrative sometimes supplies.

The scientific claim assessment below is anchored in the eight chapter dossiers, especially C01–C03 (risk), the idea-evaluation and procrastination discussions, and the parenting and organizational-culture claims. Those dossiers distinguish supportive evidence from causal or quantitative overstatement rather than treating every recommendation as equally established.

05 Chapter-by-chapter assessment

Chapter 1 · Creative Destruction

The Risky Business of Going Against the Grain

The opening chapter challenges the image of the original as a fearless outsider. Warby Parker provides the organizing case: the founders questioned an expensive default while protecting their options. That is a useful corrective to romantic accounts of entrepreneurial risk. The scientific problem is not the possibility of cautious originality; it is the tendency to attribute the eventual success of selected people to whichever cautious behaviors their histories reveal.

[1 · ch. 1]

C01 · Browser choice as a window into initiative

Verdict: intriguing association; mechanism unverified · Confidence: high in the limitation
Book's claim. Customer-service employees using Firefox or Chrome stayed longer and performed better than users of the then-default browsers. Grant explicitly says the browser itself is not the cause. He interprets the association as a sign of initiative that also changes how employees handle their jobs. [1 · ch. 1]

Assessment. The reference trail points to Michael Housman's communications and presentations, rather than an accessible peer-reviewed study whose full measurement and analysis could be checked here. The reported sample size and computer-skill controls do not,

by themselves, establish the proposed initiative mechanism. Browser selection could reflect several measured or unmeasured differences. Nor does a correlation found during one technological era automatically transport to another. [1 · References to ch. 1]

Practical verdict. Use the story to ask whether defaults deserve scrutiny, not to infer that a browser is a validated personality test. In hiring, directly sample initiative through work behavior and examine its incremental predictive value. The latter is this review's measurement recommendation, not a finding established by the browser dataset.

C02 · Keeping a day job and entrepreneurial survival

Verdict: direction supported; statistic and prescription need qualification · Confidence: high
Book's claim. Entrepreneurs who retained a day job had roughly one-third lower odds of failure than those who quit. The story supports balancing risks rather than betting everything at once. [1 · ch. 1]

Evidence. Raffiee and Feng studied a staged path: people first combined paid work and self-employment, then entered full-time self-employment. Their reported coefficient of -0.405 corresponds to about a 33.3% lower **exit hazard** than direct entry from paid employment. It is not a 33-percentage-point improvement, and it is not a randomized comparison of keeping versus quitting a job. [3]

Assessment. The staged group is selected partly by reaching the full-time transition. A promising venture can justify that transition; an unpromising side venture can be abandoned beforehand. Selection and learning can coexist. The paper supports considering a staged route, not the claim that keeping a job itself guarantees the reported reduction or that cautious personalities necessarily build better firms.

Later evidence — 2021: Kritskaya and Kolvereid used Norwegian administrative records and a propensity-score-matched comparison. Staged entrants accumulated fewer years classified as self-employed and more successive years of majority business ownership after their final self-employment year. The study used different owner/employment definitions and outcomes; it is a mixed external follow-up, not an exact replication or an overturning of Raffiee and Feng's U.S. Cox estimate. Exit from full-time self-employment must not be equated with business failure. [37]

Practical verdict. Preserve runway while testing feasibility, then make commitment contingent on evidence and the cost of divided attention. Financial security can enable exploration; indefinite fragmentation can prevent execution.

C03 · Are entrepreneurs unusually risk-averse?

Verdict: no simple consensus; the anti-recklessness lesson survives · Confidence: high
Book's claim. Entrepreneurs do not particularly like risk, and successful originals mitigate rather than maximize it. The chapter presents broad disciplinary agreement and highlights a study in which nascent entrepreneurs chose safer financial prospects. [1 · ch. 1]

Evidence. Xu and Ruef support that narrower finding. But Stewart and Roth's meta-analysis reports greater risk propensity among entrepreneurs than managers. Zhao and colleagues find risk propensity related to entrepreneurial intentions, not entrepreneurial performance.

The comparison group, definition of entrepreneurship, and measurement of risk therefore matter. [4, 5, 6]

Assessment. Risk preference, confidence about success, objective exposure, and downside protection are different constructs. Someone can seek autonomy, accept business uncertainty, and still prefer a safer gamble. Moreover, “successful founders often mitigate risk” does not imply “risk-averse people are generally more likely to succeed.” Conditioning on success makes that inference especially fragile.

Practical verdict. Reject the myth that recklessness is a prerequisite. Do not replace it with a temperament rule favoring risk aversion. Evaluate the opportunity, available information, cost of failure, and capacity to recover. Similarly, the chapter’s declaration that originality is a choice should not be read as evidence that ability, personality, resources, and social constraints are irrelevant. [1 · ch. 1]

Chapter 2 · Blind Inventors and One-Eyed Investors

The Art and Science of Recognizing Original Ideas

This is among the book’s most useful chapters. It separates generating ideas from selecting them, and confidence from market understanding. Its paired Segway and Seinfeld stories illustrate opposite errors: backing an eventual disappointment and nearly rejecting an eventual hit. However, these outcomes do not reveal which decision was rational given the information available at the time. A good selection process will still reject some eventual successes and fund some failures. [1 · ch. 2]

C04 · More ideas, better chances—not an unlimited free lunch

Verdict: useful principle; absolute quantity–quality claim overstated · **Confidence:** moderate to high
Book’s claim. Prolific creators produce more influential work; quantity is the most dependable route to quality, and a presumed quantity–quality trade-off is dismissed. Much of the support comes from historical creative careers. [1 · ch. 2]

Evidence and reasoning. More attempts can increase the chance of a valuable result without improving the average attempt. That mathematical distinction matters. If additional ideas consume negligible resources and leave earlier ideas intact, generating more expands the choice set. With fixed time, however, volume can displace research, development, or evaluation. Historical correlations cannot settle that allocation problem.

A relevant experiment by Girotra and colleagues favors an individual-then-group process over group-only work: the former generated more ideas and better leading ideas in its tasks. It supports process design, not a universal instruction to maximize count regardless of cost. [9]

Practical verdict. Generate a diverse portfolio before refining one favorite. Track whether additional ideas improve the best available option, not whether a quota has been reached. Grant’s advice to test a minimum viable product through customer behavior, rather than

simply ask customers what they want, is an important strength that appears in an endnote. [1 · ch. 2, footnotes]

C05 · Fellow creators as forecasters

Verdict: moderately supported in the studied setting · Confidence: moderate

Book's claim. Creators overvalue their own ideas, while peers can outperform managers and lay audiences at recognizing promising novelty. Briefly generating ideas before evaluating others' work may improve judgment. [1 · ch. 2]

Evidence. The book's account is based on Berg's dissertation; the subsequent journal article combines a circus-industry field study with laboratory work. The field study involved 339 professionals and audience responses from 13,248 people. It supports an advantage for creators judging others' acts, with important qualifications concerning their own work and past experience. [7, 8]

Assessment. A large audience makes audience-response estimates more informative; it does not turn professional roles into randomly assigned treatments. The laboratory component strengthens a narrower process inference. Neither component establishes that creative peers dominate customers or commercial specialists in every product category. Likes, sharing, and very small donations are not the same outcome as retention, margin, safety, or successful implementation.

Practical verdict. Add knowledgeable peers to evaluation; do not substitute them for the intended user. Obtain independent judgments before discussion, distinguish novelty from usefulness, and compare forecasts with later outcomes. The 2016 publication extends the accessible record of the research cited in 2015; it is not an independent replication merely because it appeared later.

C06 · Artistic breadth and creative distinction

Verdict: association credible; causal dose and general transfer uncertain · Confidence: moderate

Book's claim. Eminent scientists are unusually likely to have artistic hobbies, and broad experience can supply raw material for original thought. A table lists large relative differences in artistic participation; international fashion careers provide another example. [1 · ch. 2]

Evidence. Root-Bernstein and colleagues compare biographical accounts of eminent scientists with historical surveys of other groups. This design can document an association, but exposure measurement, opportunity, cohort differences, and selective biographical documentation complicate causal interpretation. It is not a trial of art training. [10]

Assessment. Grant acknowledges that openness may account for some of the association and, in an endnote, discusses experiments involving exposure to unfamiliar cultural material. Those qualifications matter: the argument is not based solely on the Nobel table. Still, a short creativity-task effect would not demonstrate that taking up painting causes scientific eminence or that decades abroad constitute an optimal training prescription. [1 · ch. 2; ch. 2, footnotes]

Source trail and later qualification: The fashion-house study by Godart and colleagues is an observational study of professional experience abroad and organizational creativity. Maddux and Galinsky distinguish living abroad from ordinary travel; related Leung and Maddux work concerns cultural exposure, openness, and learning why local practices work. These are different designs, not one replicated treatment. Forthmann and colleagues' 2018 re-examination of the related multicultural-experience-by-openness claim found a more conditional creative-quality pattern, dependent also on task instructions, with no corresponding fluency or flexibility effects. It does not directly retest the fashion-house result or show that cultural experience never helps. [45; 46; 47; 48; 49]

Practical verdict. Seek intellectually useful variety, especially when it changes how a real problem is represented. Treat major travel, career, or educational commitments as decisions with multiple benefits and costs—not as purchased doses of originality. The relevant question is what transferable insight the experience generates.

C07 · When intuition deserves trust

Verdict: one of the better-calibrated scientific lessons · **Confidence:** high in the principle **Book's claim.** Intuition is more trustworthy when the person has relevant experience in an environment with learnable regularities. Success in one domain does not confer judgment in another. [1 · ch. 2]

Evidence. Kahneman and Klein explicitly identify environmental predictability and an opportunity to learn its regularities as boundary conditions for intuitive expertise. Subjective confidence is not a reliable diagnostic. The book communicates this distinction substantially well. [11]

Assessment. The strong general principle should be separated from the speculative psychological diagnosis of particular investors. Segway's outcome alone cannot establish exactly how much hubris, enthusiasm, or inexperience caused each decision. Nor should intuition and analysis be treated as mutually exclusive: an expert impression can generate a hypothesis that analysis then checks.

Practical verdict. Before trusting a gut judgment, ask whether this person has repeatedly encountered comparable decisions, received informative feedback, and faced reasonably stable relationships between cues and outcomes. For a genuinely new market, use explicit assumptions and external tests. This is more useful than equating confidence with expertise or assuming that deliberation is always superior.

Chapter 3 · Out on a Limb

Speaking Truth to Power

The chapter's strongest feature is its attention to context: a good idea may fail because the audience lacks trust, the proposer lacks standing, or the organizational environment is unsafe. Carmen Medina's story is not presented as pure individual psychology; Grant also recognizes technological change and the post-September 11 context. That makes the narrative more responsible than a simple "communicate better and anyone will listen" lesson. [1 · ch. 3]

C08 · Voice, credibility, and unequal room to dissent

Verdict: valuable framework; broad causal promises not established · **Confidence:** moderate
Book's claim. Power and status differ. Credibility can create room to challenge norms, while speaking up can carry career penalties. The chapter also addresses gender and racial differences in how assertiveness is received. [1 · ch. 3]

Assessment. These are distinct research questions, not one universally validated sequence in which good performance earns permission to dissent. The book reports relevant studies, but this review did not independently audit every demographic comparison or reconstruct the causes of Medina's career trajectory. In particular, findings about one racial and gender combination should not be assumed to transfer unchanged to another.

Registered replication — 2026: Livingston, Rosette, and Washington's 2012 experiment reported that Black women, unlike White women, were buffered against the leadership–status penalty for interpersonal dominance. Liu, Blair, and Tenney's direct replication and extension with 1,996 online adults did not reproduce that exception: Black and White women, as well as men, received a status penalty. The official publisher abstract supports this specific conclusion; full replication methods and results were not accessed. The report first appeared online on 15 April 2026. It does not invalidate the separate evidence about employee voice, credibility, discrimination, or psychological safety. [38; 39]

The practical distinction between formal authority and earned credibility is useful. The danger is turning a description of unequal treatment into a rule that lower–status people must earn the right to report problems. Later psychological–safety research supports attention to environments in which interpersonal risk does not suppress learning and information sharing, although much of that evidence is associational. [32]

Practical verdict. Individuals should assess audience, sponsorship, and potential retaliation. Leaders should remove barriers to accurate reporting, not make credibility a prerequisite for identifying an urgent risk. The burden of a fair process belongs to the organization as well as the speaker.

C09 · Leading with weaknesses

Verdict: plausible tactic, not a demonstrated universal persuasion advantage · **Confidence:** moderate
Book's claim. Rufus Griscom's candid presentations of business weaknesses helped him attract investment and secure an acquisition. Grant connects the tactic to reduced resistance, credibility, and how readily objections come to mind. [1 · ch. 3]

Assessment. A successful pitch is not a comparison with the same pitch delivered differently to equivalent investors. Several psychological mechanisms may fit the story, but fitting is not identifying. The book appropriately warns that previously unknown weaknesses can supply reasons to reject an idea and that the underlying message must be compelling. Its endnote on expert uncertainty is another meaningful boundary condition. [1 · ch. 3; ch. 3, footnotes]

Related registered replication — 2024: Løhre and colleagues directly retested Experiment 2 of Karmarkar and Tormala's expert–certainty study with 1,018 participants. The predicted expertise–by–uncertainty interaction did not reproduce; expressed certainty was modestly favorable overall. This weakens the endnote's supporting mechanism, not a directly tested

comparison of Griscom’s weakness-led business pitch. The original study identity and three-experiment account were checked against its publisher abstract and the book endnote; the original full report was not freshly inspected. The replication’s publisher abstract, data statement, and author-hosted method extracts were inspected, but its data and code were not executed. [40; 41]

The invented “Sarick Effect” is explicitly revealed as a demonstration of familiarity a few pages later. It should not be misclassified as an undisclosed fabricated research citation. The pedagogical trick does, however, make it especially important for a review to read the complete sequence. [1 · ch. 3]

Practical verdict. Disclose material limitations clearly and show how they will be tested or addressed. Do not manufacture token weaknesses as a persuasion technique or assume that placing exactly three flaws first is evidence-based. Candor is defensible even when it does not increase the probability of getting a yes.

C10 · Familiarity, repetition, and acceptance

Verdict: basic phenomenon supported; pitch-frequency prescription too precise · **Confidence:** high
Book’s claim. Repeated exposure can make unfamiliar ideas easier to process and more appealing. Grant suggests repeated, brief, spaced presentations and discusses roughly ten to twenty exposures, while acknowledging boredom from overexposure. [1 · ch. 3]

Evidence. The mere-exposure literature includes Bornstein’s early synthesis and a later meta-analysis by Montoya and colleagues. The latter examines 81 articles and finds that liking can follow an inverted-U pattern, with meaningful differences across stimuli and procedures. This supports a real phenomenon, not a universal repetition quota. [36, 12]

Assessment. Recognizing or liking an idea differs from judging it correct, funding it, or changing behavior. An audience can understand a proposal perfectly and still reject its substance. Repetition that increases familiarity need not resolve cost, legitimacy, or feasibility objections.

Practical verdict. Present an unfamiliar idea more than once when the audience needs time to understand it. On each return, add clarification or evidence and ask what remains unresolved. Stop counting exposures as if they were doses of a treatment. The goal is informed consideration, not familiarity mistaken for truth.

C11 · Choosing an audience—and knowing when to leave

Verdict: sensible contingent advice; disagreeableness is a weak selection rule · **Confidence:** moderate
Book’s claim. Agreeable people may avoid conflict, whereas disagreeable managers can sometimes become valuable advocates. People with a history of challenging the status quo may be more receptive. The chapter ultimately argues that exit can be preferable to repeated unsuccessful voice. [1 · ch. 3]

Assessment. A diary association between personality, interpersonal behavior, and emotion does not establish which manager will protect a subordinate’s dissent. Neither a prickly style nor warm agreement is a validated proxy for principled sponsorship. What matters

operationally is the person's record: do they engage with evidence, tolerate correction, and back reasonable challenges when doing so is costly?

The exit discussion is a genuine strength. Grant does not insist that persistence inside an unreceptive institution is morally superior to leaving. This prevents the chapter from becoming a blanket instruction to absorb avoidable career damage. [1 · ch. 3]

Practical verdict. Choose audiences by relevant knowledge and demonstrated behavior, not by a pleasant-versus-disagreeable stereotype. For an important proposal, seek a credible sponsor and a small reversible trial. When the institution is persistently unwilling to consider evidence, compare exit with continued voice using future costs and opportunities, rather than treating endurance as proof of commitment.

Chapter 4 · Fools Rush In

Timing, Strategic Procrastination, and the First-Mover Disadvantage

The chapter usefully challenges “earlier is always better.” But it moves among several different decisions: when to start thinking, when to finish a draft, when to enter a market, and when a career can produce important work. These clocks should not be collapsed into a single argument for delay. Starting early, pausing thoughtfully, testing quickly, and committing later can all belong to the same effective process. [1 · ch. 4]

C12 · Procrastination or incubation?

Verdict: bounded delay can help; habitual procrastination is not validated · **Confidence:** moderate to high
Book's claim. Delaying completion can keep alternatives open and improve creativity. The chapter reports a preliminary experiment with a 28% creativity difference, then illustrates the idea with artists and public speeches. It also acknowledges that motivation matters and that procrastination can damage productivity. [1 · ch. 4]

Evidence. The book cites a 2015 manuscript. Shin and Grant's later journal article finds a curvilinear relationship under specified conditions, using experiments and field data; it does not simply establish that more delay is better. Incubation research separately supports benefits from temporarily setting aside a prepared problem, with task-dependent moderators. [13, 14]

Assessment. The later article is not an independent replication of every detail or the exact percentage in the book. More importantly, deliberately returning to an unresolved problem differs from repeatedly avoiding it. Grant's own account notes that King drew on extensive prior practice and already-tested material; the speech is not evidence that last-minute preparation outperforms preparation. [1 · ch. 4]

Practical verdict. Start early enough to understand the problem, generate initial possibilities, and reserve a bounded pause before selecting or finishing. Protect the deadline and measure the final work. The useful mechanism is avoiding premature closure, not accumulating lateness.

C13 · First movers, “settlers,” and a misleading denominator

Verdict: important comparison error; general superiority of delay unproven · **Confidence:** high
Book’s claim. Pioneers failed at 47%, compared with 8% for slower “settlers”; surviving pioneers captured only 10% market share versus 28% for settlers. [1 · ch. 4]

Source check. Golder and Tellis’s 8% group is **early market leaders**, defined by leadership during the early growth phase—not all later entrants. Their 10% pioneer share includes failures; the paper reports **19% for surviving pioneers**. These definitions and figures are visible on journal pages 165–167. [15]

Why it matters. Comparing everyone who starts first with a group selected for already having achieved early leadership cannot estimate the effect of choosing to start later. It resembles comparing all first-time applicants with later applicants who have already passed an initial selection stage. Waiting does not grant membership in the selected group. Dividing 47 by 8 gives about 5.9, but correct arithmetic cannot repair a mismatched comparison.

Practical verdict. The study challenges simplistic pioneer mythology; it does not establish a sixfold causal failure penalty for going first. Grant does mention mixed evidence and advantages involving patents and network effects. Retain those qualifications and decide timing from actual demand, defensibility, learning opportunities, and the cost of waiting—not the headline ratio. [1 · ch. 4]

C14 · Is there an age limit on originality?

Verdict: the rejection of a youth requirement holds up well · **Confidence:** high in the broad conclusion
Book’s claim. Some creators innovate early through conceptual breakthroughs; others reach influential work later through experimentation. The chapter argues that accumulated experience need not extinguish originality. [1 · ch. 4]

Evidence. Later work by Azoulay and colleagues using U.S. administrative data finds a mean founder age of 45 for the fastest-growing one-in-a-thousand ventures. Relevant industry experience also predicts success. This is stronger support against a blanket youth requirement than a list of famous late bloomers. [16]

Assessment. The evidence does not show that waiting until 45 causes success. Nor does it validate a two-category personality test dividing everyone into conceptual sprinters and experimental marathoners. Selected biographies and career peaks can illustrate strategies without defining immutable human types.

Code access — 2025 deposit: An openICPSR Version 1 record, dated 30 May 2025, provides code and supporting files for the founder-age analysis. The repository distributes them as received, without certifying them. The underlying administrative data are restricted; neither those data nor the code were independently executed in this review. Code availability improves transparency, not proof of successful reproduction or of a causal benefit from waiting. [50]

Practical verdict. Do not use chronological age as a reason to stop experimenting, or a future age milestone as a reason to postpone. Leverage accumulated domain knowledge while deliberately challenging stale assumptions. The strongest takeaway is permission to continue

producing and testing work—not reassurance that time alone creates an eventual masterpiece.

Chapter 5 • Goldilocks and the Trojan Horse

Creating and Maintaining Coalitions

This chapter is valuable when it distinguishes agreement on ends from agreement on methods, and persuading someone to join a cause from partnering on one particular objective. Its risk is treating historical coalition outcomes as proof of a universal degree of moderation—or treating concealment of purpose as simply another neutral communication technique. The suffrage narrative is interpreted here as the book presents it, not as an independently exhaustive historical reassessment. [1 • ch. 5]

C15 • Shared tactics, familiar frames, and moderate messages

Verdict: useful distinctions; context-specific evidence • Confidence: moderate

Book's claim. Shared methods can support alliances even when values differ. Familiar framing may help audiences understand novel proposals, while the right level of radicalism depends on whom one wants to recruit. [1 • ch. 5]

Evidence and scope. Berg's experiments show that initial material can shape the novelty and usefulness of developed ideas, and that integrating unfamiliar and familiar material can improve the balance. That is support for a creative-development process, not direct validation of every coalition or messaging claim. [17]

Grant also reports historical analyses by McCammon and colleagues linking different suffrage frames to different organizational outcomes. Those studies were traced in the book's references, but not comprehensively independently audited here. Their described design does not randomize movements to a message or isolate framing from leadership, constituency, and timing. The book itself notes a limit to the benefits of shared tactics in an endnote. [1 • ch. 5; References to ch. 5; ch. 5, footnotes]

Practical verdict. Identify a specific shared objective and explain the proposal in terms the audience can evaluate. Test comprehension, genuine agreement, and willingness to cooperate separately. Do not assume that moderation is always optimal or that a tactic validated for generating product concepts proves how to build a political movement.

C16 • uBeam: recruiting collaborators is not technical validation

Verdict: the claimed technical achievement is not independently established here • Confidence: high in this evidential distinction

Book's claim. Meredith Perry attracted expertise and investment for ultrasound-based wireless charging after reframing requests around component specifications. The text says the prototype could charge faster than a wire, anticipates consumer availability, and treats a fundamental viability barrier as overcome. [1 • ch. 5]

Assessment. The book's source trail includes an interview, an event appearance, and contemporary reporting. This review did not obtain independent measurements sufficient to validate the quoted performance or commercialization expectation. Funding, patents, a recruited technical team, and a compelling demonstration are not interchangeable with validated end-to-end performance. This is a finding about evidential support, not a claim that the company committed fraud or that every underlying technical idea is impossible. [1 ·

References to ch. 5]

Practical verdict. Breaking a difficult problem into testable components can be productive. But a component that meets its specification does not prove that the assembled system meets its efficiency, range, cost, or safety requirements. Use explicit interface requirements and independent system-level tests. Reframing a request should not withhold information material to a collaborator's informed participation. Neither the book's optimistic forecast nor a later disappointment, by itself, would establish the general value of concealing a project's purpose.

C17 · Should readers cut frenemies and convert enemies?

Verdict: the relational observation does not establish the proposed policy · **Confidence:** high
Book's claim. Relationships that combine support and undermining can be especially stressful. Grant recommends cutting ambivalent ties and trying to convert opponents; he also acknowledges that not every enemy can be converted. [1 · ch. 5; ch. 5, footnotes]

Evidence. Duffy and colleagues studied workplace support and undermining among Slovenian police officers. Their reported pattern supports taking mixed relationships seriously. It does not test assigning people to sever those ties, maintain them with boundaries, or invest in opponents. [18]

Assessment. Even a reliable association would leave the intervention question open. Ambivalence may reflect unavoidable interdependence, higher exposure, reciprocal conflict, or a relationship with both substantial benefits and costs. A former opponent who became an ally is also a success-selected case; the time spent unsuccessfully converting other opponents must count in a fair comparison.

Practical verdict. Judge relationships by the frequency and severity of actual conduct, willingness to repair, and future consequences. Distinguish inconsistent support from persistent sabotage, and a substantive critic from an adversary who acts in bad faith. Set boundaries where needed. There is no demonstrated general rule that uncertain allies deserve less investment than enemies.

Chapter 6 · Rebel with a Cause

How Siblings, Parents, and Mentors Nurture Originality

This is the book's weakest chapter as a scientific guide. Its broad birth-order account receives substantial narrative weight, yet the strongest relevant later evidence does not support the proposed adult rebel profile. The chapter also contains constructive parenting ideas, but the

evidence for those should stand independently of whether the birth-order story is correct. Explaining a rule can be good advice even when the proposed developmental route from later birth to creative rebellion is unproven. [1 · ch. 6]

C18 · The “born to rebel” account needs major revision

Verdict: broad adult generalization not supported by stronger later evidence · Confidence: high; narrower effects remain possible

Book’s claim. Laterborn children tend toward risk, openness, and challenges to the status quo, while firstborns tend toward conformity and conventional achievement. Grant explicitly acknowledges controversy and methodological difficulty, but still presents a strong positive conclusion. [1 · ch. 6; ch. 6, footnotes]

Evidence. Rohrer and colleagues’ large 2015 analyses found no broad, lasting birth-order pattern across major personality traits apart from small intellectual differences. Lejarraga and colleagues’ 2019 work found no adult risk-taking effect across a broad assessment program. A 2024 paper suggests some differences are concentrated in the family environment during youth rather than generalized adult dispositions. [21, 22, 23]

Important update. Ashton and Lee’s 2025 study reports associations involving birth order, family size, and HEXACO traits in large online samples. It prevents a blanket “nothing matters” conclusion, but does not vindicate the younger-rebel thesis; some openness patterns run the other way. Observational family-size adjustment is not a randomized sibling comparison. [24]

Practical verdict. Do not use sibling position as a useful diagnostic of someone’s originality. Evaluate the person’s actual behavior. The 2015 evidence predates the book’s release, but this review does not establish whether it arrived before the manuscript deadline or whether the omission was deliberate.

C19 · What the 10.6-fold baseball statistic actually means

Verdict: a real reported statistic, misleading when read as a stealing rate · Confidence: high

Book’s claim. Younger professional-baseball brothers were 10.6 times more likely to attempt a steal. The wording naturally suggests an enormous difference in how often otherwise comparable players attempt it. [1 · ch. 6]

Source check. The authors’ own clarification describes an odds ratio based on whether a brother had the higher attempted-steal rate, stratified by call-up sequence. The reported estimate is 10.58, with a wide 95% interval of 2.21–50.73; sparse cells complicate estimation. It is not a 10.6-fold ratio of per-opportunity stealing rates. The original article’s abstract also uses loose wording, so the misleading shorthand did not originate solely with Grant. [19, 20]

Assessment. A binary comparison discards the size of the gap: beating another player’s rate by a little and by a lot both count as “higher.” Its odds ratio therefore cannot be interpreted as the multiplicative difference in the underlying behavior. Professional brothers are also a selected population, and sporting decisions depend on role and opportunity as well as temperament.

Practical verdict. Do not carry this number into general personality claims, hiring, or parenting. The book's visually striking list of exceptional base stealers in ch. 6 is illustrative, not a representative comparison sample.

C20 · Explaining discipline versus reducing the number of rules

Verdict: constructive advice; the causal parenting recipe is not established · Confidence: moderate

Book's claim. Parents of Holocaust rescuers and highly creative people emphasized reasons and values. Some creative children reportedly had far fewer rules than comparison children. Explaining consequences for others is offered as a route to internalized standards. [1 · ch. 6]

Assessment. The rescuer evidence is retrospective, and the creative-family comparisons are observational as described in the book. Adults' recollections can be shaped by their later identity; parents can also adapt to a child's temperament. These designs do not tell us what would happen if the same families were randomly assigned different numbers of rules. The original studies behind these parenting comparisons were not fully independently audited in this review. [1 · References to ch. 6]

The chapter is more nuanced than a literal prescription for rule-free parenting. An endnote describes setting a rule, explaining its impact, and returning to a shared principle when a one-time explanation failed to last. That is an important correction to a simplistic reading. [1 · ch. 6, footnotes]

Practical verdict. Explain the reason for a boundary and the impact of violating it; leave room for age-appropriate choice. Do not use "fewer rules" as the objective in itself. Safety, consistency, the child's capacities, and opportunities for repair belong in the implementation. These safeguards are the review's judgment, not a tested package from the rescuer comparison.

C21 · Identity praise: an initial boost can coexist with fragility

Verdict: mixed evidence; broad person-praise recommendation needs replacement · Confidence: high in the need for qualification

Book's claim. Character language can encourage helping and deter cheating. Grant extends this to calling a child creative, rather than praising the artwork. His endnote explicitly recognizes tension with ability-praise research and calls one proposed reconciliation a bet. [1 · ch. 6; ch. 6, footnotes]

Evidence. Bryan and colleagues found short-term benefits from helper language and, in separate experiments, self-implicating anti-cheating language. Later work on dishonesty offers qualified support rather than a simple universal reversal. These findings are not a demonstration of resilient creativity across childhood. [25, 26, 27]

Favorable registered follow-up — 2020: Guo and colleagues' Japanese replication of the coin-flip experiment found less dishonest reporting in the "cheater" condition than in the "cheating" condition, with a smaller effect, $d = 0.22$. The final analyzed sample was 768 after substantial minimum-time and other exclusions; the extended attention experiment did not establish the proposed mechanism. This is favorable cross-language evidence for an

immediate task outcome, not a direct replication of helping or voting and not a demonstration of durable moral or creative identity. The inspected report is Version 2, dated 16 November 2020. [42]

Broader synthesis — 2024: Witkowska and colleagues combined 28 effect sizes, with 13,376 participants, from original studies and exact or conceptual replications. The average noun advantage was small ($g = 0.12$); their diagnostics raised doubts about stability and replicability. The publisher abstract and inclusion-marked bibliography were inspected, not the full analysis or underlying data. This broad finding does not erase the favorable cheater result or make the different behavioral domains interchangeable. [43]

Foster-Hanson and colleagues found that helper language can backfire after setbacks. Earlier drawing-related work by Cimpian and colleagues is also relevant to the move from praising an episode to labeling the person. These studies test important conditions, not the proposition that every identity reference is harmful. [28, 29]

Assessment. Helping now, persisting after failure, and building a durable identity are different outcomes. Evidence for one cannot simply be substituted for evidence about the others. A positive label can make the next mistake feel diagnostic of the self.

Practical verdict. Prefer specific, truthful feedback about a choice, strategy, contribution, or improvement, linked to a value that remains available after a mistake. Do not imply that worth or moral identity depends on maintaining an unbroken record. The goal is to make a desirable action repeatable, not make an identity verdict feel inescapable.

C22 · Mentors, stories, and national innovation

Verdict: plausible aspiration tools; macro-causal conclusion weak · Confidence: moderate to high

Book's claim. Mentors and fictional heroes can elevate aspirations. Historical changes in achievement themes in children's books are linked to later national patent rates, and Harry Potter research is invoked concerning attitudes toward marginalized groups. [1 · ch. 6]

Assessment. The reader should distinguish the three claims. A mentor association is not random assignment to a mentor. A change in attitudes after reading a particular passage does not establish enduring originality. A national time-series relationship between books and later patenting cannot identify an individual child's developmental response; educational expansion, industrial change, and other historical trends can affect both. The relevant references are identified in the book, but their complete analyses were not independently audited here. [1 · References to ch. 6]

Corrected source version: Vezzali and colleagues' Harry Potter paper contains numerical corrections dated 20 January 2015, including coefficients, test statistics, and explained-variance figures. The corrected primary PDF was inspected. This is not a retraction. The study program includes one intervention and two cross-sectional studies of prejudice-related attitudes; it does not establish creativity or innovation. This review does not rely on the affected numerical estimates, so noting the corrected version does not by itself change the substantive verdict or a score. [44]

Practical verdict. Offer varied, attainable examples and discuss how people reasoned, practiced, and revised. Stories can expand a child's imagined options without proving that one reading list produces inventors. Avoid using selected founders' favorite books as evidence that those books caused their accomplishments. The useful aspiration is a behavior—asking a question or trying a new approach—not a prediction of future eminence.

Chapter 7 · Rethinking Groupthink

The Myths of Strong Cultures, Cults, and Devil's Advocates

The chapter contains a strong methodological insight: examining only cohesive groups that made poor decisions does not establish that cohesion causes failure. It then contrasts Polaroid with Bridgewater and distinguishes conformity to a leader from commitment to examining ideas. The tension is that the chapter's own organization-level explanations sometimes lean on the same retrospective case logic it criticizes. [1 · ch. 7]

C23 · Commitment cultures and zero observed failures

Verdict: interesting cohort evidence; universal success claim unwarranted · **Confidence:** high in the limitation
Book's claim. Commitment-oriented start-ups had no failures in a studied cohort, and early organizational blueprints shaped later survival, IPOs, and market value. What helps at one stage may hinder another. [1 · ch. 7]

Evidence. Baron and Hannan report longitudinal evidence from Silicon Valley firms followed through June 2001, with statistical adjustments and distinct organizational models. The work supports taking founding organizational choices seriously. It does not randomize founders to a culture or prove that commitment is a generally failure-proof design. [30]

Assessment. Zero events in a finite group during a finite observation window is not a zero population risk. A business can also survive without becoming an attractive investment; post-IPO comparisons condition on having reached the IPO. When struggling firms change their blueprint, poorer subsequent results may partly reflect the conditions that prompted change. These issues limit causal prescription without making the entire study uninformative.

Grant does acknowledge different stages, other blueprints, and the costs of changing them in endnotes. This is not simply a one-dimensional celebration of cultural fit. [1 · ch. 7, footnotes]

Practical verdict. Build durable commitment to a mission and standards of evidence, not uniformity of background or belief. Measure both coordination benefits and the organization's ability to change course. No percentage in this cohort can select an optimal culture for every firm.

C24 · Authentic dissent versus an assigned devil's advocate

Verdict: relative advantage supported; blanket ban too strong · **Confidence:** moderate to high
Book's claim. A genuine dissenter can stimulate more searching thought than someone merely assigned to oppose the group. The final advice tells leaders to stop assigning devil's advocates and uncover real ones instead. [1 · ch. 7; Actions for Impact]

Evidence. Nemeth and colleagues' experimental findings favor authentic dissent over several role-played alternatives. Grant also describes a study in which an assigned advocate improved the balance of information selection, though genuine disagreement produced a stronger shift. The latter detailed comparison is book-reported rather than independently reconstructed here. [31, 1 · ch. 7]

Assessment. "B performs better than A" does not imply "A has no value." A group can lack a genuine dissenter because relevant information has not yet been sought, because people are afraid, or because the proposal really is good. Structured challenge can still reveal what needs testing. In an endnote, Grant includes Nemeth's acknowledgment that the Kennedy-style questioning process was better than rushing to judgment. [1 · ch. 7, footnotes]

Practical verdict. Seek actual disagreement first. When necessary, use a structured alternative-case or premortem exercise, then evaluate its evidence instead of dismissing it because the role was assigned. Protect dissenters from retaliation and distinguish criticism of a proposition from attacks on a person.

C25 · Bridgewater: a case, not a controlled culture experiment

Verdict: useful illustration with unresolved causal and measurement issues · Confidence: high
Book's claim. Bridgewater's strong culture promotes dissent and transparency, helping counter conformity. The narrative links its unusual practices with business success and describes believability-weighted judgment. [1 · ch. 7]

Assessment. Performance at one selected organization cannot identify the contribution of one practice among hiring, investment strategy, leadership, incentives, market conditions, and selection of people who remain. "Believability" scores are not automatically calibrated probabilities merely because they are numerical; other respected people's ratings can reproduce a hierarchy while appearing to replace it.

Grant makes substantially this criticism himself. He challenges subjective expert debate, proposes experiments, and records disagreement with Dalio rather than pretending the question is resolved. This passage is one of the book's clearest expressions of an appropriate evidential standard. [1 · ch. 7]

Later psychological-safety synthesis supports the relevance of an environment for learning and performance; it does not establish that compulsory public criticism or blanket transparency is the optimal way to create one. [32]

Practical verdict. Copy the principle that important concerns must surface, not every visible ritual. Check who speaks, whose corrections are adopted, and whether junior people can disagree without humiliation. Allow confidential channels where public disclosure would itself deter accurate information. Measure decision quality, not the volume of conflict.

Chapter 8 · Rocking the Boat and Keeping It Steady

Managing Anxiety, Apathy, Ambivalence, and Anger

The final chapter's valuable organizing idea is that useful action need not wait for fear to disappear. It offers different emotional tools for different situations, rather than promising permanent confidence. The practical problem is that some final prescriptions sound broader than the studies: performance anxiety becomes anxiety generally, and a temporary motivational technique can become an instruction to persist regardless of new evidence. [1 · ch.

8; Actions for Impact]

C26 · Excitement and defensive pessimism

Verdict: useful situation-specific tools, not general anxiety treatment · **Confidence:** moderate to high
Book's claim. Anxiety can sometimes be redirected into excitement, while defensive pessimists may benefit from anticipating difficulties rather than being pushed into positive thinking. [1 · ch. 8]

Evidence. Brooks compared excitement with anxiety and with no statement in the main singing experiment. The speaking experiment compared excitement with calm self-statements; the mathematics experiments included calm instructions, with an additional neutral condition in Study 3. Some performance outcomes improved without a corresponding reduction in anxiety. The comparison does not show that practiced relaxation, a full coping intervention, or treatment for an anxiety disorder is inferior. [33]

Mixed partial replication — 2025: Poynter and Pasqualini retested Brooks's speaking experiment, not the singing or mathematics experiments. Reported excitement increased as predicted, but the observer-rated speech-performance advantage did not reproduce. Recruitment stopped early during the COVID-19 pandemic: 74 participants took part and 71 videos were usable. The authors replaced the planned two-tailed tests with one-tailed analyses after that interruption and reported that the original dataset was unavailable to them. These limits leave uncertainty in both directions; the study does not establish equivalence or a universal absence of benefit. The full 12-page published replication was read. [51]

Assessment. Maintaining arousal while changing its interpretation is not the same intervention as trying to reduce arousal. A tool can help a person perform while still feeling anxious; that can be a useful outcome. Grant's defensive-pessimism discussion points to another distinction: converting a specific concern into preparation differs from rehearsing catastrophe indefinitely. The underlying Norem studies are identified in the book, but were not fully independently audited here. [1 · ch. 8; References to ch. 8]

Practical verdict. For ordinary anticipatory nerves, an excitement framing is a low-cost option to test. Keep the goal concrete and evaluate behavior, not whether the label feels perfectly convincing. Use a bounded risk review to produce precautions and an action plan. Do not generalize the final "don't calm down" instruction into a rule for all emotional states. [1 · Actions for Impact]

C27 · Allies, beneficiaries, and the limits of motivational framing

Verdict: useful mechanisms; transfer and persistence rules need boundaries · Confidence: moderate

Book's claim. A single ally can weaken conformity pressure, contact with beneficiaries can make work meaningful, and different messages may help when people are uncertain versus already committed. [1 · ch. 8]

Assessment. The chapter reports a mix of experiments and movement narratives. Its beneficiary discussion is not merely anecdotal: an endnote describes a controlled comparison holding the speaker and message substantially constant while varying the speaker's beneficiary-versus-leader role. That is stronger evidence for the role-framing question than the accompanying organizational story alone. These experiments were traced in the book, not independently reanalyzed here. [1 · ch. 8, footnotes]

Breaking unanimity in a simple laboratory task does not establish that finding any ally will overcome powerful opposition. Likewise, highlighting past progress can restore confidence, but past expenditure is not itself a reason to continue a project with poor future prospects. The final action list risks blurring that distinction. [1 · ch. 8; Actions for Impact]

Practical verdict. Recruit an ally for relevant support and independent judgment, not merely agreement. Connect work to genuine beneficiaries without exploiting them as motivational props. When persistence is in doubt, ask what the next investment is expected to achieve; use previous progress as information about capability, not as a sunk-cost obligation.

C28 · Venting anger versus processing it constructively

Verdict: a comparatively strong recommendation · Confidence: high for angry rumination, narrower for other forms of expression

Book's claim. Acting out anger while dwelling on the person who caused it can intensify rather than discharge it. Grant recommends directing attention toward constructive action and those harmed. [1 · ch. 8]

Evidence. Bushman's experiment contrasts punching while thinking about a provocateur with other conditions; it does not support the cathartic discharge account. A 2024 meta-analysis covers 154 studies, 184 independent samples, and 10,189 participants. Arousal-decreasing activities reduced anger and aggression on average; arousal-increasing activities were ineffective overall, not uniformly harmful. [34, 35]

Assessment. "Talking about a difficult event" is not one intervention. Supportive disclosure, problem solving, angry rehearsal, and aggressive acting-out should not be treated as equivalent. The book's endnote discusses expression after stressful events, but its clinical claims are not separately validated by this review. [1 · ch. 8, footnotes]

Practical verdict. Do not rehearse retaliation and expect it to remove anger. Create enough distance to choose a response, then address the actual problem. Preserve the option of calm discussion and constructive support. This recommendation also shows why "never calm down" would be a poor generalization from the chapter's performance-anxiety experiments: different emotions and goals call for different tools.

06 Claim, number, and source audit

Targeted reference-to-claim audit

This audit informs the source-fidelity assessment; it is not a common-denominator sample summary. It is a **purposive audit, not a random estimate of the book's overall citation quality**. It includes supportive and problematic examples across all eight chapters. The grade asks how convincingly the traceable source supports the specified claim; it is not a count of typographical errors. Claims are paraphrased, and page numbers identify the uploaded book.

The sample mixes narrow behavioral claims with broader conclusions actually drawn in the text. To prevent that distinction from disappearing, each row states the exact scope being graded. Later evidence informs the chapter verdicts but is not silently counted as evidence that an earlier citation originally contained. The version-limited check in R03 and abstract-level checks are explicitly marked; they are not full source authentications.

The strongest checked matches concern the boundary conditions on intuition and the warning against ruminative aggressive venting. The largest gaps concern interpreting selected comparison groups, translating one statistical quantity into another, and moving from relational associations to a policy for managing relationships. The source exists in each of these examples; the problem is what conclusion it can support.

Reference–claim pair	What the source supports	Source relationship
R01 · Staged entrepreneurship ch. 1 · C02 [3]	Claim: Retaining a day job reduces business failure by about one-third. Check: The numerical result concerns exit hazard after staged entry into full-time self-employment, not a randomized day-job intervention or a general failure probability. Direction fits; the estimand and prescription are broader in the book.	Partial or overextended support
R02 · Entrepreneurs and risk ch. 1 · C03 [4]	Claim: Entrepreneurs are not especially risk-loving, with broad agreement across disciplines. Check: The referenced study supports financial risk aversion among its nascent entrepreneurs under specified measures. It cannot establish the broader consensus claim. Other comparisons and measures yield different patterns; those affect the wider scientific verdict.	Partial or overextended support
R03 · Peer creative forecasting ch. 2 · C05 [7, 8]	Claim: Fellow creators are particularly good judges of promising novel ideas. Check: The later journal article supports a context-specific forecasting advantage. The book cites the 2015 dissertation; this check does not authenticate every detail of that exact version. Audience-response forecasting is not a universal commercial-selection advantage.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed

Reference–claim pair	What the source supports	Source relationship
R04 · Novelty plus familiarity ch. 5 · C15 [17]	Claim: Starting with novelty and integrating familiarity can yield ideas that are both original and useful. Check: The experiments directly examine creative-development sequences and the novelty–usefulness trade-off. Support is meaningful for the tasks, but does not establish a universal persuasion or market-adoption procedure.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed
R05 · Conditions for intuition ch. 2 · C07 [11]	Claim: Trustworthy intuition requires relevant learning in a sufficiently predictable environment. Check: This matches the central conclusion and boundary conditions of the cited synthesis. The grade concerns that narrow principle, not every occupation listed or the inferred motives of particular investors.	Faithful at the stated scope
R06 · Mere exposure ch. 3 · C10 [36]	Claim: Repeated exposure can increase liking and help an unfamiliar idea gain acceptance. Check: The cited synthesis supports the basic familiarity phenomenon. It does not alone justify a fixed number of business pitches or equate liking with adoption. Full original methods were not independently audited; the later Montoya synthesis supports the qualified reading.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed
R07 · First-mover disadvantage ch. 4 · C13 [15]	Claim: Pioneers fare dramatically worse than slower entrants in failure and market share. Check: The comparison class is early market leaders, not later entrants generally. The surviving-pioneer market-share figure is also misstated. Real descriptive numbers therefore do not convincingly support the book's decision-level comparison.	Substantial support problem
R08 · Baseball birth-order ratio ch. 6 · C19 [19, 20]	Claim: Younger brothers are 10.6 times more likely to attempt a steal. Check: The authors' clarification identifies an odds ratio for a binary within-brother comparison, not a rate ratio for steal attempts. Sparse cells and a wide interval add uncertainty. The original abstract also used loose shorthand.	Substantial support problem
R09 · Being a helper ch. 6 · C21 [25]	Claim: Helper language can increase young children's immediate helping. Check: The experiments address this narrow behavioral claim and support it. They do not establish durability after setbacks or validate global identity praise for creativity. Those broader applications are evaluated separately in C21.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed
R10 · Not being a cheater ch. 6 · C21 [26]	Claim: Self-implicating language can reduce cheating in the studied tasks. Check: The cited experiments support a short-term effect on inferred dishonest reporting. They do not demonstrate universal elimination of cheating, a durable moral identity, or the same benefit across every context.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed
R11 · Authentic dissent ch. 7 · C24 [31]	Claim: Authentic dissent can be more effective than assigned devil's advocacy. Check: This relative comparison matches the experimental finding. The final instruction to stop assigning advocates goes beyond it. The original abstract was checked; the book's exact 48% transformation was not independently reproduced.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed

Reference–claim pair	What the source supports	Source relationship
R12 · Anxiety as excitement ch. 8 · C26 [33]	Claim: Reappraising anticipatory anxiety as excitement can improve performance relative to trying to feel calm. Check: The tasks support the qualified performance claim. Minimal calm instructions are not equivalent to a full relaxation intervention, and improved performance need not mean less anxiety. The blanket final prescription is too broad.	Mostly faithful; qualification needed
R13 · Anger and venting ch. 8 · C28 [34]	Claim: Aggressive venting while ruminating does not reliably discharge anger and can intensify it. Check: The cited experiment directly supports the mechanism-level warning. This grade does not extend to all conversation about emotions or every activity involving physical exertion. Later synthesis is considered in the chapter verdict.	Faithful at the stated scope
R14 · Commitment blueprints ch. 7 · C23 [30]	Claim: Commitment-oriented founding models are superior for early survival and reaching an IPO. Check: The cohort supports a notable association within its observation window. The design cannot establish a generally optimal intervention. Zero observed failures and outcomes conditional on IPO need careful interpretation.	Partial or overextended support
R15 · Ambivalent relationships ch. 5 · C17 [18]	Claim: Because mixed relationships can be especially harmful, readers should cut frenemies and convert enemies. Check: The study addresses workplace support and undermining, not the comparative effectiveness of severing or converting relationships. It supports concern about mixed treatment, but not the proposed relationship-management policy.	Substantial support problem

Audit of all 30 Actions for Impact

The book closes with 15 actions for individuals, 10 for leaders, and 5 for parents and teachers. The descriptions below are compressed paraphrases; the revised instructions are this review's recommendations, not quotations or a separately validated intervention package. The original list appears in *Actions for Impact*. [1 · Actions for Impact]

Keep means retain the principle with sensible implementation limits; it does not imply that the complete advice has been tested in a long-term trial. **Modify** means an important change in scope, mechanism, or safeguard is needed. **Replace** means the literal instruction is too broad or creates a material avoidable risk. A replacement can preserve a narrower useful idea.

12 Keep · 16 Modify · 2 Replace. These are editorial dispositions, not effect-size estimates.

Individuals

Book recommendation	Decision	Bounded implementation
I01 · Question the default See C01	Keep	Ask what problem the existing practice solves and what a better alternative would need to preserve. Questioning a default is not evidence that the default is wrong.

Book recommendation	Decision	Bounded implementation
I02 · Triple the number of ideas See C04	Modify	Expand the candidate set before committing, but treat “triple” as a prompt rather than a validated dose. Stop when additional ideas cease to improve the best options enough to justify their cost.
I03 · Immerse yourself in a new domain See C06	Modify	Seek unfamiliar inputs relevant to a real problem. Begin with inexpensive exposure or collaboration. The evidence does not establish that a costly relocation or new hobby will produce creative distinction.
I04 · Procrastinate strategically See C12	Modify	Understand the task early, reserve an incubation interval, and schedule a definite return. Judge the final result and timeliness. Do not reward avoidance or move the deadline merely to preserve optionality.
I05 · Seek feedback from peers See C05	Keep	Include active, knowledgeable creators, ideally giving independent judgments first. Combine their feedback with evidence from intended users and relevant implementation experts rather than assuming one group has all the answers.
I06 · Balance your risk portfolio See C02	Keep	Limit downside and preserve resources for learning. Specify when evidence will justify greater commitment; otherwise diversification can become chronic divided attention rather than intelligent risk management.
I07 · Highlight three weaknesses See C09	Modify	Disclose material uncertainties and your plan to test them. Three is not an empirically established optimum. Avoid token flaws intended to manipulate trust or bury the issue that actually matters.
I08 · Use repeated, familiar presentations See C10	Modify	Repeat to improve understanding, not to meet a ten-to-twenty-exposure quota. Each return should resolve an objection, supply evidence, or clarify implications. Familiarity is not the same thing as justified agreement.
I09 · Choose a different audience See C11	Modify	Find people with relevant expertise, demonstrated openness, and enough influence to help. Do not equate disagreeableness with courage or warmth with unwillingness to advocate.
I10 · Be a tempered radical See C16	Modify	Connect the proposal to a shared objective and request a tractable first step. Do not conceal material purposes, technical limitations, or obligations from the people whose participation you need.
I11 · Match motivation to commitment level See C27	Modify	When committed, focus on what remains; when uncertain, review progress as evidence of capability. Still decide whether to continue using future value, not past expenditure. The next investment must be worthwhile.
I12 · Do not try to calm down See C26	Replace	For ordinary pre-performance nerves, test an excitement or challenge framing. For anger or overwhelming arousal, a different strategy may be appropriate. Do not turn a narrow laboratory comparison into a universal emotional rule.
I13 · Focus on the victim rather than the perpetrator See C28	Modify	Translate concern into a concrete act of protection, repair, or problem solving. Victim-focused attention is not automatically constructive if it becomes another way to intensify rage or rehearse the injury.
I14 · Find one ally See C27	Keep	Seek a credible ally who offers support and independent judgment. One ally can change the social situation, but is not a guaranteed substitute for a viable proposal, sufficient resources, or protection against retaliation.
I15 · Take initiative rather than silently accept dissatisfaction See C11	Keep	Compare voice, a small test, and exit using the actual constraints. Do not confuse acting constructively with escalating every disagreement. Leaving an unreceptive setting can be an active choice.

Leaders

Book recommendation	Decision	Bounded implementation
L01 · Run an innovation tournament See C04	Modify	Make evaluation criteria explicit, gather independent first-round judgments, and fund small tests. A deadline and peer vote can structure discovery, but do not guarantee that the winning idea creates value.

Book recommendation	Decision	Bounded implementation
L02 · Imagine how a competitor could kill the company See C24	Keep	Identify concrete vulnerabilities and convert the strongest scenarios into tests or safeguards. Use the exercise to challenge assumptions, not to reward dramatic threat stories that have no plausible mechanism.
L03 · Invite ideas across functions and levels See C05	Keep	Expand access to proposing and criticizing ideas. Separate permission to contribute from expertise in evaluating a specific consequence, and use customer or operational evidence to resolve consequential disagreements.
L04 · Hold an opposites day See C01	Modify	Invert an assumption to reveal alternatives, then test them. An opposite can be useful for imagination without being a sensible replacement policy. Preserve legal, ethical, and safety constraints.
L05 · Ban like, love, and hate See C05	Modify	Require reasons, decision criteria, and evidence behind preferences. Do not police vocabulary as an end in itself; subjective reactions may contain useful information when clearly distinguished from objective claims.
L06 · Hire for cultural contribution, not similarity See C25	Keep	Retain job-relevant skill and shared ethical standards while seeking perspectives that improve the team. Do not substitute a new preference for unconventional presentation or personality for a validated selection process.
L07 · Conduct entry interviews See C25	Keep	Ask new hires what surprises them before existing habits become invisible. Revisit their suggestions after they understand the constraints. Freshness and informed understanding should complement, not replace, one another.
L08 · Allow problems without ready-made solutions See C08	Keep	Provide an accessible route to raise a concern and assign ownership for investigation. Do not make a solution a prerequisite for reporting, and do not defer urgent risks to a periodic review cycle.
L09 · Stop assigning devil's advocates See C24	Modify	Prefer genuine dissent, but retain structured challenge when it helps uncover neglected evidence. Evaluate the argument's substance rather than assuming an assigned role makes it worthless.
L10 · Welcome criticism publicly See C25	Modify	Model receptiveness and show how criticism changes decisions. Offer private and confidential routes too. Public candor should not become compulsory public exposure or a performance of toughness.

Parents and teachers

Book recommendation	Decision	Bounded implementation
P01 · Ask what a role model would do See C22	Modify	Use several attainable models and discuss their reasoning, mistakes, and revisions. Ask the child to evaluate the choice rather than imitate a hero indiscriminately.
P02 · Link good behavior to good character See C21	Replace	Use specific, truthful praise for the action and the value it expresses, while leaving room for learning after mistakes. Avoid making the child's identity or worth contingent on performing perfectly.
P03 · Explain effects on other people See C20	Keep	Make consequences understandable and invite repair. Focus on what the child can do differently, rather than escalating guilt or treating one mistake as evidence of a bad person.
P04 · Emphasize values over rules See C20	Modify	Explain the values behind clear, age-appropriate boundaries and allow thoughtful questions. Fewer rules is not inherently better; autonomy and reliable protection are compatible.
P05 · Create opportunities for new niches See C18	Keep	Offer varied activities and complementary, rotating roles so children can contribute differently. Do not freeze a child into a family role or infer ability from birth order. The Jigsaw example is not separately trial-audited here.

07 Practical use, limitations, and safeguards

Practical Value · 50%

The intended uses assessed are creative work, entrepreneurship, organizational leadership and parenting. A practice is not credited with improving durable real-world outcomes solely because it affects novelty ratings, short-term performance or a selected historical example.

Practical Value is 50%: selected techniques warrant experimentation, but the breadth of the prescriptions exceeds the direct evidence and important context-dependent costs need more explicit treatment. Criterion-by-criterion rationale.

Ease of application — not included in the score: Many ideas are easy to try; organizational change requires authority and support.

The implementation suggestions that follow are the reviewer's synthesis, not evidence that the book already supplies every safeguard or that this review has validated a replacement program. The score evaluates the book itself, not the reviewer's improved version of its advice.

A more defensible operating guide

The following synthesis preserves the book's productive core while removing unsupported certainty. It is a proposed decision process, not an experimentally established superior package. Its purpose is to make progress depend less on self-description and more on learning from consequential outcomes.

Separate five questions that the narrative sometimes blends

Is it new? Identify the existing default and specify the difference. **Is it useful?** Identify whose problem changes and which outcome matters. **Is it feasible?** Check whether the proposal can work under the relevant constraints. **Will people adopt it?** Observe choices, not merely favorable opinions. **Can it endure?** Test whether benefits exceed costs after novelty and initial enthusiasm fade. A favorable answer to one question does not supply the others.

That distinction also improves measurement. A high originality rating can be appropriate for a study of novelty but insufficient for a business decision. Early revenue does not establish durability; a founder's confidence does not establish demand; winning an internal pitch does not establish implementation value. These are measurement implications, not claims that the book ignores every distinction.

Use a short evidence cycle

Define one consequential uncertainty and the smallest test that could change a decision. Generate alternatives independently before choosing a favorite, then seek knowledgeable criticism and actual user response. Preserve time for reflection without allowing incubation to become an unbounded extension. Before viewing results, specify what would justify continuing, revising, or stopping.

For example, an organization considering a new hiring assessment should not begin by asking whether it feels novel or whether influential colleagues endorse it. It should define a job-relevant outcome, evaluate prediction on held-out applicants or later cohorts, compare against its current process, and check for harmful consequences. A persuasive story about originals would not substitute for that evidence. This is an illustrative application, not a study conducted for this report.

Choose culture practices by what they reveal

A dissent system is successful when important errors and alternatives surface early enough to matter. Record concerns before a leader announces a preference. Ask what evidence would change the recommendation. Make it safe to report a problem without already possessing a solution. Distinguish a rigorous challenge from interpersonal aggression, and record whether the organization actually responds to correction.

Do not use a company's reputation as the outcome measure. Nor should an internal rating system be called an objective probability unless its predictions have been compared with outcomes. A process that produces more visible disagreement but less accurate information has not achieved the objective.

Protect reversibility without protecting indecision

Separate **learning commitments**, which purchase information, from **scaling commitments**, which assume enough has been learned. A side project, pilot, or prototype can reduce uncertainty before a larger bet. But some opportunities require concentrated execution, and delay has an opportunity cost. The decision to commit should respond to evidence, timing, and resources—not to a generalized preference for being early or late.

Use previous progress as evidence about capability and feasibility, never as a debt that future time must repay. A failed attempt can still be valuable when it answers the intended question. A long-running effort can be wasteful even when abandoning it feels inconsistent with an original identity.

Praise choices that remain available after failure

Feedback should identify what worked, why it mattered, and what the person can try next. A child, employee, or founder should be able to revise a strategy without feeling that revision disproves their identity. Encourage honest reporting of mistakes and constructive attempts at repair. The most useful form of agency is not “I must be an original”; it is “I can choose a better next action.”

08 What changes with time—and what should change in the book

What a revised edition should change

The highest-priority revisions are substantive rather than cosmetic. First, replace the birth-order account with a balanced account of the larger later literature, explicitly separating family-context effects from broad adult traits. Second, correct the first-mover comparison and the surviving-pioneer share figure. Third, explain the baseball odds ratio in terms of what was actually compared. Fourth, separate short-term identity-language effects from long-term resilience and domain-general character praise. Fifth, bound the instruction about calming down to the specific performance question tested.

The next tier is evidential labeling. Identify which results were unpublished when the book was written; distinguish later publication from independent replication; separate independently measured performance from a founder's technical claims; and label historical causal interpretations as interpretations. The uBeam passage especially needs that separation. These changes would not require abandoning the book's main practical contribution.

A revised edition should preserve the passages that already model the desired standard: the criticism of expertise without valid feedback, the argument for testing customer behavior, the acknowledgment that King's improvisation rested on preparation, the allowance for exit from unreceptive institutions, and the challenge to Bridgewater's reliance on subjective authority.

[1 · ch. 2; ch. 4; ch. 3; ch. 7; ch. 2, footnotes]

Publication-time accuracy versus later evidence

The reviewed edition is the 2016 Viking ebook. A later publication of work discussed while unpublished can strengthen the current assessment, but is not automatically an independent replication. The early-leader comparison problem is visible in the 1993 source itself. The chapter dossiers date later findings rather than using them to infer what the author knew before publication.

09 How the ratings were determined

The headline scores summarize three different editorial judgments. **Scientific Accuracy** evaluates three central propositions; **Reference Accuracy** evaluates traceability, description and inference in the examined evidence; **Practical Value** evaluates likely benefits, applicability and net value. Ease of application is reported separately and is not included in the average.

The source audits are not identical probability samples. Reference Accuracy therefore uses the same three anchored criteria in every review—not a percentage of references that passed an audit. Both faithful and problematic source use inform the assessment, and inaccessible passages are not counted as errors. See Sections 02, 06 and 10 for scope and coverage.

Overall rating: 58%. The three categories receive equal weight. This is an editorial convention, not an empirically validated estimate of overall truth or benefit. The percentage does not override the recommendation or the consequential caution on the cover.

Scientific Accuracy · 58%

Do the book's main claims hold up?

Originality does not require fearlessness or reckless commitment.

Evidence and counterexamples support rejecting the heroic necessity claim. That is easier to establish than the stronger proposition that risk aversion itself generally causes success.

[Section 04]

The recommended techniques reliably improve the generation, selection, and communication of original ideas.

There are credible findings and useful possibilities, but heterogeneous designs and selective historical examples do not establish dependable effects across settings. The 2024 expert-uncertainty failure, 2026 dominance-backlash failure, and mixed 2025 speech replication reinforce that uncertainty rather than negate every recommended technique. This evidence meets the partial/mixed-support criterion for an input of 2. [Section 04; C08; C09; C26]

Parents, teachers, and leaders can cultivate originality using the book's prescriptions.

Support varies across practices. Broad prescriptions drawn from birth order, family histories, and identity language require more qualification than the narrative sometimes supplies. Favorable Japanese cheater evidence and the broader noun synthesis concern different scopes; neither establishes a durable originality program. This evidence meets the partial/mixed-support criterion for an input of 2. [Section 04; C21]

Reference Accuracy · 67%

Do the cited sources support what the book says?

Traceability

Extensive notes usually identify the studies attached to the examined claims. Source identification is distinct from faithful description or valid inference. [Section 06]

Accurate description

Some descriptions are useful and accurate, but the first-mover denominator and several generalized numerical claims are consequential exceptions. [Section 06]

Appropriate inference

Observational selection and illustrative cases sometimes become advice about what will cause success. This is distinct from whether the sources exist. [Section 06]

Practical Value · 50%

Is the advice likely to be worthwhile for its intended reader?

The intended uses assessed are creative work, entrepreneurship, organizational leadership and parenting. A practice is not credited with improving durable real-world outcomes solely because it affects novelty ratings, short-term performance or a selected historical example.

Evidence of intended benefit

There is relevant support for selected practices, including generating alternatives, incubation, and some forms of constructive dissent or emotion regulation. These are not all equally established, and the combined set of prescriptions has not been shown to produce the book's broad outcomes. Selected success stories and associations cannot supply the missing causal evidence. [girotra; sio; nemeth; brooks]

Applicability and durability

The text often recognizes context, but advice moves between short laboratory tasks, organizations, entrepreneurship and parenting without consistent evidence of transfer. Creativity ratings, business survival, adoption and durable success are different outcomes. Several numerical or timing prescriptions go beyond what the cited comparisons establish. [raffiee; golder; shin; rohrer]

Benefits relative to burdens and risks

Many ideas can be tested at low cost, and strategic caution is a genuine strength. Other applications can create meaningful costs: delay can waste an opportunity, dissent can provoke retaliation, and identity-focused advice can carry downsides after setbacks. The book does not consistently connect such risks to practical boundaries or stopping conditions. [book; duffy; foster; frazier]

Practical Value is 50%: selected techniques warrant experimentation, but the breadth of the prescriptions exceeds the direct evidence and important context-dependent costs need more explicit treatment.

Calculation and scoring anchors

The full audit uses five anchored grades, from 0 to 4. These are the inputs behind the percentages, not an additional reader-facing rating system. At a given criterion, 0 denotes a demonstrated fundamental failure or contradiction; 1 major limitations; 2 partial or mixed support; 3 substantial support with qualifications; and 4 strong support at the defined scope. The series methodology gives category-specific anchors and missing-data rules.

Scientific Accuracy: $(3 + 2 + 2) \div 12 \times 100 = 58.333\% \rightarrow \mathbf{58\%}$.

Reference Accuracy: $(4 + 2 + 2) \div 12 \times 100 = 66.667\% \rightarrow \mathbf{67\%}$.

Practical Value: $(2 + 2 + 2) \div 12 \times 100 = 50.000\% \rightarrow \mathbf{50\%}$.

Overall: $(7 + 8 + 6) \div 36 \times 100 = 58.333\% \rightarrow \mathbf{58\%}$. This is exactly the average of the three *unrounded* category scores. Only the final displayed values are rounded.

Uncertainty. A one-grade disagreement on a single criterion changes its category by about 8.3 percentage points and the overall rating by about 2.8 points before rounding. This is a sensitivity calculation, not a confidence interval. Independent duplicate scoring and measured inter-rater reliability are not documented. Small differences between books should not be interpreted as precise scientific rankings.

Missing evidence. No category in this edition is withheld as unrateable, but some individual source passages remain unresolved. Those gaps retain their explicit access labels; they are not zeroes or hidden failed checks. If a whole required criterion could not responsibly be judged, the category and overall score would be withheld rather than silently changing the denominator.

Score rationale

The nine inputs follow the stated criterion anchors. Scientific Accuracy is (3, 2, 2): rejecting reckless commitment as necessary has substantial support, while the broader technique and developmental claims are mixed. Reference Accuracy is (4, 2, 2): sources are traceable, with denominator, description, and causal-inference problems in the book's use of them. Practical Value is (2, 2, 2): some practices are worth testing, but durable transfer and context-dependent costs are unresolved. The failures, favorable findings, and corrected-source/access records inform the evidence assessment. The score is not reduced once per failed replication, nor increased merely because code or a source becomes accessible.

10 Verification record and remaining limits

Research stages and access. The source-access labels describe what was retrieved and inspected at each stated date. The first ledger below records targeted source checks on 8 September 2026. "Primary text" means the stated material was retrieved, not that an entire article, its supplements or its dataset was independently audited. A repeat metadata or abstract check does not upgrade access to full text. The dated checks below identify the research performed and its limits; not every search or retrieval was independently repeated.

Study-integrity assessment

— 13 September 2026

The preparation record documents checks of the 36 initial source-table rows and 28 registered claims for relevant replication, reproducibility, correction, retraction, and expression-of-concern issues; additional named studies were traced where identifiable. It records source-specific searches and the series' exact-DOI Crossref/Retraction Watch screen. Not every search or retrieval was independently repeated. The search and decision records distinguish official notices, original-data reanalysis, direct replication, changed procedures or populations, later synthesis, and source access. No retraction or expression of concern was confirmed for the exact Originals studies examined; that is not certification that none exists. The reader review and appendix were read in full, and relevant book passages and endnotes were inspected. These findings are summarized in C02, C06, C08, C09, C14, C21, C22, and C26 and in references 37–51. Publisher abstracts are not represented as full-methods reads, code availability as successful reproduction, or missing adverse results as replication success.

Searches used exact study titles, author names and DOIs, paired with "replication," "retraction," "correction," "expression of concern," "data," "code," and relevant later synthesis terms. Follow-up included both favorable and contrary primary evidence. The retained local research register records the exact queries, URLs, access levels, and unresolved identities; this is not a preregistered or exhaustive database review. No participant-level dataset or analysis code was independently executed. Evidence available when the book was published is distinguished from later research.

Check and source	Finding at the checked scope	Remaining limitation
001 Golder & Tellis (1993): pioneering advantage Author-hosted primary full text and table screenshots inspected	The comparison group is early market leaders, not a representative sample of all later entrants. The 10% market-share figure includes failed pioneers; the paper separately reports 19% for surviving pioneers. The book’s stronger generalization is not identified by this comparison. The relevant passage in chapter 4 and source Tables 4, 5, 7 were visually inspected.	Historical observational comparison; no causal effect of delaying market entry is estimated here.

Edition identification and source limits

Edition details are taken from the book’s title and copyright pages. They do not authenticate the reviewed copy against a publisher-controlled master or establish correspondence with every commercially distributed edition.

What has not been independently certified

This review is not independent human fact-checking, expert peer review, legal clearance, an exhaustive quotation audit, a complete retraction/correction search, or participant-level reanalysis. Historical anecdotes, private interviews, unpublished data, blocked sources, and any unresolved numerical claims retain their original limits. Repeated AI review does not create independent corroboration.

HTML is the canonical report text; the PDF is generated from that same text without abridgment. The package’s validation record documents the executed structural, scoring, citation-target, text-coverage, and rendering checks and their results. A functioning reference link is not proof that the linked study supports an assertion. Nor does a clean PDF layout validate the science.

Substantive access limits

What this report does not establish

It does not estimate the causal effect of reading *Originals*, validate its recommendations as a combined program, or quantify the probability that any reader will become more original. It does not offer a complete historical fact-check of every anecdote, certify every number in the book, or infer misconduct from an inaccessible source. It does not establish that a study has never been retracted or corrected merely because no such notice was retrieved. Later studies are used when substantively relevant; problems in unrelated work by a researcher are not treated as evidence against a specific paper.

The review’s most secure negative findings concern inference and measurement: a selected group cannot stand in for all later entrants; a binary-comparison odds ratio is not a behavioral rate ratio; and an association does not test a proposed intervention. Its more provisional judgments concern how particular practices generalize across populations, tasks, and time. Evidence access and version limits remain visible in the source notes rather than being hidden behind the score.

Assessment scope

Practical Value is assessed from the chapter and source dossiers. Scoring does not constitute an additional independent scientific-source audit. The dated research and access records state the checks performed and their limits. Publisher identity, the corrections contact and the public Red Pen Reviews process were rechecked for the series.

Production checks cover score arithmetic, internal links, preservation of the substantive analysis, agreement of HTML and PDF text, and representative browser and PDF rendering. The accompanying production record reports the actual results; these checks do not establish scientific or legal clearance.

11 References and source access

These are the sources cited in the evidence dossiers. Their dated access notes state what was checked; an abstract or metadata record does not imply full-text verification. Source checks and unsuccessful access attempts are distinguished in Section 10. Identifying a source, including a review article or institutional guidance, is not itself evidence that it supports every claim associated with it.

Book citations use chapters and named sections rather than edition-dependent page numbers. Reference numbers are local to this report. Codes such as T/full text, A/abstract, M/metadata, or U/unresolved are defined in the local source ledger; a source can have accessible metadata while a particular passage remains unverified. External links require internet access; the review text and internal navigation work offline.

References and source-access notes

Bracketed numbers link to the sources below. Book citations identify chapters and named sections. A source labeled “abstract checked” supports only claims visible in that record; it is not represented as a full methods audit. Sources described solely in the book, such as several unpublished studies and historical accounts, remain book-reported unless an independently inspected source is listed here.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
01	Grant, A.; foreword by S. Sandberg (2016). <i>Originals: How Non-Conformists Move the World</i>. Viking. Ebook ISBN 978-0-698-40577-6. Book text, references, and endnotes inspected. Book citations identify chapters and named sections.
02	Red Pen Reviews (2025). <i>Red Pen Reviews method, version 2.2</i>. Official review rubric; accessed 8 September 2026. Full rubric inspected. This report modifies the method and is not an official Red Pen Reviews publication.
03	Raffiee, J., & Feng, J. (2014). <i>Should I Quit My Day Job?: A Hybrid Path to Entrepreneurship</i>. Academy of Management Journal, 57(4), 936–963. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2012.0522. Publisher abstract and retrieved primary-paper results excerpt checked, including the Cox-model coefficient. Full methods and raw data not independently reanalyzed. 13 September 2026 source check: The original adjusted U.S. exit association is retained; a separate mixed Norwegian follow-up is documented at reference 37. Access to one later study is not a reproduction of the original dataset.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
04	Xu, H., & Ruef, M. (2004). <i>The myth of the risk-tolerant entrepreneur</i>. Strategic Organization, 2(4), 331–355. DOI: 10.1177/1476127004047617. Publisher abstract checked; detailed original data not inspected.
05	Stewart, W. H., & Roth, P. L. (2001). <i>Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review</i>. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(1), 145–153. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.145. Research abstract checked. Relevant to the book's broad consensus claim, not a like-for-like replication of Xu and Ruef.
06	Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2010). <i>The Relationship of Personality to Entrepreneurial Intentions and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review</i>. Journal of Management, 36(2), 381–404. DOI: 10.1177/0149206309335187. Publisher abstract and university publication record checked.
07	Berg, J. M. (2015). <i>Balancing on the creative high-wire: Forecasting the success of novel ideas in organizations</i>. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. The version cited in the book. Reference entry inspected in the book (References to ch. 2); exact dissertation text not independently authenticated. The related 2016 article supplies the externally inspected evidence.
08	Berg, J. M. (2016). <i>Balancing on the Creative Highwire: Forecasting the Success of Novel Ideas in Organizations</i>. Administrative Science Quarterly, 61(3), 433–468. DOI: 10.1177/0001839216642211. Author-hosted article, methods and results passages inspected.
09	Girotra, K., Terwiesch, C., & Ulrich, K. T. (2009 / 2010). <i>Idea Generation and the Quality of the Best Idea</i>. 2009 working-paper version, subsequently published in Management Science (2010). Working-paper DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1082392. Institution-hosted working paper inspected. The report relies on this accessible version.
10	Root-Bernstein, R., et al. (2008). <i>Arts Foster Scientific Success: Avocations of Nobel, National Academy, Royal Society, and Sigma Xi Members</i>. Journal of Psychology of Science and Technology, 1(2), 51–63. DOI: 10.1891/1939-7054.1.2.51. Research abstract checked, including the biographical and historical-survey comparison design. Individual hobby ratios were traced in the book, not recomputed.
11	Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). <i>Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree</i>. American Psychologist, 64, 515–526. DOI: 10.1037/a0016755. Research abstract checked. Used for the explicitly stated boundary conditions on intuition, not for new quantitative estimates.
12	Montoya, R. M., Horton, R. S., Vevea, J. L., Citkovicz, M., & Lauber, E. A. (2017). <i>A re-examination of the mere exposure effect: The influence of repeated exposure on recognition, familiarity, and liking</i>. Psychological Bulletin. DOI: 10.1037/bul0000085. Research abstract checked. Later synthesis, not one of the book's original citations.
13	Shin, J., & Grant, A. M. (2021). <i>When Putting Work Off Pays Off: The Curvilinear Relationship between Procrastination and Creativity</i>. Academy of Management Journal. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2018.1471. Online publication preceded the final issue. Author/institution-hosted accepted article inspected. Not assumed to reproduce the book's 2015 manuscript or its exact 28% figure.
14	Sio, U. N., & Ormerod, T. C. (2009). <i>Does incubation enhance problem solving? A meta-analytic review</i>. Psychological Bulletin, 135, 94–120. DOI: 10.1037/a0014212. Primary-paper abstract and full-text methods/results excerpts inspected. Used to distinguish incubation from habitual procrastination.
15	Golder, P. N., & Tellis, G. J. (1993). <i>Pioneer Advantage: Marketing Logic or Marketing Legend?</i>. Journal of Marketing Research, 30(2), 158–170. DOI: 10.1177/002224379303000203. Full paper inspected; definitions and Tables 4 and 7 checked in page images. Key locators: journal pp. 165–167.
16	Azoulay, P., Jones, B. F., Kim, J. D., & Miranda, J. (2018 / 2020). <i>Age and High-Growth Entrepreneurship</i>. NBER Working Paper 24489, DOI: 10.3386/w24489; published in American Economic Review: Insights, 2(1), 65–82 (2020). NBER abstract, publication record, and primary-paper results passages checked. 13 September 2026 source check: The openICPSR code deposit is identified at reference 50. The restricted underlying data and programs were not executed.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
17	Berg, J. M. (2014). <i>The primal mark: How the beginning shapes the end in the development of creative ideas.</i> Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 125, 1–17. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.06.001. Author-hosted article and abstract inspected, including the distinction between novelty and usefulness.
18	Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). <i>Social Undermining in the Workplace.</i> Academy of Management Journal, 45(2), 331–351. DOI: 10.5465/3069350. Journal abstract checked; detailed relationships reported in the book were also traced to its reference entry. No relationship-management intervention was tested by this design.
19	Sulloway, F. J., & Zweigenhaft, R. L. (2010). <i>Birth Order and Risk Taking in Athletics: A Meta-Analysis and Study of Major League Baseball.</i> Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14, 402–416. DOI: 10.1177/1088868310361241. Published abstract checked; the authors' methodological clarification below supplies the interpretation of the odds ratio.
20	Sulloway, F. J., & Zweigenhaft, R. L. (2010). <i>Additional Commentary on Birth Order and Attempted Base Stealing among Major League Brothers in Baseball.</i> Authors' methodological clarification, November 2010. Indexed primary-document text inspected, including the event definition, stratification, sparse-cell warning, and confidence intervals. Direct PDF fetching was unreliable.
21	Rohrer, J. M., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2015). <i>Examining the effects of birth order on personality.</i> Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112, 14224–14229. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1506451112. Research record and findings checked; large cross-national and within-family analyses. Published before the book's 2016 release, not necessarily before its manuscript deadline.
22	Lejarraga, T., Frey, R., Schnitzlein, D. D., & Hertwig, R. (2019). <i>No effect of birth order on adult risk taking.</i> Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(13), 6019–6024. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1814153116. Full open-access article inspected.
23	Lejarraga, T., Schnitzlein, D. D., Dahmann, S. C., & Hertwig, R. (2024). <i>Birth-order effects on risk taking are limited to the family environment.</i> Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1531(1), 60–68. DOI: 10.1111/nyas.15085; first online 2023. Research abstract checked. Its 49,621 observations are not described here as 49,621 unique people.
24	Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2025). <i>Personality differences between birth order categories and across sibship sizes.</i> Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 122(1), e2416709121. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2416709121; first online December 2024. Full open-access article inspected. Online volunteer samples and family-size adjustment are not treated as randomized or within-sibling causal identification.
25	Bryan, C. J., Master, A., & Walton, G. M. (2014). <i>"Helping" Versus "Being a Helper": Invoking the Self to Increase Helping in Young Children.</i> Child Development, 85(5), 1836–1842. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12244. Author-hosted article inspected, including its own warning about failure and identity-linked praise.
26	Bryan, C. J., Adams, G. S., & Monin, B. (2013). <i>When cheating would make you a cheater: Implicating the self prevents unethical behavior.</i> Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 142(4), 1001–1005. DOI: 10.1037/a0030655. Institution-hosted article inspected. Aggregate excess claims are not treated as individual proof of dishonesty.
27	Savir, T., & Gamliel, E. (2019). <i>To be an honest person or not to be a cheater: Replicating the effect of messages relating to the self on unethical behaviour.</i> International Journal of Psychology. DOI: 10.1002/ijop.12519; first online 2018. Research abstract checked. Five experiments and their pooled small effect provide qualified, not wholesale negative, follow-up evidence.
28	Foster-Hanson, E., Cimpian, A., Leshin, R., & Rhodes, M. (2020; first online 19 September 2018). <i>Asking Children to "Be Helpers" Can Backfire After Setbacks.</i> Child Development. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.13147; first online 2018. Full-text primary-article passages inspected through indexed retrieval. This is a boundary-condition test, not an exact replication of the original no-setback procedure.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
29	Cimpian, A., Arce, H.-M. C., Markman, E. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). <i>Subtle Linguistic Cues Affect Children's Motivation</i>. Psychological Science, 18(4), 314–316. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01896.x. Official article record and primary text excerpt checked. Relevant to generic praise in the drawing domain before this book was published.
30	Baron, J. N., & Hannan, M. T. (2002). <i>Organizational Blueprints for Success in High-Tech Start-Ups: Lessons from the Stanford Project on Emerging Companies</i>. California Management Review, 44(3), 8–36. Publisher-hosted article inspected, including the observation window and survival/IPO distinctions. Not every percentage transformation in the book was independently reproduced.
31	Nemeth, C., Brown, K., & Rogers, J. (2001). <i>Devil's advocate versus authentic dissent: Stimulating quantity and quality</i>. European Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 707–720. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.58. Research abstract checked. The relative superiority result does not establish that assigned challenge is universally useless.
32	Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vacheva, V. (2017). <i>Psychological Safety: A Meta-Analytic Review and Extension</i>. Personnel Psychology, 70(1), 113–165. DOI: 10.1111/peps.12183. Institution-hosted full-text methods and results inspected. Meta-analytic associations do not establish a single optimal culture-design intervention.
33	Brooks, A. W. (2014). <i>Get Excited: Reappraising Pre-Performance Anxiety as Excitement</i>. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143, 1144–1158. DOI: 10.1037/a0035325. Institution-hosted article inspected; relevant results figure checked visually. The speaking and mathematics calm conditions used minimal instructions, not a full relaxation treatment. The main singing-performance comparison was with anxiety and no statement. 13 September 2026 source check: The partial speech replication is documented at reference 51; it did not retest the other performance tasks.
34	Bushman, B. J. (2002). <i>Does Venting Anger Feed or Extinguish the Flame? Catharsis, Rumination, Distraction, Anger, and Aggressive Responding</i>. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28, 724–731. Author/institution-hosted article inspected, including experimental conditions and limitations.
35	Kjærvik, S. L., & Bushman, B. J. (2024). <i>A meta-analytic review of anger management activities that increase or decrease arousal: What fuels or douses rage?</i>. Clinical Psychology Review, 109, 102414. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102414. Publisher abstract and results text checked, including both pooled estimates and confidence intervals. Final journal results, not the earlier dissertation, are used.
36	Bornstein, R. F. (1989). <i>Exposure and affect: Overview and meta-analysis of research, 1968–1987</i>. Psychological Bulletin, 106(2), 265–289. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.106.2.265. Bibliographic record and indexed abstract checked; used alongside the later Montoya synthesis. Full original methods were not independently audited.
37	Kritskaya, L., & Kolvereid, L. (2021). <i>Staged Entry to Self-Employment—And After?</i> International Review of Entrepreneurship, 19(4), 411–436. Primary source. Published primary PDF methods, results, robustness checks, and discussion inspected. Different Norwegian definitions and duration outcomes; no raw-data reanalysis. Checked 13 September 2026.
38	Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). <i>Can an Agentic Black Woman Get Ahead? The Impact of Race and Interpersonal Dominance on Perceptions of Female Leaders</i>. DOI: 10.1177/0956797611428079. Primary source. Original primary-paper abstract inspected; not a fresh full-methods or participant-level reanalysis. Checked 13 September 2026.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
39	Liu, C. X., Blair, B. A., & Tenney, E. R. (2026). <i>Registered Report: Can Agentic Black Women Get Ahead? An Experiment Revisited</i>. Psychological Science, 37(5), 347–364. First online 15 April 2026. DOI: 10.1177/09567976261436988. Primary source. Official publisher abstract and version/publication metadata inspected. Full methods/results and underlying data not accessed. Checked 13 September 2026.
40	Karmarkar, U. R., & Tormala, Z. L. (2010; first online 6 October 2009). <i>Believe Me, I Have No Idea What I’m Talking About: The Effects of Source Certainty on Consumer Involvement and Persuasion</i>. Journal of Consumer Research, 36(6), 1033–1049. DOI: 10.1086/648381. Original publisher source. Official original publisher abstract, author/title/DOI identity, and publication metadata inspected. Three experiments are reported; full original methods, data, and analyses were not freshly inspected. The 2024 replication is separately identified at reference 41. Checked 13 September 2026.
41	Løhre, E., Chandrashekar, S. P., Mayiwar, L., & Hærem, T. (2024). <i>Uncertainty, expertise, and persuasion: A replication and extension of Karmarkar and Tormala (2010)</i>. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2024.104619. Primary source. Official publisher abstract/data statement and author-PDF method extracts inspected. Materials/data/code at https://osf.io/hbjyv/ identified, not downloaded or executed. Checked 13 September 2026.
42	Guo, W., Liu, H., Yang, J., Mo, Y., Zhong, C., & Yamada, Y. (2020). <i>Stage 2 Registered Report: How subtle linguistic cues prevent unethical behaviors</i>. F1000Research, 9, 996, Version 2, 16 November 2020. DOI: 10.12688/f1000research.25573.2. Primary source. Primary report methods, results, discussion, and data statement inspected. Attention/minimum-time exclusions and translation limits retained; OSF data not reproduced. Checked 13 September 2026.
43	Witkowska, M., Dołżycka, J., Suitner, C., & Formanowicz, M. (2024). <i>The Grammar of Persuasion: A Meta-Analytic Review Disconfirming the Role of Nouns as Linguistic Cues of Subsequent Behavior</i>. First online 14 March 2024. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X241234845. Primary source. Publisher abstract and bibliography marking included originals/replications inspected. Full methods, diagnostics, and data not accessed; no behavior-specific pooled effect inferred from the broad mean. Checked 13 September 2026.
44	Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Trifiletti, E. (2015). <i>The greatest magic of Harry Potter: Reducing prejudice</i>. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. DOI: 10.1111/jasp.12279. Corrected version: numerical notes dated 20 January 2015. Primary source. Corrected published PDF abstract, design, and all embedded correction notes inspected. Numerical corrections are not a retraction; prejudice outcomes are not innovation outcomes. Checked 13 September 2026.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
45	Godart, F. C., Maddux, W. W., Shipilov, A. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). <i>Fashion with a Foreign Flair: Professional Experiences Abroad Facilitate the Creative Innovations of Organizations</i>. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2012.0575. Primary source. Primary author-hosted abstract and methods scope inspected. Observational fashion-house study; not an experiment assigning travel or relocation. Checked 13 September 2026.
46	Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). <i>Cultural Borders and Mental Barriers: The Relationship Between Living Abroad and Creativity</i>. DOI: 10.1037/a0014861. Primary source. Published APA PDF abstract and study-scope extracts inspected. Living-abroad associations and priming of existing experience are not random assignment to move abroad. Checked 13 September 2026.
47	Leung, A. K.-Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C.-Y. (2008). <i>Multicultural Experience Enhances Creativity: The When and How</i>. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.169. Primary source. Published-paper abstract and synthesis scope inspected. Review/theoretical synthesis, not a new independent replication of every underlying experiment. Checked 13 September 2026.
48	Maddux, W. W., Adam, H., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). <i>When in Rome ... Learn Why the Romans Do What They Do: How Multicultural Learning Experiences Facilitate Creativity</i>. DOI: 10.1177/0146167210367786. Primary source. Official publisher abstract inspected. Functional cultural learning/adaptation differs from a generic benefit of travel; full data not reanalyzed. Checked 13 September 2026.
49	Forthmann, B., et al. (2018; online 2017). <i>Revisiting the interactive effect of multicultural experience and openness to experience on divergent thinking</i>. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.10.002. Primary source. Publisher abstract and introduction inspected. Conditional re-examination of related Leung/Chiu work, not a direct fashion-house replication; complete analyses not reproduced. Checked 13 September 2026.
50	<i>Age and High-Growth Entrepreneurship</i> code record (2025), openICPSR, Version 1, 30 May 2025. DOI: 10.3886/E231438V1. Primary source. Official repository record and visible file listings inspected: code and supporting files, distributed as received without repository verification. The listing check combined cached root/first-page records and a current second page for the same V1; file contents were not inspected. Restricted underlying data and code not executed. Checked 13 September 2026.

Row	Source identity, bibliography, links, and access record
51	Poynter, M., & Pasqualini, M. S. (2025). <i>Getting Excited About Public Speaking: A Replication</i>. Psychology of Language and Communication, 29(1). DOI: 10.58734/plc-2025-0011. Primary source. Full 12-page primary published PDF read. Speech experiment only; early pandemic stop, changed one-tailed analysis, and unavailable original data disclosed. No singing/math replication claimed. Checked 13 September 2026.

12 Editorial Review Notice, Disclosures, and Corrections

Purpose and scope.

This report is published for criticism, commentary, education, and discussion of matters of public interest. It evaluates the particular work, edition, claims, and evidence identified in the report. Its conclusions should not be extended to editions, claims, publications, or professional activities that it does not examine. It is not a comprehensive audit of the author’s work or a certification of scientific accuracy.

Factual reporting and editorial judgment.

This review contains both factual reporting and editorial analysis. Quotations, descriptions of source material, and reported research findings are presented as factual information. Assessments of evidentiary strength, methodological quality, interpretation, balance, and practical value are the reviewer’s evaluative conclusions, based on the sources, reasoning, and criteria identified in the report. Readers are encouraged to examine those materials and assess the conclusions for themselves. Evaluative judgments are not intended to imply possession of undisclosed facts concerning anyone’s conduct or motives.

Meaning of critical assessments.

Descriptions such as “unsupported,” “overstated,” “misleading,” or “inconsistent with the evidence” concern the specific claim, presentation, or evidentiary relationship discussed, for the reasons explained in the accompanying analysis. They do not, by themselves, assert that an author or other person knowingly made a false statement, intended to deceive, fabricated evidence, or engaged in professional misconduct. An assessment that the available evidence does not adequately support a claim is distinct from a finding that the claim is necessarily false.

Interpretation of scores.

Scores, grades, rankings, and recommendation categories summarize the reviewer’s application of the stated rubric. They are not measurements of the author’s honesty, character, intentions, or overall professional competence. They are not estimates of the

percentage of a book that is true or false, probabilities that an author is correct, or representations of scientific consensus. The accompanying analysis explains the basis and limitations of each assessment.

Evidence, timing, and verification limits.

Conclusions reflect the materials examined and the state of the evidence assessed through the literature-search cutoff stated in this report. Relevant limitations—including unavailable sources, incomplete access to underlying data, and unresolved verification questions—are identified in the methodology or accompanying analysis. An inability to locate or independently verify a source does not, by itself, establish that the source does not exist or that a claim was fabricated. Evidence published after the reviewed work is distinguished from evidence available when it was written; later developments do not, by themselves, establish what an author knew or should have known at the time. Independent replication of studies, reanalysis of original datasets, and expert peer review are not claimed unless expressly documented.

Preparation and review disclosure.

This paired reader review and technical appendix was prepared with ChatGPT at Jason Hreha's request. AI tools materially assisted research retrieval, comparison, targeted source checking, analysis, drafting, scoring and production. The report presents the evidence, study-integrity findings and source-access limits described in Section 10, with all nine scoring inputs evaluated under the stated method. The evidence cutoff is 13 September 2026; this is not a publication date.

The publisher supplied an additional critique, *The Audit, Audited*, reporting approximately 110 checks of the review series. That document informed preparation; its author, tool identity and independent human-review status were not established in the supplied material. Its reported checks are not relabeled as independent human fact-checking or complete verification. Source and production checks do not constitute a comprehensive literature search or independent replication. The targeted study-integrity screen is described in Section 10.

No independent human subject-matter sign-off or media-law clearance is documented. Jason Hreha is not represented as having personally verified every assertion. No response from a reviewed author or publisher was solicited for this review. Source-target, arithmetic, content-preservation and rendering tests are production checks, not scientific peer review. The extent and limits of source access are stated in Section 10 and the reference records.

Relevant interests and relationships.

Jason Hreha leads The Behavioral Scientist, is the author of the commercially available behavior-change book *Real Change*, and offers behavioral-science consulting and related services. These are relevant commercial and intellectual interests, including potentially competing books, explanations or products. The publication's book page and services/contact page were checked on 8 September 2026.

The preparation record does not independently establish the presence or absence of additional relationships with the reviewed author or publisher, funding, compensation, review-copy arrangements, sponsorships or affiliate arrangements. No blanket absence-of-interests statement is made. The links included in this report are source and navigation links, not newly created affiliate links.

Affiliation and attribution.

References to individuals, organizations, institutions, publications, and trademarks identify the subjects or sources of discussion and do not, merely by their inclusion, imply sponsorship, approval, or endorsement. This is not an official Red Pen Reviews review and is not affiliated with or endorsed by Red Pen Reviews. Any use or adaptation of its publicly described approach is identified in the methodology; the ratings in this report are not ratings issued by Red Pen Reviews. Copyright in quoted or reproduced third-party material, where applicable, remains with the respective rights holders. Its inclusion in this report does not grant permission for separate reuse.

General information, not individualized advice.

This report does not provide individualized medical, psychological, legal, financial, or other professional advice, and reading it does not establish a professional-client relationship. Discussion of a recommendation's evidentiary support does not establish its suitability for any particular person or circumstance.

Corrections and substantive responses.

The publisher welcomes factual corrections, relevant additional evidence, and substantive responses from authors, publishers, researchers, and readers. Please send submissions through **The Behavioral Scientist contact form**, identifying the passage at issue, the proposed correction or clarification, and supporting sources. The publisher will assess submissions and correct substantiated factual errors. After first public publication, material corrections will be dated and explained in a correction record; changes resulting from new evidence or revised judgments will be identified as updates. A person's failure to respond to a request for comment is not treated as agreement with the review.

Publication details

Reviewer / preparation

ChatGPT-assisted critical analysis, commissioned by Jason Hreha. The extent of AI and human review is disclosed above.

Publisher and responsible editorial contact

The Behavioral Scientist / Haystack Group LLC, as identified in the website's terms. Responsible editorial contact: Jason Hreha.

Book and edition reviewed

Originals — Adam Grant; foreword by Sheryl Sandberg. 2016 Viking ebook; ISBN 9780698405776.

Literature-search cutoff	13 September 2026. Targeted critical narrative review; not a guarantee of exhaustive coverage.
Publication date	The first public publication date is recorded on the hosting page when the review is published. The evidence cutoff and source-access dates describe research, not publication.
Evidence date	13 September 2026. Dated source-access records state the actual checks and their limits. This is not a publication date.
Current evidence assessment and contact	The current evidence assessment below summarizes the basis and limits of this review. For the current public version or to submit a correction, use The Behavioral Scientist contact form and identify the book and report ID.

Current evidence assessment

Evidence basis and limits. The assessment includes the mixed Norwegian staged-entry follow-up; registered dominance-backlash and expert-uncertainty replication failures; mixed speech replication; favorable Japanese cheater evidence and broad noun synthesis; conditional multicultural sources; Harry Potter corrected-version note; and founder-age code-access record. Foster-Hanson's issue year is 2020 and its online date is 2018. The source-fidelity audit appraises what the original citations support; it is not rescored once per later result. The nine criterion inputs support overall 58%, Scientific Accuracy 58%, Reference Accuracy 67%, and Practical Value 50%. The evidence cutoff is 13 September 2026, not a publication date. No independent human sign-off is claimed.

Report format. The reader review is accompanied by this technical appendix, with shared policy on the series pages, a claim-navigation register and a source table. The evidence qualifications and numerical scoring inputs accompany the analysis. The additional audit supplied by the publisher is acknowledged as a supplied critique, not authenticated human peer review.

Scoring method. The report uses whole-number category percentages and an equally weighted overall rating. Practical Value is assessed from the documented evidence; it is not a relabeled usability score. Scientific Accuracy and Reference Accuracy use the common criteria. Difficulty is described separately from the scored categories. The substantive claim, chapter and source audits explain the judgments; the numerical scoring inputs and arithmetic are shown in Section 09.

Source and response limits. Source-specific findings and access limits are documented in Sections 08–10. No author or publisher response is recorded in the preparation material.