THE SUCCESS TRIBUNAL / FIELD GUIDE

The Overnight Success Illusion

How to spot missing attempts, invisible labour, cumulative advantage, luck, outcome bias and the difference between production and impact.

A court that refuses a simple verdict

Success is not a single scientifically validated score. This field guide offers conceptual tools and reflective exercises. It cannot infer someone’s private health, finances, relationships, or overall worth from publicly visible projects.

Sahil Tayal / New Delhi / October 2026

https://sahiltayal.com

01 The misleading opening shot

The typical overnight-success narrative begins with the visible moment: a hit product, viral post, grant announcement or publicly released website. Starting there creates an optical illusion. It excludes preparation, prior attempts, collaborators, distribution channels, material conditions and the failed cases never featured in the story.

A rapid build is not trivial; it is an accomplishment to construct working artifacts efficiently. But production speed and long-term success answer different questions. The former concerns elapsed time to output. The latter may require sustained usefulness, competence, cash flow, independent validation, welfare, or relationships over time.

02 Eight ways an overnight story misleads

1. Survivorship bias: winners are easier to interview than failed or abandoned projects. The observed population is selected, so lessons inferred from it may not generalise.

2. Selection effects: publishers, algorithms and social groups curate stories based on novelty, clarity, status and attention potential. A compelling case study is not a representative sample.

3. Invisible labour: mentoring, editing, technical maintenance, emotional support, care work, earlier drafts and abandoned experiments rarely fit the heroic caption.

4. Cumulative advantage: earlier resources or recognition can attract further opportunities. Robert Merton documented dynamics of recognition in scientific credit allocation.

5. Skill development: rapid execution can depend on years of transferable training, habits, tools or accumulated domain knowledge. A short public timeline may misstate the learning timeline.

6. Luck and opportunity: a market window, timing, platform distribution and chance can matter; skill and randomness may interact rather than cancel one another.

7. Visibility versus achievement: many impressions, search appearances or posts show distribution and discovery, not automatically accuracy, originality, usefulness or business health.

8. Outcome bias: a favourable result can make a decision appear wise even if its ex ante reasoning was poor or its risks were large.

The central research insight

Denrell (2003) explains that studying surviving organisations without their missing comparison cases can produce misleading beliefs about which practices work. Merton (1968) examines cumulative advantage in recognition. Neither paper proves that every public success is accidental.

03 Two illustrative case studies

Case A, an invented music producer: a sudden release becomes popular. The story says “one track changed everything.” A full case file would include earlier music education, mentors, collaborators, studio access, distribution relationships, prior songs and the many musicians who made comparable work without the same visibility. The proper inference is that the release attracted attention, not that one tactic guarantees fame.

Case B, an invented digital creator: dozens of sites are published in a short burst. The record confirms a high rate of public artifact production if the sites actually exist. It does not establish how many users completed the intended learning exercise, whether the content was independently correct, whether accessible design succeeded across devices, or whether a sustainable economic model emerged.

These cases are deliberately fictional teaching scenarios, not coded accounts of the creator’s private life. They show how to separate output, outcome, impact and narrative.

04 Decision quality is not the same as outcome quality

Imagine two entrepreneurs making the same decision with identical information and risks. One happens to receive a favourable media mention; the other does not. Calling the first strategic genius and the second incompetent would ignore the decision information available at the time.

Tversky and Kahneman’s seminal account of heuristics helps frame our susceptibility to vivid, available examples. In practice, an honest analysis of a decision records alternatives, evidence, opportunity cost, uncertainty and whether the reasoning was defensible before the result arrived.

Reflect & apply

Question: Describe a decision you judge differently knowing the outcome. Can you evaluate its reasoning separately?

05 Printable: the two-timeline method

The following two tracks must both be filled before making a story about how success happened. Add dates only when they can be supported. “Unknown” is a valid entry.

Public timeline	Invisible or upstream timeline
1. _____	1. _____
2. _____	2. _____
3. _____	3. _____
4. _____	4. _____
5. _____	5. _____
6. _____	6. _____

What missing failure cases would I need to examine?

Which actors or structural opportunities did the headline omit?

What further measurement would demonstrate durable benefit?

06 The eight-step printed alternative

Survivorship bias

The visible case excludes failed or abandoned counterparts.

Question: Who is absent?

Selection effects

The editor or algorithm did not sample randomly.

Question: Why was this story picked?

Invisible labour

Support and revision preceded the headline.

Question: What work was hidden?

Cumulative advantage

Earlier status or access can attract more.

Question: What compounded?

Skill development

The public debut may conceal private practice.

Question: Which skills were acquired?

Luck and opportunity

Timing and chance shape exposure.

Question: What was outside the actor’s control?

Visibility vs achievement

Attention alone is not usefulness or impact.

Question: What is the outcome evidence?

Outcome bias

A lucky result can distort retrospective appraisal.

Question: Would I judge the process the same if it failed?

07 Research checklist for your next success story

Before accepting advice from a viral success narrative, ask for an unselected denominator: how many people tried, what percentage withdrew, and what counted as success? Distinguish association from cause. Compare strategies with alternatives where possible. Ask who had access to tools and resources, and who contributed work that the public story does not credit.

The goal is not cynicism. It is calibrated admiration. Successful people can have genuine skill, effort and courage. A full account can respect those qualities without claiming that an anecdote yields a replicable formula. Stronger explanation requires stronger evidence.

What can the visible artifact actually prove?

What independent outcome would change my confidence?

Research references and further reading

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in Science. Science, 159(3810), 56-63. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/5634379/

Denrell, J. (2003). Vicarious Learning, Undersampling of Failure, and the Myths of Management. Organization Science, 14(3), 227-243. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.2.227.15164

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124-1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. Human Relations, 7(2), 117-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202

These references contextualise educational claims. They do not measure the success, health, income, or private relationships of Sahil Tayal. This guide is an original synthesis, not a systematic review.