THE SUCCESS TRIBUNAL / FIELD GUIDE

The Success Scoreboard Workbook

A printable values-clarification laboratory: nine domains, subjective weights, alternative scoreboards and honest trade-offs.

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 Instructions for this workbook

This workbook lets you design a subjective scoreboard for your own life. It is not a psychological diagnosis, personality test, aptitude assessment or validated measure of success. Nothing here yields a legitimate ranking of people. Print the pages, write by hand, or use the private controls on the interactive website.

The central discipline is to distinguish values from evidence. Choosing what matters is a normative act. Observing whether a particular outcome occurred is an empirical act. Imagining why it happened is an interpretation. A strong judgement keeps those acts visible.

02 Three alternative success constitutions

Constitution A: The security-first lens. Success means adequate money, dependable shelter, health access, contingency planning and a manageable financial future. Strength: it takes vulnerability and practical limits seriously. Blind spot: it may give limited weight to relationships, curiosity or meaningful work.

Constitution B: The creation-and-growth lens. Success means sustained learning, making work of quality, practicing craft and building something useful. Strength: it values development beyond status. Blind spot: it may excuse financial fragility or neglect important people.

Constitution C: The relationships-and-freedom lens. Success means sufficient stability plus the freedom to choose time, nurture reciprocal relationships, and act in accordance with considered values. Strength: it includes social life and autonomy. Blind spot: it can under-specify public accountability or contribution.

No constitution is the single correct answer. Their tension is the point: definitions include trade-offs. You may construct a hybrid that remains open to revision.

Write your own one-sentence constitution

03 Values clarification without forcing certainty

Imagine three scenarios: (1) a well-paid role with little independence; (2) creative autonomy with uncertain income; (3) a moderate income that protects relationships and ongoing learning. Which tensions do you notice? You do not need to select one forever. The exercise reveals the questions that matter to your situation.

Think about reversibility, obligations, baseline needs and time horizon. A value can be high priority but temporarily unmet because another need is urgent. That is not hypocrisy. Sometimes the ethical task is to provide for dependents before pursuing a passion project. Sometimes the responsible choice is to decline a prestigious opportunity that imposes hidden costs.

Which two values are non-negotiable in my current circumstances?

Which two values can I pursue experimentally without a permanent commitment?

Which value have I adopted largely because my reference group rewards it?

04 My subjective weighting worksheet

Give each dimension a weight from 0 (not a priority now) to 5 (very important). The sum need not be 100. The numbers are expressive choices, not population norms. Leave evidence unknown if you do not have it.

Dimension	Weight 0-5	What would count as evidence?
Financial security	_____	_____
Educational achievement	_____	_____
Professional development	_____	_____
Creative output	_____	_____
Relationships	_____	_____
Autonomy	_____	_____
Intellectual development	_____	_____
Contribution to others	_____	_____
Physical & psychological wellbeing	_____	_____

Missing is not zero

Unknown relationship quality, financial status or wellbeing should not be coded as failure. To avoid false confidence, report how many of the nine categories remain unassessed.

05 Exercise: the same person, three scoreboards

Fictional example: Neel has adequate income, three close friendships, is learning a craft, and has made four public creative works. He is not famous. No other facts are supplied. How might three observers disagree without anyone changing the underlying record?

An employer might value:

A close friend might value:

Neel’s future self might value:

06 Four questions for evidence-based confidence

What did I actually do or observe, without interpretation?

What does that observation establish, and what does it NOT establish?

What evidence would change my mind?

Whose perspective is missing from this account?

07 Trade-off negotiation

Choose one ambition and put its costs on the table: time, relationships, cash reserves, sleep, attention and opportunity costs. Contrast “I want this” with “I want everything this symbol promises.” Some costs are temporary or manageable. Others violate a value you wanted the ambition to serve.

What is the opportunity I am considering?

What would it enable for myself and others?

What is the plausible downside if the result disappoints?

Which condition would tell me it is time to revise course?

08 A personal review that avoids ranking

Complete this exercise once, then review it only when useful. Write three things that already provide value in your life, two difficulties that need practical attention, and one experiment you can conduct without pledging your identity to an outcome. A scorecard should be a compass, not a courtroom that reopens every morning.

Ask whether your definition leaves room for rest, ordinary pleasure, care and changing circumstances. Beware of collapsing an enjoyable human life into a sequence of milestones. Achievement can enrich living; it is not the only justification for living.

Three things in my life I already value:

Two realities I want to face clearly:

One experiment I can try without defining myself by its outcome:

09 Reading this workbook responsibly

Respect autonomy, culture and context

No single subjective weighting is morally neutral. Different cultures, families and circumstances shape what is feasible and important. Do not use this worksheet to rate someone else’s character or assign worth.

Research references and further reading

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

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(6), 1069-1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The What and Why of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. PNAS, 107(38), 16489-16493. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107

Killingsworth, M. A., Kahneman, D., & Mellers, B. (2023). Income and emotional well-being: A conflict resolved. PNAS, 120(10), e2208661120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2208661120

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self. Psychological Review, 98(2), 224-253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

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.