

UNITED WISDOM

What can become a habit, and what should remain a decision?

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A23 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

What can become a habit, and what should remain a decision?

Epigraph

> *Goals energize and direct action*

Wendy Wood and Dennis Rünger, *Psychology of Habit*, preliminary Review in Advance version (2015), p. 11.3. In the surrounding text, goals and habits are related but distinct bases for action. The fragment does not mean that every repetition requires a complete conscious decision.

What this article is about

Familiar operations spare us from choosing every movement again. We put necessary items in a bag, open a work file, or begin an ordinary activity. That convenience frees attention for the substance of the task. A familiar sequence can also extend into situations where new information, consequences, or another person’s agreement matter. Ease of response then does not establish suitability.

Consider Vera, a hypothetical person who quickly packs her bag each morning in a familiar order: notebook, keys, water bottle. Later, a friend messages her about a shared weekend plan, and she almost automatically sends her usual agreement. This time the date and location have changed, something she has not considered yet. Packing a bag and accepting new conditions are both brief outward actions, but their potential errors and information requirements differ.

This article examines the boundary between a repeated operation and a question needing a present decision. The boundary depends on the task rather than general praise or prohibition of automaticity. Habit research helps describe contextual initiation and learning; ethical questions of choice and relations with others remain separate. The practical trial at the end is editorial, voluntary, and safe. It does not guarantee that any activity can become a habit.

I. Two brief actions have different structures

When packing her bag, Vera can use stable places for objects. Keys beside a notebook help her avoid searching every time. The operation’s main purpose is known, and the required items change infrequently. Even here, checking is sometimes needed: a different route or meeting may call for a new document. A convenient procedure does not remove attention to a changed situation.

Replying to a friend has a different structure. A familiar button and tone help her write quickly without establishing whether a new date works. The other person may rely on the agreement received. The reply’s meaning depends on specific conditions and Vera’s readiness to accept them now. Repeating the movement of sending is easier than understanding the arrangement afresh; the distinction matters.

Communication should not be declared an area where automaticity is always unacceptable. A familiar greeting or a convenient way of reading messages can help relationships. A question arises when an operation expresses a decision whose consequences depend on new information. One action contains different levels: text can be typed in a familiar way while new conditions are accepted after appropriate assessment.

If Vera notices mistaken agreement, the speed of her earlier reply does not remove the need to clarify it. She can promptly say that the new date had not been checked and offer an available option. This is editorial reasoning about responsibility rather than experimental evidence about every digital response. It shows why a boundary for automation is worth seeking in an action’s specific content rather than speed alone.

A previously agreed location does not mean that participants accepted a new time; those conditions can be discussed separately.

II. Habit, automaticity, and skill differ

Wood and Rünger discuss psychological habit through learned associations between context and a repeated response. A familiar situation may initiate action without a complete fresh choice of its outcome. That mechanism is one way of explaining repeated behaviour. In their review, habit does not mean everything a person does quickly, easily, or without a detailed internal account.

A well-practised skill can also contain automatic components. Vera may type rapidly while deliberately choosing her reply’s meaning. Fluent movements do not establish that the decision about a meeting has become a habitual response. Sometimes outwardly identical agreement follows attentive reading; sometimes it precedes it. A brief sending interval alone cannot establish the difference.

In Lally and colleagues' study, participants reported automaticity in chosen everyday actions as they repeated them. That measure concerns subjective reports rather than complete measurement of skill, meaning, and consequences. A change in it does not establish that an action became good or useful for every participant. Assessing content needs an appropriate object of checking.

For our story, observable operations are enough: the bag contains the required items, the message expresses agreement to understood conditions, and Vera knows what she accepted. These results do not require proving the precise psychological mechanism first. Research concepts help raise questions without turning a hypothetical scene into a diagnostic measurement of an individual's habit or automaticity.

Observation can be precise enough without an inference about the internal mechanism. Vera notices that she read only the first line before replying, while the changed date appeared further down. A particular task is now available: read the relevant conditions and compare them with her time. This is more useful than a general demand never to act automatically. If she had read everything and deliberately agreed, the same outward speed would mean something different. Describing the information actually available helps avoid condemning all ease or explaining away every error with the word habit.

III. A goal may support initial repetition

A familiar sequence need not arise without choice. Vera may have decided to simplify morning preparations, found convenient places for objects, and used that arrangement several times. An endorsed purpose initially directed action. Later, familiar context helped initiate particular operations. Choice and habit can support each other rather than necessarily remaining in conflict.

Wood and Rünger's review considers the relationship of goals to acquiring and using habits. A stable response may continue in a familiar situation when the present outcome assessment changes. That does not mean a goal disappears from every habitual action. A person may intentionally use a convenient sequence for an accepted task. The important question is precisely where fresh assessment is needed.

Vera still wants to take her keys and notebook. A complete analysis of that purpose is unnecessary every day. When a different route is planned, the required contents are checked again; after that, the convenient sequence can remain. The current decision concerns the changed contents, while the familiar operation concerns placing the selected items in the bag.

Messages allow a similar division, although content changes more often. Vera can habitually open the conversation and attentively read new conditions. She can prepare a reply in a familiar way while pausing before expressing agreement. Automating preparation need not

automate acceptance of an obligation. This is an editorial distinction of functions; the sources prescribe no ready-made interface or compulsory sequence for every message.

IV. A cue helps identify a moment for action

A cue can be a location, the completion of a previous operation, or another noticeable part of context. Vera starts packing after putting away her cup. Her notebook lies where it is easy to notice. These are possible initiation conditions, but describing them does not measure habit strength. Someone may follow the sequence deliberately and use it as a plan.

In his 1999 article, Peter Gollwitzer distinguishes a goal intention from an implementation intention: a planned response to a specified situation. Such a plan clarifies the moment and action. It helps address the practical task of initiation without creating the goal's meaning or becoming identical to an established habit. A situation-response connection can be planned before a long history of repetition develops.

Vera can choose a noticeable checking moment: after reading the conditions and before sending agreement, she consults the date and her availability. The operation must also be feasible. If her relevant schedule is on another device and currently unavailable, an immediate response does not establish that a check occurred. She can say that she will decide after clarification instead of automatically agreeing for speed.

A cue alone guarantees nothing. It may go unnoticed, be ambiguous, or fail to fit a new situation. A plan needs accessible tools and permits revision. The article establishes neither how many repetitions Vera needs nor a universal cue. A small trial concerns the suitability of one arrangement rather than proving that every future decision will now be correct.

A noticeable situation also differs from a vague wish. Completing a message's reading can be identified through its content; a promise to be more attentive does not specify what to check. Vera can choose to check the date after full reading rather than the first notification, which sometimes displays only part of the text. The new rule should not silently expand into compulsory analysis of an entire conversation. Cue and response have a limited purpose connected to a particular arrangement. If the message format changes, the situation's suitability needs checking again.

V. A quick skill can remain flexible

Useful automaticity need not make an entire activity inflexible. Vera can easily find letters on a keyboard while attending to the reply's meaning. Prepared items in her bag let her think about the route. A practised operation supports activity in which some questions remain open to present choice. Everything fast need not be opposed to everything thoughtful.

A complex action can also consist of different parts. Handling a message includes opening, reading, comparing conditions, composing, and sending. Some parts benefit from a stable sequence; others depend on new information. Talking about automating all communication with one word loses this distinction. A practical question is more useful at the level of a particular operation and its result.

Vera can check whether stopping remains possible when something substantial changes. A friend mentions a different price, place, or group of participants; those facts need to enter assessment of agreement. A familiar reply form need not disappear, but its content may change. This check concerns decision quality in the scene rather than laboratory indicators of automaticity.

An absence of prolonged deliberation is not always an error. Conditions can be familiar and already accepted. Nor does lengthy thought always produce a good reply. What matters is whether substantial information is available and the message expresses a present decision. Speed is a useful characteristic only in relation to the task; alone it establishes neither thoughtlessness, mastery, nor correct agreement.

VI. What needs present assessment

New information, changed consequences, and others’ agreement provide grounds for a separate check. Vera need not reconsider where her keys belong daily, but she needs to know a new meeting date. Where action distributes time, money, or duties among participants, its content cannot be fully inferred from usually replying positively before. Earlier regularity does not accept a new condition on a person’s behalf.

This does not require turning every detail into extensive analysis. Significance depends on the task. Checking time, place, and availability may suffice for a family meeting. Another decision needs different questions. The sources read here establish no universal list and do not justify treating this short example as adequate assessment of financial, legal, or medical consequences.

A checking procedure and its outcome should remain separate. Vera can become accustomed to consulting the date before replying. Consulting it does not mean she must agree or refuse. The procedure supplies information for a current decision. If checking becomes a formal movement with no influence on content, its actual operation needs assessment rather than merely the existence of a new habit.

The final action must fit the decision too. If Vera decides to clarify conditions, the sent text should not express unconditional agreement. A familiar template can be changed or left unused. This is an editorial assessment of the relationship between meaning and action rather

than a general prohibition on templates. A convenient form helps while it expresses chosen content without passing off an earlier answer as the present one.

Not every new detail matters equally. Correcting a typo in a familiar location’s name may leave a decision unchanged, while moving the time may make participation impossible. Vera assesses information’s significance for her task rather than applying the same lengthy procedure to every difference. This needs content and circumstances; a formal habit of locating one changed word is insufficient. Where unclear, she can ask about the condition that affects agreement. That question leaves the other person able to supply information Vera could not obtain from a familiar template herself.

VII. Repetition may support an inference about desire

When Vera agrees quickly each time, she may conclude that she always prefers the proposed format. Wood and Rünger discuss people inferring goals from their habitual behaviour. Sometimes such an inference fits their actual wish, but repetition alone supplies insufficient grounds. A response to a familiar context may remain while assessment of its outcome changes.

Vera can ask what she endorses now, understanding the conditions and cost. That does not require treating every earlier agreement as false. The format may have suited her previously; today the date has changed. Assessing a present decision need not rewrite the past. It clarifies what is accepted this time and which facts proved significant.

Ryan and Deci relate autonomy to endorsement rather than total independence from influences or constant enjoyment. Participating in a shared meeting can be voluntary while requiring effort. A convenient reply may be endorsed or performed primarily under pressure. One message’s speed cannot establish a regulation type or diagnose a relationship.

To avoid replacing current choice with an observation of frequency, room for clarification helps. Vera can agree, decline, or request different conditions. Her friend remains free to answer her proposal too. Expressing one’s own decision does not automatically create the other participant’s agreement. That separate relational question is not settled by a familiar sending sequence.

VIII. Aristotle asks about the manner of choice

In Book II of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle considers character formation through action. An outwardly correct act does not exhaust assessment of the agent: knowledge, choice, and steadiness matter. This is ethical reasoning about how a person acts, rather than contemporary research on contextual associations or self-reported automaticity.

Comparison with habit psychology reveals different subjects. Wood and Rünger explain how repeated responses develop and begin. Aristotle asks about ethical action and character. Ease of packing cannot establish virtue, and a modern habit model has not tested the entire Aristotelian position. Shared interest in repetition preserves differences of method and purpose.

In our scene, knowing the conditions helps Vera express a considered answer. This is the author’s application of a question about choice rather than a promise that a brief sending procedure forms moral character. Steadiness may include a reliable preparation operation alongside the ability to change content when circumstances change. These elements need not contradict each other.

If Vera replies attentively once, that is a particular action. It need not immediately become evidence of a finally established quality. Further situations may differ and require new information. The philosophical source supports attention to the manner of action without turning a limited editorial trial into a universal judgement of a person or a quick route to virtue.

IX. A convenient setting and one checking moment

Vera can prepare packing by keeping objects in accessible places and separately choose a moment to read a changed message. The first reduces searching within a repeated operation; the second retains a question for decision. The whole day need not be rebuilt at once. A feasible change should address a particular task and actual conditions.

Before agreeing on a weekend, for instance, she opens her schedule and replies after checking the date. If the schedule is unavailable, she explains when she can clarify. The sequence preserves clear boundaries: what is known, what still needs checking, and what message can be sent now. Her friend need not guess whether a familiar brief phrase expresses full agreement.

After several suitable occasions, she can see whether the arrangement helps her consider new information. Merely performing the procedure is insufficient. If she opens the date without comparing it with her own time, the substantial question remains unanswered. If checking became unnecessarily burdensome for a familiar situation, its form can be adjusted. This supplies information about one arrangement rather than the outcome of testing a scientific method.

A setting can also be shared. Vera cannot change others’ notifications, access, or schedules simply because that seems convenient for her habit. Other participants retain their goals and conditions. The article concerns voluntary, safe operations; mandatory procedures and substantial decisions need their own standards. A small trial neither overrides them nor establishes an acceptable degree of inattention.

X. Freed attention has a purpose

Let us return to Vera’s morning. She packs in her familiar way and notices that a different document is needed today. After clarifying the contents, she uses her usual sequence. In conversation, she opens the message quickly without automatically transferring familiar agreement to a new date. She checks the conditions and sends a reply fitting her present decision. Convenient operations help in both tasks while preserving different places for assessment.

If the new sequence helps, Vera can keep using it. If it does not, she can identify a particular difficulty: an unnoticed cue, unavailable information, or a reply that failed to fit the decision. She need not conclude that every automation is dangerous or every conscious decision must be slow. One trial supplies information about its task and conditions.

Lally’s study shows variation in self-reported automaticity growth rather than a deadline after which every chosen act becomes habitual. Wood and Rünger’s review does not promise automation of every complex activity either. A useful sequence can remain even when part of it is deliberate. Present suitability need not depend on obtaining a final habit label.

The boundary occurs where an operation needs to support an answer to a changing question. A repeated method can be simplified and learned while meaning, consequences, and agreement are checked in context. Vera neither rejects habits nor gives them every decision. She uses familiar action for a chosen task and notices when new conditions need a fresh response. Freed attention receives a particular purpose rather than merely a promise of doing everything faster.

What this means in practice

For one voluntary, safe activity, try an editorial separation of operations. It is not a tested research method or universal automation technique.

Identify a repeated part and its function. Then identify a question depending on new information, consequences, or a participant’s agreement. In Vera’s example, familiar movements help prepare a reply while a new date remains to be checked. The boundary may differ in another activity.

Prepare accessible tools and a noticeable situation for the repeated operation. Separately choose one checking moment before the act expressing a decision. Clarify the required result: not merely opening information but understanding its significance for the present response. If information is unavailable, the decision can be postponed with a clear message.

After several suitable occasions, examine what actually happened. Was necessary information retained? Did the final action fit the decision? Was unnecessary burden added? If the sequence does not help, change one relevant element or abandon the trial. A regular movement does not by itself establish quality.

Set no exact general deadline for habit formation and demand no automation of every component. Mandatory standards, treatment, safety, and substantial shared decisions retain their own rules. This trial helps assess one method in your circumstances; it does not establish acceptable errors elsewhere.

Key quotation

> *people make inferences about their goals*

Wendy Wood and Dennis Rünger, *Psychology of Habit*, preliminary Review in Advance version (2015), introduction, p. 11.3 (PDF page 2, lines 106–108). The surrounding context concerns people inferring goals from habitual acts. Frequency may support such an inference without establishing present endorsement of a particular condition.

Connections between traditions

1. **Initiation and choice.** Wood and Rünger describe contextual response associations. Aristotle assesses action with knowledge and choice. Psychological mechanism and ethical assessment concern different questions although both approaches examine repetition.

2. **Plan and habit.** Gollwitzer distinguishes a goal from a planned response to a situation. A plan can help initiation without becoming identical to an established habit or determining a goal’s meaning.

3. **Automaticity and quality.** Lally measures self-reported automaticity in chosen everyday acts. It assesses neither the correctness of a reply to someone nor the usefulness of every operation.

4. **Frequency and endorsement.** Wood and Rünger discuss inferring goals from behaviour; Ryan and Deci distinguish regulation forms. Repetition alone establishes neither present agreement nor a motivation diagnosis.

5. **Convenience and responsibility.** Preparation can free attention for new information. Participants’ agreement and a message’s fit with a decision remain separate editorial and ethical questions rather than automatically acquired habit effects.

Sources

1. Wood, W.; Rünger, D. *Psychology of Habit*. Annual Review of Psychology 67 (2016), 289–314. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033417. University copy. The preliminary 2015 Review in Advance version was used: introduction, automaticity, and selected material on formation, goal inferences, and changing habits. The final journal version was not read in full.

2. Lally, P.; van Jaarsveld, C. H. M.; Potts, H. W. W.; Wardle, J. *How Are Habits Formed: Modelling Habit Formation in the Real World*. European Journal of Social Psychology 40 (2010), 998–1009. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.674. Research text. The abstract, introduction, methodological context, and discussion were used; not all results and figures were read in full.

3. Gollwitzer, P. M. *Implementation Intentions: Strong Effects of Simple Plans*. American Psychologist 54 (1999), 493–503. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.493. Author copy. The abstract and initial discussion of goals and plans were used; the whole text was not read. No direct fragment from this work is used.

4. Ryan, R. M.; Deci, E. L. *Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being*. American Psychologist 55 (2000), 68–78. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68. Author copy. The abstract, introduction, and selected autonomy and regulation discussions were used; the whole text was not read.

5. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book II, especially chapters 1, 2, 4, and 6. English translation by W. D. Ross. Internet Classics Archive. The complete Book II page was read rather than the whole work. Philosophical positions are used through original paraphrase.

Tags

habit, decision, automaticity, skill, operation, goal, choice, context, cue, repetition, learning, action, information, attention, consequences, agreement, autonomy, self-determination, plan, intention, responsibility, communication, message, preparation, checking, Aristotle, Wendy Wood, Dennis Rünger, Gollwitzer, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline.

Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in everyday life between people and cultures.

Instagram: @ilkutki