

UNITED WISDOM

A minimum for a difficult day: preserving the function of a practice

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-11-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A minimum for a difficult day: preserving the function of a practice

Epigraph

> *does not guarantee goal achievement*

Peter Gollwitzer and Paschal Sheeran, *Implementation Intentions and Goal Achievement* (2006), authors' abstract, p. 69. The subject in the original sentence is a strong intention to achieve a goal: its existence alone does not guarantee a result. This is not a judgement of a particular person's weakness.

What this article is about

On a difficult day, the usual amount of a chosen activity may be out of reach. Sometimes a smaller action can preserve part of its function. Sometimes a pause will be appropriate. The word "minimum" does not settle the matter: we need to understand what is preserved, what result is possible, and where a reduction stops serving the activity.

Imagine Elena, a hypothetical reader. She voluntarily keeps notes about books so she can later find important ideas and her own questions. Usually she writes several paragraphs. Today she has less time and attention than expected. She opens the file, but opening it does not yet leave a usable note. Can she choose a smaller form without treating activity on a screen as a fulfilled function?

This article treats a minimum as a limited editorial trial for a voluntary, safe activity. Research on plans and habits helps us ask about starting conditions and repetition; it does not establish a universally useful dose for difficult days. There is no requirement to do something in every circumstance, discard necessary standards, or preserve automaticity with a symbolic act.

I. The former norm meets present conditions

Elena chose her usual form of note-taking under different circumstances. Today her free evening has become shorter, the book is more demanding, or her available attention has changed. She can notice a specific constraint: several paragraphs will not fit the time she has. That fact does not require an immediate explanation of the entire difficulty or an assessment of her general ability to engage in the practice.

Naming a constraint does not automatically make every task impossible. She can check what action is still possible and what it will provide. Five minutes is a fact about time; it does not tell

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

her how many ideas she can record meaningfully. An open file is a fact about access; it does not establish a result. The assessment becomes more accurate when resources and completed action are described separately.

The former norm matters too. Several paragraphs may have helped her examine an argument, record an objection, and identify the page. Reducing the activity may lose part of this function. It helps to recognise that loss without presenting a shorter note as fully equivalent. A form chosen for one evening can be useful in a limited way even when it does not replace her usual attentive analysis.

If the previous amount was an agreed obligation, she cannot simply rename it a personal practice and reduce it without considering the recipient. This article concerns voluntary book notes. In other activities, deadlines and criteria may themselves be essential. Distinguishing conditions from a norm helps her seek a feasible response while preserving an accurate account of what was required.

II. What should remain after the action?

The function of Elena’s book notes is to let her return to an idea and a question. To support that function in a smaller form, she needs to leave usable information. Opening a file is insufficient. A book title and page together with a clear question may provide a usable trace; an empty mark made for a calendar may not. This is an editorial distinction between a function and a mark, not an experimental assessment of a minimum dose.

A meaningful result has a different form in another practice. Preparing a shared document requires an actual usable part; studying material may require understanding that needs checking. The article does not prescribe the same minimum for every task. Fewer movements do not necessarily mean less difficulty. A short question about a book may require attention that is unavailable today as well.

Elena can choose one question and record where it arose. The note need not explain the author’s whole argument. It can explicitly preserve an uncertainty: which connection she does not yet understand. The status of the result matters. If understanding is absent, a question should not be called a completed analysis. A saved trace is useful in the function it actually performs.

The smaller action also has an ending. After recording the relevant information, she can stop without proving its seriousness by adding several paragraphs. If she has resources to continue and wants to do so, a larger amount is possible. But it should not silently become a condition for counting the original minimum as completed. A boundary supports a clear decision about tonight’s workload.

The trace needs to be intelligible when used later. A vague instruction to check something, without a page or subject, may prove unusable tomorrow. Two clear sentences sometimes preserve more relevant information than a few arbitrary words. This does not establish a sentence count. Elena considers whether she can use the note for its intended purpose; she need not label every shortening of a text a useful result.

The trace’s usability can be checked on returning. If Elena recognises the page and her own question, part of its purpose has been served. If she must reconstruct the subject of the note, the saved information is insufficient. This check need not reject everything she did: she can clarify a missing connection and supplement the note. Tomorrow’s correction should not retrospectively declare yesterday’s result complete. Each state has its own content and time.

Preserving a function can also be partial. A question identifies a point of difficulty but does not supply the answer; a page reference preserves access but does not replace the question. These results can be used with future work. Elena need not choose between complete analysis and no usefulness at all. Distinguishing parts lets her accept a limited result without inventing equivalence between every form.

III. A minimum cannot be assigned for someone else

From outside, it is easy to decide that a person can manage one minute or one line. Yet the visible size of an action does not reveal its real cost. Writing a precise question may require Elena to reread a difficult page. A small form is not necessarily feasible simply because it looks brief. Her conditions and present endorsement cannot be fully established by external observation.

Ryan and Deci distinguish autonomous endorsement of an action from forms of pressure. An endorsed activity can still be difficult and bring no enjoyment today. A lack of pleasure therefore does not determine whether she should stop; nor does it authorise someone else to insist that she continue. The selected sections of self-determination theory help frame a question about choice, rather than diagnose Elena from one evening.

She can ask whether the book practice remains worthwhile and what cost she is willing to accept now. The answer may be a smaller action, postponement, or a pause. A chosen minimum does not become compulsory for every difficult day. Changing circumstances call for reassessment. Another person’s successful rule does not establish that the same response will be feasible and useful here.

If another participant offers help, she can accept it for a specific purpose: finding a page, preparing a link, or freeing an agreed period of time. Help should not replace Elena’s own note or take over the decision about her workload. This is an editorial consideration about

participation, not a prohibition on cooperation. Autonomy in Ryan and Deci’s account does not require a person to act alone.

IV. A smaller action needs a real completion

A minimum can be described so that its completion is clear. Elena might save a title, a page, and one question of her own. Opening the file is preparation; adding a usable note is an action with a result. The difference can be substantial. Preparation need not be belittled: without access, further work is sometimes impossible. Its status still deserves an accurate name.

If she has only found the page today, she can record precisely that. The action may be useful for starting next time while still not serving the function of a book note. An honest distinction does not require declaring the evening a failure. It preserves information about what was done and what remains. Tomorrow’s continuation can rely on the actual state, rather than a convenient declaration of completion.

A visible ending also protects the minimum from endless expansion. First she needed to record a question; then an explanation, an answer, and a full chapter review were quietly added. The smaller form has ceased to be the decision Elena originally made. If she chooses to expand the work, she can describe a new choice rather than a compulsory correction of an insufficiently serious minimum.

A small action should not be a fiction created for a report. If the question is written so vaguely that its subject cannot be identified, the result may not serve its purpose. Checking its substance does not require the full norm. She can assess whether she completed what she chose for this evening. There is no universal quality threshold here; it depends on the note’s function and the available conditions.

V. What research says about plans, and what remains our trial

In their meta-analysis abstract, Gollwitzer and Sheeran distinguish a strong intention to achieve a goal from planning the time, place, and manner of an action. They report 94 independent tests and an average effect of implementation intentions on goal achievement. This is the published authors’ abstract and available publisher preview; the complete methods and tables have not been read for this article.

An average result across studies does not guarantee Elena’s action on a particular evening. Nor does it establish the smallest useful book note. The meta-analysis did not test our exercise or confirm that a daily line preserves every habit. Such a substantial claim would require a different research basis.

Planning suggests a narrower question: in which available situation could Elena carry out her chosen response? For example, after putting away her cup, with access to the book, she could open the relevant page in her file and record the specified question. Conditions should not be described as inevitable if they may be absent today. The plan can allow postponement when the necessary materials are unavailable.

If the moment arrives but the note is not made, this provides information about the plan and present conditions, rather than proof of personal inadequacy. The cue may have been ambiguous, the action too demanding, or the goal no longer endorsed. The cause needs examination instead of being selected in advance. A plan addresses starting; it does not create resources, content, or permission to ignore an obstacle.

A work’s discussion of a substantial effect must not become a promise to the reader. A research effect has a definition and conditions; “minimum” names our own limited form of action. The article uses the source to distinguish intention from implementation. A particular note’s usefulness is checked against its function, rather than deduced from the magnitude of an effect reported in an abstract.

One trial can show that the chosen form was feasible that evening. It does not establish why this happened or prove that the former form would necessarily have failed. Several conditions may have differed at once. When Elena later changes the form, this limit on inference remains useful. An editorial observation helps her clarify an action; it does not turn a personal sequence of evenings into a controlled study.

VI. Conditions can be prepared without increasing the requirement

Dewey considers habits as ways of acting in relation to materials and a social environment. His philosophical question directs attention to what a real operation requires. For Elena, this means access to the book, a place for the note, a comprehensible link, and time that has not already been assigned to an agreed activity. A stricter demand does not resolve every difficulty.

She can leave the page open beforehand and choose where to save her question. Preparing the environment may reduce searching. It does not guarantee a note or replace understanding. If an idea is unclear, a convenient file will not produce an explanation. If attention is unavailable, reducing the number of clicks does not establish that meaningful action has become feasible.

The social side of conditions matters too. A smaller form does not authorise taking shared time without agreement. If Elena promised to be available at a particular moment, even a brief book

note may conflict with that agreement. The issue is the real cost and availability, rather than a belief that one minute is always insignificant to others.

Prepared conditions are useful insofar as they serve the chosen operation. They can remain available for the next ordinary session even when today’s decision is a pause. Preparation does not turn that pause into concealed completion. Discipline can include an honest distinction between states: the materials are ready, the note has not been made, and the next moment still needs choosing.

VII. Regularity does not make a streak magical

Wood and Rünger discuss repetition of a response in a familiar context. Such an arrangement may support a habitual start. Yet a reduced note is not necessarily the same response as a detailed analysis. The sections read for this article do not establish that any symbolic act automatically preserves the whole mechanism or quality of a practice.

Lally and colleagues modelled the growth of self-reported automaticity for chosen everyday actions. Trajectories and estimated times varied, and the degree of consistency needed remained unknown. These findings do not establish a universal minimum dose, an exact number of days, or a criterion for a complete book note. The object of measurement matters; a calendar should not become the only evidence.

In our hypothetical story, Elena can continue an available form for the sake of a usable trace, rather than any mark at all. One date without a note does not establish that all earlier notes have disappeared. Equally, no absence of consequences can be promised after every extended interruption. The external product, the skill of analysis, and ease of starting need separate assessments.

If the streak becomes the only value, the practice’s function can be lost. Elena opens the file daily but finds no ideas she can return to. Regular performance of an operation then fails to replace the purpose of the notes. This is an editorial observation about a criterion of results. It does not claim that calendar marks are always harmful: they can provide convenient information about completion when their role is clear.

VIII. A minimum can quietly become the full norm

At first, Elena chose a question with a page reference for one difficult evening. Then she decided she must do this in every circumstance and must add another paragraph afterwards. The smaller form has become a new permanent requirement. The word “minimum” remains, but its feasibility and ending have changed. The actual workload deserves attention instead of confidence in the name of a routine.

Voluntary continuation can be distinguished from a hidden condition. If Elena wants to keep writing after a short note and has the resources, this is a new available choice. If stopping is forbidden until a complete analysis is done, the original boundary is no longer functioning. It should not be described as intact when the actual form has changed. Revision can restore an honest account of what is required now.

Frequent use of the smaller version also provides information. Perhaps the ordinary norm no longer fits her life; perhaps a difficult period is lasting longer. This article does not identify a cause from frequency. She can choose a review point: what function is preserved, what is consistently missing, and whether another arrangement is needed. A minimum need not be a perpetual postponement of discussing the real workload.

If detailed analysis remains important, dedicated time, help with materials, or a different sequence may be necessary. If the purpose has changed, the form can change too. Keeping previous notes does not oblige her to maintain the same amount for life. The response depends on her present goal and circumstances. Research on planning and automaticity does not choose one correct workload for Elena.

IX. A pause can be a clear decision

Sometimes the smaller action is unavailable or inappropriate. There is no book, no time, or no opportunity to read safely; an essential matter requires attention. A pause can then be named without turning it into a concealed failure of a compulsory technique. In a voluntary practice, Elena can choose a next assessment point or leave it open if the conditions are not yet known.

This does not claim that a pause is always more useful than action. Its consequences depend on the task. If Elena was due to send a note to someone else, she needs to communicate the state of the work. A purely personal activity has simpler boundaries. In both cases, the absence of a note remains an absence, while previous results do not disappear because of the name given to today’s decision.

Treatment, safety, and mandatory procedures have different grounds for reduction or interruption. This article’s sources do not determine an acceptable dose, omission, or return procedure in those settings. The book-note example should not be transferred to them. Relevant information comes from an appropriate competent source, and existing instructions and agreed standards need assessment in their own context.

Elena need not justify every personal evening to an outside observer. Still, the right to choose a form does not guarantee its result. She can voluntarily prefer a pause and acknowledge that no new trace exists today. Clarity lets the story continue without an invented mark. The option to stop preserves choice where a minimum is meant to support an accepted practice rather than replace it with new coercion.

An unresolved intention may remain even during a pause. It need not immediately be closed by a permanent rule. Elena can name the information still needed for a decision: when access to the book will return or when next week’s arrangements will become clear. An open question differs from a promised deadline. If someone was promised a deadline, uncertainty deserves discussion with that person. The article does not propose hiding an obligation behind the convenient word “pause”.

X. Return with an accurate trace and an accurate status

Return to Elena. She chooses an available note: a book title, a page, and a question about one connection in the argument. Later, she can understand what she left unresolved. Today this is not a complete chapter analysis, but a usable trace for the next session. Its limits are stated; opening the file is not treated as a result, nor is the smaller form presented as equivalent to the usual one.

If she could not record the question, she can identify that state as well: the page was found, but no note was made. At the next suitable opportunity, this helps her begin from a known place. She need not first declare the previous evening a success to use the prepared materials. An honest status preserves the connection between the previous action and the present task.

At a chosen time, Elena checks what the practice supports. Could she return to her question? Is the smaller form useful under current conditions? Does the ordinary norm require adjustment? Her answer may be continuation, a new amount, dedicated time for full analysis, or a pause. The sources do not guarantee that one form will suit every future difficult day.

A minimum becomes workable when it preserves a defined function, has a feasible ending, and permits checking. Its size is neither a universal scientific dose nor a moral merit. Elena chooses an action under present conditions and describes the result accurately. Such clarity helps her use a small result without replacing meaningful practice with calendar appearances or demanding action at any cost.

What this means in practice

You can conduct an editorial trial for one voluntary, safe practice. This is not a research-validated minimum-dose method and does not replace essential standards.

Name the ordinary activity’s function. Identify what the smaller form could preserve and what it will not provide. For a book note, this might be a usable question with a page reference; the number of lines is not universal. Check that the result will make sense when you next use it.

Clarify present conditions: available materials, time, attention, and agreements. Choose an action with a visible ending and a situation in which it is possible. Give access, preparation, and

a meaningful result different names. Do not add the full norm as a hidden condition for completing the chosen minimum.

Allow a pause beforehand if the form is unavailable or inappropriate. If someone is waiting for a result, clarify its state and the next agreement. Do not treat a personal choice as evidence of others' consent. If the smaller form is used repeatedly, choose a review point while retaining information about the missing function.

After acting or pausing, record the actual result. The trial may be useful, inconvenient, or in need of change; none of these outcomes assesses the whole person. Do not transfer it to treatment, safety, or mandatory procedures. Those require their own rules and competent information, which this article does not establish.

Key quotation

> *spells out the when, where, and how*

Peter Gollwitzer and Paschal Sheeran, *Implementation Intentions and Goal Achievement* (2006), authors' abstract, p. 69. In the original sentence, an implementation intention specifies action parameters in advance. The fragment conveys that specification, rather than a demonstrated formula for minimum workload. Specifying a moment, a place, and a manner does not create missing resources or guarantee an individual result.

Connections between traditions

1. **Intention and implementation.** Gollwitzer and Sheeran distinguish a goal from a specified action plan. A plan helps frame the question of starting; it does not establish the smallest useful book note.

2. **Regularity and function.** Wood and Rünger explain contextual response associations; Lally measures self-reported automaticity. These objects differ from the substance of an external product or the preservation of every skill.

3. **Endorsement and difficulty.** Ryan and Deci connect autonomy with endorsement of action. An unpleasant evening does not establish an imposed goal, and another person's convenient minimum cannot determine someone's workload.

4. **Materials and action.** Dewey considers habits amid materials and social conditions. A prepared file can facilitate access but does not replace understanding or a result.

5. **A small amount and a clear boundary.** Preserving function, an honest status, and an option to pause are editorial comparisons. The sources do not confirm a universal technique for all difficult days.

Sources

1. Gollwitzer, P. M.; Sheeran, P. *Implementation Intentions and Goal Achievement: A Meta-analysis of Effects and Processes*. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology 38 (2006), 69–119. DOI: 10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1. Authors' abstract and publisher preview. The abstract and available parts of the introduction and conclusion were used; full methods and tables were not read.

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. Primary study text. The abstract, introduction, methodological context, and discussion were used; not all results and figures were read in full.

3. 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 Review in Advance 2015 version was used: introduction, automaticity, and selected parts on formation, goal inferences, and habit change.

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. Authors' copy. The abstract, introduction, and selected discussions of autonomy and regulation were used; the entire text was not read.

5. Dewey, J. *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology* (1922). Primary text, Project Gutenberg 41386. Selected passages in the introduction and Part I were used with their surrounding context; the entire book was not read. No direct fragment from this work is used here.

Tags

minimum, difficult day, practice, function, action, result, preparation, completion, conditions, materials, time, attention, goal, intention, planning, habit, automaticity, repetition, consistency, autonomy, voluntary action, pause, workload, boundary, agreement, feedback, Gollwitzer, Sheeran, Lally, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh

Maria Evilkut is a co-author 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 real life between people and cultures.

Instagram: @ilkutki