Integration Worksheet

Integration Makes Insight Real

Each new understanding or insight is an opportunity to change your behavior. But to become real, it has to be integrated into your life. Without that integration, it remains inconsequential.

Behavior Change is Hard

Reading, planning, and even insight are comparatively easy. Changing behavior in a way that actually improves something is not:

- **Your Life is a System:** Many parts of your life influence each other — work affects sleep, sleep affects mood, mood affects what you take on. Things keep changing whether you plan for them or not, and you never see the whole picture clearly. So you cannot change just one element in isolation, and outcomes often differ from what you expected.
- **Time is Limited:** Most days are already full. Adding a new behavior usually means taking time or energy away from something else. Every change is therefore also a decision about what not to do.
- **Life Gets in the Way:** Even well-intended changes compete with the ordinary disruptions of life — deadlines, illness, social obligations, or simply a day that does not go as planned. Without structure, intentions are easy to forget or misremember.

Taken together, reading something once or making a one-time effort rarely changes behavior for long. To see whether an insight can actually fit into your life, you need to test it under real conditions.

Twenty Minutes

The Integration Worksheet is simple in form but specific in use. Without understanding its logic, trials can produce activity without insight.

Please take about 20 minutes to read the following pages before using it. This short preparation helps ensure that your trials test something real rather than generate convincing but uninformative results.

Afterwards just take the form on page 13 and think about something you want to integrate into your life. Then run a trial and improve on it.

This Matters, Let's Trial It

The Integration Worksheet gives you a way to test whether a desired change can actually take hold in your real life.

In a nutshell, you define what you want to try and how you will recognize success or failure, run the trial for a limited time, look at what actually happened, and then decide what to keep, adjust, or abandon (see Figure 1). Most changes require several iterations before you find a version that truly fits — or before you discover that it does not.

The aim is not to generate more reflection, but to find out which changes become part of lived practice and which do not.

Behavior Focus

This method evaluates changes through observable behavior under normal life conditions. Behavior leaves traces, can be counted, and resists later reinterpretation.



Figure 1: Integration Worksheet Template

Internal states — feelings, motivation, meaning, resistance, insight — still matter. They often provide the reason to try a change. But they are not used as direct evidence, because they are easy to reinterpret after the fact. To find out whether an idea works in practice, the trial has to rely on what actually happens.

So internal experiences are translated into behavioral proxies: avoidance can signal dislike, adherence can signal fit, delay can signal friction, completion can signal alignment.

Looking at inner states this way can feel reductive, as if meaning were being stripped away. Yet even very abstract domains (for example, faith) are expressed through observable actions — lighting a candle, attending a ritual, preparing a meal. These actions make it possible to see whether a change has truly taken hold.

Translating Internal States into Observable Behavior

Many people find it difficult at first to translate intentions or internal experiences into concrete behavior. It is natural to start with aspirations, symbolic actions, or vague metrics — they feel meaningful, but as they cannot be seen, they are hard to test.

Questions that can help anchor an idea in observable practice:

- Is this a feeling or intention? If so, what would be a behavioral proxy?
- What would this look like on Tuesday at 19:00? (to interrupt abstraction)
- If a camera followed you for a week, what would it record that shows the issue?
- Is this an observable criterion? Would another person see the same thing?

If you notice the following, pause and redesign the trial:

- You feel inspired but cannot say what you will actually do.
- The trial depends on being in a certain mood.
- You want to track many variables at once.

Conducting Trials

The following pages guide you through designing and running a trial.

Method is Topic-Agnostic

This method tests whether an intended change can be integrated into real life. It does not assume a specific domain.

In *Organizing Creativity*, it connects framework understanding with practical improvement. The same trial logic can be applied to other areas — work practices, health routines, relationships, environment design, religious practice — as long as the change can be expressed in observable behavior.

Wherever something can be tried, observed, and evaluated in practice, this method can be used.

Memory and interpretation are unreliable, especially when effort and identity are involved. Use written records tied to clear criteria (files exist or don't; tasks done or not) so that decisions remain evidence-based. Over time, these records also show patterns of what works for you and what does not.

The worksheet is used in three stages:

- **Before the trial:** Define what you want to try and how you will recognize success or failure. Clear criteria prevent hindsight reinterpretation.
- **During the trial:** Carry out the behavior, stay attentive to what happens, and record observations.
- **After the trial:** Evaluate the outcome and decide what to keep, adjust, or abandon.

In conducting a trial, different failure modes can occur (see Table 1). Unlike an unsuccessful trial — which still improves decision-making — these invalidate the result and require redesign. If one of these appears, stop the trial and redesign rather than continuing to collect data.

Worksheet and Form Fields

The sheet is a means to an end. Its purpose is to support trying the behavior, not to become an activity in itself. Keep the entries functional and concise.

When you begin, use the template as provided (see Example 1). With experience, you may adapt the process to your existing tools or internalize it entirely (Example 2).

The template is on the last page and available at organizingcreativity.com/oc3/ws/it.

Failure Mode	Indicators	Correction
Protocol Fetishism (the means becomes an end)	Worksheets become primary activity, confidence rises, but no concrete output appears.	Refocus the trial on observable behavior and resulting artifacts.
Quiet Stall (behavior succeeds, project does not)	Adherence is high and the routine feels smooth, yet meaningful progress is absent (e.g., only polishing of the same material).	Link the intervention to external milestones (e.g., complete chapter 2 by date X).
Wrong Lever (constraint-task mismatch)	The intervention assumes a structure the task does not have (see Example 3a).	Redesign the trial to match the task structure (e.g., milestones not quotas).
Status Quo Preserved (no real change introduced)	The trial confirms existing preferences or identity and introduces no new constraint.	Add at least one element that challenges the status quo.
Self-Sealing Loop (cannot falsify)	Evaluation relies only on feelings, intentions, or internal coherence; no external evidence is allowed.	Redesign measurement so that evidence exists independently of belief.
Infinite Pilot (skipping the decision point)	The trial continues without a decision because stopping feels like losing invested effort.	Stop now, decide using existing data, and restart only with a new design.

Table 1: Trial Failure Modes

Attached to this document are examples that illustrate how to design trials. Example 1 uses the form, Example 2 is a highly condensed version on a post-it. The other examples are in table form for easy comparison of conditions, usually success vs failure.

1. Reason for Change

What is happening or not happening that makes this worth changing now? Describe the situation, not the cause. Litmus Test: If this were solved, would it matter in six months?

- **Start from experience, not explanation.** Focus on what you observe (e.g., ideas are lost), not on why you think it happens («I lack discipline»). Causes will be explored through the trial, not assumed beforehand.
- **The reason may start abstract — the next steps translate it into behavior.** It can be an aspiration, dissatisfaction, or question. The next steps will translate it into concrete behavior.
- **Choose something that actually matters.** Run trials on issues that meaningfully

Integration Worksheet

affect your work or life, not on every irritation.

2. Current Pattern

What is currently happening and how does it continue if nothing changes (frequency/duration, actions, consequences, trajectory)?

- **Describe what you can observe.** Imagine a camera followed you for a week. What would it record that shows the issue?
- **Establish a baseline.** Knowing what happens now allows you to compare it with what happens during the trial. If needed, briefly observe or track the pattern before changing it.

3. Goal Behaviors

What would you be doing differently if this worked? What should change, and what must remain stable?

- **Define the visible difference.** What actions, frequency, or results would show that the change has taken hold?
- **Be clear about what counts.** Decide whether you are aiming for a change in quantity, quality, or both. If this is vague now, it will be reinterpreted later.
- **Respect constraints.** Include limits the change must operate within (time, energy, responsibilities).

AI Integration Assistant

An optional AI persona can guide you through designing a trial step by step.

Prompt and access information:
organizingcreativity.com/oc3/ws/aiit

4. Change Behaviors

Plan for normal life conditions, not ideal ones. Specify what will prompt the action, how you start, what you do, and where the required time and attention come from.

Trigger:

Start Action:

Behavior:

Time Source:

- **Design all four aspects.** Without a trigger, the behavior is forgotten. Without a small start action, it is postponed. Without a defined behavior, it drifts. Without a source of time or attention, it competes with everything else.
- **Be concrete.** Describe what happens in a specific situation. If this is vague, the behavior will disappear the first time conditions are imperfect.

5. Success/Stop Criteria

What observable results count as working? What outcome will make you stop? Which foreseeable edge cases need to be decided in advance?

Success:

Abort:

Ambiguity:

- **Decide thresholds beforehand.** Define success and abort conditions now, so you do not reinterpret results later. Another person should be able to apply the rule and reach the same decision.
- **Keep measurement simple.** Criteria should be quick and unambiguous to check (often Yes/No). If deciding takes more than a minute, simplify.
- **Anticipate obvious edge cases.** Clarify how to handle predictable situations so you are not negotiating once the trial is underway.
- **The trial must be able to fail.** If no outcome would change your decision, redesign it.

6. Trial Duration

How long must this run to judge whether the behavior integrates? When will you decide, and how will you ensure the trial stays visible?

Duration:

Decision on:

Check in:

- **Allow enough repetitions to see a pattern.** The trial should run long enough for the behavior to occur several times under normal conditions.
- **Keep it bounded.** A trial is a test, not a commitment. Set a clear decision date before starting.
- **Make it hard to forget.** Use reminders, calendar entries, or environmental cues so the trial remains present during the period.

7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior

Record only what is needed to evaluate the Success/Stop Criteria. Log what happened — times, actions, deviations — without interpretation.

- **Keep evidence simple.** Physical or automatic records are better than memory. Track only what helps you decide later.
- **Make logging effortless.** If tracking becomes work, simplify it.
- **Do not interpret during the trial.** Observe and record. Evaluation comes afterward.

8. Decision

Determine the outcome using the observable evidence and the predefined Success/Stop Criteria.

Observable Evidence for Decision:

- ○ Keep (criteria met as defined)
- ○ Modify (partially met or design needs adjustment)
- ○ Abort (criteria not met or change unsuitable)

- **Apply the criteria as written.** Base the decision on what was defined beforehand, not on how the trial felt.
- **Decide before reflecting.** Make the Keep/Modify/Abort choice first. Reflection comes afterward, once the decision is fixed.

9. Reflection on the Trial

What changed? What did not change? What does this suggest about how the behavior fits into your life? Did the trial create unintended effects or displace something important?

- **Now interpret the result.** Ask what this trial teaches about the design: What helped? What created friction? What would you adjust next time?
- **Treat mismatch as information.** If something did not work, it indicates a poor fit between the behavior and your context — not a personal failure.
- **Look for side effects.** Consider what the change added, removed, or displaced. Improvements in one area should not quietly damage another.
- **Focus on viability.** The question is whether the behavior works under real conditions, not whether it is appealing in theory.

Integration Worksheet

10. Next Steps

Based on the trial, what will you do now (e.g., continue, adjust, begin a new trial, or schedule a review)?

- **Close the loop with a concrete action.** A trial should lead to either continuation, adjustment, or a new experiment.
- **Do not rely on trying harder.** If something did not work, redesign the behavior or constraints rather than adding effort.

Learning from Multiple Trials

Integration emerges through repeated trials. Use the practices below to make iterations informative rather than cumulative noise.

- **Run One Trial at a Time:** Multiple simultaneous trials make attribution unclear and decisions muddy. Running more than one requires them to be independent and separated in time.
- **Close Old Trials:** Once evaluated, trials are data, not autobiography or identity commitments. If you reread them looking for narrative continuity, you'll start retrofitting explanations. If you reread them looking for patterns, they become genuinely informative.
- **Use a Stable Medium:** A paper notebook can help: entries cannot be edited after outcomes are known, writing slows formulation, and space constraints encourage concise design. Treat the notebook as a tool, not an artifact.
- **Keep a Trial Log, Not a Journal:** Narrative distorts evaluation by reshaping events after the fact. Use a separate journal for narration and record only what happened, not interpretations.
- **Review Periodically:** After every five to ten trials, review them together: What kinds of interventions work? Which consistently fail? Are you trying to solve the same problem again?
- **Watch for Long-Term Quiet Stall:** Multiple trials can accumulate without producing meaningful progress. Are you producing more or better outcomes, or merely rotating methods?

Trials matter only if they change what you actually do.

Trial Notebook Suggestions

If you use a paper notebook, keep it functional. No decoration or narration on the trial spreads. Strike through abandoned trials — never remove but learn from them.

The following content makes sense:

1. Orientation
   - Static, rarely changed. Defines what kind of trials you do.
   - Your Aspiration and possible next waypoints. Domains you want to improve, non-negotiable constraints (sleep minimum, ethical lines, etc.; see Staying Capable), what counts as meaningful progress to you.
2. Current System Map
   - Copy of the «Creativity Assessment Worksheet» of your current creative system.
   - Information on where your time actually goes, recurring friction points that impede your creative work, existing habits that work and you want to keep (avoid further improving or optimizing them away).
3. Trial Log
   - One spread per trial. Just write the form headers on the pages.
4. Review Pages
   - Looking at multiple trials for underlying patterns.

Improving Your Trials (After You've Run a Few)

After several trials you will notice that the difficulty is no longer *doing them*, but *designing them well*. The points below help refine your experiments. Use them as needed — not all at once.

Choosing What to Test

- **Test assumptions, not preferences.** If every trial confirms what you already believe, you are protecting an identity, not learning. Ask: What result would prove me wrong?
- **Keep most of life stable.** Change one meaningful thing at a time. If everything shifts, you cannot tell what caused the effect.
- **Prefer small structural changes.** Modest adjustments produce clearer signals and are easier to reverse than large redesigns.
- **Not every irritation deserves a trial.** Work on changes that materially affect your output or life, not whatever feels salient that week.
- **Sometimes remove instead of add.** Eliminating friction is often more powerful than introducing a new behavior.

Designing Better Change Behaviors

- **Design for bad days.** If the behavior only works when motivated, it is not integrated. Lower activation cost instead of increasing willpower. Changes in the environment beat it long-term.
- **Clarify the single constraint.** Many interventions bundle multiple changes. Identify what actually matters so you can attribute results.
- **Beware of metric distortion.** A measure can quietly replace the real goal (e.g., word counts producing filler). Check that behavior still serves the outcome.
- **Expect side effects.** Every change redistributes time, energy, or attention. Watch what gets displaced.
- **Second-order effects cannot be planned.**

Methodical Background

This approach treats personal change as a series of small tests.

It relies on observable behavioral trials, clear before-after comparison, concrete definitions of what should happen, written records that cannot be revised later, and explicit criteria for deciding what to keep or change.

The structure draws on principles of iterative development (for example, human-centered design), adapted here to everyday practice.

DRAFT VERSION FOR FEEDBACK

Insight, meaning, or inspiration emerge indirectly. Design conditions for them to emerge — do not try to force them.

Setting Better Trial Durations

- **Run long enough to outlast novelty.** Early enthusiasm is not evidence. Persistence is.
- **Match duration to scale of change.** Infrastructure tweaks show quickly; identity-level shifts require longer feedback loops.
- **Always keep trials bounded.** A trial is a test, not a lifestyle declaration.

Logging Without Over-Engineering

- **Track only what you need to decide.** If logging becomes work, it is distorting the behavior.
- **Different changes need different evidence.** Some require simple checkmarks, others a few retained artifacts. Choose the lightest method that works.
- **Mid-trial friction is information.** Repeated negotiation («I'll do it later») usually signals a design problem, not lack of discipline.

Reflecting More Usefully

- **Failure is information about fit.** The question is not whether the idea was good, but whether it works under your conditions.
- **Success can hide stagnation.** A system can run smoothly while producing little. Check whether progress actually increases.
- **Integration often feels boring.** When a change fits, it stops feeling special. That is a sign of stability, not loss.
- **Do not optimize what already works.** Let successful behaviors stabilize before improving them.
- **Watch for runaway success.** Occasionally a change removes friction so well that recovery disappears. Reintroduce constraints if capacity erodes.



Continuing the Cycle

Each trial leaves you with one of three outcomes: keep, adjust, test something else. Over time, these small calibrations accumulate into a system that actually matches your life — not one imagined in theory.

Examples

The Integration Worksheet can be used for almost any behavior change.

To show the difference between successful and failed trials clearly, examples 4 to 8 contrast them for the same goal. Each time, the failed trial can be used to design better trials.

Successful examples do not rely on motivation or willpower. Motivation is a wave that changes from high to low and back up again, and willpower depletes during the day. So both are not dependable. Instead, they go for altering the structure (introducing constraints), e.g., in Example 5, time-boxed constraints, in Example 6, forced externalization, and in Example 7, scheduled embodiment.

- **Example 1 (page 6):** Capturing ideas using the form sheet.
- **Example 2 (Figure 2, right side):** Minimal version using just a post-it.
- **Example 3 (page 7):** Two writing interventions that failed but provided useful information.
- **Example 4 (page 8):** Designing for inspiration.
- **Example 5 (page 9):** Finishing artistic projects.
- **Example 6 (page 10):** Knowledge work regarding reading extensively, but little synthesis.
- **Example 7 (page 11):** Personal habit of being more connected to the outside world.
- **Example 8 (page 12):** A weekly shared meal to improve family contact.



Figure 2: Example 2 with Minimal Trial Notes

Integration Worksheet: Capturing Ideas (Example 1)

1. Reason for Change

What is happening or not happening that makes this worth changing now? Describe the situation, not the cause. Litmus Test: If this were solved, would it matter in six months?

I dimly remember having ideas but forget them before using them. When I try to continue writing, they are gone. My work could be better if these ideas were captured, even roughly. This feels like a leak in my creative process.

2. Current Pattern

What is currently happening and how does it continue if nothing changes (frequency/duration, actions, consequences, trajectory)?

I notice forgotten ideas after a shower, when returning from work, or while falling asleep. I am not sure how often – perhaps four ideas in the last two weeks that I actually captured. If I do nothing, ideas will likely continue to be lost.

3. Goal Behaviors

What would you be doing differently if this worked? What should change, and what must remain stable?

Capture more ideas (e.g., more than four in two weeks). Allow some additional effort, but not at the cost of being late or reducing sleep.

4. Change Behaviors

Plan for normal life conditions, not ideal ones. Specify what will prompt the action, how you start, what you do, and where the required time and attention come from.

Make idea capture easy by placing waterproof notepads in the shower and a notepad in the car, plus using a voice recorder at night.

Trigger: Notepads visible; recorder on watch face.

Start Action: Pick up notepad or activate recorder and note the idea without elaboration.

Behavior: Capture the idea before leaving the context (shower, parked car, bedside).

Time Source: Fits into small gaps; takes less than a minute, so no activity must be replaced.

5. Success/Stop Criteria

What observable results count as working? What outcome will make you stop? Which foreseeable edge cases need to be decided in advance?

Success: More than four ideas captured in two weeks.

Abort: Average sleep quality drops by 10 points, or two nights in a row with 2 or more hours less sleep; more than two late meetings due to capturing.

Ambiguity: Sleep loss caused by unrelated stress does not count. Idea quality is irrelevant for this trial.

6. Trial Duration

How long must this run to judge whether the behavior integrates? When will you decide, and how will you ensure the trial stays visible?

Duration: Four weeks

Decision on: 17.04.

Check in: Calendar reminders ensure the change stays visible even if the notepads fade into the background.

7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior

Record only what is needed to evaluate the Success/Stop Criteria. Log what happened — times, actions, deviations — without interpretation.

Structural Change: Check in to ensure notepads are still usable:

- 20.3. (start) ☒
- 27.3. ☒
- 3.4. ☒
- 10.4. ☒ Car notepad replaced.
- 17.4. (end) ☒

28.3. Wrote notes in parking lot; felt socially awkward.

5.4. Used watch to capture ideas in bed; later expanded into longer writing session.

8.4. Shower notepad works well.

9.4. Smartwatch capture easy to forget – weekly reminder needed.

8. Decision

Determine the outcome using the observable evidence and the predefined Success/Stop Criteria.

Observable Evidence for Decision:

43 ideas captured on paper, 19 audio files. No lateness observed. Sleep duration and quality unchanged except for one shorter night.

- ☒ **Keep** (criteria met as defined)
- ○ **Modify** (partially met/adjust design)
- ○ **Abort** (not met/change unsuitable)

9. Reflection on the Trial

What changed? What did not change? What does this suggest about how the behavior fits into your life? Did the trial create unintended effects or displace something important?

Success criteria met and goal achieved. Ideas are no longer lost.

Car ideas tend to be work-focused; shower ideas are broader and often generate new writing directions. Bedtime recordings are less clear but occasionally useful. The structure is worthwhile but may need refinement for nighttime capture.

10. Next Steps

Based on the trial, what will you do now (e.g., continue, adjust, begin a new trial, or schedule a review)?

Structural change worked. Keep calendar reminder every three weeks to check notepad usability. Weekly reminder to review audio captures. Review overall decision in six months (calendar event set).

Integration Worksheet Example 3: Writing Interventions (both unsuccessful but useful)

Step	Example 3a: Words per Day Intervention	Example 3b: Morning Writing Sessions
1. Reason for Change	Writing output is inconsistent. Long gaps occur when structure is unclear. Aim is to increase regular production.	Progress on a long-form project is uneven. Aim is to maintain continuity through regular sessions.
2. Current Pattern	Writing happens irregularly. Productive bursts alternate with avoidance during structurally uncertain phases.	Work advances in bursts separated by long re-entry periods. Mornings are predictable and available.
3. Goal Behaviors	Produce text daily to test whether output regularity improves project progress.	Establish regular contact with the manuscript to reduce re-entry cost.
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: After morning coffee. Start Action: Sit at desk and open manuscript. Behavior: Write until 500 words are reached; no editing allowed. Time Source: Replace morning news reading.	Trigger: Immediately after morning routine. Start Action: Sit at writing desk. Behavior: Write for 30–45 minutes; no editing or research allowed. Time Source: Reallocated from discretionary morning time.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria	Success: ≥ 500 words on ≥ 80% of days. Abort: Target met primarily through unusable filler OR adherence drops below 50%. Ambiguity: Words later deleted still count if written that day.	Success: ≥ 90% of scheduled sessions completed. Abort: Sessions completed but no new sections or structural advances occur Ambiguity: Session counts if time completed regardless of output.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 4 week. Decision Date: 28.06. Check-ins: Daily reminder.	Duration: 6 weeks Decision Date: 12.01. Check-ins: Weekly adherence check.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	Week 1: 5/7 days met target. Week 2: 3/7 days. Week 3: 2/7 days. Week 4: 2/7 days.	27 of 30 planned sessions completed. No missed weeks; adherence high.
8. Decision	ABORT — Criteria not met.	ABORT — Abort condition triggered (activity without project-level progress).
9. Reflection on the Trial	The fixed quantity requirement conflicted with phases of structural uncertainty. Output increased when structure was clear and degraded into filler when it was not.	The routine stabilized engagement but enabled repeated local refinement rather than advancing unresolved structural work.
10. Next Steps	Test milestone-based or time-boxed sessions aligned to structural progress.	Replace habit-based sessions with milestone-driven work tied to unresolved project decisions.
Notes	This trial failed not due to lack of discipline, but due to mismatch between constraint and task structure («Wrong Lever»). The constraint (word count) assumes structural certainty, but the task actually involved high structural uncertainty. The metric incentivized filler text when the structure was unstable and resistance increased because the constraint distorted the work.	The failure was not lack of consistency, but misalignment between the habit and the level of difficulty required to move the project forward. This is a case where high adherence and low resistance are not evidence of progress. Habits can stabilize avoidance just as well as they stabilize work. As the decision point was honored, it became apparent in the reflection. Otherwise this pattern could have continued for months or years.

Integration Worksheet Example 4: Artistic Project (allowing for inspiration)

Step	Example 4a: Inspiration — Successful Version	Example 4b: Inspiration — Failed Version
1. Reason for Change	Painting depends on unpredictable inspiration, resulting in long inactive periods. Test whether studio exposure increases the occurrence of productive sessions.	Painting output is low. Long periods pass without entering the studio. Work depends entirely on spontaneous inspiration.
2. Current Pattern	Irregular studio use. Intensive work during rare inspired periods. Extended gaps with no contact with materials.	Studio is used only when inspiration appears. On most days no studio contact occurs. No external structure influences frequency of work.
3. Goal Behaviors	Increase number of studio contacts and observe whether inspired sessions occur more frequently.	Paint only when inspiration is present.
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: Calendar reminders three days/week. Start Action: Enter studio. Behavior: Remain for 30 minutes performing material-based tasks (prepare canvases, mix paint, adjust works, sketch). Painting allowed but not required. Time Source: Reallocated from discretionary evening time (30 minutes).	Trigger: Wait for inspiration. Start Action: None defined. Behavior: Paint if inspiration appears. Time Source: Not specified.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria Success: Abort: Ambiguity:	Success: ≥ 12 studio visits over 5 weeks AND ≥ 1 completed or clearly advanced work. Abort: Avoidance increases (miss ≥ 3 planned visits consecutively) Ambiguity: Sessions count even if no painting occurs.	Success: Work «feels authentic». Abort: Not defined. Ambiguity: All outcomes judged subjectively.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 5 weeks Decision Date: 07.05. Check-ins: Weekly adherence check.	Duration: 4 weeks Decision Date: 28.06. Check-ins: None scheduled.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	12 / 15 planned visits completed. Inspired painting occurred during 6 visits. 1 painting finished; 1 advanced substantially.	Two brief painting moments occurred. No completed work. No studio visits without inspiration.
8. Decision	KEEP — Success criteria met.	Cannot be determined from criteria (no measurable thresholds).
9. Reflection on the Trial	Physical studio access increased probability of extended work sessions. Inspiration appeared during activity rather than before it.	No constraint was introduced. Existing behavior remained unchanged. No comparison condition existed.
10. Next Steps	Continue scheduled studio access. Reassess after two months.	Continue current pattern.
Notes	This configuration respects inspiration as a phenomenon while removing the structural conditions that prevent it from occurring. Respecting inspiration does not mean obeying it blindly and access conditions matter more than internal states.	This is a failed trial in the sense that nothing was really tested, just avoidance behavior confirmed. The «trial» preserved the Status Quo perfectly. The worksheet was used to protect an identity, not to test a configuration. This is not a failure of inspiration — it is a failure of trial design. And this self-sabotage often looks principled, calm, and consistent.



Integration Worksheet Example 5: Artistic Project (many studies but almost no finished works)

Step	Finishing Artistic Works — Successful Version	Finishing Artistic Works — Failed Version
1. Reason for Change	I generate sketches constantly but rarely complete paintings. Months pass with no finished work to exhibit or evaluate. This blocks artistic development because unfinished work never encounters reality.	I start many paintings but rarely complete them. I want to produce finished works consistently.
2. Current Pattern	Start new canvases frequently. Work intensely for 1–2 sessions, then lose interest once difficulty increases. Studio accumulates partial work. No external deadlines. If nothing changes, I will continue producing studies but no resolved pieces.	Begin new canvases frequently. Lose interest once difficulties arise. Studio fills with unfinished work.
3. Goal Behaviors	Produce completed paintings at a steady rate without reducing exploratory sketches. Constraint: must not eliminate experimentation phase.	Work more consistently and professionally in the studio. ***(Problem already: goal is vague and does not specify completion.)***
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: Entering studio on weekdays. Start Action: Select one pre-existing canvas labeled «finish». Behavior: Work only on that canvas for the first 45 minutes. No new canvases allowed during that time. Time Source: Replaces the usual exploratory warm-up.	Trigger: Start of each studio day. Start Action: Fill out session worksheet and prepare materials. Behavior: Follow a structured workflow (warm-up sketch, palette planning, written intention, reflection afterward). Time Source: Added on top of normal studio time.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria Success: Abort: Ambiguity:	Success: 3 finished paintings within 6 weeks. Abort: If exploratory work drops to near zero or studio avoidance increases for more than 5 sessions. Ambiguity: A painting counts as finished when signed and photographed, not when it «feels done».	Success: Complete the workflow on at least 20 studio days. Abort: If motivation drops. Ambiguity: Productive engagement counts even if no painting is finished.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 6 weeks Decision on: May 15 Check-ins: Weekly photo documentation.	Duration: 6 weeks Decision on: Not fixed («will review when it feels complete») Check-ins: Daily logs.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	Logged sessions completed vs. avoided. Four initial resistance days, then routine stabilized.	22 workflow sessions completed. Detailed notes recorded. No paintings finished.
8. Decision	4 paintings completed. Criteria exceeded → Keep	Felt highly engaged and structured → Continued. (No criteria tied to actual outcome.)
9. Reflection on the Trial	Constraint forced engagement with difficulty phase instead of novelty seeking. Exploratory work resumed naturally after the 45-minute block.	Studio practice feels more serious and intentional. I am thinking more deeply about painting.
10. Next Steps	Maintain structure. Next trial may adjust duration window.	Continue refining the workflow.
Notes	The worksheet corrected a focus imbalance, not skill or motivation. Behavioral constraint redirected existing capacity.	Protocol Fetishism + Infinite Pilot The protocol replaced the artistic outcome and removed the decision point.

Integration Worksheet Example 6: Knowledge Work (reads extensively but little written synthesis)

Step	Written Synthesis — Successful Version	Written Synthesis — Failed Version
1. Reason for Change	Large volume of reading accumulates without generating publishable output. Insight remains internal and decays.	I read a lot but want to feel more productive intellectually.
2. Current Pattern	Daily reading and annotation. Writing postponed until «understanding is complete», which never occurs.	Continuous reading and annotating without producing finished arguments.
3. Goal Behaviors	Externalize understanding continuously in small written artifacts.	Spend dedicated time writing every day. (Time defined, output undefined.)
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: End of each reading session. Start Action: Open document titled «Today's Claim». Behavior: Write a 200–300 word synthesis stating one arguable claim derived from the reading. Time Source: Uses final 20 minutes previously spent extending reading.	Trigger: 14:00 each weekday. Start Action: Open writing document. Behavior: Work for 30 minutes on research material. Time Source: Added as new task.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria Success: Abort: Ambiguity:	Success: ≥20 synthesis notes in 4 weeks. Abort: Writing time expands beyond 30 minutes or replaces core research tasks. Ambiguity: Notes count even if later discarded.	Success: Complete 30-minute session at least 5x per week. Abort: If sessions feel too stressful. Ambiguity: Editing, outlining, or rereading all count as writing.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 4 weeks Decision on: April 30 Check-ins: Weekly count.	Duration: 4 weeks Decision on: End of month Check-ins: Habit tracker.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	23 notes produced. Writing became easier after day 5.	Sessions completed: 19/20. Mostly reorganized notes and references.
8. Decision	Criteria met → Keep	Adherence high → Keep.
9. Reflection on the Trial	Writing exposed gaps faster than reading. Did not reduce reading quality.	The routine feels stable and sustainable. (No increase in produced text.)
10. Next Steps	Introduce monthly review trial to convert notes into papers.	Extend the routine.
Notes	The issue was a capture → realization break in the system. The worksheet restored flow between stages.	Quiet Stall Behavior succeeded; the intellectual output never changed.

Integration Worksheet Example 7: Personal Habit (more connected to outside world)

Step	Connected to Outside World — Successful Version	Connected to Outside World — Failed Version
1. Reason for Change	Daily life is functional but experientially flat. Weeks pass without meaningful outdoor exposure, which reduces perceptual engagement and sense of time passing.	I want to feel more connected to the world around me.
2. Current Pattern	Leave home only for necessary tasks. No deliberate outdoor presence.	Stay indoors unless necessary.
3. Goal Behaviors	Regular, non-utilitarian outdoor exposure anchored to existing rhythms.	Spend more meaningful time outside. (Internal-state definition.)
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: After Saturday morning coffee. Start Action: Put on shoes and leave apartment immediately. Behavior: Walk predefined 20-minute loop without phone use. Time Source: Replaces passive weekend browsing.	Trigger: Free time during the week. Start Action: Decide to go outside if it feels right. Behavior: Be outdoors mindfully. Time Source: Flexible.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria Success: Abort: Ambiguity:	Success: 5 walks completed in 6 weeks. Abort: If walks are repeatedly postponed or extended into errands. Ambiguity: Weather variation does not cancel requirement.	Success: Feel more grounded and aware. Abort: If the activity feels forced. Ambiguity: Any outdoor presence counts.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 6 weeks Decision on: June 1 Check-ins: Mark calendar completion.	Duration: «As long as needed» Decision on: None defined Check-ins: Occasional journaling.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	5 walks completed; 1 skipped due to travel.	Went outside irregularly. Wrote reflections about mood.
8. Decision	Success threshold met → Keep	Believed it was helpful → Continue informally.
9. Reflection on the Trial	Behavior became neutral routine rather than special activity. Not dramatic, but stabilizing.	Sometimes meaningful, sometimes not. Hard to say.
10. Next Steps	Add seasonal variation trial (change route monthly).	Try to be outside more often.
Notes	The worksheet translated an abstract desire («feel connected») into a repeatable environmental interaction without trying to measure feelings.	Self-Sealing Loop + Status Quo Preserved No observable requirement; the original pattern remained intact.

Integration Worksheet Example 8: Social Habit (weekly shared meal to improve family contact)

Step	Shared Meal — Successful Version	Shared Meal — Failed Version
1. Reason for Change	Family interaction occurs mainly through short logistical exchanges. Weeks pass without shared time.	Family contact is irregular and mostly logistical. There is no recurring shared time.
2. Current Pattern	Contact averages 1–2 brief calls per month. No recurring structure anchors interaction.	Calls and visits happen sporadically and require coordination. No shared rhythm exists.
3. Goal Behaviors	Establish predictable weekly contact that integrates without additional planning.	Introduce a weekly shared meal to create recurring contact.
4. Change Behaviors	Trigger: Fixed weekly time (Sunday 18:30, repeating calendar event). Start Action: Arrive and begin eating. Behavior: Share a simple meal for ≥30 minutes; food may be takeout or prepared individually. No hosting expectations, no rescheduling unless unavoidable. Time Source: Reallocated from discretionary evening time.	Trigger: Sunday evening, flexible if needed. Start Action: Arrange to meet. Behavior: Cook together or organize a shared meal intended to feel meaningful. Time Source: Additional coordination and preparation time required each week.
5. Success/ Stop Criteria Success: Abort: Ambiguity:	Success: ≥ 6 of 8 meals occur as scheduled with minimal coordination Abort: Two consecutive cancellations or sustained negotiation required Ambiguity: Conversation quality not evaluated.	Success: Meals occur regularly. Abort: Scheduling becomes difficult or inconsistent. Ambiguity: Experience of the meal used as evaluation.
6. Trial Duration	Duration: 8 weeks Decision Date: End of week 8. Check-ins: Weekly occurrence check.	Duration: 8 weeks Decision Date: End of week 8. Check-ins: None defined.
7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior	7 of 8 meals occurred. One skipped due to travel (no reschedule). Average duration ~45 minutes. Coordination messages decreased after week 3.	Week 1 occurred. Week 2 rescheduled twice. Week 3 canceled. Week 4 occurred with preparation stress. Week 5 moved to restaurant due to time pressure. Week 6 canceled. Week 7 shortened. Week 8 not scheduled.
8. Decision	KEEP — Criteria met.	ABORT — Recurrence not established.
9. Reflection on the Trial	Fixed timing removed the need to decide each week. The simplicity of the format allowed repetition without added effort.	The intervention required weekly planning, preparation, and negotiation. The added effort prevented the behavior from stabilizing.
10. Next Steps	Maintain as standing structure; review after 6 months for drift.	Redesign around fixed timing and minimal preparation rather than a shared ritual.
Notes	This trial worked because it tested recurrence, not meaning. A fixed time, minimal expectations, and removal of preparation made participation predictable and sustainable. The structure carried the behavior; the quality of interaction emerged from showing up repeatedly rather than being engineered.	This trial failed because it attempted to create a meaningful event rather than test a repeatable structure. The added coordination, preparation, and flexibility increased friction instead of reducing it. What looked like care and intentionality functioned as load, preventing the behavior from stabilizing.

Integration Worksheet: _____

1. Reason for Change

What is happening or not happening that makes this worth changing now? Describe the situation, not the cause. Litmus Test: If this were solved, would it matter in six months?

2. Current Pattern

What is currently happening and how does it continue if nothing changes (frequency/duration, actions, consequences, trajectory)?

3. Goal Behaviors

What would you be doing differently if this worked? What should change, and what must remain stable?

4. Change Behaviors

Plan for normal life conditions, not ideal ones. Specify what will prompt the action, how you start, what you do, and where the required time and attention come from.

Trigger:

Start Action:

Behavior:

Time Source:

5. Success/Stop Criteria

What observable results count as working? What outcome will make you stop? Which foreseeable edge cases need to be decided in advance?

Success:

Abort:

Ambiguity:

6. Trial Duration

How long must this run to judge whether the behavior integrates? When will you decide, and how will you ensure the trial stays visible?

Duration:

Decision on:

Check in:

7. Run the Trial — Log Behavior

Record only what is needed to evaluate the Success/Stop Criteria. Log what happened — times, actions, deviations — without interpretation.

8. Decision

Determine the outcome using the observable evidence and the predefined Success/Stop Criteria.

Observable Evidence for Decision:

- ○ **Keep** (criteria met as defined)
- ○ **Modify** (partially met/adjust design)
- ○ **Abort** (not met/change unsuitable)

9. Reflection on the Trial

What changed? What did not change? What does this suggest about how the behavior fits into your life? Did the trial create unintended effects or displace something important?

10. Next Steps

Based on the trial, what will you do now (e.g., continue, adjust, begin a new trial, or schedule a review)?