CHANGE & TRANSFORMATION

WHY MOST CHANGE DOESN'T LAST

An Action–Response Principle Essay

DEANO GOMES-LUIS

Why Most Change Doesn’t Last

By Deano Gomes-Luis

ISBN: 9798248073757

Preface

This book is not a guide to managing change.

It does not offer a framework, a methodology, or a set of steps to follow. It does not attempt to improve existing change practices, nor does it promise to make change easier or faster.

That work exists elsewhere.

This book is concerned with something more basic — and more elusive.

It is about understanding why change so often fails to hold, even when it is well designed, carefully managed, and supported by capable people.

If you work in change or transformation, you already know this experience.

The program launches well.
Engagement is genuine.
Early momentum is real.

And yet, over time, something fades.

Behaviour softens.
Priorities revert.
What once felt important becomes optional.

Nothing dramatic breaks.

The change simply does not last.

Most explanations for this point to resistance, culture, or execution. This book takes a different approach. It looks not at what was intended or delivered, but at what was experienced — and what organisations quietly learn as a result.

Like What Happens Next, this book is about seeing.

It is about noticing patterns that are already present but rarely named. About understanding why outcomes unfold the way they do, without rushing to fix them.

If at times this book feels incomplete, that is deliberate.

The moment a reader begins asking, “So what should I do?”, evaluation replaces recognition. And evaluation is not the work of this book.

This book is designed to sharpen perception, not prescribe action.

For those looking for tools, methods, or execution guidance, this book will feel unsatisfying. For those willing to sit with a different way of understanding change, it may offer something more enduring.

What follows is an exploration of change as it is lived — by staff, by systems, and by those whose role it is to help change succeed.

Nothing here requires you to adopt a new way of working.

But once you see what is being described, it becomes difficult to ignore.

Contents

Introduction

Most change does not fail loudly.

There is no dramatic rejection.
No obvious breakdown.
No moment where everyone agrees the effort was wasted.

Instead, something quieter happens.

A change is launched.
People participate.
New language appears.

For a time, it feels like progress.

Then, gradually, the energy thins.

Old habits return at the edges.
Attention shifts.
What once felt urgent becomes conditional.

From the outside, this looks like resistance or fatigue. From the inside, it feels more like realism.

This pattern is so common that it is often accepted as inevitable.

Change is hard.
People don't like it.
Organisations revert.

These explanations are familiar — and incomplete.

They focus on intent, effort, and execution. They assume that if change were managed better, explained more clearly, or reinforced more strongly, it would last.

But many of the people reading this book already know that this is not the whole story.

They have seen well-run change still fade.
They have seen engaged staff still pull back.
They have seen good work quietly undone by everyday reality.

This book starts from that experience.

It does not attempt to improve change practice. It attempts to explain something that change practice often overlooks: how people and systems learn from what happens after change is announced.

Because before change becomes behaviour, and before it becomes habit or culture, it becomes experience.

People notice what effort costs.
They notice which priorities survive pressure.
They notice what happens when attention moves on.

These observations shape behaviour far more reliably than intention or instruction.

This book follows that trail.

It looks at change from the inside — from the perspective of those expected to carry it, and from the systems that quietly remember what has worked and what has not.

Only later does it name the principle that ties these observations together.

Until then, it simply describes what is already happening.

If you are looking for guidance on how to run change programs, this book will not help you.

If you are trying to understand why change so often fails to hold — even when it is well executed — this book is written for you.

The work begins not with action, but with attention.

Chapter 1: Why Change Doesn't Hold

Change has become a familiar activity in modern organisations.

Strategies are refreshed.
Operating models are redesigned.
Transformations are launched with care and investment.

The plans are thoughtful.
The intent is genuine.

And still, something keeps happening.

The change looks successful at first.
People engage.
New language appears in meetings and updates.

For a while, it feels like momentum.

Then, gradually, without drama, things begin to soften.

Old habits re-emerge.
Energy thins.
Attention moves elsewhere.

Nothing collapses.
The change doesn't fail loudly.

It simply doesn't hold.

This pattern is so common that it is often accepted as normal.
Change is expected to be difficult.
Reversion is treated as predictable.

Yet this explanation never quite satisfies.

Because the same thing happens even when:

- leaders are aligned
- communication is clear
- engagement is real

The problem is not ignorance.
It is not laziness.

Capable organisations, advised by experienced professionals, continue to see well-designed change quietly dissolve.

Which raises an uncomfortable question.

If effort is real and expertise is present, why does this keep happening?

Most explanations point outward.

People are resistant.
Culture is entrenched.
Middle management blocks progress.

These explanations are familiar — and incomplete.
They assume that if people understood the change better, or believed in it more, it would last.

But lived experience suggests something else.

People often do adopt change — briefly.
They attend the sessions.
They adjust behaviour while attention is present.

What they do not do is sustain it once pressure returns and focus shifts.

That gap — between initial adoption and lasting change — is where most transformations quietly fail.

Instead of examining that gap directly, organisations respond by increasing communication, refreshing initiatives, or re-labelling priorities.

Each response assumes the problem is insufficient effort, rather than misplaced attention.

This book starts from a different place.

It does not ask how to design better change.
It asks why change fades even when it is well designed.

Because before change becomes behaviour, before it becomes habit or culture, it becomes experience.

And experience has consequences.

Understanding those consequences is where this book begins.

Chapter 2: When Expertise Isn't the Missing Ingredient

When change fails to hold, the explanation is usually sought in the wrong place.

The assumption is subtle but powerful:
if something didn't stick, something must have been missing.

More clarity.
More alignment.
More engagement.

For professional change and transformation agents, this assumption carries weight. The work is specialised. The methods are sound. Programs are designed carefully and delivered with intent. When change fades anyway, the failure feels professionally unsettling.

If expertise is present and effort is real, what else could be missing?

This is where explanations turn inward.

Perhaps leadership sponsorship weakened.
Perhaps middle management didn't follow through.
Perhaps the workforce resisted.

These explanations are familiar. They preserve a comforting belief: that with enough refinement, adoption should follow.

But this belief does not align with lived experience.

Highly capable change agents see the same pattern repeated across industries. Well-run programs generate early momentum and visible participation — only to watch behaviour soften once attention moves on.

This is not a marginal problem.
It is the defining frustration of change work.

And it persists precisely because competence is not the issue.

Most professional change agents understand complexity. They recognise that systems adapt in unexpected ways. What is harder to accept is that even when those complexities are handled well, something essential can still be missed.

That "something" is rarely technical.

The methods work.
The sequencing makes sense.

What fails is not the design of the change, but the assumption about how change becomes durable.

Much of professional change practice treats adoption as a milestone to be achieved. Once enough people understand, agree, or comply, the change is considered embedded.

Yet this is not how change unravels.

People often do what is asked — especially while attention is present. From the outside, this looks like success.

But while the change is being delivered, people are learning something else.

They are learning what the change costs.
They are learning what happens when pressure rises.
They are learning which priorities survive conflict.

These lessons are learned through response.

And this is where professional change agents are most exposed.

Their work is visible early, when activity is high. What happens later — when attention shifts and reinforcement weakens — often sits outside their formal scope.

By the time durability is judged, the work has already moved on.

This creates a structural blind spot.

Change agents are evaluated on delivery, while durability is decided in the accumulation of responses that follow.

This is why experienced professionals can do everything "right" and still feel something slipping away.

Change does not persist because it was well explained.
It persists because the system learned something consistent enough to trust.

Until that distinction is recognised, effort will continue to be applied in the right places — and still miss the moment where change either takes root or quietly begins to fade.

Chapter 3: The Illusion of Adoption

One of the most persistent illusions in change work is the belief that early activity equals adoption.

People attend the sessions.
They use the new language.
They follow the updated process.

From a distance, this looks like success.

Progress is visible.
Momentum appears real.
The change seems to be taking hold.

And yet, time and again, this apparent adoption proves fragile.

When pressure rises, behaviour softens.
When attention moves elsewhere, old patterns return.
When trade-offs appear, priorities quietly revert.

This is not because people were dishonest earlier.
It is because something else was happening at the same time.

What is often called “adoption” is, in many cases, something closer to probation.

People are not deciding whether they agree with the change.
They are watching what happens around it.

They are noticing:

- what effort costs in practice
- how leaders respond when things go wrong
- whether the new way survives conflict with existing priorities

These observations begin immediately, but they rarely announce themselves.
Instead, they accumulate quietly.

Early compliance is easy to misread because it is visible. Attendance can be tracked. Training can be completed. Language can be observed. These are tangible signals, and they are reassuring.

But compliance does not require trust.
It requires only enough safety to participate while attention is present.

Commitment forms later.
It forms when people decide — often unconsciously — whether the change is worth investing in once the spotlight moves on.

That decision is not made in workshops or town halls.
It is made in the small moments that follow.

A priority clash that reveals what really matters.
A mistake that tests whether learning is protected or punished.
A signal that the change is optional when things get difficult.

These moments carry more weight than the launch itself.

Change programs often conclude while these lessons are still forming. Reports are written. Milestones are marked complete. Adoption is declared.

What happens next is left to the system.

This is why the illusion of adoption persists.

The most visible indicators of change appear early.
The most consequential indicators appear later — when attention has already shifted elsewhere.

From the outside, it can look like people changed their minds.
From the inside, it feels more like people finished learning.

Once those lessons settle, behaviour adjusts accordingly.

This adjustment is rarely dramatic.
People do not announce disengagement.
They simply thin their investment.

They comply where required.
They hedge where possible.
They revert where it feels safe to do so.

This is often explained as resistance or fatigue.
But what is happening is not rejection.

It is interpretation.

And as long as adoption is treated as a decision people make at a moment in time, change will continue to be evaluated too early — long before the conditions that determine whether it holds have been revealed.

Chapter 4: What Change Feels Like When It's Done to You

From the inside, change does not arrive as strategy.

It arrives as interruption.

Work that once felt familiar is unsettled.
Expectations shift.
Priorities are reweighted.

For staff, change is not first experienced as an idea to evaluate.
It is experienced as a disturbance to an existing understanding of how things work.

That understanding is rarely written down.
It lives in habit, rhythm, and accumulated experience.

This is how effort has paid off here.
This is what gets noticed.
This is what is safe to say.

Change disrupts that contract before it improves anything.

Before opinions form, before resistance appears, staff experience a period of heightened alertness.
Behaviour becomes more careful. Attention sharpens.

This is not disengagement.
It is assessment.

Change introduces risk long before it introduces benefit.

Even well-intentioned change asks people to expose themselves:

- to new expectations
- to unfamiliar measures of success
- to scrutiny while learning

So, the first question staff ask is not whether the change is sensible.

It is whether the change is safe.

Will mistakes be treated as learning, or as failure?
Will effort here be recognised, or quietly disappear?
Will this priority survive when pressure rises?

These questions are rarely spoken aloud.
They do not need to be.

They are answered through experience.

Early in change, staff often participate willingly. They attend sessions. They try new behaviours. They use the language that is being introduced.

From the outside, this looks like openness.

From the inside, it often feels provisional.

Participation is a way of staying visible while gathering information.

People are not deciding whether to believe in the change.
They are watching what happens around it.

They notice when effort is protected — and when it is not.
They notice when leaders hold the line — and when they quietly revert.

If effort is met with curiosity, people lean in.
If effort is met with silence, they pull back.
If risk is punished once, it is rarely taken again.

None of this requires cynicism.
It is simply how people adapt to conditions.

From the staff perspective, change that does not hold is rarely experienced as failure.
It is experienced as clarification.

The system has shown what really matters.
It has revealed what will last.

So when behaviour returns to earlier patterns, it is not because people have forgotten the change.

It is because they have learned something more durable.

What looks like resistance from above often feels like realism from below.
What looks like disengagement often reflects prior cost.

Change does not fail because people refuse to carry it.
It fails because the environment teaches them — through response — that carrying it is not worth the risk.

Chapter 5: Why Organisations Revert

When change fades, it is often described as forgetting.

The organisation lost focus.
People slipped back into old habits.

This language is misleading.

Most organisations do not forget change.
They remember something else.

They remember what happened after the change was announced.
They remember how effort was treated.
They remember which behaviours quietly carried a cost.

People do not recall the wording of the strategy.
They recall what happened when priorities collided.
They recall how mistakes were handled under pressure.

These recollections shape expectation.
Expectation becomes pattern.

This is why reversion is so common.

From the outside, it looks like the organisation returned to its old ways.

From the inside, it feels like the organisation continued doing what experience taught it would last.

Change that does not hold rarely collapses suddenly.
It thins.

Language becomes optional.
Practices survive only when attention is present.

This erosion is not random.
It reflects a lesson that has already been learned.

At some point, often early, the system discovered that the change was provisional.
It mattered while it was visible.
It softened when pressure arrived.

That lesson did not need to be explained.
It was absorbed.

This is why repeated change initiatives feel familiar to staff.

Each new program is evaluated against memory.

How did the last one end?
What happened when enthusiasm faded?

These questions do not signal resistance.
They signal learning.

When organisations describe themselves as cynical, they are often encountering history.

History of effort that was not protected.
History of priorities that did not endure.

From this perspective, organisational memory becomes the real battleground of change.

It is not enough for a change to be logical.
It must be experienced as durable.

Otherwise, memory defaults to what came before.

This is also why change fatigue is a misleading concept.

People are not tired of change itself.
They are tired of investing in change that does not last.

Each time a change fades, it leaves behind a residue — a narrowing of effort, a reluctance to fully commit next time.

Over time, this residue accumulates.

The organisation does not become resistant.
It becomes cautious.

This caution is rational.

It reflects a system that has learned to protect itself from repeated disappointment.

Seen this way, reversion is not an accident.

It is memory, doing exactly what memory does.

Chapter 6: The Blind Spot in Best Practice

Most change and transformation practices are not misguided.

They are thoughtful.
They are structured.
They draw on experience across industries.

They emphasise clarity, communication, engagement, leadership alignment, and careful rollout.
These elements matter. They often make the difference between chaos and coherence at launch.

And yet, even when these practices are followed carefully, change still fades.

This is not because the practices are wrong.
It is because they share a common assumption.

If change is explained well enough and supported visibly enough, people will adopt it — and adoption will hold.

Most change models operate on this belief.

They focus on:

- how people understand change
- how leaders sponsor it
- how resistance is managed
- how engagement is sustained

All of this sits on the action side of the equation.

What happens next is treated as a consequence.

But durability is not decided where change is delivered.
It is decided where response accumulates.

This is the blind spot.

Best practice tends to focus on moments that are visible and controllable: launches, communications, training, governance, milestones. These are important — but they are early.

What determines whether change holds happens later.

In how trade-offs are resolved.
In how mistakes are treated once attention shifts.
In which priorities survive pressure.

These moments rarely sit inside a change plan.

They occur in everyday work, long after the formal program has moved on.

This is why organisations can do everything “by the book” and still feel momentum slipping away.

The book ends before the lesson forms.

Change practices often assume that once people have been engaged and aligned, behaviour will stabilise. But behaviour stabilises only when experience stabilises.

Until then, people remain watchful.

They continue testing whether the change is real.
They continue adjusting effort based on response.

None of this contradicts best practice.
It sits beneath it.

Most change practices are designed to manage transition.
Durability depends on what is reinforced after transition.

When fading change is met with more communication or a re-launch, the same assumption is repeated: that insufficient action is the problem.

What is rarely examined is the experience those actions produce — especially when they collide with existing pressures and incentives.

From inside the system, repeated messaging without consistent reinforcement teaches a clear lesson.

The change matters in theory, but not enough to reshape what truly counts.

That lesson does not need to be stated.
It is learned.

This is not a failure of methodology.
It is a limitation of orientation.

Until success is evaluated where response accumulates — not where action is delivered — change will continue to be judged too early, and reversion will continue to feel mysterious.

Chapter 7: What the System Is Learning

If change does not hold because of what systems learn, then behaviour has to be understood differently.

Behaviour is often treated as the outcome to be managed.
Something to encourage, correct, or control.
A signal of whether change has succeeded or failed.

But from inside a system, behaviour is rarely chosen in isolation.
It is shaped by what has already been learned.

People do not decide how much effort to give in the abstract.
They adjust effort in response to conditions.

They notice where energy is welcomed and where it dissipates.
They notice which priorities endure and which quietly disappear.
They notice what happens when they speak up, take a risk, or try something new.

Over time, these observations settle into expectation.

Expectation guides behaviour long before intention does.

This is why behaviour during change is so often misread.

When people hesitate, it is labelled reluctance.
When they revert, it is labelled resistance.
When they disengage, it is labelled apathy.

But these labels describe outcomes, not causes.

What sits underneath is learning.

The system has taught something — repeatedly, consistently enough to be trusted — and people have adapted.

This adaptation does not require agreement.
It does not require belief.
It does not require motivation.

It requires only experience.

Consider how quickly people learn where not to invest.

A suggestion that goes nowhere.
An idea acknowledged but never acted on.
An effort praised once, then ignored.
A risk taken that quietly carries a cost.

Each of these experiences teaches something small.
Repeated, they teach something durable.

The same is true in the opposite direction.

When effort leads to visible impact.
When priorities survive pressure.
When mistakes are met with curiosity rather than blame.
When speaking up consistently leads somewhere.

These experiences teach as well.

From this perspective, behaviour becomes information.

It tells a story about what the system has been reinforcing — not what people believe or intend.

This is an uncomfortable shift for many organisations.

It means behaviour cannot be fixed without examining conditions.
It means disengagement cannot be addressed without understanding cost.
It means resistance cannot be resolved without looking at history.

Most importantly, it means that change does not fail because people refuse to behave differently.

It fails because the environment does not teach a different pattern strongly enough to replace the old one.

Once this is seen, a subtle but important reframe occurs.

The question is no longer:
Why aren't people doing what we want?

It becomes:
What is the system consistently teaching people to do?

That question changes where attention goes.

Instead of focusing on messages, leaders begin to notice responses.
Instead of correcting behaviour, change agents begin to observe learning.
Instead of interpreting hesitation as attitude, they read it as signal.

This does not make change easier.
It makes it more honest.

Because it removes the fiction that behaviour can be sustained through intent alone.

Change that holds is not enforced.
It is learned.

And learning is shaped by response.

By what happens next.
And then again.
And again.

Once behaviour is understood this way, it becomes impossible to ignore the role of response in shaping outcomes.

What remains is to name this pattern clearly — and to understand what it offers those whose work depends on change actually lasting.

Chapter 8: Seeing Change Through Response

By this point, a pattern should be difficult to ignore.

Change does not hold because it was well designed.
It does not persist because it was clearly explained.
It endures — or fades — based on what the system learns through experience.

That learning happens through response.

What follows action.
What is reinforced.
What quietly costs effort.
What survives pressure.

Up to now, this book has described that pattern without naming it. That was deliberate.

Naming an idea too early invites evaluation.
Seeing it first allows recognition.

The Action–Response Principle gives language to what has already been visible throughout this book.

In its simplest form, it states that the effect of any action is revealed only in the response it creates.
Not in intent. Not in effort. In response.

For change and transformation work, this reframes where success is decided.

Change does not succeed at the point of delivery.
It succeeds — or fails — in the responses that follow.

Consider a familiar moment.

A team member uses the new process for the first time. It slows the meeting slightly. The discussion becomes less efficient. Someone jokes about how much quicker the old way was. The room moves on.

Nothing dramatic happened.
No one rejected the change.

But something was learned.

The new process carries social friction.
Efficiency matters more than consistency.
Reversion is safe.

That lesson may never be discussed.
It may not even be conscious.

But if similar responses repeat, behaviour will adjust.

This is how durability is decided.

The Action–Response Principle does not introduce a new technique. It introduces a different place to look.

Instead of asking whether people understand the change, it asks what the system is teaching through repeated response.

Instead of treating behaviour as something to manage, it treats behaviour as information.

Instead of evaluating success at launch, it looks at what patterns are forming once attention shifts.

This shift does not require authority.
It requires noticing.

For change agents, this can be disorienting.

Much of their professional identity is built around action: designing it, coordinating it, delivering it. ARP asks them to observe what happens after action — especially when nothing dramatic appears to be happening.

But this is precisely where durability is decided.

Small responses repeat.
Signals compound.
Lessons settle.

ARP makes those processes visible.

It does not give control over outcomes.
It gives clarity.

And clarity changes the nature of judgement.

Change agents begin to recognise when a change is becoming symbolic rather than substantive. They sense when early compliance is masking later reversion. They notice when effort is thinning before metrics reveal it.

ARP does not ask them to fix these signals.
It asks them to see them.

And seeing shifts the work.

Chapter 9: The Change Agent's Real Work

Seen through the lens of response, the work of change looks different.

Not simpler.
Not easier.
But clearer.

Much of change and transformation work has been framed as a problem of movement — how to move people from a current state to a future one. The change agent's role, in this framing, is to design the path and encourage people along it.

When change fades, the instinct is to push harder.

More communication.
More engagement.
More reinforcement.

From the Action–Response perspective, this instinct makes sense — and yet it often misses the decisive moment.

Because change does not fail at the point where movement is initiated.
It fails at the point where learning settles.

This reframes the role of the change agent in a subtle but important way.

Change agents are not simply designers of plans or managers of adoption. They are observers of how systems respond. Interpreters of what those responses teach. Witnesses to the moment where change becomes durable — or provisional.

This does not diminish the importance of action.
It changes how action is understood.

Action creates opportunity.
Response determines what survives.

For professional change agents, this distinction can feel uncomfortable.

Much of their value has been defined by what they deliver: programs, artefacts, engagement plans, milestones reached. ARP draws attention to something less tangible and harder to claim ownership over — the experience that forms after delivery.

Yet this is where the real work of change is decided.

When response-awareness is absent, change agents may leave an organisation believing the work is complete, while the system is still learning what to discard. When response-awareness is present, they can sense when a change is quietly losing ground — even if all visible indicators still look positive.

This awareness does not grant control.
It grants honesty.

It allows change agents to recognise when a system is reverting not out of defiance, but out of memory. When effort is thinning not because of laziness, but because cost has become visible. When behaviour is signalling something important long before metrics catch up.

ARP does not ask change agents to fix these signals.
It asks them to see them.

And seeing changes the nature of professional judgement.

Success is no longer defined solely by whether a change was launched well.
It is judged by whether the environment is teaching something consistent enough to last.

This perspective also brings a different kind of responsibility.

Once response is understood as the mechanism through which systems learn, ignoring it is no longer neutral. Attention itself becomes an intervention.

Not because noticing guarantees success — but because not noticing guarantees repetition.

This book has not offered techniques or tools.
It has not prescribed how to design change or embed reinforcement.

That work belongs elsewhere.

What it has done is shift attention.

Away from intent and effort.
Away from plans and proclamations.
Toward experience, response, and learning.

Because change does not become real when it is announced.
It becomes real when it is lived — repeatedly, consistently enough to be trusted.

The Action–Response Principle does not promise that change will be easy.
It explains why change is fragile.

And in doing so, it offers change agents something essential:
a way of seeing what is already shaping their outcomes, quietly and relentlessly, long after the program has ended.

That awareness does not complete the work.
But without it, the work can never truly begin.

Where This Leads Next

This book has been concerned with understanding.

Not with improving change practice.
Not with prescribing better methods.
Not with offering tools to apply.

It has focused instead on where change actually succeeds or fails — in the experience that follows action, and in what organisations learn through response.

That focus is deliberate.

Until response is seen clearly, attempts to improve execution tend to repeat the same pattern. More effort is applied in familiar places, while the conditions that determine whether change holds remain largely untouched.

The work of this book stops at that point.

It does not explore how to design for response.
It does not examine how to reinforce learning once it is visible.
It does not address how leaders, systems, or structures might be reshaped to support durability under pressure.

Those questions require a different kind of engagement.

They move beyond recognition into design, discipline, and decision-making. They ask not only what is happening, but what must be altered — consistently — for change to become something organisations can rely on rather than repeat.

That work sits elsewhere.

The Action–Response Principle extends beyond explanation. It can be used to examine how value is created and lost, how effort is reinforced or stranded, and how systems quietly teach people what truly matters over time.

Exploring that territory means working at the level of execution.

It means confronting trade-offs.
It means designing reinforcement deliberately.
It means paying attention to response long after attention has shifted elsewhere.

This book has not gone there.

Its purpose has been to sharpen perception — to make visible what is already shaping outcomes, often without being noticed.

For some readers, that may be enough.

For others, it will raise new questions.
If this book has changed how you interpret behaviour during change — if it has made you notice responses you previously overlooked — then the next step is not to act quickly, but to sit with that awareness.

Action taken without clarity simply reproduces existing patterns.

Clarity, once established, changes what action becomes possible.

Where that leads depends on the kind of work you are prepared to do.

Further reading and related work

Website: *ActionResponsePrinciple.com*

Books:

- *Value leaking in plain sight: The action–response principle;*
- *The Action-Response Principle: The Strategic and Technical Guide to Value Creation;*
- *Beyond Execution: Turning What You Do Into What They Value;*
- *Making It Land: Action-Response Principle Field Guide;*