

- About...

The Document

The ideas you are about to read began more than three decades ago. In 1995 I documented and registered early manuscripts with the U.S. Copyright Office that outlined the core framework now known as *Behavior's Common Denominator – The Theory of Behavior*.

At the time, the work was raw—a bold hypothesis about the roots of human thought, decision-making, and change. Over the years, I continued to refine, test, and expand the model, incorporating insights from emerging research, real-world observations, and evolving psychological and behavioral sciences.

The 2025 edition before you represents the culmination of this journey: a complete, expanded, and updated presentation of the theory, supported by decades of continuous refinement.

While the foundational concepts remain faithful to their original form, every chapter has been reworked for clarity, depth, and applicability to today's world. This is not merely a reprint of past ideas—it is the most comprehensive and practical articulation of a theory that has been in development for over 30 years.

I invite you to approach these pages knowing they are grounded in both the persistence of time and the urgency of the present moment.

— *D.M. Chabon*

The document is readily available:

At

thetheoryofbehavior.com

White paper with download, discussion, commentary and communication options.

On Amazon

For Paperback (ASIN: BOFV3C4YJK) Or E-Book (ASIN: B0FHC25T2W)

Behavior's Common Denominator – The Theory of Behavior

Project At

Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/3fcnw/>

Identifier: DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/QP8VK

Email

thetheoryofbehavior@gmail.com

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2557-1009>

Feedback is requested; All inquiries are entertained.

The Author

I am an Applied Behavioral Scientist, both by certified academic training and by many, many years of work “in the field.” I have tried OD, TA, MBO, most job enrichment designs, job enlargement, participation plans, incentive systems, reinforcement designs, and pretty much everything else the applied behavioral scientists could devise. I have tried this in the largest Fortune corporations, internationally, in trades, civic organizations, government, personally and in systems that were purported to be socialist. I have participated (both formally and informally) as an employee, a consultant, an observer, a manager and as a “technical expert.” My specialty was originally industrial/organizational.

But I began noting difficulties with this subject long ago, right after college, when an effort to do my job was followed by the realization that what I learned in graduate school was either wrong, or incomplete, or something - it just didn't work. Not well. Not reliably (like a science should.) And further offerings from “experts” weren't much better. So, I tried to figure it out. And while questions came early, insights took longer.

My professional career began as a Staff Associate in the large Midwest manufacturing facility of one of the biggest Fortune 500 Corporations. This complex of plants was the workplace of several thousand employees fabricating cable and wire switching equipment while personifying what literature had dubbed the “Blue Collar Blues.” Management, as is often the case, was interested in maximizing productivity and sought techniques to accomplish that end. Being a large corporation with a history participating in behavioral science research we regularly were visited by high-end consultants who would advocate then apply their latest trend. But we never saw a sustained result, or any result of note. Another consultant would show up; old-timers would shake their heads; time would pass; not much would change; and I wondered why.

Early work assignments allowed me to wander the shop floors. I liked it out there. I'd talk with operations, hang out with the crafts, drink coffee with supervisors and meet with managers and QC, and union reps too. Why were some work groups productive and some not? Some people more so than others? The machinery was constant. The organization was constant. The variable was the employee. But while the work environment was critical it was clearly only part of the picture. As one foreman reflectively put it, “...they bring more to work than their lunch.”

Of interest was Mike. I knew Mike because on joining the company my assigned desk in their ‘sea of desks’ was by chance directly in front of his desk. But then Mike was promoted to supervisor in the shops and we lost touch for some time. Every now and then, though, someone would mention his name. People liked working for him. When he took over an operation productivity would jump, and quality would climb. Absenteeism and turnover became minuscule - notable results in that environment. And furthermore, it turned out that when he was transferred to a different department (due to a rotational system) his old group's performance would slide to factory norms while the new ones would climb. And even more enticing was that when

management caught wind of his results and tried to institutionalize his “process” there was no change in overall plant performance. But Mike’s groups continued to excel, and I wondered why.

The result of this was a career-long inquiry that eventually resulted in the development of a white paper, called *Behavior’s Common Denominator - The Theory of Behavior*. A fundamental comprehensive algorithm for human behavior – the algorithm behind our decisions and actions. Feedback is requested; all inquiries are entertained. As this is about all of us, we’re all the ones best able to give “peer review.”

[Note: As my employers and affiliations were often my subjects, I do not cite them by name.]