

UNITED WISDOM

Procrastination: which part of the task am I avoiding?

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A24 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Procrastination: which part of the task am I avoiding?

Epigraph

> *“situational and task-specific influences”*

Lena Wieland and colleagues, their 2021 study, discussion paragraph on the limits of examining only differences between people. A short fragment about considering the circumstances of academic action in research, rather than an established cause of one person's delay.

What this article is about

A task can look like a single thing from a distance: sort some papers, prepare a gathering, finish a personal project. Yet it contains different actions. You have to decide what to keep, understand something unclear, make a draft, show it to someone, or deal with expectations that do not match. You may willingly do one part while spending weeks without moving to the next. In that situation, the word procrastination names a delay but does not yet explain what is happening. For a decision about your own work, locating the point where it stops can be more useful than drawing an immediate conclusion about your character.

This article considers postponement through a particular task and the observable transitions between its parts. It offers neither a way to identify someone else's hidden motive nor a test of proper productivity. Sometimes a delay concerns missing conditions, an unclear requirement, or disagreement with the goal. Sometimes someone wants to continue but keeps going around one particular action. These situations can be distinguished without a promise to understand yourself completely. It may be enough to see what is already happening, what result was expected next, and what obstructs that transition. A more suitable question, a request for help, or permission to reconsider the task can emerge from there.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A general label conceals different actions

Masha has decided to sort a folder of materials for a small family album. It contains photographs, notes, a few letters, and old tickets. She has bought dividers, labelled envelopes, and carefully straightened the piles. Every free Saturday she opens the folder again and improves something. Yet she has not assembled a single album page. In the evening, it is easy to say, “I put the work off again.” That description is not entirely wrong, but it combines what she did with what she did not do, as if the entire day were empty. It gives her little guidance about the action to return to.

Looking more closely at the last Saturday reveals distinctions. Sorting photographs by year was clear and even interesting. Choosing one photograph for the first page was harder. Masha began comparing similar images, then looked for another storage method, and finished by sorting the envelopes again. The delay occurred before a choice, rather than before any activity involving the folder. This observation does not reveal the reason for the difficulty; different circumstances remain possible. But it changes the subject of the conversation. “Why am I doing nothing?” can become “What is being asked of me when I choose the first photograph?”

This detail matters only in relation to the actual task. Work can be divided endlessly into an elegant diagram that changes nothing. Here, naming a few different actions and the point of the last stop is enough: open the materials, choose one item, make a page, decide whom to show it to. If no transition comes to mind, that is an honest result too. There are not yet grounds for attributing a particular form of avoidance to yourself. Perhaps the task needs greater clarity or suitable working conditions, rather than an even more detailed account of your own behaviour.

Observation need not become an accusation. “I stopped before choosing” reports an action. “I am always afraid of responsibility” already explains many situations through a single characteristic. One evening is not sufficient grounds for that broad conclusion. Someone can leave the explanation open and still make a small decision: choose a criterion, ask for missing information, or consciously pause the album. Locating a delay is useful because it makes a local obstacle available for consideration. It does not have to become the final story of what kind of person Masha is.

II. The intended result and the actual work can diverge

At the beginning of the day, Masha intended to make one page. Later, she notices that her activity repeatedly returned to storing the materials. The difference can be described without judgment: the intended result was a page with a chosen photograph and a caption; the actual result was a better organised folder. The folder really is more convenient, and that work need not be dismissed. It nevertheless does not replace the page if the page remains her chosen goal. Distinguishing the results preserves respect for what has been done while showing which part of the work has not begun.

This comparison does not always indicate procrastination. Sometimes the sequence changes for a reasonable cause. Masha may discover that the photographs are being damaged and protect them first. New materials may alter the project. An earlier plan does not make every subsequent departure a mistake. Before considering postponement, it helps to ask whether the person still wants the result, could at least discuss the transition, and notices that another activity repeatedly replaces it. Even these features do not authorise someone on the outside to establish the person's motive.

Another possibility is that the original goal no longer reflects Masha's wishes. She enjoys preserving documents but does not want to make an album for others to view. The absence of pages may then call for something other than a technique to speed up work. She needs to decide which result she now chooses. She can keep an archive instead of an album, reconsider the timing, or abandon the project. This is a change of task, rather than evidence of successfully overcoming delay. Distinguishing a new goal from an old one matters especially when someone else still expects a promised result and needs to hear about the change.

There is no need to impose one required pace on every personal activity. An album without a deadline can remain unfinished for a long time, and duration alone says nothing about its owner's moral quality. This article has a narrower subject: someone sees a recurring stop in work they want to continue and wishes to understand the particular point. Without that request, observation should not turn into supervision. Help begins by asking whether the person wants to discuss the work, rather than inspecting why an acquaintance has still not completed a personal project.

III. Observing a stop does not explain its cause

You can notice a sequence: Masha chooses an image, hesitates over its caption, and returns to sorting. That sequence does not establish that the caption makes her afraid of being judged. Perhaps she does not know the name of someone in the photograph. Perhaps she does not agree to reveal a family story. Perhaps she is too tired for careful work with words just now. Several plausible explanations can look the same from outside. It therefore helps to separate the observable transition from a proposed explanation, and to avoid presenting the latter as the former, however convincing it seems.

In a 2021 study, Lena Wieland and colleagues examined delays in academic action through students' repeated self-reports. The analysis of academic activities involved 75 participants, with task appraisals and subsequent initiation reported in everyday situations. Such work lets researchers consider differences between episodes within one person, rather than only a general participant characteristic. It is, however, an observational study involving self-reports and a limited sample. It does not establish the cause of Masha's particular delay or justify transferring associations found among students to every adult and every task.

For everyday reflection, a limited distinction is available: the same task may be appraised differently at different moments. Today a caption seems straightforward; tomorrow it seems to disclose too much. Applying a question about a particular episode in this way is an editorial analogy, rather than a reproduction of the research method or a promise of an outcome. You do not have to keep a diary or collect numerical ratings. If recalling the last stop and naming one difficulty is more convenient, that is sufficient for a conversation about a next action. Missing information about yourself need not become another large project.

Separating observation from explanation also protects against overly confident help. A friend might say, “You stopped when you reached the captions; would you like to discuss those?” That invitation remains open to an answer. “You are afraid of showing who you are” assigns a cause in advance and may close off other possibilities. Masha can decline to discuss personal circumstances while asking for technical help with the layout. Coordinating work does not always require revealing an inner history. Sometimes an available condition is enough: this photograph cannot presently be captioned without a confirmed name.

IV. Uncertainty calls for clarification, rather than overcoming yourself

The caption may have no clear requirement. Masha alternates between a date, a short story, and a comment from every relative. Every version seems incomplete because she compares it with several different tasks at once. The stop need not concern an unwillingness to write. The object of the work itself keeps changing. A useful question is concrete: what caption does this page need, and who is it for? The answer can be modest: a name, an approximate year clearly marked as such, and one known detail. A boundary for completing the individual page then becomes available.

Clarification does not have to remove every uncertainty. Masha may know the format and still not know the date. Those gaps call for different decisions. She can choose a format herself if the album is personal; she can leave the date uncertain or investigate it separately. Without the distinction, researching the date may endlessly delay choosing a format, while choosing a format can justify the absence of a page. Separating the questions gives each a place. It does not mean pretending that the unknown date no longer matters. If the uncertainty is significant, it must remain visible in the resulting text.

If someone else set the task, Masha cannot simply invent that person's completion criterion. A shared family project may require agreement about whether a short caption is sufficient, which information remains private, and who checks the names. Asking for clarification can be part of the work. Yet waiting endlessly for a perfect requirement should also be described honestly. If a safe example is possible, she can offer one draft page for discussion. If there is no agreement to use the materials, producing a draft for circulation does not become justified merely because it is easy to revise.

Someone need not prove their competence by acting blindly. In tasks with substantial consequences, a required check may be essential; this article does not suggest substituting an experiment for it. In a safe personal project, a particular question or a limited example can reduce uncertainty. The distinction depends on the circumstances, rather than a wish to tick a box quickly. If clarification shows that the task itself has not been agreed, the next action may be a conversation about its purpose. Continuing at any cost is not the only way to take responsibility for unfinished work.

V. A difficult part may require a skill

Masha knows what caption she wants but cannot place it beside the image in her chosen software. She opens the editor, tries one method, encounters an unexpected line break, and returns to the paper folder. Here, the recurring stop concerns a particular operation she cannot yet perform reliably. Naming that operation is more useful than demanding greater determination. “Learn to design an album” is too large a task. “How can I keep a short caption within this frame?” makes limited technical help possible.

Lack of confidence and lack of skill are not the same thing. Someone may know how to perform an operation while doubting the result; someone else may begin confidently and discover that they do not know the necessary technique. Showing one completed fragment or describing the point of failure can sometimes distinguish these situations. Help need not become an examination. If Masha does not want to show a personal photograph, she can use a neutral example with an empty frame. Checking an operation should respect both the project's content and the person's right to limit access to their materials.

Learning can also replace the work when its subject continually expands. Instead of answering one question about the frame, Masha starts exploring every feature of the editor. The new knowledge may be interesting and useful, but it serves a different goal. It helps to distinguish chosen study of the software from preparation for a particular page. If the second result matters now, one repeatable operation can define the boundary of the help. This is neither a universal limit on learning nor a ban on curiosity. It identifies how much knowledge is actually connected to the transition where the work stopped.

Sometimes the needed skill is unavailable for the moment and alternative methods do not fit. An honest decision then changes the timing, format, or division of work. Asking for help does not oblige a helper to take over immediately. Someone can discuss a particular technique, receive a refusal, and seek another possibility. If help is not available yet, the delay remains a condition of the task rather than evidence of poor character. Describing limits accurately matters because it lets people stop imposing a demand for which there are presently no adequate means.

VI. Selection and disclosure can be different obstacles

Suppose the layout is now clear. Masha can make a page but stops before choosing a letter to include. Some materials contain another person's private words. The question then concerns more than the difficulty of selection. She needs to decide whether the letter can appropriately be shown to the album's audience. Wanting to finish does not remove that question. Not every difficulty with selection is an obstacle to overcome in pursuit of a result. Sometimes a delay reveals an unresolved condition, and limiting the work to materials Masha is entitled to use is a reasonable choice.

A more ordinary situation is also possible: several photographs fit equally well, and excluding the others is difficult. The selection criterion can be simple and local. For example, the first page represents one event, while the remaining photographs stay in the archive. Choosing need not mean that excluded materials are inferior or lose their value. Such a criterion is useful only if it actually serves the project. An arbitrary reduction cannot be presented as a solution to every question of substance. Sometimes several versions need to be retained, or the present album format must be recognised as too narrow for the chosen story.

Showing a completed page can be a separate transition. Before it, Masha works comfortably alone; afterwards, she starts changing the typeface again. From outside, this may resemble delayed selection, but the action has another object: who will see the result, and in what capacity? She can clarify whether the viewing is meant to verify a name and date, invite a general layout comment, or obtain agreement to use the material. Different requests have different boundaries. Someone who only needs an answer about a date does not have to agree simultaneously to discuss the entire family story and every decision they made.

That boundary does not guarantee a convenient response. The other person may still offer broad criticism; Masha can decline to discuss it or postpone the viewing. Clarification should not be presented as a means of controlling someone else's reaction. It identifies her request and consent, rather than securing a particular impression. If viewing takes place under threat or coercion, the task falls outside a voluntary trial. The right to end the discussion matters more than the convenience of finishing a page. Neither a project deadline nor other people's interest makes disclosure of private content obligatory.

VII. Fatigue and unavailable conditions should not be renamed avoidance

Sometimes Masha opens the folder after a long day and simply lacks the attention to read letters. She can still organise envelopes but cannot thoughtfully choose words for a caption. That difference between available actions does not necessarily mean she is going around an unpleasant part. A lighter activity may suit her present capacity. For a decision of her own, naming the condition is useful: attentive reading is not working just now. This does not require forcing herself onward or creating another system to monitor every free evening.

A single outward detail cannot establish whether someone has rested enough. A person may be at home and appear unoccupied while lacking conditions for the chosen work. Other responsibilities, the space, the state of the materials, and the opportunity to concentrate quietly all change the task. This article neither determines causes of fatigue nor provides medical advice. Within its scope, distinguishing an available action from an unavailable condition is enough. If Masha considers continuation important, she can seek a suitable time or reduce the scope. That is her decision, rather than a required response to someone else's criticism of the delay.

At the same time, an explanation in terms of conditions can remain limited and open to checking. If the folder has been opened at different times and the work always stops before one letter, a question about its content may deserve consideration. Repetition nevertheless does not prove a single cause. It only gives grounds for cautiously comparing episodes: what stayed the same, what changed, and which action remained undone? Someone can notice a combination of circumstances without reducing it to one motive. For a local decision, an incomplete picture can be more honest than an overly confident general explanation.

The practical consequence depends on what the person learns. Insufficient time may call for postponement; lack of a quiet space, for changed conditions; an unresolved question about a letter, for a discussion of its use; disagreement with the album, for reconsidering the goal. These decisions are not interchangeable. Answering every delay with the same instruction to start small may leave the real question unanswered. A small action fits only when it is permissible, serves the chosen goal, and does not conceal a more substantial obstacle that the person can already name.

VIII. A small trial should answer a particular question

If Masha willingly wants to understand the stop before captioning, she can select one photograph whose details are known and write two neutral lines. The trial has a limited subject: can she move from selecting an image to a suitable text when the content is clear? The result need not be beautiful and must not be circulated without agreement. Such a trial does not measure her ability to finish everything. It concerns one operation under particular conditions. If the text appears, that shows a completed transition here; if it does not, she can describe where the attempt stopped.

An unsuccessful trial does not require an immediate increase in effort. Perhaps the wording is still unclear, the software is distracting, or the photograph is less neutral than it seemed. She can notice this and end the attempt. A limited action can be useful not only by producing a page but also by clarifying a condition, if she wants to consider it. Yet not every action should retrospectively be described as a useful experiment. If the trial clarified nothing, it is permissible to say so. A lack of new understanding need not be justified through an elegant conclusion about hidden resistance.

The trial's boundaries need to remain intact afterwards. One caption does not prove that the entire album will now be easy. Another photograph may involve different conditions. A successful operation also does not imply agreement to publish personal materials or continue the project at its earlier scale. Masha can keep the result as a draft, change the project, or return to an archive. A small action should not silently become a commitment to a large result. Consent to a next step is considered separately when it changes the timing, audience, or another person's involvement.

Someone can choose not to make a trial at all. Sometimes naming an obstacle and deciding about the task is already sufficient. Without permission to use a letter, testing one's readiness to caption it makes little sense. If the album is no longer wanted, the promise deserves discussion rather than another way to begin. A limited action is an opportunity for voluntary clarification, not a compulsory stage before gaining the right to refuse. This preserves an adult meaning of work: someone chooses a permissible result and addresses real consequences, rather than proving compliance with another person's productivity standard.

IX. Help becomes more precise when the part is named

“Help me stop postponing the album” can lead to a long conversation about habits when Masha needs one answer about a caption. A more precise request is different: “I have sorted the materials, but I do not know how much text the first page needs. Could you look at one neutral example?” It identifies what is already done, where the stop occurred, and what answer would help. The other person can agree, propose another kind of help, or decline. Precision does not create an obligation to help, but makes the actual contribution easier to discuss.

A helper can also maintain the limits of their role. Being able to use the editor does not mean knowing which letters should be included. They can demonstrate a technique and leave the content decision to Masha. That division does not make the help incomplete: it preserves the difference between a skill and a right to choose. If information from another relative is needed, it should be requested from that person, rather than turning a technical helper into a source of family history. Otherwise, solving one part may quietly introduce new unsupported assumptions.

In shared work, the effects of a delay on others matter too. Masha may have promised to send a page before a gathering. She can reconsider the task, but the recipient needs to know what to expect now. “I will not have it ready” can be sufficient if she does not want to disclose personal reasons. She can offer a different time or a narrower result, without promising it before agreement. Respect for her own boundary and clarity about a commitment are compatible. She need not choose between a complete confession about the delay and silence that leaves another person waiting.

If discussion turns into accusation, accurately describing the part does not guarantee a calm conversation. Someone can end it and decide how to continue the shared work. This article does not recommend enduring pressure to complete a project. Explaining a task should help people choose actions, rather than give others a new vocabulary for supervision. Questions about another person's delay therefore remain invitations that can be declined. Even a useful framework loses its purpose when it is used to prove that refusal is unacceptable.

X. The next decision can be smaller than a general explanation

At the end of her observation, Masha may not know why she postpones some personal projects. She can nevertheless learn something more particular: this page stopped before captioning, the format was unclear, and use of the letter had not been agreed. Those details already make a change possible. She can make a page with other materials, discuss the letter separately, or pause the album. The decision does not need a triumphant account of overcoming herself. Its grounds are the actual conditions of the project, rather than a final conclusion about her whole personality.

Sometimes the obstacle remains mixed. Masha understands the format, partly knows the editor, and is still unsure whether she wants to show the album. There is no need to force a single cause before beginning a conversation. The questions can be separated: technical help concerns the frame, agreement concerns the audience, and timing concerns the promise. Each has its own recipient and boundary. That division does not make the task simple, but avoids asking one action to solve everything at once. Otherwise, a completed frame may mistakenly be treated as evidence that no questions of substance remain.

A change here has an observable form: a draft exists, a condition has been identified, the format has changed, a new time has been communicated, or a decision not to continue has been made. These results differ and need not be combined under the single word progress. Another person needs the precise form: what exists now and what does not yet exist? For Masha, the link between the decision and her chosen goal matters. An unfinished page cannot be called ready just because the conversation was useful. Clarity about a delay and a completed result are different possible outcomes.

The word avoiding is useful only while it helps examine a particular action and remains open to revision. It becomes too heavy when it turns into a permanent name for someone or a universal explanation for every postponement. Someone can say, “Before this step I repeatedly moved into another activity; now I want to understand what the step requires.” That statement contains an observation, a limit to knowledge, and a voluntary direction for further work. It may be enough to choose a suitable question. It creates no obligation to prove that delays will never happen again.

What this means in practice

If you want to consider one safe task you have freely chosen, recall the last episode of working on it. Name the expected result and what you actually did, without dismissing the latter. Then identify the nearest transition that did not happen: selection, understanding, an operation, showing something, agreement, or another particular step. If no transition is visible, do not assign yourself a hidden cause. You can decline this practice, reduce it to one question, or choose another task. It does not require evaluating someone else's delay through the same framework.

Separate what you noticed from a possible explanation. “I returned to sorting before captioning” is an observation; “perhaps the required length is unclear” is a hypothesis. Consider whether the situation calls for a question, a particular skill, an available condition, agreement with the goal, or reconsidering a promise. If appropriate, choose one limited trial that answers that question without committing you to finish everything. It does not replace required professional checks or decisions with substantial consequences.

Afterwards, name only the actual outcome: a transition was completed, a condition clarified, the task changed, or there is no new understanding yet. Continuation remains a separate decision. You can refuse the trial, withhold personal materials, and stop if there is a threat or coercion. You need not disclose private circumstances to explain refusal. Where an agreement with someone else exists, you can communicate only the available result and a change in timing or scope. This practice serves your own voluntary question, rather than supervision of yourself or anyone around you.

Key quotation

> *“we cannot draw conclusions about why”*

Lena Wieland and colleagues, discussion paragraph on changes in initial task appraisals. In this short fragment, the authors limit what can be concluded about why those appraisals changed. It is a boundary of this particular study, rather than a claim that reasons for postponement can never be understood.

Connections between traditions

Distinguishing a task, a transition, and its possible explanation connects everyday observation with cautious reading of research on delayed action. It neither transfers a research procedure into personal life nor diagnoses procrastination. The study is used here for a limited question about differences between particular episodes; every album scene is a hypothetical editorial example. Questions about clarity, skill, conditions, and agreement with the goal remain distinct. None follows automatically from the fact that work is still unfinished.

Sources

• Wieland, L. M.; Ebner-Priemer, U. W.; Limberger, M. F.; Nett, U. E. (2021). Predicting Delay in Goal-Directed Action: An Experience Sampling Approach Uncovering Within-Person Determinants Involved in the Onset of Academic Procrastination Behavior. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.695927. Actual reading covered the abstract and selected continuous passages of the introduction, method, results, discussion, and limitations, together with appendix item wording and the licence notice. No complete reading of the article or underlying data is claimed. Observational student self-reports do not establish the causes of a particular adult's delay. The publication is available under CC BY, with credit to its authors and original publication.

Tags

procrastination, postponement, task, transition, observation, action, choice, clarity, skill, consent, goal, conditions, fatigue, draft, result, preparation, caption, personal project, boundaries, asking for help, commitment, timing, uncertainty, hypothesis, self-report, research, voluntary action, refusal, practical reflection, 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.