

UNITED WISDOM

Changing Your Work or Changing How You Work

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A32 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Changing Your Work or Changing How You Work

Epigraph

> *In every affair consider what precedes and follows, and then undertake it.*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 29, the first sentence of Elizabeth Carter's translation. Considering action's conditions, rather than an instruction to remain in one profession forever.

What this article is about

Ilya prepares educational materials. He once enjoyed explaining complex things clearly, but now thinks only of leaving by the week's end. Increasingly, he fixes tasks received without enough information, answers evening messages and reworks materials after late comments. He tells a friend that he has probably lost interest in the profession. Yet at the weekend he enjoys helping an acquaintance understand a small subject. This episode does not prove that leaving is wrong. It merely keeps a question open: what exactly does Ilya want to change?

In this hypothetical scene, content, conditions, relationships and expectations have become entangled. Calling everything work makes it easy to choose between two broad answers: endure or start life afresh. Other possibilities may exist: clarify tasks, change scope, agree feedback arrangements, move somewhere with similar content or genuinely change direction.

How can these options be considered without compulsory optimism or deciding from one difficult evening? Describe the intended change, check available authority and compare current reality with a sufficiently investigated alternative. A trial must not require enduring everything first to deserve permission to leave.

I. The Word Work Can Conceal Different Subjects

Ilya says he no longer wants to work like this. Which action does like this concern: explaining, continually reworking, answering at night or awaiting an unclear comment? Each aspect has its own subject. Combining everything into one profession's name can reject content when the main obstacle was organisation. Or it can preserve content at any price while significant conditions stay unchanged. Distinguishing aspects does not determine the answer beforehand. It reveals what the answer should address.

Content is what someone does: explaining, repairing, coordinating, researching or serving. Conditions include time, resources, scope, payment and information access. Relationships

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

include agreement, feedback and how people treat one another. Expectations concern what someone hopes a role will provide: recognition, development, stability or continuous interest. These categories may overlap. They are an original descriptive approach, rather than a diagnostic model with established accuracy. No list knows a situation instead of the person living it.

Ilya can record a concrete episode for each significant aspect. Instead of everything has become unbearable: a task arrived without agreed scope; explaining the material was interesting; late revisions disrupted the evening. Such descriptions do not cancel the overall experience. They give it a subject and reveal possible changes. If an episode concerns several aspects, retain that connection. Accuracy does not require artificially separating a living situation into independent parts that do not actually exist.

Uncertainty also helps. Ilya may not yet know whether he enjoys explaining outside the current pace. He need not immediately identify his true calling or its final rejection. Acknowledge the open question and identify an observation that would clarify it. This promises no correct decision. Yet it protects against a conclusion based more on a general word than examined experience. Sometimes the first change is naming the task clearly enough for the next choice.

II. Difficult Conditions and Lost Interest Are Not Identical

Tiredness after a week may relate to workload, relationships, content or other circumstances. One account cannot establish a cause, health condition or professional destiny. This article does not diagnose Ilya. It suggests avoiding an automatic transition from this is hard to I am incapable or I never liked this work. Those conclusions exceed what is known. Health questions require appropriate consideration; philosophical distinctions cannot replace it or prove the absence of a problem.

The weekend episode shows that a small explanation under different conditions interested Ilya. This observation matters without justifying his current work. It proves no duty to stay and does not show how he would experience the profession under a lasting different workload. A more precise statement is that interest in one aspect remains in this episode. Content therefore remains an open question, while evening messages remain a real issue. One good experience does not cancel an established obstacle.

The reverse is possible too: conditions become clearer, but someone still does not want this content. This may involve genuinely reconsidering direction. It need not be dismissed as a whim because the job has become outwardly convenient. Interests and purposes may change. Yet distinguish I do not want this task, I do not want its current arrangement and I do not know. Each opens different options. A choice's moral dignity does not depend on which statement proves accurate.

Observation needs time without becoming endless waiting. Ilya can choose a sufficient limited period to clarify an available question if that is acceptable. Where a significant limit is already known, another trial may be unnecessary. Every obstacle need not be experienced again for a complete record. Proportion means gathering information capable of changing a decision, rather than proving endurance. Incomplete certainty creates no obligation to retain every condition until the whole life becomes entirely understandable.

III. Expectations of Work Also Need Consideration

Ilya once imagined the profession as continually explaining interesting subjects. It now includes repetition, agreement and preparation. Some disappointment may concern that expectation rather than external conditions alone. May matters here: we are not assigning a cause for him. Ask what was expected, which aspect is absent and whether it was promised or merely assumed. This distinguishes a breached condition from a wish that the role never secured.

Not all expectations are unfounded. Asking for clear scope, agreed hours or respectful treatment differs from expecting constant delight. Confusing them makes it easy to advise greater realism instead of examining an actual obstacle. Ilya can accept that not every subject will interest him while still questioning late revisions. Accepting ordinary labour does not constitute agreement to any expansion of the role. Realism should describe conditions rather than automatically justify them.

Separate a necessary condition, an important wish and an image of ideal life. The first requires a decision without which participation is unacceptable; the second can guide a search; the third reveals a dream without necessarily being a real alternative. Their boundaries depend on situation and person. This list does not test whether Ilya deserves more. It helps avoid comparing the present workplace with everything good imaginable, as though another job already combined every benefit without its own price.

In the selected passage from On Liberty's third chapter, Mill defends independently considering a life plan and applying experience to personal circumstances. This is a political and philosophical argument about individuality's development, rather than a contemporary job-satisfaction method. A narrow question helps Ilya: is the expectation actually his, or borrowed from someone else's persuasive story? Examples can help without choosing for him. Independence includes both wishing for something else and clarifying what is wished for.

IV. Changing Working Methods Begins With Real Authority

Ilya can alter his preparation sequence where this falls within his role. He cannot unilaterally declare a new deadline a shared agreement or decide for colleagues that late messages need no reply while existing conditions remain unclear. A proposal differs from an accepted change. What can I change must therefore include authority: independently, by agreement or currently not at all? Otherwise, a helpful idea becomes an imagined change on which plans are built before others know about it.

Feedback arrangements can be discussed through a specific proposal: when significant comments arrive, who sets priorities and what happens after late task changes. This is more precise than a general request to respect Ilya's time. A shared value matters without yet describing a process. The proposal should show mutual conditions, available resources and limits. Colleagues may agree, clarify or decline. Until they answer, preserve that absence rather than treating attractive wording as an already functioning arrangement.

If Ilya cannot discuss conditions with whoever controls tasks, that is significant information. He cannot be required to change a system through one personal skill. He can seek an available recipient, investigate another option or identify his participation's limit. Yet inability to change things internally does not prove that every choice is impossible. Sometimes only preparation to leave is available. Identify the actual field without promising that a correct conversation solves every problem or turning somebody else's power into a worker's personal inadequacy.

In the selected section of Nicomachean Ethics Book III, Aristotle considers deliberating about means available to an acting person and seeking others' help with important questions. His historical account of choice is not contemporary workplace organisation. We use only the distinction between a desired result and an attainable means. It helps ask which action is actually possible now. Discussing Ilya's purpose remains permitted: the original argument's treatment of ends is not transferred as a prohibition on reconsidering one's direction in life.

V. A Limited Trial Needs a Definite Question

If change is available and acceptable, Ilya can agree a short period with a clearer task or different comment arrangements. Its value lies in its question rather than its label. What can be learned: whether content still interests him, whether particular reworking decreases or whether the agreed pace fits? One small experience cannot establish the whole profession's correctness. A precise question makes the result clearer and reduces temptation to declare any episode proof of a final answer.

A trial needs consent where it affects shared processes. Identify duration, work, resources and ending conditions. If a necessary part is not secured, lack of results cannot automatically be

attributed to Ilya's unreadiness. Perhaps the trial simply did not occur as agreed. That distinction matters for honest assessment. The proposed arrangement, the arrangement actually in force and the experience observed are three different entries. Confusing them produces conclusions about change that may never have happened.

Not every question needs a trial within the current workplace. If continued participation requires a known unacceptable condition, Ilya need not test it again to deserve departure. Nor should a trial expand unagreed workload to prove an ability to cope. Its purpose is learning something significant for a decision, rather than testing moral loyalty to a profession. Where withdrawal or stopping within known limits is relied on, include that possibility in the conditions. Otherwise, exploring disguises ordinary continuation without an exit.

Afterwards, describe observations without diagnosis or causal guarantees. During these days, the task was clearer, a particular part remained appealing and late changes still occurred. A limited practical conclusion can follow, with unknowns identified. This article asserts no scientific efficacy for the proposed trial. It uses ordinary checking of an agreed personal action. A decision may change, stay the same or need further information; no outcome must portray the initial assumption as victorious.

VI. Another Job Needs Its Own Costs Examined

An image of new work can lack every present inconvenience because it is insufficiently known. Ilya imagines calm tasks, attentive colleagues and preparation time. Such conditions are possible without being secured by a vacancy description or an acquaintance's account. Compare sufficiently investigated options with unknowns visible, rather than full present reality with an imagined future. This does not demand eliminating every risk. It prevents a significant decision from hiding in the appealing word new.

Investigate ordinary daily content, pay and time arrangements, agreement practices, actual duties and entry requirements. Not everything can be known beforehand. Identify what remains assumed. Ilya may consider transition a reasonable risk without calling it a proven result. Choosing under uncertainty is permitted. Yet promises to loved ones or colleagues should fit actual knowledge. Hope sustains movement without turning unknown conditions into commitments already accepted by a different workplace.

In section 29 of The Enchiridion, Epictetus proposes examining what precedes and follows an action through athletic and philosophical examples. The original includes a strict ideal of consistency and its own division of life. This does not become a prohibition on changing profession. Our article uses only a question about the chosen action's components: what is needed before entry and what follows it? Ilya can notice learning, searching, changed income or task handover without declaring these moral reasons necessarily to reject transition.

The cost of leaving does not decide by itself, nor does the cost of staying. Someone can deliberately accept a difficult transition for significant change, choose a gradual approach or temporarily remain. The option should include real actions, resources and boundaries rather than merely relief at the thought of departure. Specialist financial or legal conditions require appropriate information. A philosophical article must not replace them with general appeals either to trust oneself more boldly or cling more carefully to familiarity.

VII. Changing Workplace and Changing Content Are Different

Ilya may move to another team and continue preparing educational materials. This changes place and conditions without necessarily rejecting the profession. He may remain in the organisation while moving to another role, or change content entirely. These options preserve and alter different parts of experience. Each has its own price and uncertainty. Leaving this does not show what someone wishes to escape or hopes to retain.

If interest in explaining remains, Ilya can investigate similar content with different conditions. This is no duty to rescue his former calling. It is one possible path matching a known observation. If he wants a different task, familiar job titles need not limit the search. Acquired skill may help elsewhere without guaranteeing readiness for any role. Clarify requirements and available preparation. Recognising experience is compatible with acknowledging what remains to be learned.

New content also does not automatically remove an old pattern of agreeing to everything. Ilya may carry unclear expectations, silent acceptance of extra work or absent boundary conversations into another role. This is a possibility to consider, rather than an accusation or established cause of difficulty. Ask which conditions the place creates and which actions he accepts himself. Assigning everything to personality erases organisation; assigning everything to organisation may erase an available personal step. Distinctions preserve both questions without promising a simple proportion.

Describe options in the same way: content, conditions, relationships, expectations, access and transition costs. They need not become a single score. A particular limit may be decisive and another benefit desirable. This record helps compare subjects rather than impressions from titles. Where information is scarce, retain that visibility. Someone may choose the option, but should not silently present missing information as absence of disadvantages. Honest comparison leaves room for hope and uncertainty together.

VIII. A Decision Affects Others Without Belonging Entirely to Them

Departure can affect colleagues, clients and family plans. These relationships need attention, particularly where Ilya created intelligible expectations of participation. Attention does not prohibit changing work. Discuss accepted commitments, deadlines and available handover. People rely on you does not define an infinite debt. Identify who relies on what and on which grounds. Consequences can then enter the decision without making another person's expectation an ultimate right to control someone's whole life.

When preparing transition, distinguish investigating an option from deciding, and deciding from completing departure. Not every preliminary question needs public announcement. Yet once significant certainty arises and affects accepted work, silence may leave others calculating wrongly. Communication arrangements depend on actual circumstances and specialist rules not established here. The moral question concerns accurate status and timely consideration of significant dependency, rather than a duty to disclose every movement of thought to everyone.

Handover needs an actual recipient and intelligible scope. Tasks are not necessarily transferred because a list was posted in a group chat. Where acceptance is needed, establish it or follow a known agreed procedure. Yet Ilya need not promise endless management after leaving. Any remaining part should be identified separately if genuinely agreed. A good departure joins attention to those continuing with the right to finish one's role. It requires neither sudden disappearance nor permanent availability.

Loved ones can discuss shared consequences without choosing Ilya's profession for him. If income or time affects shared life, intelligible conditions and realistic discussion matter. Yet another person's fear does not automatically prove transition wrong, just as personal desire does not erase shared planning. The decision retains a complex relationship between freedom and responsibility. This article prescribes no universal family rule. It prevents independence becoming absence of relationships, and relationships becoming absence of independence.

IX. Staying and Leaving Can Both Have Clear Reasons

If an agreed change genuinely addresses the main obstacle, Ilya may remain and revise his working method. That need not look like defeat after discussing departure. A new reason appeared and he may respond to it. If change is rejected or content no longer fits his purposes, he may prepare transition. This is not necessarily rejection of responsibility. A choice's dignity depends on examining actions and consequences rather than which side appears braver in somebody else's story.

Avoid appointing a moral winner beforehand: decisive people leave, mature people stay, faithful people endure and free people start again. These formulas replace situations with images of personality. Ilya may expend energy proving an image and stop noticing what actually changed. Retain specific reasons instead: a condition was accepted, an opportunity is unavailable, an option is sufficiently examined and a limit matters. Reasons may be imperfect but can be discussed. An image without a subject demands only confirmation of belonging to it.

Sometimes information suffices for a decision without final certainty. Name the remaining risk and available responses to an unfavourable outcome. This does not guarantee reversibility or replace resources. A return plan nobody agreed is not a secured fallback. Distinguish a wished-for possibility from a real one. Ilya can consciously accept an irreversible part if he understands it, but should not hide it from himself under I will try.

Reconsider decisions when significant new information appears, rather than every minute to eliminate anxiety completely. An agreement changes, different content appears or a significant limit emerges: these justify returning to the question. Ordinary hesitation may remain part of choice without requiring immediate cancellation. The article diagnoses no experience or prescribes how to manage it. It distinguishes new information about action from the wish for an impossible guarantee that the chosen path will never require another decision.

X. The Subject of Change Matters More Than a Ceremonial New Beginning

Ilya may conclude precisely: I want to retain explaining, but not continual late reworking. Or differently: I want other content even under acceptable conditions. He may honestly leave this open: I do not know yet and need particular information. All three can be serious. They fit the subject examined. None needs the title of a new true self to ground the next action.

The next step should fit the answer. A condition needs someone authorised to agree it. Another option needs investigation of actual access. A question about content needs a proportionate way to learn. Endless self-description cannot substitute for these actions. Nor can a proposal be declared a completed change. Accurate status sustains freedom and responsibility together: what was decided, what has not yet been obtained and what others may rely on remain known.

The result can be small and significant. A clarified task, different feedback arrangement or clear recognition that internal change is impossible alters a choice's grounds. We do not promise that accuracy makes work pleasant or transitions successful. It makes the question more comprehensible. Someone sees what they actually want to change and can seek an

appropriate action. If another form of help or specialist information is needed, that limit also belongs to an honest result rather than demonstrating failed attention.

Changing work and changing how one works are different possibilities that sometimes connect. Neither should be prescribed universally. Consider content, conditions, relationships and expectations, retain knowledge's limits and recognise actual dependencies. Choice then becomes more than a contest between endurance and courage. It is a particular person's action in a particular life: neither bound to preserve the past forever nor promised an ideal future, and able to answer for the next available part of their path.

What this means in practice

Record three concrete work episodes relevant to change. Distinguish content, conditions, relationships and expectations, retaining overlaps and unknowns. Identify what you wish to retain and alter. Do not make the record a diagnosis or calling test. Where a significant limit is clear already, do not require another trial solely to prove endurance.

Choose an available step: clarify a condition with an authorised person, agree a limited trial or investigate a real alternative. Identify the trial's question, duration, resources and ending conditions; a proposal differs from accepted change. For transition, investigate ordinary content, workload and preparation, keeping unknowns visible. Compare real options within equivalent scopes rather than present deficiencies with a costless future.

Afterwards, record which reason emerged and what follows under your circumstances. Where departure is decided, separately consider accepted duties and intelligible handover. This original practice promises no scientifically guaranteed correct choice or improved condition. It clarifies a decision's subject without replacing qualified consideration of health, specialist financial conditions or employment law.

Key quotation

> *He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties.*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter III, a short literal sentence. Independent consideration retains others' rights and interests; the quotation promises no successful career decision.

Connections between traditions

Source or perspective	What it helps us notice	Limit of comparison
Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 29	Actions include entry and continuation conditions	A strict consistency ideal does not prohibit career changes
Mill, On Liberty, III	Others' experience needs application to personal circumstances	Individual development does not cancel others' interests
Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, III, 3	Desiring a result differs from having available means	Historical deliberation theory does not prohibit revising a purpose
United Wisdom	Content, conditions, relationships and expectations give change different subjects	Original description rather than diagnosis or scientific testing

Sources and notes

1. Epictetus, The Enchiridion, Elizabeth Carter's translation, Internet Classics Archive, section 29 read continuously in full, displayed lines 76–83; epigraph from its first sentence. Athletic and philosophical examples and its strict consistency ideal remain explicit. They do not become lifelong professional loyalty or contemporary health advice.

2. John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter III: continuous selected displayed lines 539–550 read in full; key sentence at 546. Project Gutenberg 34901, Walter Scott Publishing Co. printed basis, W. L. Courtney's introduction dated 5 July 1901; the printed basis's publication year was not separately established. Experience and independent choice retain qualifications concerning others' rights and interests, rather than becoming an empirical career model.

3. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book III, W. D. Ross's translation, Internet Classics Archive, section 3 read continuously in full, displayed lines 65–80. A limited distinction between deliberation, means and attainability is used; the original treatment of ends does not prohibit revising a purpose. The electronic version's printed basis was not separately established.

Reading checked on 10 October 2026. Worldwide rights for specific versions have not been established; brief quotations, links and limited paraphrase are used without full import or source vectorisation. Russian quotations are our translations of the named English versions. The hypothetical scene and practice are original; causes of tiredness, diagnoses and transition guarantees are not established.

Tags

changing work, working methods, work content, working conditions, relationships, expectations, choice, professional direction, tiredness, interest in work, independence, authority, agreement, limited trials, accessibility, transition costs, task handover, commitments, personal boundaries, uncertainty, real alternatives, practical ethics, next steps, feedback, new experience, freedom and responsibility, Epictetus, Mill, Aristotle, 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.