

UNITED WISDOM

Someone else's standard of success in my decision

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-05-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Someone else's standard of success in my decision

Epigraph

> *rewards or praise*

Tim Kasser and Richard Ryan, *Further Examining the American Dream*,1996, first paragraph of the published abstract; short fragment concerning the orientation of extrinsic goals. It belongs to a research distinction, not an assessment of every outside recommendation. Publisher's primary abstract.

What this article is about

Lena is assembling a small series of stories about her courtyard. She wants to preserve different voices so that speakers recognize their own speech and readers can distinguish their experiences. An acquaintance suggests defining success beforehand by a particular subscriber count: otherwise, he thinks, the work will remain amateur. Lena notices that she is already choosing speakers for their likely popularity. She has promised no commercial release, raises no money and uses her own free time. The scene is fictional, but its question is specific: what now governs the selection of the next story, and who established it?

An outside standard can help. An editor may notice an unclear transition, a reader an inaccurate description, an organizer a genuine participation condition. The difficulty begins with an unnoticed change of task rather than another person's mere presence. Making speech intelligible becomes proving one's adequacy through audience size. Those requirements are not automatically equivalent. In a small voluntary project, we can examine an assessment's origin and role while remaining attentive to others. This is neither a search for an entirely independent inner voice nor a promise to escape every influence: a person's language, experience and interests already develop through relationships.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Notice which question has been replaced

Lena's initial question concerned the form of a small collection: how to preserve differences between speakers while making their stories accessible. The proposed measure answers another question: how many people follow the page? Both subjects can matter, but the second does not contain the first. A popular short text may flatten someone's speech, while an accurate story may initially find few readers. The replacement becomes visible in a particular selection rather than an abstract dispute about values. Lena leaves out a neighbor with a quiet story, although his distinctive experience had seemed important to the series.

A subscriber count is not itself a false fact. When its counting method is known, it tells us something about a page's reach. The mistake comes when reach is declared a measure of every merit without a further reason. The same figure then judges accuracy, attentiveness, artistic organization and the author's personal adequacy. Its jurisdiction quietly expands. We can check that expansion by asking which aspect of the project the count actually reveals. Lena need not immediately stop counting or close her page. She needs to restore the measure's boundary before allowing it to determine everything else.

Changing a project differs from silently replacing it. Lena may come to want a widely read series and accept the editorial decisions that follow. A new desire does not become someone else's merely because it emerged after a conversation. Yet the change deserves a name: a large audience now matters, and some original qualities may yield to it. A hidden replacement preserves the old description while altering each step's reason. Lena keeps saying that she preserves voices while gradually choosing only those voices most easily turned into a recognizable format. Naming a change makes its costs more available for consideration.

This distinction does not test an intention's purity. An act may combine interest in stories, a wish for recognition, enjoyment of the work and hope for a future profession. Mixed reasons do not invalidate it. The narrower question is which reason governs this present selection, and whether its role can be named honestly. Lena need not reveal one profound cause of her entire life. For her next conversation with a speaker, it may suffice to understand why she invites this particular person and which participation conditions she can actually offer. A limited explanation can have real content.

II. An assessment's origin does not establish its fitness

Someone else's standard need not be poor, and one's own need not be reasonable. Lena might invent a daily publication requirement that destroys her attentiveness to speech. An editor might suggest a way to distinguish voices that helps her original task. Origin and fitness are different questions. Rejecting every outside proposal can exclude opportunities to learn along with pressure. Accepting every confident recommendation turns another person's experience into authority to redefine one's project. Between these responses lies consideration of a particular reason and subject. The proposal needs a connection to what Lena is actually trying to do.

Examination begins with that connection: what does the requirement serve here? Removing a long introduction might clarify a story, or deprive the reader of necessary circumstances. The passage and intended reader matter alongside the editor's authority. Experience gives Lena reason to listen closely without making consideration unnecessary. She may also acknowledge that she cannot yet assess the editorial question. A next step might be asking for an explanation or comparing two brief versions. It need not become a universal verdict about experts' right to give advice. Uncertainty about one passage has a narrower and more useful subject.

Sometimes an external condition determines whether a route is available. A venue accepts stories of a stated length, a competition requires a format, or a speaker consents only to anonymous publication. Fidelity to oneself cannot cancel those conditions. Lena can take another route, revise her project or accept the constraint. Yet a participation condition need not become a general measure of human success. Failure to fit a competition's format concerns eligibility rather than whether writing has any meaning. A speaker's consent limits the use of their speech; it does not assess the author's whole personality or creative future.

The source of a comment also differs from a right to control the result. A friend, editor, speaker and casual viewer occupy different positions. Speakers can limit the use of their own words; viewers can report impressions; friends offer opinions. A formal vote need not make their voices equivalent. Before judging persuasiveness, we can ask how each person is connected to the act. Attention to others then ceases to mean fulfilling every request. It becomes more exact: whose consent is necessary, which evidence is useful, and which recommendation may remain unaccepted? Different roles make different claims on the same work.

III. Research distinguishes goal content, not every suggestion's origin

The published abstract of Kasser and Ryan's1996 study compares the relative importance of different aspirations. Among adult participants, greater centrality of financial success, attractive appearance and social recognition was associated with less favorable well-being indicators; another pattern concerned self-acceptance, affiliation, community feeling and health. The same abstract reports a second study in a college sample. Relative centrality and observed associations matter here. This brief primary text establishes neither causation nor an individual diagnosis, and we derive no promise that changing a goal will improve Lena's condition. Its reported findings have a narrower scope than that.

Our scene's external standard is broader than the research category. A comment about a typo comes from another person without becoming a pursuit of public recognition. Conversely, Lena may wish for praise without an acquaintance suggesting it. Calling every external requirement a harmful goal and invoking this study would therefore be inaccurate. The research helps frame a narrower question: what place do rewards and recognition occupy among other subjects of activity? One indicator or an uncomfortable feeling after conversation cannot answer it. Goal content needs consideration separately from a suggestion's source, however strongly the two may appear connected.

Nor should the distinction become a new hierarchy in which people must prove that they pursue only intrinsic aims. Income may make work feasible, recognition may help reach interested readers, and a public indicator may be necessary for an organizer. These roles differ from making a rating the sole measure of personal worth. Lena can want an audience while preserving another reason for selecting stories. Centrality concerns a goal's place among others. It requires neither erasing that goal's significance nor despising people who work under genuine economic necessity. A simplified judgment would lose precisely the relative relation the research examines.

Our next move is philosophical and editorial: examining which requirement a person accepts as a reason for their decision. The cited authors did not study this exercise, and it is not their procedure. It may clarify a formulation without guaranteeing calm, better well-being or independence from evaluation. Discovering a strong wish to be noticed does not yet tell Lena what to do with her stories. First, we avoid attributing a ready recommendation to the research. Then we return to available actions, particular obligations and the result this current work actually needs. Those questions remain open to reasons beyond the abstract.

IV. Accepting a standard involves naming one's reason

Lena can accept an audience measure thoughtfully. She may need to establish interest in an open reading before spending her own money on a room. Then registrations concern a specific decision and expense. The count neither declares a quiet story unsuccessful nor judges its speaker's worth. Its adoption has an explanation: this measure helps avoid taking on an unsupported burden. Moving from a general demand for success to a limited connection between information and action changes its role. The same count can serve substantially different purposes, depending on what decision it informs and what it is allowed to assess.

Naming one's reason does not require inventing a thought nobody has expressed before. Lena may repeat an editor's convincing explanation and agree with it. Independence here involves seeing the relation between proposal and project rather than owning a thought's exclusive authorship. Reasonable trust can also support another person's competence without checking every detail oneself. That trust has a domain and conditions. An editor may better understand a compositional transition; this does not make their expertise an automatic answer to which life an author must call accomplished. Trust is useful precisely when its subject is sufficiently clear.

A refusal matters too, without turning the adviser into an enemy. Lena can acknowledge that a suggestion would help her page grow while deciding that growth does not govern this series' selection. She need not claim that her acquaintance is universally wrong or mass readership inferior to a small audience. Limiting the proposal's application is enough. The disagreement retains a subject: this series, its composition and next installment. Precision may permit a useful conversation to continue. It cannot guarantee that the other person will accept the boundary or stop interpreting refusal as insufficient ambition. Another person's response remains partly beyond her control.

Thoughtful adoption allows reconsideration. After several installments, Lena might discover that her stories serve readers unlike those she imagined. New evidence need not be resisted as a threat to an unchanging personality. Yet every disappointment need not replace her criterion with the loudest available indicator. What changed: information about readers, the author's desire, resources or publication conditions? Naming the change gives reconsideration a subject: a particular relation between reason and act. It need not become an attempt to justify herself before someone who once presented his own standard as the only mature one. A revised reason can still be her reason.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

V. Another person's view helps when it has a subject

Lena's work addresses readers and speakers; a completely closed standard would not suit it. If nobody understands the transition between voices, certainty about fidelity to her intention will not repair the text. Feedback reports the work's encounter with another experience. But we need to distinguish what someone encountered. One reader lost the thread, another disagrees with a character, a third prefers another genre. All three reports are real without requiring the same editorial response. Sometimes circumstances need restoring, sometimes disagreement should remain, and sometimes a preference lies outside the chosen genre. Naming the subject makes the response more proportionate.

An audience need not offer one final answer. Readers have different knowledge, attention and purposes. Revising every text around the latest comment may dismantle the series without establishing a stable new subject. Describing the intended reading helps: what should become accessible, and to whom? That question gives feedback a role rather than authorizing dismissal of every dissenter. Someone outside the intended audience may still notice a factual error. Membership in the desired group does not make every assessment true, and membership elsewhere does not empty it of content. The actual observation still needs attention.

Accuracy and consent are distinct requirements. Lena cannot preserve an attractive sentence when a speaker points out that it attributes words they never said. She cannot publish a personal detail against an agreed participation condition in the name of artistic fidelity. Here another person reports more than a viewer's preference. Their words and the permissible use of them are involved. Discussing personal success cannot cancel that boundary. Distinguishing form, factual testimony and necessary consent reduces the temptation to call every inconvenient observation outside pressure on creative freedom. Each kind of message warrants a different kind of response.

Lena can request more precise feedback while respecting someone's right not to provide it. Where did the distinction between voices disappear? Which circumstance remained unclear? Questions address a particular part of the text and reduce the demand for a verdict on its author. Yet feedback is voluntary work unless otherwise agreed. Lena has no right to others' attention merely because she wishes to avoid dependence on ratings. When help is unavailable, other limited ways of reading and checking remain. Independence does not turn the people around her into a permanent council required to confirm every next step's quality.

VI. A limited project's success differs from a person's adequacy

The series may not find its expected audience. That result matters for another installment or an open reading. But a distance remains between the series' outcome and a complete assessment of its author. Lena worked with particular stories, time, skills and distribution. A public measure summarizes only some consequences of these conditions. Turning it into proof of general inadequacy erases questions with possible answers. An unclear introduction can be repaired, an unsuitable channel changed, a group's lack of interest acknowledged. A verdict on the whole person does not show which action is available next or which part of the work needs attention.

This limit should not declare every outcome successful. If Lena wanted intelligible speech and readers could not distinguish speakers, her task may have been inadequately fulfilled. Acknowledgment is more precise than replacing the original subject with the comforting merit of effort. Yet a particular means' failure does not establish that the entire work has no meaning. She can preserve an intention while altering the text, or honestly change the intention. Either way, naming the assessed subject helps. Protection from a sweeping verdict should not remove opportunities to learn from an actual mistake or recognize genuine limits in one's present ability.

Conversely, a large audience does not prove that every initial condition was met. Popularity cannot repair a speaker's distorted account. Praise cannot replace consent to use a personal episode. Desired attention still leaves Lena needing to check the subject for which she began. This is not suspicion toward every favorable result; it preserves independent requirements. Some requirements cannot acquire significance only after the outcome, because they establish permissibility beforehand. Recognition can support the work without confirming each decision that produced recognition in this particular case. The audience's response and the act's conditions answer different questions.

A limited success can be described positively without judging the entire person. Three voices remained distinct, participants confirmed accuracy, several readers understood the episodes' connection. This need not make small scale inherently virtuous. Aiming for a large audience would require other information. Specific results retain a connection to the task and reveal possible further action. They promise no lasting confidence. Sometimes they suffice to avoid demanding that a small work certify adulthood, talent or a right to pursue something that has not become a visible public career. The accomplishment has a subject, even while the larger questions remain open.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

VII. Pressure needs more than a clear formulation

Our acquaintance controls neither Lena's housing nor income nor obligatory work. She can leave his advice unapplied. Elsewhere, an external standard is backed by power, sanctions or dependence. A simple suggestion to name one's reason may then be insufficient. Someone can see a replacement clearly while lacking a safe refusal. Preserve that distinction before offering a voluntary exercise. Clarity does not establish an action's availability. Nor does failure to refuse prove inward agreement with a standard imposed by someone controlling an essential life condition. Thoughtfulness cannot be inferred from visible compliance or its absence alone.

Independence should not require disclosure. Lena need not explain her income, doubts or private history to justify a different standard for the series. A working description may suffice for discussing the text. Demanding personal confessions as proof of sincerity changes the conversation: assessment now extends to access to the person. She may stop that part of the exchange, if safe, or seek another space for discussion. A voluntary exercise establishes no way to resist a threat. It especially should not require revealing circumstances that participants prefer to keep private. A boundary can remain valid without a comprehensive personal explanation.

Lena might temporarily accept a condition to use an available route without making it a general success measure. She can shorten a story for a venue while retaining a full version in her own series. This needs an actual possibility of separating versions and participants' consent. A concession cannot always be called free adaptation merely because someone explains it. What remains available, what is paid, and who bears the cost? Examining a standard does not cancel environmental limits. It helps prevent a constraint from becoming a moral truth about how everyone ought to live, irrespective of their circumstances.

Rejecting a measure also gives Lena no reason to require everyone else to reject it. Her acquaintance may value popularity in his own project. She can disagree and decline participation without declaring his life less authentic. This article distinguishes reasons for one's specific action rather than sorting people into independent and dependent kinds. Selective acceptance of advice remains part of relationships. It permits gratitude, disagreement and different goals without turning another person's choice into permanent confirmation or refutation of the author's right to have a limited project. Different projects can coexist without one supplying the other's final standard.

VIII. Name the new fact before reconsidering

After the first stories, Lena may discover that publication takes more time than expected. This is a fact about conditions rather than proof that the acquaintance was right about everything. She can change frequency, reduce the series or finish it. A large audience is another new circumstance, bringing proposals, expectations and possible expenses. It does not automatically cancel the initial choice. Separate information from a general conclusion about oneself. What became known, and how does it affect the next available step? That relation gives reconsideration a subject rather than endlessly comparing who was the more perceptive person.

Sometimes a desire changes rather than a fact. Lena finds herself more interested in editorial work for broad readership. She may change the project and name a new aim. Seeing the associated concessions and agreeing conditions with participants keeps the change explicit. She need not prove that her earlier small project was a mistake. Different stages can have different subjects. Yet a right to change cannot retroactively fulfill promises made to speakers under the former arrangement. Her changed interest does not control their participation conditions. Revision of the project's purpose still needs attention to commitments that continue to apply.

The reverse can happen: audience growth increases pressure, and Lena finds that a small series is enough. She can limit publication consistently with obligations. That decision proves neither fear of success nor special spiritual maturity. It concerns resources and a chosen subject. What consequences follow, and how should they be explained to those affected? An observer may assess them differently. But another assessment need not require endless justification of every limit. Sometimes work is finished in a form answering its declared purpose, although it could have developed otherwise. An unused possibility alone does not make completion unreasonable.

To reduce dependence on the latest mood, Lena can name a few material conditions beforehand. The series continues while speakers consent, checking remains possible and she has a stated amount of free time. This is neither an eternal contract with herself nor an automatic algorithm. New circumstances may warrant another assessment. Limited conditions nevertheless show what changed before every earlier decision is called a failure. They also distinguish a genuine need to reconsider from returning to a general measure whenever an installment receives less attention than desired that day. A condition can guide inquiry without replacing judgment.

IX. A next choice reveals a standard's role better than a declaration

Lena can discuss independence from ratings at length while selecting only recognizable stories. This calls for examining one act rather than accusing her. Whom will she invite, what will she ask, which detail will remain? A particular step shows which subject receives support. A new way of life need not be announced. She can restore one distinction important to the series even when it promises little reach. A small correction tests a project's content more precisely than proclaiming complete freedom from public recognition forever. What matters is the reason that becomes active in this particular text.

The trial needs safety and voluntary participation. Where another person's speech is involved, consent remains independent. Lena cannot experiment with someone's private history to test her courage. Two ways of arranging already authorized episodes might be suitable. She can compare which preserves distinct voices more clearly without publishing both or recruiting another audience. The trial will not establish the whole aim's correctness. It offers a limited observation about form and helps show where a proposed standard connects to action, rather than merely sounding persuasive in conversation. Its modest scope is part of what makes the result intelligible.

There is no need to choose between abandoning indicators entirely and applying them unquestioningly. Lena can track reach separately from accuracy. These observations serve different purposes. Using readership to arrange a gathering should not automatically determine which voice deserves preservation. Separation takes attention because one convenient measure can return to the center. Still, it can repeatedly be connected to a particular question. This is practical limitation rather than a promise of finally purified motives. A person can notice another replacement and return to the subject without accusing herself of false independence. Repetition of the question does not erase earlier thoughtful choices.

The trial can end without a final standard. Lena might not yet know which audience she wants, while now distinguishing a publication condition from an assessment of personal worth. That result has content: the next question is more precise. It requires neither immediately publishing a story nor closing the page nor debating the acquaintance. Sometimes experience, explanation or a pause is needed. The important point is not to fill an unfinished answer by default with someone else's ready measure. An open question can remain open while its conditions are considered; uncertainty need not be presented as agreement with a sweeping verdict.

X. One's own standard stays open to conversation

A thoughtfully adopted measure does not become untouchable merely because someone calls it their own. Distortion identified by a participant, an unintelligible arrangement or exhausted resources calls for consideration. Independence permits correction. Its subject is seeing which observation concerns the work and why an act changes. Stubbornness may preserve an original formulation while losing the project itself. Conversely, attending to another person's comment may support precisely what motivated the work. The distinction helps avoid confusing steadiness with refusing to listen, or treating every change as evidence that one never had a reason of one's own.

Lena can keep caring about readership. This article requires no indifference to recognition. The question is what the measure serves and what it is asked to do beyond its capacity. It can report reach without settling accuracy, help planning without certifying a right to write. Such limits make room for wanting attention alongside other subjects. They will not remove disappointment at a weak response. But disappointment acquires an address: expected attention did not arrive. From that fact, a reasonable change for this series still needs a separate argument, if any change is currently needed at all.

Freedom from total assessment also improves the precision of conversation. Lena can request a reading of a transition rather than confirmation of talent, clarification of a venue's condition rather than a dispute about real success, or identify the useful part of advice rather than silently accept its entirety. These forms guarantee no agreement but preserve a disagreement's subject. Relationships can include different goals without a permanent struggle for each person's right to find life meaningful. Sometimes a conversation should still end. Limiting it does not require condemning the speaker, or making an unfinished dispute mean unfinished work.

In the next story, Lena keeps the neighbor's quiet voice because it helps distinguish courtyard life. If she pursues broad readership, that aim can be named separately and its means considered. For now, it is enough that the selection supports her declared subject. Outside assessment remains information or a proposal rather than an automatically adopted measure of everything. A decision gains its own reason within relationships: it can learn, respect consent and recognize limits without asking one indicator to settle who a person is or whether she may continue her small voluntary undertaking.

What this means in practice

If useful, choose a small voluntary undertaking where you control your own safe action. You may omit or stop the trial without explanation. Do not use it to resolve threats, dependence, serious risk or absent consent. Name the original subject: what should become accessible, intelligible or accomplished in this particular case?

Write one requirement proposed by another person and the question it actually answers. Distinguish a necessary condition, factual testimony, useful advice and an assessment of the whole person. Consider how accepting it changes one next step. You may agree, limit its application or leave the question open. Having a reason requires neither an original thought nor violating anyone's consent.

A limited possible result is a clearer connection between standard and act. Independence from praise, calm and success are not guaranteed. Stop under pressure, demands for private confession or an unknown essential condition. Finishing without choosing or discussing the advice is allowed. Do not turn the trial into a new indicator by which you must prove sufficiently independent personhood.

Key quotation

> *relatively central to one's personality*

Kasser and Ryan, the same abstract's first paragraph; short fragment concerning goals' comparative centrality. The surrounding sentence describes an association without establishing individual causality. Primary context.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Meaning and boundary
Research ↔ editorial scene	Relative goal centrality helps frame a question. The scene and trial are not a studied procedure.
Outside source ↔ one's reason	A useful proposal can be thoughtfully adopted; origin alone does not establish fitness.
Indicator ↔ subject	Reach, accuracy and consent answer different questions.
Expertise ↔ overall judgment	Competence has a domain; it gives no final assessment of a person.
Reconsideration ↔ steadiness	New evidence can change means while preserving a declared subject.

Sources

1. Tim Kasser; Richard M. Ryan. Further Examining the American Dream: Differential Correlates of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*22(3),1996,pp280–287,doi10.1177/0146167296223006. The complete published abstract, bibliographic details and available footnotes were actually read. The entire eight-page paper was not read. Only abstract-reported associations and short attributed fragments are used; no causal effect, individual recommendation or result of this editorial trial is attributed to the research.

Tags

choice, standard, success, recognition, praise, goals, Kasser, Ryan, independence, reason, advice, expertise, indicator, audience, project, speech, accuracy, consent, feedback, relationships, constraints, power, pressure, voluntary participation, reconsideration, resources, action, distinction, responsibility, 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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.