

UNITED WISDOM

A Good Decision with a Bad Outcome

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-07-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A Good Decision with a Bad Outcome

Epigraph

> *“When the same decisions resulted in failures”.*

Aiyer and colleagues, 2023, abstract, first sentence: a short part of the definition comparing evaluations of the same decisions with successful and failed outcomes. It does not declare every failed choice good. The Russian companion provides a translation made for this article. Primary context.

What this article is about

A choice can be well founded and its outcome painful. This combination is particularly difficult to acknowledge when you proposed the action and now see other people's disappointment, expenses, or lost time. It can seem that respecting the consequences requires calling the earlier decision bad. Yet the outcome tells us what happened, while the quality of the choice also depends on the information available then, the conditions accepted, and the reasonable opportunities for checking. These questions are connected, but one does not fully answer the other.

This article uses an invented everyday situation: a small group chooses a venue for an outdoor session, checks the known conditions, and then faces an unexpected cancellation. We will consider how to assess the initial choice, use new information, and fulfil present obligations. A psychological study helps identify a limited difficulty in evaluation. It does not determine the reader's correct choice or establish a universal mechanism of behaviour. The suggested practice is an authorial way of examining an episode; its effectiveness has not been tested. The modest aim is to keep each question clear and choose an available action now, without requiring either complete vindication or final condemnation.

I. First, recognise what happened

In our hypothetical group, Irina proposes holding a session in the courtyard of a local venue. The participants want to work outdoors, and the indoor room is available only on another day. Irina checks the owner's permission, opening hours, the available weather forecast, and the possibility of notifying everyone in advance if the session is cancelled. The group discusses this information and accepts the option. On the morning of the session, the venue closes because of an unexpected emergency at a neighbouring property. Several participants have already left home. The session does not happen; some preparation expenses and time are lost. This is an invented example, not a report of an observed event.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The first subject of discussion is the cancellation itself. Within the example, it is real regardless of how carefully the choice was discussed. Participants need timely information, and those who have already arrived need a clear account of what happens next. Describing earlier checks does not replace that message. It is possible to acknowledge that the venue is now unavailable, the earlier arrangement cannot be fulfilled, and the next conditions have not been agreed. No final judgement about who deserves blame is needed before stating the available facts and preventing further pointless journeys.

Irina may also find the event distressing. Because she proposed the venue, the cancellation is connected with her initiative, although she did not cause the closure. The discomfort of that connection does not establish the quality of her proposal. Equally, confirmed permission does not make other people's lost time insignificant. Two acknowledgements belong here: the consequences matter, and the earlier reasons need their own examination. Both can be stated without requiring participants to calm down immediately or agree on a single judgement of the person who first suggested the option.

The distinction also applies to the opposite case. If the session goes wonderfully, a known omitted check does not become completed retrospectively. Suppose Irina never asked for permission, but the owner happened to be pleased. A favourable outcome does not certify the entire preparation process. We are therefore not introducing special leniency only for failure. The same question about available reasons applies across different results. This gives the examination a consistent subject: what was done before the choice, what happened afterwards, and what the present situation requires.

II. Reconstruct the actual moment of decision

To assess the choice, we must return to a particular date rather than an idealised past. Irina had the owner's confirmation, the known schedule, and the weather information available then. The emergency had not happened, and there was no closure warning. Messages and correspondence may establish these conditions if they survive. What matters is not automatically supplementing them with what became known that morning. A later fact can change the next decision, but it cannot change the date on which it emerged. Checking when information was available is a separate part of the examination, not a way of denying the outcome.

We must also ask what information should reasonably have been obtained. Not every unknown is alike. If the owner had warned about possible repairs and the group ignored the warning, that belongs in the assessment of the earlier choice. If repairs became necessary unexpectedly and an ordinary enquiry could not have revealed them, the situation differs. Calling the event an emergency does not settle this question. We need to establish whether relevant information existed, who could access it, and what it meant for the commitment. The

possibility of finding an omission remains open; uncertainty does not protect every choice in advance.

A reasonable check is not an endless search for every imaginable threat. For an ordinary session, no one can guarantee the absence of every future event. Requiring that guarantee would make almost any initiative impossible. But neither can every additional check be dismissed beforehand as excessive. Its significance depends on the stakes, a known warning, the cost of clarification, and the consequences for people. Checking permission has a clear subject in our example. Investigating the entire district's infrastructure for a single session would require a different justification. The extent of checking must be explained through the circumstances, rather than a convenient slogan.

The resulting picture may remain incomplete. A message has been lost, participants remember the conversation differently, or some conditions were discussed orally. An honest conclusion then has a boundary: confirmation of the venue is known, while the content of a particular remark is not. A complete report need not be invented to produce a convenient final judgement. The absence of a record does not prove the absence of a check, but a confident memory does not establish that a check occurred. We can clarify what is available and stop where the evidence ends. Future rules should not rest on fictitious precision about the past.

III. State what makes the choice good

A good decision here does not mean a flawless prediction. It means a choice whose reasons can be explained in relation to a particular task, available information, and accepted limits. The group wanted an outdoor session, had permission, and understood that cancellation was possible. The proposal must be examined against these conditions. If the aim had been to guarantee a session on that exact day under any circumstances, this venue would not have met it. A decision cannot simply be labelled good without answering: good for what purpose, and according to which criteria?

Criteria need to be distinguished from justifications invented after the outcome. Perhaps the group originally discussed only the pleasant setting, but later declared ease of rescheduling to have been the central consideration. If rescheduling had not been considered, it cannot be presented as a deliberate original safeguard. It can be acknowledged as an option available now. But that is a present possibility, not evidence of an earlier calculation. This order protects evaluation from convenient changes of standard: success should not retrospectively confirm any purpose, and failure should not prompt a claim that the purpose had always been something else.

The criteria also include the position of those accepting the consequences. The group may have agreed to an outdoor venue without knowing that some participants would pay for

non-refundable travel. In that case, the discussion of the stakes was incomplete. Permission remains confirmed, but the quality of the agreement needs separate examination. A choice cannot be called good solely because its technical arrangements were studied. We must consider the conditions people were offered and what they actually accepted. Agreement to attend a session does not mean agreement to bear every possible expense without a previously understood limit.

Quality can therefore vary across parts of the decision. The venue was checked carefully, cancellation messages were poorly prepared, and expenses were not discussed. These parts need not be compressed into a single label. Next time, the group might retain the useful venue check and change its notification procedure. That is more precise than either rejecting the entire approach or preserving it unconditionally. We are assessing particular relationships between a purpose, a piece of information, and an action. One difficult outcome does not have to give one verdict on all these relationships, just as one sound part does not certify the others.

IV. What research adds to outcome evaluation

Aiyer and colleagues' 2023 replication found that evaluations of one medical vignette by 692 MTurk participants differed with the described outcome. The authors limit generalisation. Our session was not studied; this information does not give it a ready-made assessment. Examining it requires returning to the example's actual conditions. Someone may discuss lost time even when the initiator considers the preliminary choice well founded. Naming a research result cannot replace answering a particular objection.

We do not extend research explanations to every person or claim that a painful result automatically activates one universal psychological mechanism. An effect's name is not a diagnosis for someone in a conversation. A participant's statement about lost time does not establish that they are evaluating the decision incorrectly; they may be describing a consequence accurately. The subject of their statement must be heard before attaching a research concept to it. If someone asks about late notification, a general distinction between quality and outcome does not yet answer their question.

The source has a limited role in this article: it helps us ask whether the evaluation criteria changed after the outcome became known. The subsequent distinctions between notification, consent, and checking circumstances are the authors' examination of an invented scene. They should not be presented as experimental findings about an ordinary group's work. We do not promise that learning about the study will prevent a repeated mistake or remove disappointment. The reader may use the distinction while retaining their own information and the right to assess the event differently. A scientific label does not settle the participants' disagreement for them.

There is also a useful boundary for self-examination. Someone who tells themselves that the outcome has no bearing on evaluation at all may overlook new evidence. The study does not require excluding the result from consideration; the question is what, exactly, it shows. The closure tells us that the venue became unavailable. It may reveal a weak notification procedure. But it does not by itself prove that a warning existed earlier. Different conclusions require different grounds. This question maintains contact with what happened without allowing a convenient explanation to end the whole examination in advance.

V. The outcome as new information

After the cancellation, the group discovers that the owner's message reached Irina too late for some participants. This is specific new information about communication. They can agree who checks messages that morning and how a cancellation is sent to everyone at once. Such an agreement responds to the difficulty found. It does not require claiming that this particular closure was obvious beforehand. The conclusion's scale matters: one episode reveals a particular break in communication, rather than establishing that every outdoor session is pointless or every venue owner unreliable.

Another conclusion might concern the cost of cancellation. The group recognises that next time it should not accept non-refundable expenses without a separately discussed condition. This change does not make the current losses imaginary. Nor does it guarantee the absence of future expenses. It connects a proposed procedure to a subject actually encountered. Testing the new rule will require another appropriate occasion and the participants' actual agreement. For now, there is only a proposal. It should not be declared a proven improvement merely because its necessity can be described persuasively on paper.

Sometimes an outcome does not add a new rule. The possibility of cancellation was already understood, the message arrived in time, the planned alternative date is available, and everyone accepted those conditions. A bad day can then remain a bad day without an obligatory new lesson. This does not make the loss pleasant. But requiring a change of method after every event can lead to an arbitrary accumulation of rules. What should change is what relevant evidence supports changing. If none has emerged, the earlier procedure may be retained while the cost of the realised possibility is acknowledged separately.

It is also important not to generalise more than one outcome permits. One successful session does not confirm permanent availability; one cancellation does not establish permanent unavailability. The reasons for this closure and conditions for another date can be investigated. But each answer has its own subject and time. If the group wants regular sessions, its information and requirements will differ. Repetition changes the task: a stable arrangement now matters, rather than one instance of permission. This may justify a new examination without rewriting the earlier choice as though that different task already existed then.

VI. Repair need not wait for a final judgement

Irina can immediately notify people, collect the known questions, and propose a possible next date. These actions concern the present commitment, rather than proving that she was right. A sound initial choice should not become a condition of assistance: first agree that I did everything correctly, then we can discuss rescheduling. Other participants may remain disappointed. At the same time, proposing another date does not oblige Irina to remedy every expense for everyone. Her action's scope depends on the role and particular agreement she accepted; these must be named separately.

If a serious dispute about reimbursement arises, this article does not determine its legal resolution. Actual conditions and appropriate competent help are needed. Ordinary clarity is possible earlier, however: what was promised, which expenses are known, what is being proposed now, and what remains unagreed? That may be enough for a first conversation. A new voluntary offer should not be presented as acceptance of every possible demand, just as the absence of such an offer does not prove indifference. An action's meaning should be clear to its recipients rather than supplied by a general judgement of character.

The limit of repair can also be acknowledged. A spent morning does not literally return; another day has its own value and inconveniences. If the group agrees to reschedule, that is a new arrangement, rather than cancellation of the loss that occurred. Describing it precisely does not reduce the next session's value. It releases it from the impossible task of making the first day have happened differently. This boundary matters for the initiator and participants: a good continuation can occur without one judgement of the whole past or complete disappearance of an unpleasant feeling.

The present response may therefore be small: one clear notice, a deadline for the next decision, or refusal to promise an unconfirmed venue. Sometimes the action is to end the project because no suitable continuation is available. Not every cancellation requires restoration of the original intention. But those expecting a shared next step need to hear that it has ended. Freedom to change a plan does not erase the subject of a promise already given. It allows an available continuation to be chosen while honestly acknowledging that the earlier condition can no longer be fulfilled.

VII. Distinguish a reasonable risk from unacceptable stakes

An initial choice can be well informed and still be unsuitable because of the possible loss. Suppose the group is asked to pay for expensive equipment that cannot be returned if the session is cancelled. Permission and favourable available information do not answer whether these participants can accept that stake. It needs separate discussion. Decision quality includes fit with consequences a person is actually entitled to accept. Careful checking does not automatically create capacity to withstand every outcome, and an attractive session does not make someone else's loss agreed.

In the original scene, the stakes are limited to time and ordinary preparation. That is a stipulated condition of the example, which cannot be transferred to dangerous, medical, or legally significant decisions. Those require appropriate standards and professional information. We do not propose substituting an everyday exercise for them. The principle of specific evaluation remains understandable: know what is at stake and who is affected. Sometimes the unacceptability of the loss makes refusal appropriate even if its likelihood seems small. That conclusion does not require inventing a precise number that the available evidence cannot supply.

Necessary consent is not exhausted by saying that the group decided. Some participants may not have heard the limitation; others joined later. Before a new stake is accepted, conditions must be stated clearly to those whose participation is needed. Consent should not be inferred from silence, friendship, or gratitude to the initiator. This does not guarantee identical attitudes to an adverse outcome. It makes the choice's subject clearer. People may voluntarily accept a limited risk and still be upset when it materialises. Their distress neither cancels earlier consent nor proves consent where it was never obtained.

The examination may therefore have a mixed conclusion: the information was checked well, but the stakes were insufficiently discussed. The next step is to clarify acceptable commitments while preserving the useful check. Neither extreme is required: the entire choice was right, or the entire approach must be rejected. A partial judgement demands precision but gives an action corresponding to the part identified. It permits a particular condition to change without making initiative permanently dangerous or treating earlier care as universal certification of future decision quality.

VIII. Disagreement does not always need a single verdict

One participant regards choosing the courtyard as reasonable and is willing to repeat it with a different notification procedure. Another prefers waiting for an indoor room. Their difference may concern acceptable stakes rather than knowledge of the facts. Clarifying the initial information need not remove it. They can agree on the next format or recognise that no shared option is currently available. Disagreement need not be explained through hidden fear or a supposedly wrong attitude to failure. Participants may weigh time, expenses, and the desired setting differently when their own voluntary participation is involved.

It helps to name what an objection concerns. Was permission unchecked? A warning unclear? Cancellation too costly? Notification late? These questions lead to different answers. Combining them into a statement about a bad decision in general may leave the group arguing over one word while referring to different parts. A specific objection does not promise agreement, but makes an appropriate answer possible. The group may acknowledge weak notification while retaining its judgement of the venue, or decline new stakes without denying that the earlier discussion was conscientious.

The initiator does not have to prove to everyone that the decision was good before choosing a next step. But neither may the initiator demand that others stop discussing consequences to protect their self-evaluation. A middle position is available: provide relevant information, respond to accepted obligations, and leave room for a different judgement. This is not compulsory compromise on every question. Sometimes participation ends. That can be an honest result if deadlines and necessary communications are respected and other people's consent is not presumed.

Nor does everyone affected by the cancellation have to join an examination. Some only need clear information; others want to express an objection. A private exercise creates no right to require detailed participation from each person. The review is for those making the next decision or voluntarily discussing the previous one. Its boundaries can be set beforehand: one conversation about a future format rather than an indefinite trial of someone's quality as a person. Meanwhile, important new information still matters whether or not the first meeting has ended or participants have felt relief.

IX. Preserve an approach without making personal vindication its purpose

If examination leaves the earlier decision well founded, it can remain an available option. That does not make this venue a compulsory part of Irina's identity. Next time, the group may have different purposes, another deadline, and new participants. The decision is assessed again in relation to that task. Commitment to a conscientious procedure does not require commitment to every earlier form. Equally, changing the form is not an admission that the first attempt was entirely mistaken. New conditions can make a different choice appropriate without contradicting the earlier assessment.

An unresolved question can also be retained. For example, the group does not know how often closures occur. It can request available information if frequency matters for a regular project. Until then, a single experience should not become a confident expectation. A limited choice may be made under this uncertainty, or the new format postponed. Either response needs an explanation in relation to the stakes. The task is not to eliminate every unknown but to name it and understand which part of the choice depends on it, without presenting an unsupported assumption as reliable.

When a similar situation arises, outcomes alone should not be compared. What warnings, communication opportunities, expenses, and agreed conditions existed? Two cancelled sessions can have different grounds, as can two successful ones. A count of successes does not itself show which checks were completed. Yet accumulating information may justify changing the approach. Experience should not be rejected to protect one past judgement. Precision permits updating: new evidence receives its significance without becoming an imaginary proof that supposedly existed before the first choice.

A person can thus hold two answers: I still regard that decision as well founded; I see the loss and am changing a particular condition. Neither promises a favourable next outcome or requires others to share the judgement. This is a personal position that can be checked against the available facts and limits of the commitment. It keeps initiative possible after failure without making initiative an excuse for inattention. A good decision remains specific and open to revision, rather than a title bestowed on someone permanently.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

X. Evaluation ends with an available response

After the cancellation, Irina can clearly state three things: what supported the choice, what the outcome showed, and what the group proposes now. These answers need not have the same emotional tone. One may respect the earlier check, regret lost time, and not want a repeat. One may acknowledge a particular omission, retain the format, and propose another procedure. Each conclusion needs its corresponding evidence. An unpleasant event should not do the work of missing proof, and a good explanation should not replace action on a present commitment.

The examination need not end in complete knowledge. The group may not know the emergency's cause; part of the earlier conversation may remain unconfirmed; future availability may be uncertain. The response then retains these limits. Cancellation can be communicated and new enrolment stopped without waiting for every detail. A separate check can be agreed before another date. Participants need not formulate a universal rule for their entire lives. Sometimes a completed action is much smaller than the philosophical question of what makes a choice good in a world where consequences are not fully controlled.

This limitation does not make evaluation empty. It allows an omitted check to be distinguished from an unknown future, an unacceptable stake from an unpleasant accepted risk, and present assistance from a demand to prove faultlessness. Each subject permits a specific response. Mixing them may lead someone to reject a suitable way of choosing unnecessarily or preserve an unsuitable one to defend themselves. We do not claim that these distinctions will prevent such mistakes. They provide questions whose answers can be sought in the actual conditions of one episode.

A good decision with a bad outcome therefore remains possible, but it is not declared good merely because someone wants it to be. Its reasons need examination, its consequences acknowledgement, and new information appropriate use. By keeping dates and subjects distinct, a person can respond without fictitious knowledge of the past. The next step promises neither success nor the return of a lost day. It can be precise: notify people, clarify a condition, limit a stake, alter a proposal, or end a shared intention within agreed boundaries.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary completed episode suitable for private reflection. First, briefly state the actual outcome and present commitment. Who needs a message, what deadline applies, and what can no longer be done in its earlier form? This part does not require a final assessment of the decision. Serious harm and specialised consequences require appropriate information and competent help; an everyday example cannot replace them.

Then reconstruct the date of the choice: known information, reasonably available checks, the purpose, stakes, and consent obtained. Distinguish surviving evidence from present recollection. Do not add a later fact to earlier knowledge without grounds. If some circumstances are unknown, leave them unknown. Assess the quality of particular parts rather than only using the general words good or bad. What fitted the task, what was omitted, and what cannot now be established?

Finally, name the specific new information the outcome supplies and a proportionate response. If a communication gap was identified, discuss communication. If the stakes proved unacceptable, discuss the limit of the commitment. If no new evidence emerged, changing a rule is not compulsory. Another person's response remains voluntary; the exercise gives no right to demand agreement or immediate forgiveness. This is an authorial suggestion without tested effectiveness. It may be shortened, skipped, or stopped. One clear present action, with reasons and uncertainty honestly stated, can be a sufficient result even while disappointment remains.

This concerns a safe activity chosen voluntarily. You may stop the exercise if there is a threat or coercion; answering these questions does not require disclosing private material.

Key quotation

> *“Limited generalizability”.*

Aiyer and colleagues, Constraints on Generality, p.13, first sentence: a short fragment about the replication's own limits. It retains the boundary on transfer to other situations. The Russian companion provides a translation made for this article. Context.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What it helps distinguish	Boundary
Evaluation research ↔ an everyday choice	The outcome and preliminary grounds have different subjects of examination.	The invented session is not the studied vignette.
Conscientious checking ↔ acknowledging consequences	A well-founded choice allows a present response to loss.	Explanation replaces neither notification nor an accepted obligation.
Updating knowledge ↔ participants' consent	A new condition can be proposed within its appropriate scope.	Participants may decline; a shared verdict is not guaranteed.

Sources

• Aiyer and colleagues. Outcomes Affect Evaluations of Decision Quality, 2023, DOI10.5334/irsp.751. The abstract, selected discussion and limitations, and CC-BY4.0 information were read; not the entire paper or original 1988 experiment. Russian fragments were translated for this article. Other everyday scenes and distinctions are authorial, without tested effectiveness.

Tags

decision, choice, outcome, failure, evaluation, grounds, information, checking, time of knowledge, uncertainty, prediction, risk, stakes, consent, commitment, message, cancellation, rescheduling, consequences, responsibility, repair, initiative, notification, criteria, generalisation, experience, revision, Aiyer, replication, conscientiousness

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.