

UNITED WISDOM

An unclear task, a missing skill and disagreement with the goal

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-10-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

An unclear task, a missing skill and disagreement with the goal

Epigraph

> *“hope of product”*

William Morris, “Useful Work versus Useless Toil,” in *Signs of Change*. A short fragment from his enumeration of three hopes associated with work. Here it opens a question about the purpose of a result; it does not promise that a clear goal will remove every difficulty.

What this article is about

Someone who says they cannot begin may mean very different difficulties. They do not understand the result expected of them, cannot perform a particular operation, or disagree with the goal for which they are supposed to work. One outward condition—the work is unfinished—does not explain the difference. Learning can be attempted where a clear question is needed first, or clarity demanded where the question is understood but participation has not been chosen. Neither a feeling of difficulty, others' confidence nor the number of postponed attempts establishes the appropriate answer.

We explore this through a hypothetical small shared discussion of a book. The authors invented the example. Ryan and Deci's self-determination theory offers a limited research distinction between competence and voluntary participation; Morris's discussion of labour raises a historical question about work's purpose. Neither establishes why our character stopped. The rest of the article offers questions about the task, an available method and agreement with the goal. This is no diagnosis, promise of changed motivation or duty to disclose private reasons for withdrawing. Clarification, learning or reconsidering participation may be sufficient decisions.

I. One complaint may contain different questions

Imagine Ilya, who agreed to help acquaintances prepare a voluntary discussion of a book they have read. They ask him to make material for the conversation. He opens a document several times and leaves it empty. One participant recommends a formatting lesson, another suggests simply writing down thoughts, while a third asks whether Ilya is really interested. Each suggestion addresses a possible reason that has not been established. An empty document reports only the document's condition. Choosing appropriate assistance requires knowing what remains unavailable before the next action.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Ilya may not understand what material means: a question list, summary or character table would produce different results. He may understand that questions are wanted without knowing how to derive them from the text. Finally, he may understand and know how, yet not want to turn an informal conversation into a test of correct answers. The delay looks alike in each case. Changing the file format addresses only some possible questions. Confident advice to start small also establishes neither the goal accepted nor the method available to the person.

The distinction does not require immediately selecting one cause. Conditions can coexist. Ilya lacks a clear format and also doubts whether participants need a prepared analysis. Both questions can be named without explaining his whole personality. The article seeks a sufficiently specific object for the next decision, rather than a complete classification of inner states. One question may be resolved before another emerges. This does not establish that the first was invented or that someone deliberately changes explanations to avoid working.

Assistance starts with respect for what is already known. Ilya read the book, attended the discussion and agreed to participate within a particular scope. Those facts do not guarantee readiness for every additional assignment, but an empty document does not cancel them either. Instead of concluding that he cannot organise himself, the particular work not yet performed can be named. This account leaves room to change conditions or decline an expanded role. It requires no advance judgment about whether someone takes the shared undertaking seriously enough.

II. Uncertainty concerns the result, not the quantity of explanations

Ilya asks what participants want before the discussion. They reply that anything useful for conversation would do. The answer is friendly but leaves several significantly different possibilities. A summary helps recall events; questions without supplied answers leave room for personal interpretations; a character diagram directs attention to relationships. Length alone cannot determine suitability. Half a page can be clear or unclear depending on its purpose. Clarification is needed to understand the prepared text's function, rather than obtain detailed instructions for every step.

Who will use the material and how can be asked. If everyone has read the book, a long retelling may be unnecessary. If some want to join without reading it, they may expect different support. These circumstances concern the arrangement of the discussion, rather than Ilya's abilities. He need not infer them from the assignment's name. Participants themselves may have no answer yet. The uncertainty then belongs to the shared purpose. Acknowledging it is

more useful than requiring one person to make the task clear for everyone while somehow leaving others' expectations untouched.

A finished example can help if it suits the present purpose. Ilya is shown questions for another book. He sees the form, but some resemble a school test. An example provides information without having to become a standard. He can identify what he wants to retain: brevity, a clear connection to the text, and no compulsory single answer. An example's mismatch does not establish inability to follow instructions. The mismatch needs discussion through its content, rather than concealment behind a general demand to be more practical.

All uncertainty need not disappear before beginning. Participants may agree that Ilya will offer several possible questions while selection remains open. The task then includes room for choice rather than being inadequately explained. This needs distinction from a hidden expectation to guess the final format. What counts as an acceptable version and who will discuss it can be named beforehand. Clarification is sufficient when an agreed action becomes available, rather than when every possibility of doubt or disagreement about the future meeting disappears.

III. A missing skill can be named through a particular operation

After clarification, Ilya understands that a short list of open questions is wanted. Yet he cannot move from an episode he enjoyed to a question for discussion. This is more precise than saying he cannot prepare meetings. One episode and several ways of asking about it can be considered without commissioning an entire communication course. The missing operation may be narrow: distinguishing a factual question from an interpretive one. Identifying it promises no rapid learning, but indicates which assistance or learning it makes sense to discuss now.

Confidence and an available method need not coincide. Ilya may speak uncertainly yet produce an intelligible question with an example. Or he may confidently describe a method without applying it to the chosen episode. Conversational tone therefore cannot substitute for assessing the operation. If he wants, availability of the method can be examined through safe private material. The trial seeks the present operation and remaining question. It measures no general competence, is no examination and establishes no ability to manage every later task without further assistance.

If the operation remains unavailable, support options differ too. One person explains the sequence, another demonstrates an example, while a third is willing to examine the result together. Ilya can choose appropriate available assistance. Others cannot be required to provide it without consent, and an explanation is not an acquired skill. An attempt, clarification or different method may still be needed afterwards. Shared work has a scope of its own. A

voluntary helper need not become a permanent teacher, nor Ilya a pupil required to prove gratitude through immediate success.

The skill also depends on the task actually chosen. Forming a question differs from leading a large public conversation, moderating conflict or assessing everyone's understanding. If another purpose emerges later, its conditions need separate consideration. Requirements of a future expanded role need not be placed on the present few questions. Conversely, a small trial cannot establish readiness for every scale. Naming the operation precisely preserves both limits: it avoids demanding too much now and avoids assigning an ability that has not actually been demonstrated.

IV. Disagreement with a goal does not disappear after a good explanation

Ilya knows how to form questions but learns that the meeting is intended as a competition for the correct interpretation. He does not want to help in that format. This disagreement differs from misunderstanding instructions. A detailed explanation may clarify the goal without making it accepted. An invitation to practise also does not answer the participation question. Another format or narrower role can be discussed, but any arrangement producing a filled document is not automatically sufficient. Completed work alone does not establish agreement with its purpose.

Agreement with a goal requires no continual pleasure in every action. Ilya may want an open conversation without enjoying text formatting. An unpleasant operation does not necessarily mean rejecting the entire meeting. Yet this distinction cannot justify calling every disagreement superficial inconvenience. The objection's content matters: someone dislikes a technical part, rejects the method of assessment or no longer chooses participation altogether. These answers have different consequences. They need not be inferred from mood. Room can remain to identify which result or condition does not fit now.

Acknowledging disagreement does not require a personal explanation. Ilya need not reveal why the competitive format feels unwelcome. Saying he is not willing to prepare that material can suffice for a role decision. This does not automatically cancel earlier promises. If others are relying on him, the changes and remaining options need separate discussion. However, discussing a commitment gives no right to demand a detailed confession. The practical question concerns participation and consequences; privacy is not a reward for proving a sufficiently convincing reason to withdraw.

Sometimes a goal is not rejected entirely but needs alteration. Ilya is willing to prepare questions without supplied correct answers. Participants can accept, reject or revise the proposal. Nobody has to agree to preserve the old distribution of work. If purposes are

incompatible, a voluntary project may end or continue without one participant. This is not necessarily a failure to cooperate. Shared interest in a book does not establish one suitable meeting format. Agreement acquires content through a particular choice, rather than requiring everyone to want the same thing.

V. Competence and voluntary participation differ within the research framework

In their 2000 paper, Ryan and Deci discuss self-determination theory, distinguishing competence, autonomy and relatedness. In the theoretical discussion read, autonomy concerns volition rather than complete independence from assistance. This is a limited reference for our distinction: having a method and agreeing to participate are different matters. The review is no study of Ilya or this proposed trial. We do not use it to infer hidden motivation or promise that a particular conversation will end delay or improve wellbeing.

The discussion can remain collaborative while participation is voluntarily chosen. Ilya uses someone else's example, agrees on a format and receives help. This need not remove his agreement with the goal. Conversely, making the file alone establishes no volition if the role was imposed. The distinction helps question a demand to cope entirely alone before claiming a decision as one's own. Actual conditions of participation nevertheless need separate consideration. The word autonomy establishes neither the agreements accepted, pressure present nor changes someone can make without consequences for others.

Experienced competence also differs from an objective list of acquired operations. The theoretical framework discusses psychological conditions, while our particular task requires establishing whether a specific question can be formed. Ilya can feel capable or incapable; this matters as his account without replacing examination of the work itself. Philosophy or psychology should not become a means of contradicting someone by declaring them fully capable because they once succeeded. An earlier result may be relevant evidence. It does not automatically establish present resources, conditions or agreement.

Morris's historical discussion of useful work asks what labour produces and under which conditions it occurs. This is a nineteenth-century normative social position, rather than a contemporary procrastination experiment. We compare it with the material's purpose while preserving the difference between sources. It establishes neither that every difficult, necessary or unpleasant task is useless nor an obligation to accept the author's political judgments. For our scene, asking which result participants choose and how someone's participation relates to it can suffice.

VI. A mixed situation requires separate answers

Suppose Ilya wants a noncompetitive discussion, lacks a suitable format and cannot derive questions. Three difficulties coexist. The shared purpose can be addressed first because learning the old format will not resolve agreement. Yet this sequence is no rule for every case. Sometimes one example makes an unclear purpose discussable; sometimes an existing obligation requires first reporting a delay. The choice depends on the questions' particular relationship. Resolving one should not automatically close the others or authorise refusal to hear new clarification.

Three brief statements can be written: which result is unclear, which operation unavailable and what participation is agreed. A record is optional and needs no table for every project. It helps if it keeps answers separate. Ilya obtains a clear format yet still disagrees with assessing participants. Or he accepts the purpose but needs a question example. These are different changes in the work's state. Saying everything was explained so he must now perform erases a remaining question. Saying he does not want to may also be too broad if part of the goal is actually chosen.

Reasons can change as work progresses. Ilya starts writing questions and discovers that available time cannot cover the promised scope. This resource question is not fully addressed by our three distinctions. He need not be forced to choose only uncertainty, skill or disagreement. The distinction is limited to this article's purpose, rather than a complete model of human action. A significant circumstance can be added and scope reconsidered. Precision means correspondence with the observed situation, rather than loyalty to a predefined scheme that initially helped the conversation.

Another perspective can be considered without being declared final. One participant thinks Ilya needs an example; Ilya believes the format was not agreed. They can compare which result each means. The difference does not necessarily imply dishonesty or generally poor communication. They may actually intend different kinds of discussion. In a safe voluntary conversation, particular questions permit clarification. Under coercion, a scheme creates no duty to continue explaining. Naming a difficulty is an opportunity for a decision, rather than a means of demanding an explanation convenient for others.

VII. Assistance needs to address the present question

When the material's purpose is unclear, discussing its use may be more appropriate than immediate advice on discipline. When an operation is unavailable, repeating the goal in detail may not help. When the goal is not accepted, another lesson need not change the decision. These are editorial distinctions concerning suitable assistance, rather than an experimentally established intervention sequence. Actual conversation may be more complicated. Comparing question and answer nevertheless shows why a friendly suggestion sometimes leaves a difficulty untouched: it addresses other content even though it formally concerns the same work.

Assistance needs consent. Ilya may not want acquaintances examining his draft or assessing his abilities. He may ask only for an example and use it privately. Another participant can decline to explain when lacking time or experience. A difficulty does not automatically distribute others' resources. A small joint examination with a clear limit can be agreed. This preserves both sides' participation. Help becomes no duty of others, while receiving it does not oblige Ilya to accept the whole project or every later suggestion.

After assistance, the actual result needs description. A format named, an example received and one question composed are different reports. Ilya may still be unable to form the remaining questions independently. Actual work can be recognised without expanding the conclusion. This precision supports choosing further work: another example, changed scope, divided tasks or a pause. First success need not establish that every difficulty disappeared. Yet retaining a general claim of being unable to do anything after a particular result is unnecessary too. The present boundary can change without becoming a permanent characterization.

Chosen assistance may be unsuitable. An example requires unfamiliar knowledge or an explanation concerns another book. That warrants reconsidering the method, rather than automatically accusing someone of resistance. The mismatch can be named and other assistance considered. Sometimes none is available and the task remains undone. Acknowledging that is more useful than confidently promising that anyone can manage with the right approach. The article recommends no endless search for an ideal helper. It preserves stopping, limited participation or a result corresponding to actually available conditions.

VIII. An agreement and personal acceptance should not replace each other

Ilya promised material by a particular date. Later he realised he did not accept the proposed format. This new understanding matters without erasing the promise from history. The change can be communicated, another scope discussed or part of the work transferred. Participants can consider consequences for the meeting. This does not mean forcing someone to perform any role initially accepted. Deciding on participation and addressing an expectation already created are different questions. One honest answer should not conceal the other beneath a general reference to boundaries.

An obligation also has limits. Agreeing to make several questions is not agreeing to assess people, lead the discussion and ensure its success. When extra tasks emerge quietly, the original agreement needs recovery. Ilya can decline expansion without explaining it as inadequate skill. Participants can find another person or alter the purpose. Discussing a role becomes clearer when grounded in what was actually accepted. An expectation of total availability becomes no promise merely because others habitually treat one participant as a convenient performer of every emerging task.

An unpleasant part of a chosen shared undertaking may still need doing. Ilya dislikes correcting typographical errors but agreed to prepare a readable list. He can recognise displeasure, perform that part, request help or discuss another scope. Displeasure does not establish lack of agreement with the goal. Yet someone saying everyone finds things unpleasant does not refute his particular rejection of competition. The distinction follows content: an operation is inconvenient, a method unavailable or a purpose unaccepted. It gives no participant authority to decide which description another person may use.

When an agreement becomes a subject of threats or humiliation, a voluntary clarification trial may be unsuitable. Someone can stop it without disclosing private matters to prove sincerity. This article determines no legal consequences of commitments and offers no universal exit from dangerous relationships. Concrete consequences and available options can be discussed in our safe hypothetical project. Other situations require relevant information and assistance. A modest assignment does not make coercion permissible, while clear language does not guarantee that others will respect withdrawal.

IX. A small trial clarifies work, rather than the whole person

If he wants, Ilya can select one episode and compose one question after examining an example. First, what is being considered can be named: whether the form is clear, the operation available or the intended use suitable. A trial may provide material for one question without resolving all three. A completed question is no proof of agreement with the goal. An absent question is no diagnosis. What matters is a bounded result related to the initial request, without assessing someone's general readiness to participate in life or take responsibility.

The form may prove clear while the example remains insufficient for independent work. A more specific question about the operation remains. Ilya may form a question but not want to use it to assess others. Learning then does not resolve disagreement. Or the changed format may suit him and one question be ready. This change can be named without promising easier further preparation. Each possibility concerns the present relationship between conditions. It establishes no permanent cause of every previous stoppage and gives no right to rewrite their history through one later result.

The result can remain private. Ilya need not send the question before choosing that action. If discussion is needed, only the relevant part can be shared while privacy is retained. A safe draft and its use in a shared meeting differ. Being able to do the first establishes no permission for any second action. Consent, the promised format and actual readiness need consideration. This transition particularly matters when others want every trial to count as an accepted contribution: agreed use cannot quietly be added to voluntary examination of a possibility.

The trial can be declined altogether. When the goal is unchosen, significant conditions absent or further consideration presently unsuitable, withdrawal remains available. Someone need not prove having tried every method first. Clarification helps insofar as it serves an actual choice. It can end with a remaining question or a participation limit. This is more precise than universally overcoming postponement. Work should not become an endless proof that a person deserves the right to withdraw only after enough explanations and attempts.

X. The next decision concerns the task, method or participation

Ilya agrees on several open questions without assessing participants. He examines an example and saves a first version. In this hypothetical story, the material's purpose and availability of the operation changed. This result can be recognised without concluding that all preparation will now be easy. Other episodes, time constraints or disagreements may arise. The distinction remains a question about present work: what is unclear, which method unavailable and what participation agreed? It requires neither a detailed diary of every inner state nor turning life into continual self-examination.

Another story could end in withdrawal. Ilya understood the format and acquired the operation but still did not choose the goal. Clarity and learning would not be wasted: they supported naming the decision more precisely. This benefit cannot be promised beforehand to everyone. Sometimes someone learns only that the question remains difficult or assistance unavailable. The limit can remain without a compulsory positive conclusion. The right not to continue does not depend on finding an attractive meaning in time spent. Actual agreements are considered separately.

Information about work need not become a permanent label. Today a format is unclear, tomorrow clear; one operation acquired, another not; one goal accepted, another rejected. These differences do not necessarily mean inconsistency. They can describe changing tasks and conditions. More precise language supports discussing particular assistance and participation. It does not replace attention to feelings, but neither makes a feeling sufficient evidence of a cause. Personal experience can be respected while retaining the question of which action, explanation or decision is actually available now.

Postponement becomes more specific when no single explanation of the whole self is demanded. A clear result can be requested, a needed method learned and agreement with a goal discussed as related but different tasks. Sometimes they resolve together, sometimes separately. What matters is assistance and action corresponding to the real question, rather than the right causal label. This leaves room for cooperation, privacy, changed conditions and withdrawal. It does not guarantee a result; it helps avoid treating a performed operation as accepted participation or an unclear assignment as personal inability.

What this means in practice

For a small safe task chosen voluntarily, name the expected result, one necessary operation and the agreed purpose of participation. An imagined example can replace a personal situation. Avoid actions lacking necessary permission, qualifications or safety checks. Ask separately whether the requirement is clear, a method available and the goal suitable. You need not immediately select one reason for stopping or disclose private motives to others.

For an open question, an appropriate action can be chosen: clarifying the result's use, examining one learning example or discussing participation's scope. Assistance needs both sides' consent. Afterwards, name only the actual change: a clearer format, a method tried, agreement clarified or a remaining question. Infer no diagnosis, whole-person assessment or guaranteed success. This is an editorial invitation to clarify a task, rather than a scientifically validated motivation-change protocol.

The invitation can be declined, shortened or stopped under threat or coercion. The result can remain private. A pause, changed scope, assistance or withdrawal remain available, with

actual agreements discussed separately. Disagreement need not be disguised as missing skill, nor necessary learning called hidden rejection. Where a significant condition exceeds your role, this record does not replace relevant specialist information and checks. A sufficiently specific present question can be the result, without an obligation to begin at any cost afterwards.

Key quotation

> *“hope of rest”*

William Morris, the same lecture, in its opening enumeration of conditions of work. In the following paragraph he discusses the sufficiency and quality of rest. This historical normative question draws attention to the conditions of participation; it does not establish why Ilya stopped or demonstrate the effectiveness of our small trial.

Connections between traditions

Ryan and Deci's theoretical review, Morris's normative lecture and our hypothetical book conversation have different grounds. Competence and volition differ from questions about usefulness and labour conditions in a nineteenth-century social argument. We compare them through participation's purpose without deriving a unified psychological theory or assigning our scene to the source authors. Morris's political judgments are no condition for considering our editorial questions. Task clarification, learning and agreement may require separate decisions; no tradition authorises deciding them for the reader.

Sources

• William Morris. Signs of Change: Seven Lectures, selected Useful Work versus Useless Toil, p. 141 onwards. Project Gutenberg3053, transcription of Longmans, Green, and Co.,1896. Actual reading covered metadata, complete contents and the selected lecture opening on hope, product and working conditions; not the complete collection. Normative social argument, not a postponement experiment. Gutenberg's territorial conditions are retained; worldwide rights are not asserted.

• Richard M. Ryan; Edward L. Deci. Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. American Psychologist55(1),2000,68–78; DOI 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68. Actual reading covered selected theoretical review passages on competence, autonomy, internalisation and comparison limits; not the whole paper or every cited study. Copyright APA; no open licence established. Used through bounded paraphrase here, with no direct fragments of this work.

Tags

unclear task, skill, agreement, goal, participation, competence, autonomy, voluntary choice, result, operation, explanation, example, assistance, learning, condition, resources, agreement scope, commitment, privacy, right to refuse, revision, book, shared meeting, question, draft, Ryan, Deci, Morris, labour conditions, editorial distinction

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 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.