

UNITED WISDOM

Recognising an Unexpected Useful Result

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-13-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Recognising an Unexpected Useful Result

Epigraph

Exploration develops theories and hypotheses

Ulrich Dirnagl, 2020, a methodological article on exploratory research. Here exploration means searching for possible explanations and new directions, rather than research of every kind. The source concerns biomedical work; the everyday scene below is a limited authorial analogy, without a claim that the exercise has proven effectiveness.

What this article is about

Alina is making a small paper map for family guests. She wants them to walk independently from the house to several familiar places and back, without asking for directions at every turn. The map has large labels, simple landmarks, and few unnecessary details. A neighbour sees a trial printout and says that this format would help him find shops: he rarely opens a map on his phone and prefers paper. Alina had not set that goal. She was preparing a route for guests and heard about another possible use.

It is easy to turn this response into an attractive story: the true purpose of the work was discovered by chance, so everything must have been right. Yet less is known so far. The neighbour liked the format; it is unclear whether the landmarks are sufficient for him, whether the route suits him, and whether he will want to use the map for everyday errands. The guests' original task remains separate too. The new benefit may be real, but it need not immediately be declared established or used to justify an unfinished original promise.

This article explores how to preserve an unexpected finding without an excessive conclusion. We will distinguish an observation, a possible new goal, and grounds for checking it. Not every side effect is useful, not every benefit is shared, and no result automatically makes a means permissible. The suggested practice is an authorial approach to ordinary situations, rather than a scientific protocol or a promise to find something good in every event. A person may notice an opportunity and decline to develop it if it does not fit their resources and choice.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Notice the Difference from What Was Expected

To call a result unforeseen, we need to remember what we expected. Alina wanted to make a route for guests and check whether its landmarks were understandable. The neighbour's suggestion concerns everyday use by a different audience. If the original goal is blurred into generally helping people, the difference disappears: any pleasant consequence can be declared the fulfilment of the plan. Sometimes a short note of the initial task, kept alongside the new observation, is enough. It clarifies the history rather than forbidding a change of interest during the work.

Unexpected does not necessarily mean accidental in a strong sense. Alina chose the large labels, but she did not plan the neighbour's response. Some conditions were created intentionally, while their new application emerged later. We can name precisely that combination. There is no need to portray the author as a passive recipient of good fortune or credit her with complete foresight. Work involves a plan, actions, and emerging experience; a useful discovery sometimes arises between what was consciously chosen and what became visible only after the result.

The first observation deserves a narrow description. The neighbour said that he would prefer this kind of map to a phone. That is different from saying that all older people need paper maps or that large labels always solve orientation problems. Even for this person, how he will use this particular sheet is not yet known. A narrow record does not diminish the response's value. It preserves what actually happened and reveals the next question needed before a broader claim.

The benefit need not be noticed immediately. Alina may first encounter a difficulty: the map was not finished in time, the guests used another approach, or one landmark was unclear. Later, a particular detail may become useful for a different task. Both results can be preserved. There is no duty to turn an unpleasant experience into a lesson immediately or feel grateful for the discovery it produced. A person's feelings and the analysis of a consequence concern different questions. The new opportunity should not become a demand that forbids disappointment about the original difficulty.

II. Ask Who Benefits and How

Usefulness relates to a particular action or need. The neighbour wants to find several places without constantly consulting a phone. A large printed diagram may be convenient for him. A guest arriving in the neighbourhood for the first time needs different landmarks and details. Someone who knows the streets might prefer information about a particular place's opening hours, but that information needs separate verification. We cannot combine every need under convenience and treat one map as a sufficient answer. A new audience changes the task, not merely the number of copies.

Alina can ask the neighbour what use he has in mind and whether he wants a trial copy. He may decline or clarify that he only noticed the readable type. The discovered benefit then concerns the format rather than the completed route. Clarification preserves his authorship of his own action. The organiser does not need to demonstrate her finding's value through someone who is now supposedly obliged to use the result. Interest in a possible improvement does not make another person a compulsory participant in checking it.

A benefit for one person can also carry a cost for another. If Alina postpones the map promised to her guests to pursue the new task, their need remains. If the sheet shows relatives' private addresses, circulation beyond the original group requires a different boundary and consent. If producing extra copies takes a helper's time, that resource is not free. A useful result deserves consideration together with its consequences and means. The excitement of discovery grants no permission for an action that previously required a separate agreement.

Sometimes only the author notices the new benefit. Alina sees that she has learned to arrange information clearly, although no one uses the finished sheet. This may be a meaningful personal result. Yet acquiring a skill is different from fulfilling a promise to guests, and enjoyment of preparation does not prove the map's usefulness to the neighbour. Giving each result a separate name preserves several grounds without making them compete for a single good outcome. We can value our experience, acknowledge the object's limitations, and decide the next task without demanding general approval.

III. Preserve the Original Goal's History

After a pleasant response, it is tempting to say that the map was designed from the beginning for people who find phones inconvenient. The story becomes tidier, but the actual discovery disappears. Alina loses sight of how the new task arose through encountering someone else's need. A retrospective story makes the result confirm an already known plan. Preserving the initial goal is more useful: it lets her assess separately what worked for the guests and what became a new direction that still requires choice and checking.

If the original task remains unfinished, a side benefit does not automatically close it. The guests did not receive the promised route; this remains a fact even if the neighbour liked the draft. Alina can explain the limitation, suggest another approach, and decide on the new work separately. Such clarity does not require declaring the experience a failure. It preserves the outstanding promise. The freedom to develop an unexpected idea and responsibility for an existing agreement can coexist when the new direction does not quietly erase the old obligation.

Sometimes the initial goal really is no longer needed. The guests have decided to walk with a relative and agreed to give up the map. The project can then change openly. The issue is the distinction between an agreed change and a rewritten history, rather than a prohibition on revision. If others release Alina from her original promise, that is a new event. It does not mean there was never a promise. The record can be brief and ordinary: the task changed after a conversation, and the first version now serves a different purpose.

Nor must the new goal be truer than the former one. Discovery stories often celebrate a turn as though an unexpected use always reveals the work's real meaning. In ordinary life, a map can have several permissible uses. Alina chooses between them according to her interest, obligations, resources, and people's consent. A chance response adds an option rather than a command to change her life. She can keep the idea for later, invite someone else to develop it, or stop without treating refusal as the loss of a single correct path.

IV. Separate Discovery from Confirmation

In his methodological Perspective, Ulrich Dirnagl distinguishes exploratory work that generates possible explanations from subsequent confirmatory work. A narrow analogy matters for our scene: the encounter that produced the idea is not yet independent confirmation of its role. The source concerns biomedical methodology and does not study everyday maps. We do not transfer the entire scientific protocol. The distinction allows us to call the finding preliminary, preserving interest without treating it as proven simply because it arose from actual experience.

The neighbour may have responded to an understandable label, Alina's attention, or the idea of a paper diagram itself. His words do not establish which element mattered most. This does not mean that his response was wrong. He describes his reaction; explaining its cause is a different question. Alina can retain several possibilities: large text, fewer details, familiar landmarks, or the ability to look without a device. Establishing each one's role calls for an appropriate next step. Not every such question is necessary for the practical decision to offer a small trial copy.

An independent everyday check need not be a complicated study. We can offer someone a new version for the task they described, then invite them freely to explain any difficulty. We can ask another willing reader, uninvolved in the first conversation, to check comprehensibility. Even one subsequent experience has a limit, however. It may show convenience for several people under particular conditions, rather than a universal solution for any audience. Naming that limit matters more than imitating scientific rigour through a long list of ratings.

If checking does not confirm the first impression, the finding need not disappear entirely. The neighbour likes paper, but the map has too few landmarks. The format may be useful while the content needs revision. Or the readable type may suit another document. We can refine what is useful without requiring the original version to be rescued. Learning as an author means changing the explanation in response to the result, rather than proving that the pleasant moment of discovery was right in all its assumptions.

V. Preserve the Conditions Alongside the Story

The discovery depended on conditions: the neighbour knows the area, saw the map beside Alina, and could immediately ask a question. Some of that support disappears during independent use. Unless we name it, a conversation's results can easily be transferred to the finished object. Alina can record what was actually in front of him, what help he received, and what he had not yet done. This does not devalue the response. It helps define the new version and avoids promising independent clarity where clarity arose through a shared explanation.

In Chapter VI of How We Think, Dewey considers checking a suggested thought and the relationship between an inference and experience. This offers a historical perspective on inquiry, rather than an evaluation of an exercise for finding useful surprises. Alina can work with a new suggestion without making it established knowledge. There is no need to reproduce every stage of the chapter or declare every conversation scientific research. It is enough to distinguish the emerging thought, available observations, and the scope of the next conclusion, keeping the discovery's story honest and open to change.

Knudsen and colleagues' medical review of PDSA discusses limitations in project reporting and causal conclusions about a result. Its analogy to our map is limited: reporting an improvement does not replace clarity about conditions and grounds for an explanation. We do not claim that an everyday check works like a medical intervention. If the map was used after the conversation, the result could also have depended on prior familiarity with the route. Such conditions deserve attention when the author intends to make a broader claim about the format's usefulness, rather than simply give someone a sheet.

Preserving conditions lets us pass a finding to another person without exaggeration. Alina can say that one neighbour liked the readability of the trial diagram, but independent use has not

yet been checked. This is less celebratory than announcing a new universal approach to navigation. Yet the next person understands what is available for further work. They will not have to dismantle an attractive story to ask an obvious question. Honest limitation can assist collaboration by leaving room for a different observation and another development path.

VI. Examine the Means and the New Cost

An unexpected benefit can obscure the question of how it arose. If the map became useful through information that people did not permit Alina to share, the new task does not make its use permissible. If the initial trial broke a promise, a pleasant side result does not cancel repair. Means and consequences need separate consideration. Respecting the discovery is compatible with declining to develop it in its present form. The author can preserve a lesson about the format and remove information whose circulation needs different consent.

The new version has a cost too. The neighbour needs different places, more detailed landmarks, and perhaps a different sheet size. Alina may want to help, but she still has work and existing commitments. An unexpected opportunity creates no automatic duty to make maps for everyone. She can offer a small available step, name a deadline, pass the draft to someone who wants to continue, or decline. A limit is compatible with goodwill. It maintains the connection between an intention to help and an action that can actually be fulfilled.

In the read context of Book III of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, choice concerns available means of action and differs from wishing for an outcome. This provides a useful historical distinction: interest in a benefit is different from deciding to do everything its creation would require. The text does not establish our practice's effectiveness or prohibit revision of goals. Alina can recognise the value of the new direction and choose a narrower contribution without presenting a wish for the entire result as a commitment already made.

If someone else will benefit, their choice matters. Alina can offer a trial map without requiring them to use it, respond in detail, or demonstrate gratitude. Even a truly convenient object does not become compulsory because of the giver's effort. A refusal may clarify a need or simply express another preference. It need not become a diagnosis of resistance to help. Preserving autonomy is an independent condition of this authorial practice, rather than an empirical conclusion from a methodological article on scientific discovery.

VII. Choose the New Direction Separately

After the conversation, Alina can write down a new goal: make an understandable printed diagram of several ordinary routes for the willing neighbour. This is a different result with its own criterion and limit. It need not incorporate the entire initial map or every new idea. She chooses what is actually needed, which information requires checking, and whose consent is affected by sharing. The project's unexpected origin does not exempt it from ordinary clarity. A new formulation shows that the discovered opportunity has become a chosen action.

The new direction can coexist with the old one. Alina finishes the guests' route and leaves the other diagram's draft for later. Or she invites the neighbour to prepare the necessary landmarks together, if both are interested. This preserves the difference between the tasks. There is no need to declare one genuine and the other mistaken merely because the second arose later. Resources may permit one, both, or neither now. An idea's value and the availability of its implementation are different grounds that deserve consideration together.

Sometimes the chosen result is retaining an approach. Alina notices that large labels and fewer details help her arrange information more clearly. She can use this in future work without creating a separate neighbourhood project. It is neither a guaranteed skill nor a proven general principle of accessibility. It is her own experience, remaining open to new conditions and checks. This modest result may be enough. A discovery does not have to end in expanded activity, publication, or a new identity for its author.

If a new action is chosen, it helps to mark the end of its first check. Did the diagram work for the particular user, what difficulties remain, and is another version needed? There is no need to keep seeking confirmation of a discovery's value once the local task is complete. We can stop, name the result and limits, and preserve the original history. Continuing becomes a separate choice if a new important question appears. Unexpected usefulness can enter life without making every pleasant response a programme of continuous growth.

VIII. Preserve the Freedom to Find No Benefit

An article on useful surprises can quietly turn into a demand to see something positive in every outcome. That would be a different and excessive rule. Some events bring loss, harm, or exhaustion without any discovery available to the person. There is no need to invent a benefit to be allowed to finish reflection. Alina may find no new direction or have no wish to develop one. This authorial practice offers a question when appropriate, rather than compulsory gratitude to circumstances or a measure of maturity based on transforming distress into a resource.

We can also notice a possible benefit without treating it as sufficient compensation. If an initial promise was broken, a new skill does not automatically repair someone else's inconvenience. If the result brings joy to one person and harm to another, a generally positive label hides the difference. Reflection should preserve the people and consequences separately. An unexpected finding does not permit us to rewrite the means as good or declare the cost acceptable on behalf of whoever bore it. This is the article's ethical boundary, not a deduction from research usefulness.

The right to pause remains after a joyful discovery too. Alina may be tired of the work and unable to respond to new suggestions yet. She can record the idea briefly, finish what was promised, and return later. She can pass on a finding without committing to support every application. It matters to name the boundary to people whose expectations have arisen. Stopping need not establish that the idea is bad. It may reflect the author's present choice and resources, preserving interest without making an opportunity a new hidden debt.

A useful surprise thus becomes a separate observation and a possible new direction. The original task retains its history, new promises arise through choice, and confirmation needs appropriate grounds. Alina can value her neighbour's response, finish the guests' map, and try another sheet without a grand conclusion about discovering her destiny. This way of seeing results makes room for curiosity, honesty, and autonomy: a noticed opportunity may become action, but gains no authority to decide the person's entire future.

What this means in practice

Choose one action followed by an unexpected positive consequence. Briefly record the original goal and what happened. Describe the observation narrowly: who reported a benefit, what exactly was convenient, and under what conditions? Do not replace this with a universal conclusion. If no positive consequence is visible or the question is unnecessary now, do not create one artificially. The practice does not require finding something good in every event.

Separate the possible new goal from the former one. Was the original promise fulfilled, what remains, and who is affected? Clarify for whom the new benefit exists and whether they want further involvement. Consider means, consent, and cost. Even an interesting discovery may require declining to circulate private information, changing the format, or postponing the project. Usefulness does not grant permission for every means or erase another person's harm.

If the new task matters, choose an independent and proportionate next step. Check the possible use itself rather than just the pleasantness of the first response. Preserve the conditions, alternative explanations, and the conclusion's limit. If experience does not confirm

the initial thought, refine or abandon it without a duty to rescue an attractive story. The new result can produce another question, but not every question must be investigated now.

Then choose continued work, retaining the approach, passing on the idea, or ending. Name commitments and the available boundary of help. The practice guarantees no discoveries and does not assess psychological state. It helps distinguish discovery from confirmation, the original intention from a new goal, and benefit from permissible means. Above all, it allows unexpected information to be used honestly while preserving the freedom to leave it undeveloped and keep the history intact.

Key quotation

> *Confirmatory research must follow*

Dirnagl, 2020, discussing the sequence of exploratory and confirmatory work. The scientific context concerns a new hypothesis requiring further confirmation. For our scene, this is a limited analogy: the first response may generate an idea without establishing its transferability. The fragment does not demand a scientific study of every everyday impression or assert that every discovery will prove true.

Connections between traditions

Dewey considers checking a suggested thought; Aristotle distinguishes wishing for a result from available choice of means. Dirnagl draws a methodological boundary between exploration and confirmation. These perspectives help the article keep a new idea, the possibility of action, and the limits of knowledge separate. Their subjects differ: historical educational thought, the ethics of choice, and biomedical methodology. None makes an unexpected benefit a person's obligatory project.

The PDSA review adds caution about a causal story built around a positive result. Consent, resources, the original promise, and the right to leave a discovery undeveloped remain independent authorial conditions. We do not claim that every tradition taught a shared technique for fortunate accidents or that the exercise reliably increases useful discoveries. It simply suggests a more accurate way to name what was noticed and choose our subsequent relationship to it.

Sources

• Ulrich Dirnagl. Preregistration of exploratory research: Learning from the golden age of discovery, 2020. Metadata, abstract, discussion of exploratory and confirmatory work, and selected subsequent context read. A commissioned Perspective without external peer review, not an empirical trial of the exercise. CC BY; two brief excerpts and a United Wisdom Russian translation. Historical analogies are not adopted as guidance.

• John Dewey. How We Think, 1910, Chapter VI, pp. 68–78. Full chapter and note read in a university transcription. A historical perspective on suggestion and checking, without transferring medical examples into instructions; brief paraphrase, no quotation or import, and no worldwide rights claim.

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book III, W. D. Ross translation. III.2–3 read, alongside II.1–4 and selected II.6. A historical distinction between wishing and choice of means, neither a ban on revising goals nor a trial of the practice. Print edition of the translation unidentified; paraphrase only, no quotation or import.

• Søren Valgreen Knudsen and colleagues. Can quality improvement improve the quality of care?, 2019. Abstract, method context, selected results and discussion read; CC BY 4.0. Medical projects; a limited analogy concerning conditions and causal inference, without direct quotation or a guarantee of everyday benefit.

Tags

unexpected result, benefit, discovery, observation, exploration, hypothesis, confirmation, original goal, new goal, conditions, cause, explanation, uncertainty, choice, means, consent, resources, promise, responsibility, autonomy, curiosity, practice, map, accessibility, completion, Dirnagl, Dewey, Aristotle, PDSA, authorship

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.