

UNITED WISDOM

A boundary of competence and the right to decline a task

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-22-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A boundary of competence and the right to decline a task

Epigraph

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

Epictetus, Enchiridion, 29, translated by Elizabeth Carter. This concerns preparation and the consequences of an undertaking, not a modern rule of employment law.

What this article is about

Sometimes a new task is offered precisely because someone already performs related work well. Declining is difficult: we want to preserve trust, help the team and avoid appearing weak. Yet similar experience does not always provide grounds for a new promise. This article examines a boundary of competence as a boundary of specific responsibility: what we can actually do, what we do not know, which conditions are missing and what we can honestly offer. Through a hypothetical workshop example, we consider unconditional agreement, participation under checkable conditions and declining a particular part of a task. We turn to Epictetus, Confucius and Aristotle while preserving their different contexts. This is ethical discussion of a promise, not a universal legal right to reject assignments. The aim is to describe our abilities precisely enough for other people to make grounded decisions and for learning to proceed without pretending qualification has already been attained.

I. What we promise when we agree

In a small workshop, an employee is asked to accept an order for a structure she has never calculated before. She can assemble similar products and understands the manager’s wish to retain the client. This time, however, careful assembly is not the only expectation: she must confirm that the chosen design can carry a specified load. This is a hypothetical situation, not a report about an operating company. What matters is the shift between two promises. “I can build from a checked drawing” and “I can substantiate the drawing’s safety” sound related, yet require different knowledge and create different consequences for other people.

Agreement often looks like one short word, although it contains several commitments. What result will be delivered? Who will check its quality? On what grounds does the person believe they can do the work? What information and actions from others will they need? If these questions remain unspoken, the participants may agree to different tasks without noticing. The manager will hear a promise of a finished solution, while the employee means an attempt to

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

understand the problem. Later, the error will appear not only in the product: uncertainty will already have been passed to the client as confidence.

It is therefore useful to describe a boundary of competence through a specific promise rather than a general judgment about a person. The employee need not declare herself incapable. She can say precisely: I can do the assembly and collect the starting dimensions, but I cannot substantiate this structure’s load-bearing capacity. That wording preserves an existing skill and identifies what is missing. It can be checked, discussed and assigned to a qualified participant. A broad “I understand nothing” removes this precision from the conversation; an equally broad “I’ll manage” conceals the difference between familiar work and a new responsibility.

The title uses the right to decline in an ethical and practical sense: a person can state the boundary of their promise and discuss conditions of participation. It does not establish a universal legal right for an employee to reject any assignment. Legal obligations depend on the specific situation, agreement and applicable rules; ancient texts do not settle that question. Our question is narrower and at the same time harder: how can we remain honest with people who rely on a result when we want to agree but do not yet have sufficient grounds for the promise? The answer begins with a clear description of the work, not an attractive justification.

II. Missing knowledge, missing conditions and limited capacity

Not every inability to complete a task means insufficient competence. An experienced specialist may know what to do but lack starting information, access to equipment or authority to stop an unsafe stage. Another participant may have everything necessary but never have performed this particular work. A third has both skill and access, yet carries several commitments that cannot all be completed well by the deadline. These cases require different decisions. Additional training will not grant authority, and a new password will not replace understanding a calculation. First name the obstacle; only then choose how to address it.

In the workshop, the distinction is straightforward. If the employee knows a checked procedure but is not given the material’s specification, the issue is missing information. If she cannot calculate the new structure even with that information, the issue is knowledge and experience. If she can calculate a familiar variant but the deadline leaves time only for a guess, the issue is working conditions. All three limitations can occur in one order. Calling them general “uncertainty” is convenient for a quick conversation but poor for a decision: the manager may offer encouragement where a document, a specialist or a different deadline is needed.

In Book VI of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle distinguishes knowledge, the art of making and practical judgment. This is an ancient philosophical classification, not a modern procedure for

authorizing work. For our purpose, it helps preserve distinctions: knowing a general proposition, making an object and taking a responsible decision about its use are not the same action. A person may be good at one part and need help with another. We do not derive a list of present-day professions from Aristotle; we use his distinction to avoid treating related skills as sufficient grounds for a new promise.

Limited capacity to carry several tasks also deserves precise language. Instead of claiming complete unsuitability, we can describe a conflict of commitments: checking this order will take a day, and that same day has already been promised to another client. This does not yet prove that the new order is the one to decline. The manager may change priorities, reassign part of the work or agree a different deadline with the client. Until the conflict is resolved, however, honest agreement must include a condition. Otherwise the person is not expanding the team’s capacity: they are making its plan depend on a hidden assumption that one day can be lived twice.

III. A boundary needs grounds

People do not always know their own competence accurately. A familiar task name may reassure them too soon, while an unfamiliar one may provoke an overly broad refusal. It is therefore useful to compare essential parts of the work, not impressions. What similar tasks have I performed? What has changed this time? How were errors detected before? What will checking the new result depend on? This is not an examination of the right to call oneself a good employee. The analysis separates confirmed ability from hope, and an unfamiliar presentation of a task from knowledge that is actually missing. Errors in either direction can be costly.

The employee may discover that the new structure resembles the old one only in appearance. The material differs, the fastening method has changed, and the load now acts differently. Assembly experience remains valuable, but its transfer is limited. The reverse is also possible: an order is described in unfamiliar words but, once clarified, turns out to be a familiar operation under the same conditions. The initial boundary can then be reconsidered. A person’s dignity does not require maintaining a refusal after sufficient grounds appear. Precision means being willing to revise either agreement or refusal as understanding changes; uncertainty should not become a fixed personal role.

A useful ground for a boundary may be observable: no experience with a particular calculation, an unclear condition or a check that another specialist has always performed. This does not require proving ignorance endlessly or attempting something dangerous to demonstrate weakness. Where consequences are substantial, a trial is appropriate only under conditions in which its limits are understood and it is not presented as a finished result. Naming a specific gap may be enough for the next organizational decision: involve the necessary qualification,

narrow the promise or stop accepting the order. A lack of confidence by itself does not reveal the size of the risk.

In section 29 of the Enchiridion, Epictetus connects considering what precedes and follows with the preparation and costs an undertaking requires. The ancient context includes demanding discipline and the image of a contest; it cannot be transferred silently into modern management. Here it supports a narrower point: wanting a result does not replace understanding what one is entering. Examining conditions before agreeing does not necessarily mean becoming afraid or predicting everything. It means noticing at least the necessary actions and consequences already available for consideration, rather than hiding them behind the appeal of the goal.

IV. Conditional agreement and an actual refusal

There are often several honest options between an unconditional yes and a complete no. We can agree to collect starting information, do the familiar part, prepare a trial version or learn under the review of a competent participant. Each option is honest only when its boundaries are clear to those expecting the result. “I can do it if this specialist checks the calculation before manufacturing” differs from “I’ll do it and we’ll see.” The first identifies a dependency; the second leaves risk inside an undefined promise. A condition needs to be concrete enough to check before an irreversible step.

In the workshop, conditional agreement might mean that the employee is ready to measure the parts and assemble from an approved drawing, while someone with the relevant skill takes responsibility for substantiating the calculation. The participants need to clarify who engages that person, when the information will reach them and who informs the client about the deadline. If no reviewer has been found, the condition is still unmet. It cannot become decorative wording while manufacturing starts as though everything were agreed. What matters is not only a correct phrase but a sequence of actions that actually allows checking and, if necessary, changing the decision.

An actual refusal becomes necessary when acceptable conditions cannot be secured or the proposed scope still exceeds substantiated ability. It can be calm and specific: “I cannot substantiate this calculation and will not make that promise. I can hand over the dimensions and describe what has already been checked.” Declining a particular commitment need not mean abandoning people. Yet offering adjacent help must not quietly reintroduce the rejected promise. If the person continues giving instructions as the principal designer but asks someone else to sign, the boundary itself remains dishonest.

Learning also requires a clear distinction between an educational task and a commitment to the recipient of a result. A manager may propose training, and an employee may want to attempt a

new level of work. The participants then need to define where error is acceptable, who will detect it and who is responsible for the final decision. Another person's need for a safe product does not become training material merely because the employee wants to develop. Competence can grow alongside responsibility; growth does not require pretending competence has already been achieved. Sometimes the right step is a separate exercise without a client promise, rather than conditional acceptance of an actual order.

V. Honesty towards people who depend on the result

A conversation about competence may take place between an employee and a manager, but the consequences extend beyond that pair. The client, an adjacent team and the future user of a product will act on what they are told. If a task is regarded internally as a trial but presented externally as checked, the client's agreement concerns a different situation. Not every technical detail is needed by every person. Yet the difference between a finished solution and an unchecked version can materially change their choices, timing and costs. That difference must not be concealed for the comfort or convenience of the internal participants.

In the hypothetical workshop, the client could honestly be offered a preliminary sketch with a stated status: dimensions have been clarified, the calculation is not yet substantiated, and manufacturing has not begun. Calling a sketch preliminary is insufficient, however, if it is accompanied by a dispatch promise that assumes a finished calculation. People rely on the combined messages and actions. If they are asked to pay for a final result while being assured that further checks "change nothing," a formal label does not make the expectation clear. A boundary of competence needs to appear in the promised result, the sequence of stages and the client's ability to decide under understandable conditions.

A useful question is who is carrying the uncertainty now. The employee may believe she is risking her reputation, while the manager thinks about the order's profit. A failed product, however, will affect someone who was absent from their decision. This is not an argument against every new undertaking. Novelty inevitably leaves unknowns, and work cannot await knowledge of everything. The question is whether a material unknown has been identified, whether an acceptable check exists and whether its cost has been passed to someone promised an established result. Limiting the promise allows that cost to be discussed before it arises.

A responsible refusal need not include a full account of the employee's feelings. The recipient needs to know what cannot be promised, what has already been done and what options remain. "I'm afraid of letting you down" explains a person's state but not yet the state of the work. "I cannot check this calculation; the dimensions and two questions have been handed over, and this review is needed before manufacturing" makes the next step visible. Feelings may belong in the conversation, but they should not replace material information. Honesty

becomes useful when it lets another participant choose an action, rather than merely judge the speaker’s sincerity.

VI. Pressure does not create missing skill

A specific conversation may receive replies such as “Everyone had a first time,” “Don’t let the team down” or “You doubt too much.” There may be a fair element in these remarks: learning requires attempts, and excessive caution can delay familiar work. Yet no general appeal explains how the particular unknown will be checked. It helps to return to that issue: which calculation is needed, who can check it and which stage can be completed now. Replacing clarification with a judgment of character does not make the decision more dependable; it changes the subject and makes material conditions harder to discuss.

An ethical boundary does not guarantee a calm response. A manager may become angry, a client may choose another offer, and admitting a limit may be uncomfortable. We should not promise that correct wording will necessarily preserve relationships or earn respect. Its value is narrower: it reduces the gap between a promise and what has grounds. The next action depends on actual relationships and circumstances. Sometimes ordinary agreement is possible; sometimes the decision needs discussion with another responsible person. This article does not establish one procedure for every organization or advise people to ignore their actual obligations.

In Analects XV.1, Confucius answers a question about military matters by distinguishing what he has heard about from what he has not learned. The text then reports a departure and hardship on the journey. We do not attribute a modern employment strategy to him or turn the narrative sequence into proof of a universal right to refuse. What matters for our argument is the manner of stating the boundary: the answer does not present knowledge of an adjacent field as sufficient for a different question. It is a brief example of specifying a limit of knowledge when speaking with someone in a higher position. Modern organizational conclusions remain ours, not the ancient speaker’s words.

The boundary needs to be equally honest with less powerful and more powerful people. If an employee declines before the manager but separately promises the client everything, the knowledge has not become sufficient: the promise has merely moved. If a person calls themselves incompetent only when work is unpleasant but accepts the same risk for a profitable order, the stated ground needs reconsideration. This does not mean suspecting every reluctance. People may not want a task for other reasons and can discuss those reasons honestly. Distinguishing missing knowledge, conflicting interests and personal preference is more useful than covering every case with one noble phrase.

VII. When the boundary appears after agreement

Not every limitation is visible beforehand. Someone may accept a task in good faith and later discover a new condition that materially changes the work. In the workshop, clarification reveals that the product will be used differently from what was assumed. The familiar drawing no longer supports the original promise. This moment calls for updating the agreement, not continuing silently out of loyalty to the initial yes. Responsibility for what has already been done remains; at the same time, the unsubstantiated result should stop moving further. Changing the promise does not erase the past, but can prevent another step for which sufficient grounds are missing.

A useful message identifies the changed condition, its significance for the result and the nearest acceptable action. “After the load was clarified, the old calculation no longer applies; I cannot substantiate a new one. Assembly is paused, the dimensions are preserved, and a specialist needs to reconsider the design” says more than “It became complicated.” We should not declare complete safety before checking, but neither should we call every difficulty a catastrophe. A clear account helps assess consequences: what has already been handed over, who may have used it and whether it can be brought back for review. If information remains incomplete, that incompleteness should also be named as the state of the work.

If the original agreement was hasty, acknowledging that mistake matters in its own right. It prevents blaming everything on a new condition when part of the problem came from a missing check at the outset. We can say: “I accepted the calculation work without sufficient experience; that was a mistake. Here is what I handed over, what remains unchecked and whom I informed.” Acknowledgment does not prove that the consequences have been addressed. Correction requires actions and confirmation that affected participants received the necessary information. Statements about one’s limitations must not become a way of shedding responsibility for an expectation already created.

Reconsidering a boundary after an error should rest on changed understanding rather than a wish to hide permanently. Sometimes training is needed, sometimes a different scope of role, and sometimes further work under qualified review. One sentence about a mistake cannot establish which is appropriate. First identify the part that was not understood and the conditions that were missing. Then choose a small next step whose grounds and review are transparent. Competence grows through particular actions; the experience of failure by itself neither produces a new skill nor destroys every ability already substantiated.

VIII. Declining preserves room for development

Stating a limit can easily turn into a fixed description of oneself: “I’m not the kind of person who does these tasks.” That may relieve pressure while closing the question about a specific skill. A more precise statement has a time and an object: “At present, I cannot check this type of calculation.” It does not promise that the person will necessarily learn it or demand learning at any cost. It leaves a choice: is this direction needed, are learning conditions available, and does it fit other commitments? Declining a present promise and deciding about future learning are connected but different; one answer should not silently replace the other.

In our scene, the employee may choose to study calculations, or may retain her role as a skilled assembler working alongside another specialist. Neither choice becomes ethically superior merely through its title. What matters is whether the role corresponds to actual actions and whether its boundary of responsibility is clear. A team need not turn everyone into an all-purpose practitioner. Sometimes dependable work comes from combining different skills and making the handovers between them clear. This is editorial reasoning about a possible arrangement of cooperation, not an established experimental finding: a specific decision needs assessment through the work and its conditions.

The boundary also changes with the task, not only with time. A person may be competent enough for a familiar product but not for something similar in appearance that will be used differently. New learning can expand one part of a role while leaving other limitations. It is therefore useful to return to the specific promise when conditions change materially. This does not mean proving one’s entire professional worth anew before every action. What needs checking is the difference on which the new decision depends. Respect for acquired experience can coexist with attention to what that experience does not yet substantiate.

The right not to pretend to possess a missing skill is supported by an obligation to use existing skills honestly. A person can decline a calculation promise while handing over measurements carefully, representing the work’s status accurately, cooperating with qualified review and acknowledging their part in an earlier mistake. This requires more than the defensive phrase “That isn’t my job.” It establishes a visible boundary of participation and leaves room for other people. An honest no need not be the conversation’s last word. It can open precise statements: “Here is what I can do,” “Here is what I do not know,” and “Here are the conditions that would give the next step grounds.”

What this means in practice

Choose one task about which you have a real doubt. This is an editorial exercise for clarifying a conversation, not a validated universal method of assessing competence. Do not use a dangerous trial result to prove ability to yourself. If the task requires established authorization or specialized review, the exercise does not replace them.

Write the promise specifically: what result is expected, for whom and by when. Separate three questions: what you can already do, which material knowledge is missing and what information, authority or time is needed. Do not label a general fear as a specific gap without examining the task, but do not treat a positive mood as evidence of ability either.

Compare the assignment with one genuinely familiar case. Identify the difference that could affect the result’s quality. State how that difference was checked before and who can check it now. If you do not yet know, write that down. Do not replace an unidentified specialist with “someone will take a look.”

Prepare three possible answers: unconditional agreement, agreement with one specific necessary condition and refusal of an unsubstantiated promise while offering acceptable help. Choose the answer that has grounds in the actual circumstances. A condition should specify an action, a responsible participant and a review point before the next material step.

Discuss the answer with someone who actually participates in the decision. Clarify what they understood as the promised result and what will be communicated to people who depend on it. If agreement changed after work began, list what has already been handed over and what remains unchecked; identify the nearest corrective action. Do not treat a conversation as confirmation that a check was completed. Finally, keep the decision about present participation separate from a possible next learning step: they are two different choices.

Key quotation

> *I have heard all about sacrificial vessels, but I have not learned military matters.*

Confucius, Analects, XV.1.1, translated by James Legge. The answer distinguishes fields of knowledge; we do not attribute a universal legal right to decline or motives unstated in the text.

Connections between traditions

Context	Ground in the source	Connection and boundary
Stoic discipline	Epictetus, Enchiridion, 29 and 37: preparation, consequences and suitability of a role	Helps examine the cost of a promise before participation. Ancient discipline does not become a mandatory employment procedure or a ban on learning new work.
Confucian conversation	Analects, XV.1.1–3: the reply about military matters and distinction between studied fields	Supports precisely naming a limit of knowledge. The departure narrative proves neither a modern refusal strategy nor an invented motive.
Aristotelian distinction	Nicomachean Ethics, VI.3–5, 7–10: knowledge, making and practical judgment	Being able to perform part of the work is different from substantiating the entire decision. A philosophical classification is not a modern authorization standard.

This map preserves distinctions chosen for a specific question. Three substantive connections suffice here; we do not add traditions for a count or attribute our workshop example or exercise efficacy to the sources.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus, Enchiridion, sections 29 and 37. Elizabeth Carter translation, Internet Classics Archive. The full context of 29 and the sentence of 37 with surrounding text were read; reading the entire collection is not claimed. The short epigraph follows this version. This is philosophy, not employment-law guidance.

2. Confucius, Analects, XV, chapter 1, paragraphs 1–3. James Legge, The Chinese Classics, volume 1, 1861, Wikisource transcription. The specified context, including the subsequent departure and hardship, was read, not the whole volume. The key quotation follows this version; unstated motives for departure are not supplied.

3. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, VI, sections 3–5 and 7–10. W. D. Ross translation, Internet Classics Archive. The specified sections were read, not the whole Ethics. Distinctions between activities are used; modern authorization rules and the efficacy of our exercise are not derived from them.

The workshop, agreement options and practical exercise are our hypothetical examples and editorial reasoning. Historical translations are not presumed unrestricted in every jurisdiction;

the article supplies links, short attributed quotations and limited paraphrase without importing full works into the library.

Tags

competence, boundaries, responsibility, promise, refusal, agreement, conditions, knowledge, skill, experience, learning, qualification, review, authority, time, starting information, honesty, trust, cooperation, handover, management, client, consequences, correction, Epictetus, Confucius, Aristotle, practical judgment

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.