

UNITED WISDOM

Recovering Responsibility After Delegation Goes Wrong

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-23-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Recovering Responsibility After Delegation Goes Wrong

Epigraph

> *it is the truth that I seek after*

Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, Sixth Book, XX in the numbering of the consulted Meric Casaubon translation. A short fragment about revising one’s own action, not a promise of infallible management.

What this article is about

A task was handed to someone else, and the result did not arrive. A deadline passed, an important part remained unchecked, and a client is waiting for an explanation. The manager may rush to redo everything, declare the other person unreliable, or act as though handing over the task ended every obligation. Each response can briefly reduce tension without making the work clearer.

Responsibility is recovered through several distinct actions: containing further damage, establishing what was handed over, acknowledging one’s own decisions, and agreeing on how work will proceed. Taking a task back can be necessary. It should not silently cancel another person’s autonomy or allow the conditions of delegation to escape discussion forever.

This article considers hypothetical working situations in which participants can discuss their roles. It separates urgent help from permanent substitution, an execution error from a defective assignment, and owning one’s part from absorbing everyone else’s burden. The aim is to restore workable obligations while preserving people’s dignity and an honest answer for those affected.

I. Responsibility Does Not Disappear at Handover

Imagine a small editorial team. Its manager asked a colleague to prepare material for a joint release and gave her a date, but retained control of final approval. By the deadline, only part of the material is ready and approval has not begun. Saying that the task was delegated accurately describes a past action without establishing the quality of that handover. The team needs to identify which decisions the colleague could actually make, whose response she depended on, and who should have noticed the blockage. Otherwise, delegation becomes a convenient screen: an obligation is named while its conditions remain outside the discussion.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The person doing the work and the person assigning it do not have the same obligation under two different names. The former answers for accepted actions, timely reports, and an honest account of the result. The latter answers for choosing someone, making the assignment intelligible, providing available authority, and handling decisions retained personally. These areas can overlap. A manager may have given an unclear task while the colleague concealed a difficulty she already understood. Acknowledging either fact does not require denying the other. Distinguishing them helps repair how the work is arranged; it is not a calculation designed to produce a convenient share of blame or excuse either participant.

Recovering responsibility here means reconnecting decisions with the people entitled and obliged to make them. Sometimes the whole project returns to the manager; sometimes only a stalled approval does. The colleague may retain work she can complete, with a clearer boundary and access to support. The first useful question therefore concerns which present decision lacks someone who is actually taking responsibility for it. It need not become a struggle over who is now in charge. Until the gap is identified, even vigorous rescue work can merely move uncertainty from one person to another.

II. Contain the Consequences Before Examining Their Causes

After a clear failure, different conversations have different degrees of urgency. If people are already receiving incorrect material, the first task is to stop its further circulation and state that checking remains incomplete. If an internal deadline has slipped while the external one can still be changed, those planning the next step need prompt notice. Examining the causes remains a separate and important task. Waiting for a complete account does not justify keeping others misinformed. Recovering responsibility starts with an available action that limits further damage, without treating that action as a substitute for assessing what happened.

Urgent intervention should not come with invented certainty. The manager can take responsibility for contacting the client and clarifying a date while admitting that the usable portion of the work is still unknown. This is less dramatic than promising to repair everything by evening and more accurately describes the situation. Stopping a dangerous action also does not require proving that the colleague has a bad character. A concrete risk and an available way to limit it are sufficient grounds. Safety, mandatory rules, and participants’ rights may require established procedures or appropriate expertise; a philosophical exercise does not replace them.

Once the situation is stable, the limits of urgent assistance need to be named. One person may temporarily finish a check, another notify affected participants, and a third preserve versions for comparison. Their involvement does not automatically erase the original obligations. An emergency phase without an endpoint can turn help into permanent invisible work. It is useful to specify the event after which an ordinary review begins: for example, the recipient has been

warned and the current release paused. This boundary gives the rescue a clear function and prevents the team from being held indefinitely in a state of exception.

III. Recover the Assignment Without Inventing It Afterwards

Memory often makes an assignment clearer than it actually was. The manager now finds it obvious that the colleague should have approved every part; the colleague finds it equally obvious that final checking remained with the manager. Available records can help: a message, a shared note, dates, or an example of an accepted result. These records do not always settle a dispute, but they show what was communicated and what each side supplied through expectation. The absence of a record does not prove that no conversation occurred. It does limit the confidence with which a precise obligation can be attributed to another person, especially when that attribution carries serious consequences.

The intended result, the required actions, and the authority provided must be distinguished. Preparing a list of questions is not the same as obtaining answers; approving an answer is not the same as independently changing the original decision. Someone may honestly have accepted preparatory work without accepting authority to speak for the whole organisation. Attributing a broader role today than was granted yesterday rewrites the past for present convenience. New authority can be offered for future work. It does not make the earlier assignment complete or justify evaluating past actions as though that authority had already existed.

In Book XIII of the Analects, rectifying names connects appropriate language with actions that can be carried out. For the contemporary scene, a limited question is useful: does the name of a role match its actual content? The ancient passage concerns hierarchical government, not an agreement between equal parties at work, and its foundations should not be treated as identical. The gap between a title and a task can nevertheless be examined without equating them. If someone was called responsible for a release while another person alone could stop it, that arrangement needs explanation. Repeating the title more forcefully does not repair the gap.

IV. Identify the Factors Without Flattening Their Differences

A single failure may involve several causes. Inexperience, a dependent decision that arrived late, incompatible deadlines, and concealed bad news are not interchangeable explanations. For each, it helps to ask which observable fact supports it and what might show it to be mistaken. Someone who lacked a necessary skill and someone who knew the work was late but reported it complete call for different next decisions. Training or a reduced scope may address the first situation; the second requires restoring truthful reporting. Neither decision should be derived from a general label of unreliability without examining the actual actions.

Calling something a system failure can also become an evasion. An unclear process does not erase a particular choice when someone knew the work was not ready. Equally, a personal error does not establish that the conditions were reasonable. In the hypothetical editorial team, the colleague may have failed to report an empty section while the manager set a date that left no time for approval. Both can acknowledge their part without bargaining. The manager's acknowledgement does not buy the colleague's silence, and hers does not release the manager from revising the schedule. Two gaps can then be repaired instead of making one invisible.

The review must remain open to correction. If a message reporting the delay later appears, an earlier conclusion that it was concealed needs to change. Protecting authority by refusing a new fact again breaks the connection between a decision and its grounds. The short Marcus Aurelius epigraph concerns a person's own readiness to revise an action when an error is demonstrated. It does not entitle a manager to declare every disagreement a proven mistake by a subordinate. Here the orientation first addresses the person conducting the review: how willing are they to reconsider their explanation rather than merely obtain a change in someone else?

V. Choose the Form of Recovery by the Task

After a failure, several arrangements are possible: retain the assignment with support, take back part of it, transfer it to someone else, or stop the work. They can be compared in terms of available competence, time, risk, and clear authority. Taking everything back may be necessary when nobody else can presently make a dangerous or irreversible decision. It should not become an automatic response to every imperfection. If a colleague made an error in one section while the remaining work is usable, removing the whole project can discard valuable work without helping anyone correct the part that failed.

Taking back part of a task often requires a more precise conversation than removing it entirely. What remains with the colleague, who now makes the dependent decision, and which actions are no longer required all need to be named. Otherwise, both repair the same thing or each

waits for the other. In the editorial scene, the manager can take approval and the external message while the colleague completes two specified sections. The old deadline must be explicitly cancelled or confirmed. If it changes only in the manager's mind, the colleague remains bound to the earlier promise and may again conceal a difficulty while trying to meet a requirement that no longer serves the work.

Sometimes the honest decision is to end the assignment despite the effort already invested. Continuing is justified by an acceptable result and a workable path to it, not merely by the discomfort of stopping. Ending the task does not erase obligations to affected people: an explanation, a transfer of usable material, and agreement about unfinished matters may still be needed. The wish to prove that delegation was correct after all can hold a team inside fruitless repair. Recovering responsibility includes the freedom to acknowledge that an arrangement has reached its limit and the obligation not to leave its consequences with people who did not choose it.

VI. A Return Requires Clear Authority

When a task is taken back, it matters to state when the previous arrangement ceases to apply. The colleague may already have scheduled a meeting, commissioned work from someone else, or given a partner a date. Saying that the manager will now do everything does not explain who cancels those actions or communicates the change. Returning a role has consequences outside the conversation between two participants. Immediate dependencies need checking, along with the boundary between completing a handover and having authority to promise a new result. This precision is not an expression of distrust; it prevents two conflicting sources of instructions.

The transfer of usable material should be proportionate. Known versions, current questions, and an intelligible account of what remains unfinished can reasonably be requested. Someone should not have to create an ideal order overnight, when that order never existed during the work, merely to earn release from the task. Time needed for a handover is work too and belongs in the new agreement. In the editorial scene, a list of open questions and unchecked sections is more useful than an elegant report about causes. The person handing over must not present an assumption as completed approval: the next participant is entitled to know the limit of what is established.

The new person responsible needs to accept the role actually offered. Passing a troubled project to a third person without explaining its condition repeats the original failure in a new place. The remaining scope, date, available decisions, and matters retained by the manager must be shown. If the role cannot be accepted, that refusal provides important information about the assignment. It need not be treated in advance as evidence of disloyalty. A smaller result, a later date, or stopping may be the appropriate response. Responsibility is recovered

when a workable role has been accepted, rather than when a new name has been attached to an old burden.

VII. Own the Choice and the Arrangement

In Chapter XXII of The Prince, Machiavelli connects a judgement of a ruler with the people chosen around him. His political reasoning includes personal loyalty to the prince and a servant's deliberately maintained dependence; those conditions cannot simply become norms for contemporary delegation. A narrower reminder is useful here: choosing a helper is also an action of the person making the choice. A colleague's failure does not automatically establish a poor choice, but it calls for checking whether the task fitted known competence, support was available, and the manager expected knowledge that had never been discussed.

Owning one's part becomes concrete when a decision and its consequence can be named. The manager may have assigned independent approval to someone who had previously only prepared material, delayed an answer, or retained the power to stop the work without arranging a check. Saying that one is generally imperfect does not replace these distinctions. It can support an attractive image of a modest manager while changing very little. A more honest acknowledgement identifies what will be arranged differently: different access, a specified check, or an agreed smaller scope before independent responsibility for the whole task is offered.

Taking one's part does not mean declaring oneself the sole cause of what happened. That acknowledgement can conceal another form of power: the manager takes both achievements and errors, leaving everyone else as people whose actions do not matter. The colleague is also entitled to name a choice and answer for it without humiliation. The discussion needs to preserve both possibilities: the manager answers for the conditions, and the colleague for actions within the accepted role. If the evidence is still insufficient, an open question is better than an early, morally attractive story about a single person at fault, even when the manager volunteers to occupy that position.

VIII. Explain the Change to Those Affected

A task’s return is often discussed inside a team while its consequences are already visible elsewhere. A recipient may still expect the earlier result, or another colleague may build the next part of a project on a promise that has been cancelled. They need an account of the current arrangement, not the details of a personal dispute. It helps to name the contact person, which information has been checked, and when a further update is expected. This does not require revealing private conversations or attributing an unconfirmed motive to someone. An honest answer about one’s own dependency is different from access to every detail of another person’s error.

If the colleague’s failure was publicly announced and a significant defect in the assignment is later discovered, correction should not remain entirely private. Otherwise, the larger audience retains a false picture while the manager regards a personal acknowledgement as sufficient. The scope of correction should fit the scope of the inaccurate message. The manager can clarify a decision and the new conditions without making the colleague an object of public examination. In the hypothetical editorial team, stating that approval remained with the manager and was omitted from the schedule restores the factual picture without staging a collective performance of repentance.

An explanation should not require affected people to reassure the team immediately. They may be angry, reject the new date, or request a separate decision about the consequences. Recovering responsibility neither guarantees restored trust nor entitles the team to prescribe a convenient emotional reaction. The team can answer for truthful communication and the proposed repair; it cannot control another person’s agreement. It also needs to discover whether the new result is still wanted. Producing it only to secure the team’s own sense of closure would again place the workers’ need above the recipient’s actual situation.

IX. Another Attempt Needs Different Conditions

After a review, the team may want to repeat the assignment immediately to demonstrate continuing trust. Repetition alone is neither support nor evidence that anything has been repaired. If the colleague still lacks access to the decision that stopped the earlier work, another attempt reproduces the same dependency. The participants need to identify which discovered cause has been addressed and how they will observe the difference. The change may be modest: an agreed opportunity for questions, an example of an acceptable result, or authority to pause an action until it is checked. It must respond to the actual gap rather than decorate an announcement of a fresh start.

The cost of an error in a trial must be acceptable. Health, safety, other people’s resources, or serious irreversible consequences should not become training material merely to restore a

colleague’s confidence. Another attempt may be possible only in a limited part of the task, with planned checking and permission to stop. If no such arrangement is available, continuation needs to be postponed or declined. That does not deny the person’s dignity. Dignity does not require access to every role immediately; it requires that restrictions be discussed on actual grounds, without turning a failed attempt into a final description of the person.

In the Analects, pardoning small faults appears alongside employing officers’ services and selecting able people. That connection allows a distinction between an individual mistake and the arrangement of a shared undertaking, without extracting a modern personnel procedure from the passage. An error is not small merely because that description suits the manager or because the colleague is liked. Its actual consequences in the situation matter. Repeated concealment of significant information cannot automatically be treated as trivial. Moderation in assessment remains meaningful when it does not require other people to pay silently for the consequences and leaves a role open to revision.

X. Closing the Review Does Not Mean Forgetting

Delegation that went wrong can end in renewed cooperation, a different division of work, or the end of a particular role. None of these outcomes should be declared the only morally acceptable one in advance. If participants can accept new conditions, work may continue. If agreement is unavailable, a clear ending can be more honest than continuously testing a person who is no longer trusted. The transition matters: leave no vague promises, conceal no grounds for the change, and do not turn the earlier failure into an indefinite debt. Responsibility concerns particular actions and consequences; it does not make one person another person’s permanent debtor.

A useful record of the review can be small but sufficient for the next decision. It can state which role changed, which conditions were added, and when the arrangement will be reviewed again. This is different from a dossier assembled for future humiliation. The record helps participants avoid reconstructing an agreement each time from conflicting memories. Its contents and access should fit that purpose. Private information that explains neither the assignment nor its repair should not be added merely because failure made someone vulnerable. A clear process does not require destroying personal space.

Ultimately, responsibility returns to the undertaking, rather than merely to the image of a responsible manager. This can be seen in who is making the open decision, who told affected people the truth, and what limits the next attempt has. Someone can feel frustrated and still do these things; someone can offer an elegant acknowledgement without doing any of them. The failure does not thereby become good or have to become an inspiring lesson. It can cease to generate further opaque obligations. Participants gain the possibility of continuing or ending

work from the situation as it actually stands, rather than from a convenient story about the past.

What this means in practice

Choose one unsuccessful handover of work that can appropriately be discussed calmly. Do not use this exercise instead of urgently limiting danger, an established review procedure, or specialist assistance. Write a few short answers; you do not need to secure another person’s agreement with your version.

1. Name the particular unfinished result and the nearest participant depending on it. Separate the observed situation from a hypothesis about someone’s motive.

2. Recover the assignment from available records. What was accepted, which decisions were available, what stayed with the person assigning it, and what did the parties understand differently?

3. Name one decision of your own that may have contributed. Identify its known consequence and an open question; do not convert uncertainty into either accepting everything or denying everything.

4. Propose the next arrangement: who contains present consequences, what returns, what remains, and which earlier promises are cancelled. Check whether those whose participation is necessary have accepted it.

5. If another attempt is proposed, name the changed condition and the acceptable cost of an error. Without a safe, workable arrangement, stop or reduce the assignment.

Finish with one immediate action and a date for clarification. If facts are disputed, retain the open question and propose a way to check it. This practice helps shape a conversation; it establishes no guilt, guarantees no trust, and obliges nobody to continue cooperating.

Key quotation

> *pardon small faults*

Confucius, Analects, XIII.II.1, a short fragment from James Legge’s translation. In the consulted conversation, it sits beside employing officers’ services and choosing able people. Here it helps distinguish a mistake from cancelling an entire role. The seriousness of consequences still needs its own assessment; the fragment neither releases anyone from repairing harm nor requires every assignment to continue.

Connections between traditions

• The Confucian discussion of names and offices raises the relation between a role's name and actions that can be carried out; its ancient hierarchy is not a contemporary agreement between participants.

• Marcus Aurelius's Stoic readiness to revise his own error first addresses the person making a judgement; it does not make a manager an infallible judge of others.

• Machiavelli's political reasoning recalls responsibility for choosing helpers; a servant's personal dependence is not adopted as a norm of delegation here.

• United Wisdom's original distinction connects these questions with a concrete handover, containment of consequences, and renewed agreement; it does not present the three texts' foundations as one doctrine.

Primary sources

1. Niccolò Machiavelli, The Prince, XXII. The complete chapter was read in W. K. Marriott's English translation. The question of choosing helpers is used; courtly loyalty and deliberately maintained dependence are not adopted as rules for contemporary relationships.

2. Confucius, Analects, XIII.I–VI. A continuous passage of James Legge's English translation was read, including XIII.II and the conversation about rectifying names. This digital file does not include the Chinese original or Legge's notes; comparison with the original is not claimed.

3. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, Sixth Book, XVIII–XXI. A continuous passage was read in Meric Casaubon's translation; the epigraph comes from XX in this file's numbering. Its editorial notes explain the translation's character and its difference from a critical text. This is not George Long's translation.

The sources offer distinct moral and political questions rather than establish the efficacy of the proposed practice. Scenes and working arrangements are original editorial constructions. Worldwide rights to the digital editions have not been established; short quotations do not permit unrestricted raw-source import or vectorisation.

Tags

delegation, responsibility, leadership, task, assignment, authority, approval, deadline, error, repair, assistance, trust, dignity, role, working conditions, competence, transparency, honesty, consequences, handover, feedback, stopping, revision, consent, shared undertaking, Confucius, Marcus Aurelius, Machiavelli, practical ethics, United Wisdom

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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.