

UNITED WISDOM

The Limits of Self-Knowledge: Why Sincerity May Not Be Enough

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I10 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Limits of Self-Knowledge: Why Sincerity May Not Be Enough

Epigraph

> *“introspection is difficult and fallible”*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, Chapter VII, a fragment of the concluding discussion of introspection. The Russian epigraph is the author's translation of this English original.

What this article is about

Someone can honestly describe what they felt and be mistaken about why they acted as they did. They may remember an intention clearly while missing how their words sounded to another person. This makes neither every self-description worthless nor an outside observer the final judge. Self-knowledge requires distinguishing its subjects: an experience, its name, a proposed cause, a visible action, and a generalization about character. Through an invented conversation, we consider William James, Richard Nisbett and Timothy Wilson's review, one study by Simine Vazire, and two instructions by Epictetus. These sources belong to different periods and genres. They provide no general test that discovers the real person. They do help explain why sincerity matters without replacing evidence, what a friend can contribute, and how to revise one claim about ourselves while retaining authority to describe our experience and responsibility for a particular action.

I. Four Different Answers About One Conversation

Imagine Oleg, who considers himself an attentive listener. After a meeting, a friend says that he began offering advice several times before she had finished her account. Oleg replies sincerely: he wanted to help, remembers her worry, and tried to find a solution. His friend may also speak sincerely: she experienced the conversation as interrupted. There is no established winner or loser yet. Their testimony concerns different subjects. An intention to help, the sequence of remarks, the listener's experience, and a general image of an attentive person cannot all be assessed with the same question. This is a teaching example, not an observation of real participants or a research result. Its purpose is to make the distinctions available for discussion.

“I wanted to help” reports an intention. “I spoke before your account ended” describes an action, if the sequence has actually been established. “I interrupted because I feared your

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

distress” proposes a causal explanation. Finally, “I am a good listener” generalizes across many possible encounters. Each further step requires its own grounds. A confirmed intention does not automatically establish the cause of an action; one action does not measure an entire skill. An action does not disappear because its motive was kind. Someone can acknowledge that their remark was poorly timed without accepting another person's account of its origin. The participants might also discover different understandings of a pause or an expectation of advice.

The limit of self-knowledge appears when these answers quietly substitute for one another. Oleg defends his intention while his friend asks about the order of the conversation; she judges his character while possessing evidence primarily about one meeting. A useful correction starts with a narrower subject: which words, at what moment, and in relation to which expectation are being discussed? This promises no removal of tension. A factual disagreement may remain. But it will become identifiable: they can disagree about the sequence of remarks instead of proving to each other the presence or absence of a good soul. That precision serves self-knowledge better than hasty agreement with whichever account of the person sounds most confident.

II. An Experience Still Needs Describing

In Chapter VII of The Principles of Psychology, James considers the difficulties of introspection. He distinguishes feeling itself from subsequent naming, description, and classification. We can have an experience without possessing an exact word for it. Remembering the conversation, Oleg says “care,” but that word might combine wanting to help, impatience, a habit of solving problems, and satisfaction in finding an answer. We do not know which components existed in our example. What matters is the possible mismatch: a name organizes an experience without presenting all of it. Sometimes refining a word changes our present understanding of a report rather than the past experience itself. A sincere speaker, too, works with a limited vocabulary.

Nisbett and Wilson's 1977 review makes a different distinction: between the contents of private knowledge and the processes that produced those contents. They explicitly retain a person's access to personal history, sensations, plans, and much information unavailable to an observer. Their challenge concerns the inference that this access simultaneously reveals the operations behind an evaluation or action. Knowing that a decision felt easy and knowing what made it easy are different claims. In the selected section, the authors allow private knowledge to assist explanation; they do not require treating it as fiction. Their text therefore cannot justify rejecting in advance every explanation someone gives of their own action. It requires closer attention to what that explanation establishes.

The comparison is useful precisely because the questions differ. For James, description does not coincide with experience; in the review, content does not coincide with the process that produced it. Oleg can first clarify what he means by “care” and then separately examine his explanation for giving advice. These are two steps, not the discovery of a hidden mechanism through one inward glance. If he remembers wanting to help, that testimony deserves to be retained. If he proposes that anxiety caused the hasty remark, the proposal can remain open. Correcting an explanation of a cause does not require denying the experience. Otherwise, examining ourselves becomes a contest to discredit personal experience first and thereby stop discussing it.

III. Why a Convincing Story Does Not End the Inquiry

We often explain an action through a familiar connection: wanting to help led to advice; being busy led to a short reply. The connection may be correct. Nisbett and Wilson discuss the possibility that causal reports draw on plausible causal theories rather than only on directly observing a process. Their review also allows accurate reports. The vulnerability lies in the grounds for confidence, not in having an explanation. A well-constructed story links known circumstances; it does not yet establish which circumstance exerted an influence or how much. Resembling an ordinary account of care neither proves the particular cause of Oleg's behavior nor makes that cause impossible. The distinction leaves room for inquiry rather than supplying a verdict.

In our teaching conversation, several versions are possible. Oleg believed the account had ended; heard a question as a request for advice; was rushing to another task; or habitually answered every difficulty with a solution. These possibilities are invented for analysis, not discovered in the character. Listing them gives no permission to select the least flattering one as the hidden truth. We should ask which available information distinguishes them. Does his friend remember the question she asked? Had they agreed on the time available? What did Oleg hear immediately before his reply? Sometimes the answer will remain unknown. Lacking a confident explanation need not prevent acknowledging that advice arrived before his friend wanted to receive it.

Checking requires specifying beforehand what could change the story. If Oleg claims that his friend explicitly requested advice, clarifying her words concerns the grounds for that claim. If he merely says, “That is how I usually help,” he offers a broader description of his customary participation. A memory of a good intention cannot establish it alone. James's possibility of correcting earlier observations with later ones supports openness to revision without promising that every new account improves on the old one. A correction is valuable when it addresses a discovered mismatch. An equally unchecked new version may simply defend the

previous self-image more skillfully. Narrowing a claim can be more useful than decorating it with explanations that leave its relation to the facts unchanged.

IV. What Someone Knows from Within

Limits to causal explanation easily become an excessive conclusion: that people know nothing about themselves. Nisbett and Wilson's selected section allows us to reject this substitution. Personal history, experienced sensations, plans, and information about one's attention provide material for a conversation. Sometimes they assist explanation better than an observer's available picture. Oleg's friend may not know about an earlier similar meeting or that he understood her account as a familiar problem recurring. If this information bears on the question, it deserves a hearing. Its private nature neither removes it from discussion nor makes it automatic proof of any inferred cause. Listening to it and evaluating the resulting claim are separate tasks, both necessary to a fair inquiry.

Vazire's 2010 study approaches differences between perspectives in another way. The proposed model relates the accuracy of self-ratings and other people's ratings to the observability and evaluativeness of particular traits. The abstract reports differing results across groups of traits and perspectives. The study compares ratings with selected behavioral criteria; it does not establish who knows an entire person best. This restriction of the subject matters. An internal feeling, a visible manner of speaking, and an assessment of intellectual ability need not be equally accessible to someone and their acquaintances. Before asking whom to believe, we should ask what testimony we seek and what we intend to compare it with. The answer may change our choice of a suitable observer.

Oleg may be the best available source about the intended subject of his remarks, while his friend knows what she managed to say and how she understood the advice. Neither perspective has to absorb the other. They may also share a memory error or hold different standards of attentiveness. Self-knowledge benefits from combining relevant information rather than simply voting. Three people repeating one rumor do not create three independent observations. A detailed account of an intention does not, through detail alone, determine the accuracy of a causal explanation. Distinguishing access from checking helps both participants: it preserves personal testimony while limiting its claim to final authority. A contribution can be valuable without settling every question raised by the encounter.

V. Outside Observation Has a Structure Too

Selected parts of Vazire's study describe participants, procedure, and limitations. The study involved 165 American undergraduates aged 18–22; it used self-ratings and ratings by friends and unfamiliar participants, alongside particular tasks. These included a short public speech, group discussion, and separate ability tasks. This was not a random collection of opinions declared true by majority vote. Its conclusions depend on how comparisons were organized and what counted as a criterion. The author separately discusses the limited range of traits, the specificity of certain criteria, possible method overlap, and the sample's cultural bounds. These qualifications belong to the conclusions' substance; they are not an optional appendix. Removing them would enlarge the claim beyond the evidence examined.

Everyday life may lack an organized comparison. A friend says, “You are inattentive,” without specifying whether she means no response, premature advice, a glance at a phone, or a forgotten promise. To understand the observation, Oleg needs an episode and the meaning of the assessment. He is not entitled to demand a laboratory protocol or an apology for an unpleasant feeling. Specificity matters because different actions call for different corrections. Failing to hear a question, assuming advice was expected, and deliberately interrupting are different situations. His friend can describe dissatisfaction without knowing its causes. He can clarify what she observed without denying that dissatisfaction. Neither possibility guarantees that both participants will continue the conversation or agree on its result.

The observer's access also has a boundary. Someone who sees Oleg only in meetings may know his manner of answering publicly and know little about other conversations. A close friend possesses a different history, yet closeness does not make every memory accurate. The scientific study supports distinguishing conditions and criteria; it gives acquaintances no ready-made expert title over another person's character. If an outside observation concerns a particular sphere, it can be accepted in that sphere. This does not establish that the observer is wrong everywhere else; it means further conclusions need grounds of their own. Limited testimony can remain valuable without becoming a complete biography. Its usefulness depends on the question it actually helps answer, not on claiming unrestricted authority.

VI. Observation and Label

In instruction 45 of the Enchiridion, Epictetus distinguishes describing an action from evaluating it: someone bathing quickly is not thereby bathing badly. The historical example also concerns the amount someone drinks; we use it to distinguish claims, not to reach conclusions about drinking safety. Before knowing the principle behind an action, one should not hastily combine observation with evaluative judgment. This is a Stoic instruction, not a measured model of witness accuracy. It draws attention to the transition in Oleg's conversation: from “You started advising before my account ended” to “You never hear people.” The latter adds scope, repetition, and evaluation that the former does not establish by itself. Those additions require further grounds rather than louder delivery.

A label is difficult to check without implying that every generalization is forbidden. Someone may repeatedly act in ways deserving a general description. But we need to distinguish which cases support the conclusion and where its boundary lies. “Never” requires much more evidence than “in this meeting.” Even a limited correction may be unpleasant and important. Oleg need not accept an absolute claim to acknowledge a particular interruption. His friend need not abandon her experience to replace a general verdict with a description of the meeting. Both can refine their words without promising immediate reconciliation. Precision serves understanding the subject; it does not require being agreeable at any cost. An accurate complaint may remain demanding after its wording becomes narrower.

Instruction 44 of Epictetus warns against another transition: greater wealth or better eloquence does not make someone better as a whole person. Here the inference matters rather than the complete Stoic ideal. A confirmed inattentive remark likewise does not determine someone's entire human worth. Limiting the conclusion still preserves responsibility. If Oleg promised to hear his friend's account, he can discuss an unfulfilled promise without accepting a global label. Distinguishing an action from a whole person provides no excuse that actions do not matter. It allows a precise question about change: what should happen differently in a similar conversation, and which previous expectation should first be clarified with his friend? The answer concerns conduct rather than a final judgment of identity.

VII. A Blind Spot Has a Subject

“Blind spot” sometimes sounds as though a hidden region of personality has been discovered and another person already sees it whole. Careful usage identifies a specific gap in the available picture. Oleg knows his intention to help but may have missed his friend's stopping the account after his advice. She knows her reaction but may have missed his clarifying question or not known his time was limited. These possibilities are not equally probable merely because we list them; our invented case measures no probability at all. They illustrate what information might be missing and why it should be investigated separately from a general impression of someone. Naming a possible omission is a question, not evidence that it occurred.

Identifying a gap specifies what a particular conclusion lacks. A disagreement about the order of remarks needs information about those remarks. A claim about recurrence needs other relevant episodes and attention to their selection. A claim about cause may require more than two events occurring together. Participants may remember only part of the conversation; uncertainty should then remain explicit. A friend's confident opinion does not automatically fill the gap. Nor must someone invent a detailed internal explanation to make their version appear complete. “I remember wanting to help, but I am unsure why I spoke then” contains less explanation while showing the boundary of knowledge more accurately. It leaves the behavior itself available for examination.

This answer does not abandon self-knowledge. It separates retained knowledge from a connection not yet established. James allows observations to be corrected; Nisbett and Wilson preserve private content while discussing limits to process access. Against that background, a useful question about a blind spot becomes specific: what have I left out of this account? It does not demand conceding that one's entire past life was misdescribed. Oleg can revise his understanding of one conversation and then cautiously examine a broader skill. The more precisely the gap is identified, the less temptation there is to replace it with an all-embracing story—for example, that he is always selfless or always seeks control. Neither extreme follows from the episode we have considered.

VIII. Feedback Without Surrendering the Whole Biography

Feedback helps when it supplies information relevant to a question. Oleg's request, “When did you feel I had stopped listening?” makes room for an account of the meeting. “Tell me who I really am” offers his friend disproportionate authority over self-description and simultaneously gives her an impossible task. A friend may know much without having access to a final version of someone's personality. Oleg need not accept every answer to prove openness either. The question should enlarge the picture rather than examine obedience to another person's assessment. If participation is involuntary or the grounds cannot be discussed, the exchange may provide no suitable information for this purpose. The availability of a conversation matters alongside the willingness to receive criticism.

It helps to separate requesting an observation from requesting advice. His friend can describe what happened for her without suggesting a remedy. Oleg can ask whether she wants to discuss their next conversation. This distinction reflects the subjects of our article: testimony, explanation, and action are not identical. Even accurate feedback does not prescribe a single measure for future conduct. They might need to agree on when advice is welcome and when time to speak is wanted. Their expectations may also remain incompatible. Self-knowledge promises no removal of that conflict. It may help reveal its subject and prevent a difference in expectations from being covered by unsupported claims about each participant's character. Understanding a disagreement can be useful even when agreement does not follow.

Asking about grounds works both ways. Oleg has no privilege to reject everything unpleasant by saying, “You cannot know my motives.” His friend has no privilege to treat every question as resistance to truth. A claim about an action can be discussed without complete access to motives. A claim about a hidden cause must account for limited access. Afterward, Oleg can retain a private note, revise a particular phrase, or leave a question open. None of this requires publishing another person's history, making secret recordings, or turning acquaintances into observers in a personal experiment. Our teaching comparison concerns information discussed voluntarily, not collecting evidence at any cost. Respecting that boundary is compatible with taking a particular complaint seriously.

IX. What a Limited Correction Looks Like

Suppose Oleg accepts the sequence: he offered a solution before hearing the end. A correction could be, “In this meeting, I decided too soon that I understood the problem.” It identifies an episode, an action, and a questionable step in the inference. “I am an attentive listener” might become, “I try to listen; sometimes I start solving before clarifying the request.” This is no required formula for readers, only one possible outcome of our example. The correction measures neither the frequency of a habit nor its cause. It also does not promise that the error will never recur. That promise requires grounds unavailable here. A more exact description can be achieved without pretending to know everything needed for a prediction.

The next action can be chosen without a final explanation of the past. Oleg intends to ask whether advice is wanted and allow his friend to finish her thought. This is a specific choice, not a scientifically established attention-training program. Its meaning for this conversation depends on the participants' expectations. If his friend already requests a solution explicitly, a habitual pause might be inappropriate; limited time should be mentioned beforehand. Change requires sensitivity to circumstances rather than an identical ritual in every encounter. It may also include acknowledging the consequences of the earlier remark: discussing a new choice does not undo her not being heard in the form she wanted. Revising a description and repairing an interaction are connected but distinct tasks, with no guaranteed common outcome.

Later, Oleg might examine whether the correction applies to other conversations. The source of the examples matters: remembering an unpleasant episode is no random sample of all meetings. A few notes do not assess an entire personality or prove a constant cause. They may suggest a question to discuss and reveal specific differences in conditions. If new information conflicts with the first version, that version remains revisable. James's thought about correcting observations demands no endless internal trial. Refinement may stop when enough is known for the present decision and a broader conclusion is unnecessary. A limited correction can be complete for its purpose while incomplete as a biography. Knowing when the question has been answered is part of keeping its scope proportionate.

X. Sufficient Sincerity and Sufficient Grounds

Sincerity expresses an important condition of conversation: someone tries to communicate what they believe true. It ensures neither complete memory nor an exact word, access to a causal process, or a correct generalization about character. These limitations do not devalue sincerity; they help avoid demanding the impossible from it. Oleg need not become suspicious of every feeling. He needs to distinguish reporting an experience from making a further inference. His friend need not regard an observation as useless because it does not describe his entire personality. She needs to name its subject and boundary. This retains the possibility of a conversation in which two incomplete accounts actually add information rather than merely compete for precedence. Neither account needs unlimited authority to make a worthwhile contribution.

The sources support different tasks. James examines descriptions of inward experience and their possible correction. Nisbett and Wilson distinguish private contents from explanations of operations. Vazire investigates differences in perspectives' informativeness for selected traits and criteria, with explicit limitations. Epictetus recommends not turning a particular action or advantage into an unsupported general assessment. Together they form no universal psychological instruction. Their comparison offers more exact questions: what is known, how is it known, what has explanation added, and how far can the conclusion extend? Differences in grounds matter more here than similar words about attention, accuracy, or knowing ourselves. They keep each comparison within its own domain rather than suggesting that distinct arguments establish the same thing.

Action need not await complete self-knowledge. Someone can acknowledge a particular error, retain uncertainty about its cause, and choose a relevant next step. They can accept a friend's observation without granting authority over their whole personality. They can refine a word without abandoning the experience it was meant to express. In our example, a valuable result is a more accurate understanding of one meeting and its expectations. It is no final truth about Oleg. Such self-knowledge leaves room for personal testimony, outside information, and future correction. Sincerity is sufficient to begin an honest conversation; each broader conclusion requires grounds appropriate to it. A useful answer can remain limited without becoming empty or evasive.

What this means in practice

1. Choose an episode you can consider without disclosing another person's private information. Write separately what you felt or intended; the action you remember; your explanation of its cause; and any general claim about yourself you draw from it. Leave a part blank if you do not remember it. Do not complete a story merely to make four symmetrical entries. Mark which sentences are testimony, which are hypotheses, and which require additional examples. This separation concerns the status of claims, not a score for honesty.

2. If another participant freely agrees to discuss the meeting, ask one question about a specific moment: what they heard or what they expected then. Clarify beforehand that you are requesting an observation rather than a final assessment of your personality. Retain differences if they remain. Declining the conversation proves neither your account nor its opposite. Without the other person's participation, you can stop at the boundary of your own memory. No recording or public report is necessary.

3. Formulate one limited correction, or retain the previous version with its uncertainty marked. Specify the episode the conclusion concerns and what it does not establish. If you choose a next step, connect it with a particular expectation you managed to clarify. This voluntary, author-created exercise distinguishes claims; its efficacy has not been studied. It requires no diagnosis or agreement with every opinion about you. An unanswered causal question can remain open alongside a practical decision about one interaction.

Key quotation

> *“we do indeed have direct access to a great storehouse of private knowledge”*

Richard E. Nisbett and Timothy DeCamp Wilson, “Telling More Than We Can Know,” “Confusion Between Content and Process,” p. 255. A verbatim English fragment; the Russian rendering is the author's translation. Private contents do not imply infallible access to the processes that produced them.

Connections between traditions

1. **Experience and description — content and process.** James, VII, discussion of naming and classification; Nisbett/Wilson, “Confusion Between Content and Process,” pp. 255–256. The first distinguishes experience from verbal description, the second available contents from their producing operations. The comparison separates two questions without merging the texts into one established theory.

2. **Causal account — revising observation.** Nisbett/Wilson, the same section's discussion of causal theories; James, VII, concluding discussion of correction. A confident explanation can

be examined through relevant information and conditions for revision. A later version does not become true merely by being newer.

3. **Private knowledge — differing observability.** Nisbett/Wilson, pp. 255–256, benefits of personal information; Vazire (2010), abstract. Different perspectives possess different access to a question's subject. A historical review and one study establish no universal hierarchy of who knows a person best.

4. **Assessment criterion — describing an action.** Vazire (2010), Participants/Procedure and Limitations; Epictetus, Enchiridion 45. An assessment becomes clearer when episode, context, and grounds are identified. A limited research criterion and a Stoic instruction make no friend an infallible diagnostic instrument.

5. **Particular property — whole person.** Vazire (2010), trait differences in the abstract; Epictetus 44, wealth and eloquence. A supported claim about a particular domain does not determine someone's entire human worth. This boundary preserves responsibility for a particular action.

6. **Possible correction — method's boundaries.** James, VII, end of the introspection discussion; Vazire (2010), Limitations. Both personal accounts and other people's assessments remain open to refinement within available information. Agreement replaces no independent grounds, and the author-created exercise promises no measured result.

Primary sources

1. William James. The Principles of Psychology, VII. Original English, 1890, in the York University transcription. The selected discussion of feeling, naming, and correcting introspective observations was read; James's quotations from Mill and Mohr are distinguished from his own words. A historical methodological argument, with no claim to present consensus. The Russian epigraph is an original translation.

2. Richard E. Nisbett, Timothy DeCamp Wilson. Telling More Than We Can Know: Verbal Reports on Mental Processes. Psychological Review 84(3), 1977, 231–259, original English. The complete abstract and entire selected “Confusion Between Content and Process,” pp. 255–256, were read. This is a review and theoretical synthesis, not one new study; underlying experiments' methods were not separately examined. The Russian key quote is an original translation.

3. Simine Vazire. Who Knows What About a Person? The Self–Other Knowledge Asymmetry (SOKA) Model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 98(2), 2010, 281–300, doi:10.1037/a0017908, original English on the author's website. The complete abstract, Participants/Procedure, and Limitations were read. Full Results/Measures are not claimed as

read. Findings concerning selected traits and criteria in American undergraduates provide no universal observer ranking or individual diagnosis.

4. Epictetus. Enchiridion 44–45. Historical English translation by Elizabeth Carter in the Internet Classics Archive; both selected instructions were read in full. A Stoic instruction about moving from a property or action to assessment, rather than empirical observer-accuracy research. No Greek collation was performed.

Tags

#SelfKnowledge, #Sincerity, #SelfObservation, #Introspection, #SelfDescription, #PrivateKnowledge, #Experience, #Intention, #Cause, #Explanation, #Observation, #Feedback, #Friendship, #Conversation, #Attention, #Listening, #Memory, #Context, #Grounds, #Uncertainty, #Revision, #Character, #Labels, #Responsibility, #James, #Nisbett, #Wilson, #Vazire, #Epictetus, #UnitedWisdom

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.