

UNITED WISDOM

Fear of error and fear of another’s reaction

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-08-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fear of error and fear of another’s reaction

Andrey Zarinsh · Maria Evilkut

Epigraph

> *“when you do not know a thing, to allow that you do not know it”.*

Confucius, Analects II.17, excerpt, translated by James Legge. Text.

What this article is about

Someone can fear a mistake in a task or another's response to any mistake. Both may look like hesitation: work postponed, a question unasked, a message rewritten. Yet the tasks differ. Missing knowledge requires checking; humiliation or punishment risk also requires examining relationships, power and safety. Both can coexist when an error has actual consequences and another's response adds a separate threat.

This article distinguishes action's quality, assessment of its outcome and anticipated treatment of a person. Research on team psychological safety shows that discussing errors concerns more than personal courage; its limited design does not become universal law. Philosophical and religious texts raise questions about honest knowledge, control over responses and speech while preserving different grounds. The practical goal is identifying what requires checking or protection and which immediate step is available. We promise neither confidence, treatment nor a safe conversational outcome. Asking, correcting, refusing or preparing support must fit actual conditions rather than being prescribed identically to everyone.

I. A mistake and treatment after it are two events

A mistake concerns a particular action or result; treatment of the person making it is another action. They can be connected without sharing an ethical judgement. Someone can genuinely err and be wrongly humiliated, work correctly and be unfairly accused, or err and receive useful correction. Calling everything fear of mistakes removes anticipated treatment; calling everything fear of opinion removes actual checking needs. Separating them preserves both and guides action instead of demanding greater confidence.

A hypothetical employee repeatedly checks a table. Incorrect totals worry them, as does earlier public mockery. One task checks data and calculation; another examines how errors are discussed and who can support proper consideration. Fixing arithmetic cannot guarantee a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

respectful manager. A kinder manager cannot make wrong numbers right. Keeping the layers distinct allows technical verification to help without falsely promising that relationships will become safe or an unpleasant response will become impossible.

In Analects II.17, acknowledging ignorance belongs to understanding knowledge. This Confucian ethical instruction does not guarantee that others reward candour. Our application is that a question about an unknown can be responsible even when asking is frightening. But scripture does not cancel a question's cost in an unsafe setting. Knowing a preparation limit differs from being able to state it openly. Where the latter is absent, examine it before recommending a demonstration of courage.

Clarify the phrase fearing a mistake: what error, how would it be recognised, what would the result affect, and what might someone else do? Answers may remain incomplete. Partial distinctions still identify facts, skills, procedures and safe discussion needs. Unknowns are not personality traits. Responsibility for work and respectful treatment need not be chosen between; both can apply. Holding them together makes error discussion accurate and prevents substantive criticism from concealing arbitrary humiliation.

II. Quality requirements need to become identifiable

Fear may be sustained by an unclear outcome criterion. Without knowing what counts as correct, checking has no stopping point. Revising may continue because any finish seems risky. This is a possible arrangement, not a perfectionism diagnosis. Identify requirements, examples, timing, responsibility and verification. Criteria may genuinely be unclear, or clear while another's response is feared. Similar outward behaviour does not make additional standard clarification useful for both.

A hypothetical colleague requests a good text without specifying length, audience or purpose. The writer revises the opening repeatedly, waiting to recognise the right version intuitively. Useful questions concern who reads it, what it should support and required content. Clarification can define the task. If requirements change after every delivery, however, the assessment process may be moving. Preserve the revision history rather than treating every mismatch as inability to guess concealed expectations.

Confucian acknowledgement of limits does not require portraying oneself incompetent where conditions changed unannounced. Honesty concerns both what one lacks and what the task never specified. Both can be named without assigning motive. Concrete history can establish changed conditions, while intentional humiliation requires further grounds. Yet inability to prove motive does not prohibit identifying contradictory requirements. Process can be corrected even when participants disagree about why it arose.

A useful criterion identifies sufficient quality for the present step as well as an ideal. Drafts, final documents and irreversible actions need different checks. Professional standards and procedures remain applicable. Our question avoids assigning final requirements to every preliminary movement. Imperfection in a draft for agreement can belong to work rather than a finished error. Transfer for use changes the basis. Naming the stage selects appropriate verification while preserving responsibility without making endless preparation the sole route to avoiding judgement.

III. An error does not pass judgement on a whole person

A wrong result does not establish someone's overall worth. This distinction must not minimise the result: harmful errors require appropriate examination and repair. Dignity does not erase consequences, while consequences do not authorise a complete personality judgement from one case. Asking what was wrong, what harm followed and what kind of person one is requires different grounds. A specific check may answer the first; effects inform the second; one failure cannot reliably settle the third, however convincing shame makes it.

A hypothetical employee sends a document with the wrong date. Establish where it arose, who was informed, needed correction and recurrence prevention. Declaring the employee always irresponsible exceeds the event. A repetition history may exist but needs separate examination. Even repeated errors require concrete accounts instead of obvious character causes. Unclear sources, overload, insufficient skill, haste or missing checks may differ. We choose none beforehand. The next measure should answer an established gap rather than general personal guilt.

Gita 17.15 considers truthful, agreeable and beneficial speech within spiritual discipline, not a contemporary feedback technique. Our comparison asks whether words help understand and correct an error or only cause shame. Criticism can be unpleasant and useful; pleasantness is not the sole standard. Yet a true fact does not make adjoining humiliation useful. Speech's subject and effects matter as well as the speaker's right to be displeased.

Self-judgement can arise without another's involvement. Making a mistake becomes being unreliable, and correction feels insufficient until one's whole character is proved. Notice this possible transition without diagnosis. Ask what supports the general inference and what could change it. If a corrected date suffices, the task is limited. A guarantee of never erring may be impossible. Responsibility relates more accurately to acknowledging facts, manageable repair and suitable verification than repeatedly obtaining permission to remain worthy after each wrong action.

IV. The environment affects whether an error can be named

Saying one does not know or made an error depends on more than inward courage. Acknowledgement may bring respectful clarification, indifference, mockery or significant punishment. This history matters. Someone asking freely in one team and remaining silent in another cannot automatically be explained through a constant personality trait. Examine rules, leadership, prior consequences and the ability to clarify. This expands conditions for expressing responsibility and correcting work rather than removing responsibility.

Amy Edmondson's 1999 study examined 51 teams in one manufacturing company. Psychological safety meant a shared belief that it is safe to take interpersonal risks within the team, and it was associated with team learning behaviour. This multimethod field study does not randomise a managerial technique or guarantee results. We read the introduction, definition and model. A group measure does not diagnose an employee or promise one conversation's causal effect. It supports examining team conditions as well as the questioner's personal qualities.

A hypothetical manager asks for immediate error reports but publicly blames and mocks anyone reporting. Stated rules differ from actual responses, which employees may anticipate despite reassuring language. Change needs environmental actions: how errors are considered, whether facts are separated from humiliation and who handles repair. Demanding courage creates none of this. Elsewhere, errors can be named, consequences acknowledged and work improved without abandoning standards. Respectful examination and serious quality are compatible when responsibility does not reduce to public shame.

Not every unpleasant response proves the whole setting unsafe. Disappointment, questions and correction requests can belong to responsibility. Examine content, repetition, consequences and ability to answer. Yet humiliation cannot become quality's normal price merely because outcomes matter. Safety is neither universal pleasantness nor absent checks. Our narrower question is whether someone can report a consequential gap without arbitrary damage to their position. If not, it remains part of the task even after preparation improves, since knowledge alone does not change another's response.

V. Another's choice is not contained in our words

Precise wording makes a question clearer but cannot guarantee another's response. Rewriting may assume a combination that inevitably produces respect. Perhaps the text genuinely needs clarification; perhaps the guarantee concerns another's choice. Distinguish these. Immediately dismissing the response loses attention to one's speech; endlessly seeking perfect words assigns it impossible power. An answerable question remains about clarity, measure and an available way to communicate.

In Enchiridion §1, Epictetus assigns action and external outcomes to different domains of power. Stoicism is more radical than contemporary social-risk analysis. We use a narrower distinction: preparing a message differs from guaranteeing its assessment. This does not make reactions irrelevant; they can affect income, housing, resources and safety. Their real importance requires assessing conditions and options rather than declaring external behaviour removed by recognising control's limits.

Someone hypothetically refuses a trip honestly because time is unavailable. Their friend is disappointed. This need not prove wrong wording; incompatible plans can bring understandable disappointment. Elsewhere, disappointment becomes threats and coercion. Gentler wording cannot be promised to repair that. The difference concerns behaviour and consequences. Speech still matters, but safety cannot reduce to its quality. Someone can check their words while recognising another's responsibility for their own treatment of people.

Preparation can end when the subject, request and facts are clear, unnecessary accusations removed and communication chosen for conditions. Uncertainty then remains without invariably requiring another revision. Serious consequences may need support, another role or appropriate procedure. Limited consequences may permit an unwelcome response alongside one's choice. This requires no fearlessness. It prevents every external emotion from proving personal error while retaining responsibility for genuine inaccuracies discovered in a message or later events.

VI. Actual power changes the cost of errors and objections

Fear of another's reaction may rest on real power to cause harm. Control of income, housing, children or work can make the response more than an unpleasant opinion. Threats, violence or punishment for objections are substantial information, not automatic sensitivity. We do not establish danger from one everyday word. Preserve power and treatment history. Otherwise advice about independence from opinion may be practically unsuitable: the person bears losses the adviser will not restore.

In a hypothetical family, one partner threatens to withdraw money if a demand is refused. The other fears lost resources as well as wrong wording. Rehearsing a confident refusal does not create safety. Support, information and possible risk reduction matter. An individual plan depends on circumstances; this article neither replaces appropriate assistance nor suggests a dangerous experiment to test the threat. Emotional clarity can describe the position without ending dependence. Direct confrontation is not required to prove strength before fear's connection to reality is acknowledged.

A workplace may combine humiliation with threats of dismissal without physical violence. Risks and options differ from the family scene and should not be conflated, though the cost of

objecting remains a question. Are procedures, support, independent consideration or authority to identify constraints available? Sometimes not. Respectful speech cannot be promised a respectful response. Examine resources for another choice and currently available limited actions. The word boundary creates no safety, and weak fear at one moment does not establish it.

Power does not prove every forecast of punishment. Distinguish a threat, past fulfilled threats and predictions. Some information remains unknown; caution can be reasonable without certainty of the worst. Preserve knowledge limits alongside serious facts. No risky test of danger is required, and fear supplies no permission for any response. Assess steps through availability, role and consequences. A safer support channel may matter more than public objection or a feeling that another can no longer cause pain.

VII. Repair requires a question rather than endless self-accusation

Once an error is established, connect the next step to repair. Self-accusation can express regret without replacing a corrected record, warning or changed check. Shame need not stop immediately; action can coexist with it. Identify what happened, whom it affected, what is repairable and the appropriate role. Inward judgement alone may leave others without correction; technique alone may omit acknowledging harm. Responsibility holds both as concretely as circumstances permit.

A wrong date hypothetically reaches a client. The employee checks correct information and sends a correction where authorised, then examines consequences and coordination. Preparation does not prove closure; receipt and changed use matter. Professional procedures remain in force. The example separates prepared correction from actual effect. Acknowledgement also does not require accepting insults: responsibility for the date can coexist with objection to treatment unrelated to the work.

Confucian acknowledgement of ignorance preserves honesty from which learning can continue rather than fixing someone's final condition. Our application distinguishes a missing skill from general incapacity. A checking method, intelligible source or agreed verification time may be needed. Resources may genuinely be absent, preventing a false guarantee. Naming limits belongs to responsibility. Conversely, unclear tasks cannot explain every error in advance to avoid personal contribution. Hypotheses are checked against history, including unwelcome evidence of haste or skipped checks.

Define a reasonable reason to recheck. Updated sources, changed dates or new recipients supply grounds. Without changed information, repeatedly revisiting a verified line may not improve quality. This is no universal exemption: consequential tasks retain mandatory checks.

Our question concerns an agreed sufficiency criterion, not abolishing control. A portion of work can be finished while feelings remain unfinished. That is more accurate than requiring full self-exoneration before delivery or permanent reliability from one successful correction.

VIII. The next step should fit this particular risk

Distinguishing mistake from response permits action fitting a gap. Unknown criteria need task clarification; absent skills need preparation; an existing error needs repair; dangerous mistreatment needs safety information and resources as well as wording. Several actions may be needed together without conflation. Fear stops being the whole situation's only name, and general confidence need not be proved before one part becomes clearer or manageable.

A hypothetical employee clarifies criteria, checks data and prepares a result while knowing the manager sometimes humiliates people. Technical readiness is established; social risk remains. Another available participant, clear conditions or an authorised delivery route may help without guaranteeing safety. Missing resources remain limits. A modest benefit is that the task gains shape: completed parts, unknowns and responsibilities become visible. This is useful separately from continuing fear.

These references form no single theory. Confucius concerns honest knowledge, Epictetus control over actions and externals, Gita spiritual speech discipline. Edmondson studies team conditions and learning rather than metaphysical freedom. Compare questions while preserving different answers and limits. Our practice combines stages of an episode's examination rather than teachings: information, criteria, resources, action and consequence. Participant evidence identifies where attention is needed. Ancient or scientific names neither replace that work nor prove a step beneficial beforehand.

Check each outcome within its limits. Was a question answered, a criterion clarified, harm corrected, support actually available, or an enduring arrangement changed beyond one softer reaction? These questions permit updating without premature triumph or total judgement. Small results can remain small; continuing risks remain in further choice. Quality and respect can be required together. The next step need be neither a display of fearlessness nor surrender to every external displeasure.

What this means in practice

For one episode, form two sentences: the action in which an error is possible, and what someone might do if it occurs or a question is asked. Identify grounds alongside them: criteria, sources, prior treatment and consequences. Forecasts remain forecasts and reports remain reports. Unknowns need no invention. Calm is not required; separation shows whether concerns involve quality, relationships or both and which questions could help.

Check the stage and sufficient criteria. Is this a preliminary version, final delivery or consequential action? What verification and mandatory procedures apply? Everyday courage cannot replace them. Final infallibility must also not be required of a draft for agreement. Preserve changed requirements' history. Identify a missing skill area rather than general incapacity. For an established error, choose manageable correction and assess actual effects rather than treating acknowledgement as completion.

Examine reactions through content, power and consequences. Disappointment, substantive criticism, humiliation and threats differ. Is there coercion, punishment history or inability to answer freely? Direct refusal cannot be universally prescribed in those conditions. Support, a safer channel or resource information may come first. This offers no individual safety plan or dangerous threat-testing experiment. It preserves external constraints without attributing them to sensitivity or insufficient philosophical independence from opinion.

Name a next step and revision trigger: clarify one criterion, check one consequential part, prepare correction, choose an authorised delivery method or find support. Afterwards observe actual change rather than confidence alone. Fear may persist while an error is corrected and respectful arrangements remain absent; these are separate results. The outcome is responsibility for one's part without accepting arbitrary treatment, and consideration of reactions without trying to control them entirely through words. Pace, pauses and updating remain possible when new evidence changes the apparent task or risk.

Key quotation

> *“Some things are in our control and others not”.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion §1, translated by Elizabeth Carter. Text. This is a Stoic distinction, not a claim that external harm has no actual consequences.

Connections between traditions

Similarities concern limited questions, not proof of one shared path. Outcome criteria, ethical speech, team conditions and personal safety retain different grounds.

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Confucius II.17 ↔ criteria clarification	Acknowledging unknowns makes a task more honest	Instruction does not guarantee a safe managerial response
Edmondson ↔ quality and treatment	Conditions for discussing errors matter	Field associations across 51 teams do not prove every individual's outcome

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Epictetus §1 ↔ message preparation	Own action differs from another's assessment	External consequences are not declared insignificant
Gita 17.15 ↔ substantive criticism	Truth and benefit in speech need consideration	Spiritual discipline differs from modern feedback methods
Confucius ↔ Epictetus ↔ editorial practice	Knowledge and control limits can be named	Ethical learning, Stoic freedom and resource assessment are not identical

Primary sources and research

• Confucius; translated by James Legge. Analects, II.17 — II.17, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330; acknowledging limits of knowledge.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, 20 — §§1, 5, 20, Elizabeth Carter translation; control, judgement and delay.

• Bhagavad Gita; translated by Swami Adidevananda. Bhagavad Gita 17.15 — 17.15, Gita Supersite translations, especially Swami Adidevananda; discipline of speech, accessible indexed verse text read.

• Amy Edmondson. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams (1999) — Administrative Science Quarterly 44, 350–383; DOI 10.2307/2666999; introduction and definition, field study of 51 teams in one company.

Tags

inner navigation, human experience, emotions, distinctions, life episode, interpretation, responsibility, consent, dignity, safety, boundaries, relationships, dialogue, choice, consequences, uncertainty, attention, ethical judgement, hypothetical example, philosophy, religion, research, United Wisdom, practical reflection, facts, Fear of error and fear of another’s reaction, quality criteria

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.