

UNITED WISDOM

How to examine the claim “I have become a different person”

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-22-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How to examine the claim “I have become a different person”

Epigraph

> *by doing them*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, II.1. W.D.Ross translation, MIT, displayed line30; a short exact English fragment, with our own Russian translation in the companion edition. A normative philosophical account of action retains its genre and is not presented as experimental proof of personality change.

What this article is about

After another delay in a shared project, someone tells their partner: things will be different now; I have become a different person. The conversation sounds sincere. They have read a new book, reconsidered their earlier story, and acknowledged for the first time that they promised more than they could deliver. Their partner wants to know whether they can plan the work around this answer again. Two questions meet here: what has happened in the person's inner understanding, and what has changed in the conditions of their shared work. They are connected, but one answer does not cover both. An acknowledgment can matter in itself, while a deadline still needs a specific agreement.

A statement about change can contain very different events. I describe myself differently. I want to act differently. I have once done something I previously avoided. I have kept a new agreement several times. Another participant has received the result they needed. Sometimes all of these do happen together. Sometimes only the first is known. To avoid dismissing change or treating hope as an already verified result, it helps to clarify which claim the account concerns. We do not have to decide immediately whether the entire person has changed. It is enough to understand what is being discussed now and which next decision depends on it.

In this article, philosophical texts by Aristotle and John Stuart Mill help us ask questions about action and personal choice. The research by Nathan Hudson and R.Chris Fraley is considered separately, within the parts read and the methods of measurement used. These sources do not place a general seal of authenticity on a personal story. Our task is more modest: to preserve the distinction between intention, action, self-description, and available evidence. An examination can be small, voluntary, and limited to a real commitment. It should not become an examination of someone's right to have a new life, or an endless demand that they prove their worth.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. First clarify which change is being discussed

In our example, we might ask: what will be different about handing over the materials now? This is more specific than a request to confirm a complete inner transformation. The person might name earlier notice of a delay, a narrower promise, or a different organization of the work. Each statement has its own subject. If the subject is a new understanding they have experienced, we can name it as such. Their partner does not have to deny the inner experience to clarify a work deadline. The person does not have to turn that experience into an accomplished external result for their account to remain meaningful and honest.

An intention concerns a future action. It may be serious, but its presence does not yet tell us that the action has happened. A new action concerns a particular occasion. It deserves its own description, but does not automatically establish consistency in every circumstance. A new view of oneself concerns one's own understanding. It may accompany actions or exist separately for now. These distinctions do not form a ladder whose lower steps are meaningless. They help us choose the appropriate word and avoid requiring one kind of evidence to answer an entirely different question.

It also helps to name the domain. A person responds differently to work requests, but this does not immediately tell us how they act at home, while travelling, or under a different workload. A change in one agreement does not have to extend to the whole personality to be useful. There are conditions within the domain too: a familiar format, available time, new help, a smaller volume of work. Stating them does not take away the result. It helps us understand what has actually worked and under which circumstances it has so far been observed, instead of arguing about whether the person can be described as definitively new.

Sometimes the statement simply means a wish to stop living under an old label. This is a human question in its own right. Other people do not gain the right to reduce someone forever to a previous mistake. At the same time, asking them to abandon a label does not make every new promise fulfilled. We can change the language of the relationship and continue discussing specific consequences. In our example, the partners can remove the sweeping verdict and agree on the next handover. This conversation leaves room for change and responsibility, without making respect for someone conditional on an obligation to confirm every change they claim in advance.

II. An action has a scale and conditions

Suppose the new material really does arrive on time. This now differs from a promise to send it. We can identify the date, contents, and recipient, if those details concern the shared work. But we should not extend the conclusion beyond the event. Perhaps the task was easier than the previous one. Perhaps help became available. Perhaps the person really changed how they plan. These possibilities do not cancel the delivered material, but distinguish the result from its explanation. For the next decision, it matters to retain both levels: we know what worked, while why it worked may still be a question.

The absence of an occasion cannot count as evidence of a new response. If there was never a need to warn of a delay during the selected period, we do not know how the person will do so now. We can note that the commitment was fulfilled without claiming verified behavior under difficulty. Similarly, silence does not always mean someone maintained a deliberate pause: perhaps the conversation never began. A record should identify an appropriate opportunity for action, rather than only a convenient outcome. This helps us avoid conclusions based on a test that did not actually occur, without artificially creating a conflict for the sake of testing.

Comparison needs reasonably understandable occasions. An earlier complex handover and a new short note cannot automatically count as equivalent tasks. We can compare a particular element, such as communicating a deadline, if it genuinely occurred in both. We can acknowledge that there is no complete comparison. That answer is not equivalent to failure. It shows the limits of the information. An examination is needed for a selected decision, not to produce certainty at any cost. If seeing the current version and agreeing on the next deadline is enough for the partners, they need not construct an account of every earlier and future circumstance.

A change in conditions should not be treated as proof of deception. A smaller workload, a reminder, or help may be part of a new way of acting. The question is not whether the person did everything without support. The question is which support is needed and available for the next task. If its presence is hidden, the promise may be incomplete. If the conditions are stated, the agreement becomes more precise. This is an editorial criterion for conversation, rather than a scientific claim about a mechanism of development. It allows people to discuss the actual organization of action without demanding proof of independence from every environment and every other person.

III. Repetition clarifies an account without creating a final certificate

When a new action occurs on several appropriate occasions, its description can become less general. Instead of a complete transformation of personality, we can name early notice of two postponements and a timely third handover. This preserves the observed pattern and its period. It does not establish permanent consistency, but provides grounds for the next limited decision. It matters not to invent a universal number of repetitions. This article has no threshold after which every person counts as changed. The scale of an examination depends on the task, consequences, and available conditions, rather than a magical arithmetic of good actions.

One inconvenient occasion also needs its own scale. A missed deadline does not prove that all previous changes were lies. It may reveal a particular weakness in the new arrangement or a broken promise. This has consequences that need discussion. But a sweeping conclusion that the personality has remained unchanged adds more than is known. We can name successful handovers and the current delay together. The review then becomes neither an erasure of the problem nor a cancellation of the entire history. The next step addresses the difficulty found, rather than a demand to choose a definitive moral portrait of the person.

A criterion chosen beforehand makes comparison clearer than an explanation selected after the result. If people agreed on warning before a certain time, they should not quietly replace this later with simply warning at some point. The condition can be revised openly if it has become unsuitable. The new agreement then needs to be named, while the status of the previous occasion is retained. This is not a prohibition on flexibility. It is a way to avoid presenting a change in the rule as compliance with the old rule. Evaluating a particular promise becomes clearer, and personal growth need not justify every retrospective edit to the story.

Examining consistency should not require provocation. There is no need to deliberately deprive someone of sleep, start an argument, or impose an excessive workload to find out whether they have changed enough. Ordinary circumstances may provide the relevant information, and sometimes a decision does not require such a test at all. Participants have a right to boundaries and to refuse a particular format. The reliability of a shared plan can be discussed through scope, timing, and communication. A person's right to respect does not depend on agreeing to take part in someone else's experiment on their reactions or continually supplying evidence of inner transformation.

IV. An account of oneself and available information

Self-description deserves attention, but speaks from its own position. Someone says that they experience waiting differently or have stopped agreeing automatically. This is a report about their experience. Another participant may know only whether a response arrived and whether a condition was fulfilled. The different information need not coincide completely. In our example, we can acknowledge the account of a new understanding and check the handover separately. There is no need to demand access to every inner thought. It is enough to distinguish where a statement came from and which question it actually helps resolve in the selected task.

A memory of earlier behavior has its own status too. If there was no earlier record, today's account of constant delays may be an impression rather than a complete list. We should not turn a memory into an exact count to make an attractive comparison. We can use available correspondence about the shared project, if this is acceptable to the participants, or honestly leave the earlier frequency unknown. The new timely handover then remains a fact without an invented magnitude of improvement. This limit does not prevent satisfaction with the result. It prevents assigning it a measured history that is not actually available.

When another person's perspective matters, we need their answer rather than an imagined reply. We can ask whether the new handover method works for them and what remains inconvenient. Their answer does not have to confirm our new self-assessment. It may name a different criterion: the materials arrived on time, but a necessary section is missing. This is new information about a result, not a right to issue a general diagnosis. It helps to discuss content separately from tone and retain the possibility of clarification. Meanwhile, no one is obliged to become a permanent evaluator of another person's personality or provide intimate details to prove a sweeping change.

Another person's answer does not always resolve the whole question. An observer may see only part of a life, remember an old story, or have their own interest. This is not a reason to reject every comment in advance. It is a reason to identify the domain and examine the specific content. Asking about the material received is more useful than asking whether its author has become a better human being. Agreed observation concerning a task differs from covert monitoring, collecting opinions behind someone's back, and requiring unanimity. A limited decision generally needs information relevant to it, rather than a complete commission on a participant's inner condition.

V. What the research permits us to say and does not confirm

In their2015 work, Hudson and Fraley studied the wish to change personality traits in two sixteen-week studies with students. They used repeated self-reports; the intervention variants differed in outcome. The authors identify limits of measurement, causal explanations, and lasting stability. This supports treating change as a research question rather than every intention as an accomplished fact. The parts of the primary paper read do not establish the outcome of our example. Nor do they test the editorial note proposed below or promise a particular personal change within the same period.

In an everyday conversation, it matters not to assign the name of a scientific scale to an impression. Reporting a timely handover is one claim. Declaring a measured increase in a particular trait on that basis is another. The latter requires an appropriate method and its limitations; no such assessment is made here. A particular observable action has value without a psychometric title. We can talk about the selected action, a new communication rule, and the available result. This preserves the subject of scientific concepts, while allowing participants to handle an ordinary task without improvised personality testing.

New self-description is not automatically evidence of a causal mechanism either. Someone may read a book, receive help, and change their workload at the same time. Their later result may differ, but this sequence does not yet mean that the book caused the change. For a selected agreement, retaining a helpful condition may sometimes be enough, without resolving the whole causal question. If a causal explanation matters, it needs separate information and an appropriate examination. A simple note does not become research merely because it includes a date before and a date after. It remains an account of particular occasions and one's own assumptions.

Scientific content does not provide a moral rank. Even a verified change in a measure does not in itself tell us whether a particular decision is fair to another participant. Someone may become more organized and still fail to keep a promise to this recipient. They may describe emotions differently and still need appropriate help. These questions should not be reduced to a single score. Our article discusses the precision of a personal claim and a shared agreement. It does not offer a clinical conclusion, treatment forecast, or assessment of maturity disguised as the name of a researched trait.

VI. Aristotle: action and the quality of action

In the selected parts of the second book of Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle connects the acquisition of moral character with activity. In section4, he also distinguishes an outwardly appropriate action from the agent's own conditions for acting. This is normative philosophy: the author discusses what counts as virtuous action, rather than measuring the modern personalities of experimental participants. We can read this move as a question for our own account: am I talking about knowledge, choice, or something actually done? That question belongs to our application. It does not turn an ancient text into a validated program for correcting delays or promise the same result to every reader.

The possibility of going beyond a new vocabulary matters. Someone may learn to explain an earlier mistake in detail and still not hand over the necessary material. This does not make reflection meaningless. It shows that understanding and performance concern different subjects. If an action is needed now, it helps to name that action. There is no need to reread the whole story of inner change before the next letter. One can prepare a realistic message about timing and then check whether it was sent. The philosophical question retains its meaning, while the external result obtains an ordinary factual basis.

At the same time, philosophy should not be used to demand endless proof of a correct inner intention. Another participant does not gain free access to our inner life simply because a text distinguishes conditions of action. In a shared task, people can discuss what concerns the agreement. If someone wants to reflect separately on their reasons, that is their choice. A normative tradition remains a partner in thought, rather than an instrument of compulsory interrogation. One delivered version cannot tell us everything about its author's character, just as one doubt cannot invalidate their action.

A historical text also does not erase the differences between modern tasks. Handing over a document, making a moral choice, and describing a lasting trait are not identical. An editorial connection can be found between them through attention to action, while retaining different grounds for conclusions. The selected passage does not establish a particular number of days needed for a new habit or a universal sequence of development. Nor does it require enduring harm to train a quality. A practical decision must consider the real task, available conditions, and participants' rights, which cannot be replaced by the authority of an ancient concept or an attractive transformation story.

VII. Mill: personal choice does not remove other people's rights

In the third chapter of On Liberty, Mill discusses individuality and a person's own application of experience. The selected passage connects the exercise of judgment with choice, rather than only repeating custom. This is a philosophical argument about the organization of life, not a scale for measuring change. In our example, it lets us ask whether a new way of acting is one's own considered decision or merely a new expected image. We do not attribute a project-management program to the author. The comparison is editorial and limited: the right to choose one's life is not equivalent to evidence that a chosen action has already taken place.

We can accept a useful rule from another person's example and still make it our own decision. A suggestion's origin does not by itself determine sincerity. What matters is how it fits the task and what the person is prepared to promise. Perhaps the earlier attractive image required agreeing to any deadline, while the new choice consists in an earlier refusal. Fewer promises may then accompany clearer responsibility. This guarantees no favorable outcome for every participant. It does, however, allow discussion of an appropriate scope, instead of competing for the most impressive story of personal renewal that future recipients are expected to believe without reservation.

Mill's selected discussion also retains a boundary concerning other people's rights and interests. In our conversation, a new personal path does not confer the right to assign someone else a duty to trust again or cancel the consequences of an old promise. We can state a decision, propose a new agreement, and accept that the recipient may choose another format. Their answer does not establish the truth of the entire inner story. It establishes agreement or disagreement to participate now. Respect for one person's freedom has practical meaning only if the other participants retain the possibility of choosing too.

When reading, it matters not to transfer historical generalizations about cultures and people into a contemporary assessment of the reader. We use the selected argument about choice and boundaries, rather than the authority of every judgment in a large work. It does not rank our biographies or decide which worldview is necessary for authentic change. Readers can have different convictions and still agree on scope, timing, and the right to refuse. A philosophical source helps formulate a question; it does not become a ready-made description of any family, team, or culture, and does not replace their actual answers.

VIII. A new story does not erase previous consequences

Let us return to the delayed project. Someone may genuinely understand what happened differently and express regret. The other participant may still have expenses, lost time, or work left to finish. These consequences need to be named at an appropriate scale, without demanding permanent punishment or immediate forgiveness. A changed self-description does not resolve them automatically. People can separately discuss present help, correction of a particular result, or refusal of another shared task. Each decision has its own status and need not serve as a final verdict on whether the person can ever change at all.

Making amends, a new promise, and trust do not coincide either. Corrected material can resolve a work error, while the recipient is not yet ready to plan the next task together. This distinction does not necessarily deny all the effort. It may reflect a separate decision about risk and participation. We should not compel someone to confirm our transformation for a completed correction to count as real. It is better to state what was corrected, what was proposed, and which answer was received. Trust cannot be registered as achieved merely because one party decided to become more reliable and described that decision convincingly.

The opposite substitution occurs too: a participant agrees to continue working, and the author declares all earlier questions resolved. But consent may concern only the next small stage. If a limited scope was agreed, it should be retained. A new opportunity is not permission to restore the old conditions automatically. It creates room for a particular action whose result still needs to be seen. This does not make distrust a compulsory norm. It means precision about a particular agreement. Partners are free to choose a broader or narrower format if it was genuinely discussed and not presented as someone else's decision without their answer.

It helps to retain a person's right to a new self-description without demanding that they live forever within an old story. At the same time, we can acknowledge that others remember consequences and have their own boundaries. These positions do not require a general judge who first certifies a transformation of the whole personality. For the next task, a clear action and an appropriate agreement are enough. If the conversation becomes pressure, one can stop it or choose another form of help. This article does not prescribe restoring every relationship or treat renewed closeness as a compulsory test of a new intention's sincerity or proof of spiritual development.

IX. Finish the examination at the scale of the decision

A useful outcome for our example can be simple: I promise one piece of material by the agreed deadline and will communicate an obstacle in advance; the recipient agrees to this stage. This is a prepared agreement until the material has been delivered. After delivery, the status changes only in relation to that action. We can acknowledge a successful result without demanding a conclusion of permanent reliability. If the recipient has not answered, their agreement remains unknown. This precision does not remove hope. It allows hope to coexist with the actual state of the task, which needs to inform the next decision.

An examination needs a stopping condition. If the question concerned receiving the current version, checking it need not lead to collecting information about every sphere of its author's life. If several agreed stages are needed, that format should be named beforehand. If information is insufficient, one can limit the promise, postpone the decision, or leave the question open. None of these options requires an appearance of complete certainty. It helps to finish when there are the grounds needed for the selected action, rather than when every possible doubt about someone for all future years has disappeared.

Inner change can have a meaning that does not fit into a work table. This article does not prohibit such an account. It proposes protecting it from excessive extension when someone else's resources, answer, or consent are requested on its basis. We can speak of an experience in the first person and discuss an available result separately. We can acknowledge a new action without declaring it a therapeutic achievement. We can leave some causes unknown and still keep the next promise. A precise statement often leaves more room for a continuing life than a final designation that needs constant defending.

What this means in practice

If the format suits you, choose one statement you have made about change. Clarify the domain, period, and what is actually known: an intention, a new self-description, a particular action, or several appropriate occasions. Do not add missing memories or treat someone else's silence as consent. For the next decision, name one action and the necessary conditions. This is a voluntary editorial note, not a psychometric assessment, therapy, or replication of research. Declining it does not mean being unready to change, and completing it does not in itself confirm a lasting change in character.

If the decision concerns someone else, ask only about the necessary subject and preserve the possibility of refusal. A prepared question is not equivalent to an answer received. A new action does not erase an earlier action's consequences or oblige the recipient to restore trust. Record the actual status of the agreement, then check the selected result if the task requires it. Do not provoke difficulty for the sake of a test or gather someone else's private information

secretly. You can stop when the next step is clear or an unknown is honestly stated. A claim about change becomes more precise when its scale matches what can actually be said now.

Key quotation

> *making a choice*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, III. Gutenberg34901, Walter Scott Publishing, displayed line543, printed page109; a short exact fragment of Mill's prose, with our own Russian translation in the companion edition. W.L.Courtney's introduction is distinguished from Mill's text; the year of this print edition is unestablished. The philosophical argument is not a measured effect of our exercise.

Connections between traditions

Aristotle's account of activity and Mill's account of choice allow different questions to be asked about a claim of change. Hudson and Fraley's self-report research retains its separate methodological subject. The comparison is editorial: there is no shared measure of moral character, personality, and individual freedom here. Historical influence or agreement among all traditions is not established. The everyday criterion for the next promise is not attributed to the primary authors, and a personal experience is not converted into an experimental result. Distinguishing genres helps preserve both the significance of an inner account and the limits of using it in relation to other people's rights and consent.

Sources

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, BookII, W.D.Ross, MIT. Attribution and selected sections1–5 were read, not the entire book or Ethics. Print edition and pages are unestablished. Primary normative philosophy, not an experimental program. International rights UNKNOWN, no full import; the quotation budget is shared across all books of the work.

2. John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, III, Gutenberg34901. Attribution and selected primary III528–576 were read; Courtney's introduction is distinguished and the print edition's year is unestablished. Historical cultural hierarchies are not adopted as contemporary facts. International rights UNKNOWN, no full import; the budget is shared with chapterII used in another article in this batch.

3. Nathan W.Hudson; R.Chris Fraley, Volitional Personality Trait Change: Can People Choose to Change Their Personality Traits?, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology2015,109(3)490–507, DOI10.1037/pspp0000021. Original abstract and selected methods, discussion, and limitations were read, not the whole paper, tables, or cited studies.

©APA2015; the copy carries a personal-use and broad-dissemination restriction. The source text and PDF are neither imported nor distributed; there are no direct quotations. This is limited editorial exposition with a link, without claiming an open licence.

Tags

change, personality, intention, action, self-description, self-report, evidence, criterion, period, conditions, comparison, repetition, habit, choice, Aristotle, Mill, Hudson, Fraley, research, limitations, promise, agreement, result, trust, responsibility, consent, privacy, boundaries, observation, United Wisdom

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 the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.