



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



**REFERENCE
SHEETS**

REFERENCE SHEET 15

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY BIAS CHECK

The Accountabili-Buddy is part of the accountability system.

Accountabili-Buddy assumptions, emotions, preferences, and habits can affect:

- What questions are asked
- Which explanations seem credible
- How much challenge is applied
- Which interventions are chosen
- Whether the client retains decision ownership

Professional accountability therefore requires examination not only of the client's behavior, but occasionally of the Accountabili-Buddy's own reasoning.

1. CONFIRMATION BIAS

Risk

Once the Accountabili-Buddy develops a formulation, new information is interpreted primarily as evidence supporting it.

Example:

Prior Pattern:

Client has repeatedly avoided launching a website.

Current Event:

Developer identifies a genuine technical defect.

Biased Interpretation:

"This is another excuse."

Check

"Would I interpret this information differently if I did not know the client's history?"

History should inform scrutiny.

It should not predetermine the conclusion.

2. RECENCY BIAS**Risk**

The most recent week receives more weight than the larger pattern deserves.

Example:

Client completes five sessions after six weeks averaging two.

Immediate Conclusion:

"The problem is solved."

Check

"How does this result compare with the full record?"

One week is evidence.

It is not necessarily the new baseline.

3. FRUSTRATION BIAS**Risk**

Repeated non-follow-through causes the Accountabili-Buddy to become less curious and more negative.

Signs:

- Explanations begin sounding like excuses automatically
- Questions become prosecutorial
- The Accountabili-Buddy expects failure
- Tone becomes sharper than the evidence warrants

Check

“Am I responding to this interaction, or to my accumulated frustration with previous ones?”

4. RESCUING**Risk**

The Accountabili-Buddy becomes uncomfortable with client difficulty and starts solving too much.

Examples:

- Choosing the commitment
- Designing every schedule
- Repeatedly lowering targets
- Giving answers before asking what the client thinks
- Taking responsibility for keeping the client motivated

Check

“Am I helping the client make a decision, or making the decision because I want the difficulty resolved?”

5. OVER-CHALLENGING**Risk**

The Accountabili-Buddy begins treating directness as inherently superior.

Examples:

- Challenging when clarification would suffice
- Treating ordinary misses as evidence of avoidance
- Refusing reasonable recalibration because it feels “too easy”
- Interpreting compassion as weakness

Check**“What evidence requires challenge here?”**

Directness should serve accuracy.

It should not become an identity.

6. DESIRE TO BE LIKED**Risk**

Rapport begins interfering with accountability.

Signs:

- Repeated misses are turned into jokes
- Difficult patterns remain unspoken
- Reassurance appears before inquiry
- The Accountabili-Buddy avoids disagreement
- Commitments are accepted despite obvious problems

Check**“Would I say something different if I were less concerned about how this response will be received?”**

Warmth and challenge can coexist.

7. DESIRE TO BE RIGHT

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy becomes invested in proving a formulation.

Example:

Accountabili-Buddy suggests:

“Preparation is functioning as avoidance.”

Client disagrees.

Instead of testing the hypothesis, the Accountabili-Buddy interprets disagreement as additional evidence.

Check

“What evidence would make me abandon this formulation?”

If the answer is “nothing,” the formulation is no longer evidence-based.

8. FAVORITE-INTERVENTION BIAS

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy repeatedly uses the same intervention because it is familiar or has worked elsewhere.

Examples:

- Always shrink the task
- Always schedule it
- Always increase check-in frequency
- Always ask about motivation
- Always challenge
- Always recommend consistency before progression

Check

“Am I selecting this intervention because it fits the formulation, or because it is what I usually do?”

9. OVERIDENTIFICATION

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy interprets the client through personal experience.

Example:

“I had the same problem, and what fixed it for me was...”

The client may not have the same problem.

Check

“What evidence says their mechanism is the same as mine?”

Personal familiarity can generate hypotheses.

It should not substitute for client-specific evidence.

10. HALO EFFECT

Risk

A historically reliable client receives less scrutiny than current behavior warrants.

Example:

“She is normally extremely disciplined, so this must just be a rough patch.”

After six weeks, that assumption may no longer fit.

Check

“If this were a new client and I only had the last six weeks, what would I notice?”

11. NEGATIVE HISTORY EFFECT

Risk

The opposite of the halo effect.

A client with a history of avoidance is treated as though every future barrier is avoidance.

Check

“What evidence supports this explanation in the current instance?”

Past behavior changes probability.

It does not establish current cause.

12. ACTIVITY BIAS

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy feels that every conversation must contain an intervention.

Examples:

- Successful week leads to a new strategy
- Stable behavior leads to increased goals
- Clear explanation leads to unnecessary inquiry
- Client receives advice simply because a check-in occurred

Check

“Does anything actually need to change?”

Sometimes the correct intervention is:

Continue.

13. COMPLEXITY BIAS

Risk

A complicated explanation feels more professionally sophisticated than a simple one.

Example:

Client:

“Nothing happened. I just did not do it.”

The Accountabili-Buddy searches for:

- Hidden fear
- Identity conflict
- Unconscious resistance
- Perfectionism

There may be no evidence for any of them.

Check

“Is simple non-follow-through sufficient to explain what I currently know?”

Do not invent complexity.

14. CLIENT-LANGUAGE BIAS

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy adopts the client’s terminology without evaluating it.

Client:

“I was overwhelmed.”

The Accountabili-Buddy immediately records:

Overwhelm.

Check

“What behavior supports that label?”

Shared vocabulary should improve communication, not eliminate professional reasoning.

15. OUTCOME BIAS

Risk

The result determines whether the Accountabili-Buddy believes the decision was good.

Example:

A well-calibrated commitment is missed because of an unpredictable emergency.

Outcome Bias:

“The commitment was unrealistic.”

Or:

A badly designed commitment happens to be completed through extreme effort.

Outcome Bias:

“The plan worked.”

Check

“Was the decision reasonable based on the information available when it was made?”

Good process can occasionally produce failure.

Poor process can occasionally produce success.

16. HINDSIGHT BIAS

Risk

Once the outcome is known, the Accountabili-Buddy believes it should have been obvious.

Example:

“Clearly she was going to miss five sessions.”

But at the time:

- Four had been completed regularly
- Five was a modest progression
- Capacity appeared available

Check

“What could reasonably have been known before the outcome?”

This is especially important when evaluating trainees.

17. DEPENDENCY REINFORCEMENT

Risk

The Accountabili-Buddy unintentionally rewards client dependence.

Examples:

Client:

“How many should I do?”

Accountabili-Buddy always chooses.

Client:

“Is it okay if I pause?”

Accountabili-Buddy grants permission.

Client:

“What do you think I should do?”

Accountabili-Buddy answers before asking for the client’s judgment.

Check

“Am I providing useful professional input, or becoming the authority the client believes must approve the decision?”

18. INTERVENTION ESCALATION

Risk

Repeated failure leads automatically to more accountability intensity.

Example Sequence:

One check-in per week

→ Two check-ins per week

→ Three check-ins per week

without evidence that increasing check-in frequency addresses the actual barrier.

Check

“What evidence says insufficient accountability contact is the problem?”

More accountability contact is not necessarily better accountability.

BEFORE A SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGE

Ask:

What behavior am I responding to?

What evidence supports my interpretation?

What plausible alternative exists?

Am I frustrated?

Am I trying to rescue?

Am I trying to be liked?

Am I trying to prove something?

Am I relying too heavily on history?

Am I relying too heavily on the most recent event?

Does this intervention actually fit the mechanism?

AFTER AN INTERVENTION FAILS

Do not immediately intensify it.

Ask:

Was the formulation wrong?

Was the intervention poorly matched?

Did circumstances change?

Did the intervention itself create a new problem?

What did the failure teach us?

WHEN THE CLIENT CHALLENGES YOU

Do not assume:

"They are defensive."

Consider:

"Could they be right?"

Professional authority does not require interpretive dominance.

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY SELF-CORRECTION

Appropriate language may include:

"I think I was treating scheduling as the problem longer than the evidence supported."

"I have been choosing the target too often. I want you making that decision first."

"I think we have gotten too comfortable carrying this forward without examining it."

"Your history made me too skeptical of this explanation. This barrier appears legitimate."

Acknowledging Accountabili-Buddy error can strengthen accountability when it is specific and relevant.

THE PROFESSIONAL SELF-AUDIT

When the accountability process is not working, ask three separate questions:

What is the client contributing?

What is the commitment or structure contributing?

What am I contributing?

Do not assume the problem exists entirely on one side of the relationship.

THE CENTRAL PRINCIPLE

The Accountabili-Buddy must remain accountable to the evidence too.

Professional judgment requires the ability to challenge the client when warranted, and the ability to challenge one's own interpretation when the evidence warrants that instead.