



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



TRAINING
MODULES

WORKBOOK 2A — DIAGNOSTIC DISCRIMINATION

PURPOSE

Stage 1 established the discipline required to conduct an accountability conversation: determine what was agreed, establish what occurred, distinguish observation from interpretation, ask only useful questions, preserve client ownership, and avoid conclusions that exceed the available evidence.

Stage 2 develops a more difficult competency.

The trainee must determine what kind of follow-through problem is occurring.

Different patterns of non-follow-through can produce nearly identical observable results. A client may fail to complete a commitment because the action is being avoided, because the commitment was unrealistic, because another priority displaced it, because the client became overwhelmed, because the completion standard became excessive, because the goal is no longer genuinely wanted, or because the client simply failed to follow through on an otherwise reasonable commitment.

The observable fact—

“The commitment was not completed.”

—does not distinguish among these explanations.

Diagnostic discrimination is the process of determining which formulation is best supported by the available evidence, which alternatives remain plausible, and what additional information would meaningfully distinguish among them.

The purpose is not to assign labels to clients.

The purpose is to improve the accuracy of the accountability response.

PART 1 — THE SEVEN CORE FORMULATIONS

For Stage 2, the trainee will work primarily with seven recurring formulations.

1. AVOIDANCE

The client retains the goal but repeatedly does not perform, begin, complete, or expose themselves to a particular action when the available evidence does not adequately explain the pattern through lack of opportunity, insufficient

capacity, or another external constraint.

The defining feature is not merely non-completion.

The relevant pattern is selective non-engagement with an action that carries some form of aversive consequence, while other actions remain possible.

Possible evidence includes:

repeatedly completing easier or less consequential tasks instead;

extensive preparation without performing the decisive action;

delaying at a predictable point in the process;

repeatedly creating new prerequisites;

having adequate time but redirecting it elsewhere;

approaching the action and then disengaging;

disproportionate difficulty with tasks involving evaluation, uncertainty, exposure, rejection, conflict, or irreversible action.

Avoidance should not be inferred merely because a task was missed.

2. UNREALISTIC GOAL OR COMMITMENT

The commitment exceeds what can reasonably be completed under the client's actual circumstances.

The relevant problem is calibration.

Possible evidence includes:

the available time is objectively insufficient;

the commitment depends on resources the client does not possess;

the required workload substantially exceeds demonstrated capacity;

the same target repeatedly produces partial completion despite credible effort;

the commitment was established according to an idealized schedule rather than the schedule that actually exists;

required steps were omitted when estimating the workload.

An ambitious goal is not necessarily unrealistic.

A missed goal or commitment is not necessarily unrealistic.

The question is whether the commitment was reasonably executable under the conditions that existed.

3. COMPETING PRIORITIES

The client has sufficient ability to perform the commitment, but another legitimate priority receives the available time, attention, or resources.

The defining issue is priority allocation, not necessarily insufficient capacity.

Possible evidence includes:

the client deliberately chooses another important obligation;

multiple legitimate goals cannot all receive the desired level of attention;

one priority repeatedly wins when commitments conflict;

the client's stated priorities differ from their behavioral allocation of time;

the client wants several outcomes that cannot simultaneously receive primary attention.

Competing priorities do not automatically mean the displaced goal should be abandoned.

They require the client to decide what should receive priority under current conditions.

4. OVERWHELM

The volume, complexity, ambiguity, or perceived simultaneity of demands interferes with the client's ability to organize and initiate effective action.

The relevant problem is not simply "having a lot to do."

Possible evidence includes:

- difficulty deciding where to begin;
- frequent switching among tasks;
- substantial activity with little completion;
- inability to establish sequence;
- treating many tasks as equally urgent;
- cognitive overload when confronting a large or poorly structured project;
- improved performance when demands are reduced, sequenced, or externally organized.

Overwhelm may coexist with limited capacity, competing priorities, or avoidance.

The term should therefore not be accepted as self-explanatory.

5. PERFECTIONISM

The client applies a completion, quality, certainty, or readiness standard that materially interferes with appropriate completion or release of the work.

The relevant issue is not simply high standards.

The issue is whether the standard being applied is unnecessarily restrictive relative to the actual requirements of the task.

Possible evidence includes:

- repeated revision after functional completion;
- inability to submit without near-total certainty;
- excessive checking;
- disproportionate time spent on low-consequence details;
- refusal to produce an intentionally rough first version;
- repeatedly moving the definition of "ready";
- difficulty distinguishing required quality from preferred quality.

Care must be taken not to classify legitimate accuracy requirements as perfectionism.

6. LOSS OF INTEREST

The client no longer assigns sufficient value to the goal to justify continued active pursuit.

The relevant change concerns goal value, not confidence, difficulty, or recent performance.

Possible evidence includes:

- the client states that they would not choose the goal now;
- the desired outcome itself no longer matters sufficiently;
- continued pursuit is driven primarily by sunk cost, obligation, identity, or fear of "quitting";
- the client expresses relief at the possibility of closing the goal;

alternative priorities now have greater genuine value.

Loss of interest should be distinguished from discouragement.

A client can strongly want an outcome while doubting their ability to achieve it.

7. SIMPLE FAILURE TO FOLLOW THROUGH

The commitment was reasonable, the client retained the goal, no meaningful external barrier prevented completion, and the available evidence does not yet support a more specific formulation.

Sometimes the client simply did not do what they intended to do.

This category is especially important because professional reasoning can become distorted by the assumption that every miss requires a deeper explanation.

Possible evidence includes:

isolated non-completion;

sufficient time and capability;

no recurring task-specific pattern;

no evidence of excessive standards;

no meaningful priority conflict;

no indication that the goal has lost value;

no sustained evidence of overload;

subsequent follow-through without intervention.

Simple non-follow-through is not a failure of analysis.

When the evidence supports no more specific explanation, it is the more disciplined formulation.

PART 2 — CORE DISTINCTIONS

Complete the following before continuing.

Exercise 1 — Define the Distinction

In one or two sentences, distinguish each pair.

Avoidance vs. simple non-follow-through

Unrealistic commitment vs. competing priorities

Overwhelm vs. competing priorities

Perfectionism vs. appropriate quality control

Loss of interest vs. discouragement

Avoidance vs. perfectionism

Overwhelm vs. avoidance

PART 3 — SAME RESULT, DIFFERENT FORMULATION

In every scenario below, the observable result is identical:

The client planned four study sessions and completed one.

Identify the most plausible formulation.

Scenario A

The client worked 65 hours during an unexpected project deadline. The available calendar shows only one realistic study period.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario B

The client had four available study periods but spent three of them working on optional tasks for another project that the client currently considers more important.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario C

The client had sufficient time but repeatedly moved between the textbook, flashcards, practice test, notes, and study plan without completing a study session.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario D

The client completed one session and spent the remaining available study periods reorganizing notes because they did not feel sufficiently prepared to take the practice exam.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario E

The client says:

"I honestly do not care whether I get this certification anymore. I am mostly continuing because I already paid for it."

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario F

The client had sufficient time, wanted the certification, knew what to do, missed three sessions, and completes all four the following week without any intervention.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Scenario G

The client completes all reading assignments but repeatedly does not take the practice examinations because seeing a low score makes them anxious.

Primary formulation:

Evidence:

Exercise 2 — What Did the Result Tell You?

Did "one of four completed" distinguish among any of the seven formulations by itself?

Why not?

What information created the discrimination?

PART 4 — SAME CLIENT LANGUAGE, DIFFERENT PROBLEM

Client language is evidence, but it does not establish the formulation by itself.

For each pair, explain why the same statement could reflect different formulations.

1. "I DIDN'T HAVE TIME."

Client A:

The client worked two jobs, cared for a sick parent, and had no realistic open period.

Likely formulation:

Client B:

The client had three open evenings and used them to redesign a website instead of making scheduled sales calls.

Likely formulation:

What distinguishes the cases?

2. "I WAS OVERWHELMED."

Client A:

The client has 17 unsorted tasks, cannot identify priority order, and repeatedly begins one task before switching to another.

Likely formulation:

Client B:

The client completes everything except one scheduled conversation with their supervisor.

Likely formulation:

What distinguishes the cases?

3. "THE GOAL IS TOO MUCH."

Client A:

The client committed to exercising six days per week despite having only three available exercise periods.

Likely formulation:

Client B:

The client successfully completed four workouts for eight weeks, missed one week during a temporary disruption, and now says four is too much.

Likely formulation:

What distinguishes the cases?

4. "I DON'T THINK I WANT THIS ANYMORE."

Client A:

"I would not choose this degree if I were making the decision today."

Likely formulation:

Client B:

"I still want the degree badly. I just feel like I am never going to finish."

Likely formulation:

What distinguishes the cases?

5. "IT ISN'T READY."

Client A:

Three required financial figures have not been verified in a regulatory filing.

Likely formulation:

Client B:

A first draft for internal discussion has been revised seven times because the client does not want colleagues to see anything imperfect.

Likely formulation:

What distinguishes the cases?

PART 5 — PRIMARY AND ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

Professional discrimination does not require certainty before action.

It requires identifying:

Primary formulation: the explanation currently best supported.

Alternative formulation: another explanation that remains reasonably plausible.

Missing evidence: information that would materially distinguish them.

Exercise 3

Client:

“I keep saying I am too busy to send proposals.”

History:

The client completes administrative work, website updates, invoicing, and professional-development tasks each week. Proposals remain unsent.

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing evidence:

Exercise 4

Client:

"I keep missing workouts because work is more important right now."

History:

The client has accepted several optional projects because they are pursuing a promotion.

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing evidence:

Exercise 5

Client:

"I cannot finish the report."

History:

The client has worked on it for 15 hours. The substantive analysis is complete. The client continues rewriting the introduction.

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing evidence:

Exercise 6

Client:

"I keep missing because I have too much going on."

History:

Seven goals are active simultaneously. The client starts work on all seven each week and completes almost none.

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing evidence:

Exercise 7

Client:

"I keep putting off Spanish."

History:

The client says Spanish remains important but has missed two weeks after six months of consistency.

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing evidence:

PART 6 — WHAT EVIDENCE WOULD DISTINGUISH THEM?

For each pair of possible formulations, identify the information that would most effectively discriminate between them.

1. Avoidance vs. Unrealistic Commitment

Useful evidence:

Best question:

2. Overwhelm vs. Avoidance

Useful evidence:

Best question:

3. Competing Priorities vs. Unrealistic Commitment

Useful evidence:

Best question:

4. Perfectionism vs. Legitimate Quality Requirement

Useful evidence:

Best question:

5. Loss of Interest vs. Discouragement

Useful evidence:

Best question:

6. Avoidance vs. Simple Non-Follow-Through

Useful evidence:

Best question:

PART 7 — EVIDENCE WEIGHT

Not all evidence deserves equal weight.

For each scenario, identify which evidence should receive greater weight and explain why.

Scenario 1

Client says:

"Four workouts is unrealistic."

History:

The client completed four workouts during 10 of the previous 12 weeks.

Greater-weight evidence:

Why?

Scenario 2

Client says:

"I definitely still want the course."

History:

For three months, the client has repeatedly questioned why they are taking it, declined opportunities to work on it, and says they would not enroll if deciding today.

Greater-weight evidence:

Why?

Scenario 3

Client says:

"I am avoiding the report."

Further information:

The client is waiting for financial data that another department has not provided.

Greater-weight evidence:

Why?

Scenario 4

Client has a history of perfectionism.

Current task:

Final verification of dosage information in a healthcare document.

Client says:

"I need to check these numbers again."

Greater-weight evidence:

Why?

Scenario 5

Client has historically avoided sales calls.

Current week:

The client's phone system was unavailable for two days and this is independently confirmed.

Greater-weight evidence:

Why?

PART 8 — SELECTIVE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

Selective failure is often diagnostically useful.

The question is not simply:

What did the client fail to do?

It is also:

What did the client successfully do under the same conditions?

Exercise 8

Client Goal:

Launch a freelance business.

Completed:

Website Logo CRM setup Business cards Service descriptions Pricing research

Not completed:

Contact prospective clients.

What does the selective pattern suggest?

What does it NOT prove?

What question would improve discrimination?

Exercise 9

Client Goal:

Complete a certification.

Completed:

Videos Reading Flashcards Notes

Not completed:

Practice examinations.

What formulations become more plausible?

What additional information would distinguish them?

Exercise 10

Client Goal:

Complete a book manuscript.

Completed:

New scenes Research Character notes Outline revisions

Not completed:

Editing the final three chapters.

What should the trainee resist concluding immediately?

What would you investigate?

PART 9 — GLOBAL VS. TASK-SPECIFIC NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

Classify each pattern as primarily:

GLOBAL — difficulty extends broadly across commitments.

TASK-SPECIFIC — difficulty is concentrated on one action or class of action.

Then identify the diagnostic significance.

1.

Client misses most commitments across work, exercise, household administration, and study.

Classification:

Diagnostic significance:

2.

Client completes every weekly commitment except calling prospective customers.

Classification:

Diagnostic significance:

3.

Client completes drafting tasks but repeatedly fails to submit completed work for evaluation.

Classification:

Diagnostic significance:

4.

Client begins many tasks but finishes almost none across several domains.

Classification:

Diagnostic significance:

5.

Client performs routine work reliably but repeatedly misses tasks requiring confrontation.

Classification:

Diagnostic significance:

PART 10 — TEMPORARY DISRUPTION VS. STRUCTURAL PROBLEM

A single week and a six-week pattern should not receive the same diagnostic weight.

For each scenario, classify the evidence as:

Temporary disruption likely

Structural problem increasingly likely

Insufficient evidence

1.

Eight successful weeks followed by one miss during an unusual work crisis.

Classification:

2.

Six consecutive weeks of completing two against a target of five.

Classification:

3.

First-ever missed submission with no explanation yet.

Classification:

4.

Five deadlines moved at the point of final submission.

Classification:

5.

One week of low productivity during international travel.

Classification:

6.

Repeatedly describing “busy weeks” for two months while the same specific action remains incomplete.

Classification:

Exercise 11

Why does repetition change the professional significance of the same behavior?

PART 11 — MIXED FORMULATIONS

Real accountability problems frequently involve more than one factor.

The task is not always to select exactly one category.

The trainee must determine:

Which factors are supported?

Which factor is primary?

How do the factors interact?

Which factor must be addressed first?

Scenario 1

A client genuinely has a demanding job. The client also consistently uses the limited available personal time for low-stakes business preparation rather than sales outreach.

Supported factors:

Primary formulation:

Interaction:

Scenario 2

A client has seven active goals, cannot prioritize them, and also refuses to submit work unless it feels exceptional.

Supported factors:

Primary formulation:

Interaction:

Scenario 3

A client no longer values a certification but continues pursuing it because quitting would feel like failure.

Supported factors:

Primary formulation:

Interaction:

Scenario 4

A client sets an unrealistically large weekly writing target and then avoids beginning because the required session feels unmanageable.

Supported factors:

Primary formulation:

Interaction:

Scenario 5

A client has a legitimate competing family priority for three weeks and begins describing the displaced business goal as something they “probably never really wanted.”

Supported factors:

What should remain uncertain?

What should be reassessed after the temporary priority changes?

PART 12 — FORMULATION REVISION

A formulation is not a verdict.
It is a working explanation that should change when the evidence changes.
For each case, state:
Initial formulation
New evidence
Revised formulation
Case 1

Initial evidence:
Client repeatedly fails to complete a software setup.
Client has sufficient scheduled time.

Initial formulation:

New evidence:
The client demonstrates that the instructions refer to features unavailable in their software version.

Revised formulation:

Case 2
Initial evidence:
Client says workload prevents sales outreach.

Initial formulation:

New evidence:
Client completes numerous optional business tasks during the same available periods and reports dreading rejection.

Revised formulation:

Case 3

Initial evidence:

Client repeatedly revises a report.

Initial formulation:

New evidence:

The client reveals that three figures are legally required to be independently verified before filing.

Revised formulation:

Case 4

Initial evidence:

Client says they no longer want to run a marathon after missing several training sessions.

Initial formulation:

New evidence:

Client says, "I still desperately want to run it. I just think I have ruined my chances."

Revised formulation:

Case 5

Initial evidence:

Client misses one of four weekly sessions.

Initial formulation:

New evidence:

The same miss occurs at the same stage for six consecutive weeks.

Revised formulation:

PART 13 — DO NOT DIAGNOSE FROM ONE CLUE

For each statement, explain why the conclusion is insufficiently supported.

1.

"They had time, so it must be avoidance."

Why insufficient?

2.

"They missed repeatedly, so the goal must be unrealistic."

Why insufficient?

3.

"They said they were overwhelmed, so we should reduce the workload."

Why insufficient?

4.

"They keep revising, so the problem must be perfectionism."

Why insufficient?

5.

"They said they do not care anymore, so the goal should be closed."

Why insufficient?

6.

"They chose work instead, so work is obviously their real priority."

Why insufficient?

7.

"They missed once for no reason, so there must be an underlying barrier."

Why insufficient?

PART 14 — DIAGNOSTIC DISCRIMINATION CASES

For each case, complete the full formulation.

CASE A

Client Goal:

Write a book proposal.

Commitment:

Submit the completed proposal Friday.

History:

The proposal has been substantively complete for three weeks.

Each week the client finds additional wording, formatting, or research changes.

Client says:

"I just want to make sure I am giving it the best possible chance."

Observed facts:

Client interpretation:

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Evidence supporting primary formulation:

Evidence against or limiting primary formulation:

Missing information:

Best discriminating question:

Confidence:

Low / Moderate / High

CASE B

Client Goal:

Exercise five times weekly.

History:

For eight weeks the client completes two or three sessions.

The client has a full-time job, two young children, and realistically identifies three recurring exercise periods.

Client says:

"I just need to become more disciplined and make five happen."

Observed facts:

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Evidence:

Best discriminating question:

What should not be assumed?

CASE C

Client Goal:

Build a consulting practice.

Commitment:

Three sales contacts weekly.

History:

Nearly all operational and preparation commitments are completed.

Sales contact results:

0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0.

Client says:

"I am still getting everything ready."

Observed facts:

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Missing information:

Best discriminating question:

Confidence:

Low / Moderate / High

CASE D

Client Goal:

Complete a professional course.

History:

Strong progress for four months.

During the last month, the client has repeatedly missed lessons.

Client says:

"I am not sure I care about finishing anymore."

Further context:

The client recently received a promotion that makes the credential substantially less relevant.

Observed facts:

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Best discriminating question:

What evidence would strengthen loss of interest?

What evidence would weaken it?

CASE E

Client Goal:

Complete a home renovation plan.

The client has 26 outstanding decisions and repeatedly moves among flooring, paint, lighting, furniture, budget, contractors, and fixtures without finalizing any category.

Client says:

“I spend hours on this every weekend and somehow finish nothing.”

Observed facts:

Primary formulation:

Alternative formulation:

Best discriminating question:

What pattern would strengthen an overwhelm formulation?

What pattern would instead suggest perfectionism?

CASE F

Client Goal:

Run three times weekly.

History:

The client has completed three runs for 14 of the previous 16 weeks.

This week:

One run.

Client says:

“Nothing happened. I had time. I just did not feel like going.”

Observed facts:

Primary formulation:

Why should the trainee resist deeper interpretation?

What future evidence would justify revising the formulation?

PART 15 — FORMULATION WITHOUT INTERVENTION

Instructions:

For each scenario, identify the formulation only.

Do not propose a solution.

This exercise is intentionally restrictive.

1.

Client has sufficient time, repeatedly completes every task except making collection calls, and reports dreading conflict.

Formulation:

2.

Client commits to 20 hours of study despite having eight available hours.

Formulation:

3.

Client repeatedly chooses childcare responsibilities over a recreational goal during a temporary family transition.

Formulation:

4.

Client has 14 active tasks, cannot establish order, and continually switches among them.

Formulation:

5.

Client spends 12 hours refining a document expected to be a rough internal draft.

Formulation:

6.

Client says they would not pursue the degree if choosing today and are continuing primarily because they have already completed two years.

Formulation:

7.

Client misses one routine workout after months of consistency, with no identifiable barrier.

Formulation:

8.

Client has enough time for three workouts but repeatedly schedules five.

Formulation:

9.

Client completes every stage of a job application except pressing submit and reports fear of being evaluated.

Formulation:

10.

Client wants both a promotion and rapid progress on a side business but repeatedly chooses optional work assignments that increase promotion prospects.

Formulation:

PART 16 — CONFIDENCE CALIBRATION

A professional formulation should include an appropriate degree of confidence.

Classify each as:

Low confidence

Moderate confidence

High confidence

1.

One missed commitment with no explanation.

Confidence:

2.

Six weeks of the same selective failure despite successful completion of comparable tasks.

Confidence:

3.

Client states they are overwhelmed, but no behavioral information is available.

Confidence:

4.

Client repeatedly revises completed low-stakes drafts and explicitly reports being unable to tolerate visible imperfections.

Confidence:

5.

Client says they lost interest during one unusually difficult week.

Confidence:

6.

Client says for two months that the goal no longer matters, would not choose it today, and continues only because of prior investment.

Confidence:

Exercise 12

Why is confidence calibration professionally important?

What problems result from excessive confidence?

What problems result from refusing to form any working hypothesis?

PART 17 — RAPID DISCRIMINATION

Choose the best current formulation.

A. Avoidance B. Unrealistic goal/commitment C. Competing priorities D. Overwhelm E. Perfectionism F. Loss of interest G. Simple non-follow-through H. Insufficient information

First miss. No explanation available.

Answer:

Target requires ten hours; client has four available.

Answer:

Client completes every business task except contacting prospects and reports fear of rejection.

Answer:

Client has 12 simultaneous priorities and cannot determine sequence.

Answer:

Client repeatedly chooses a promotion-related project over a recreational goal.

Answer:

Client revises a completed internal draft nine times.

Answer:

Client says, "I would not choose this goal today."

Answer:

Client misses once after six months of consistency and reports no particular reason.

Answer:

Client says, "I was overwhelmed."

No other information is available.

Answer:

Client repeatedly misses a five-session target while only three sessions fit the calendar.

Answer:

Client spends available outreach time redesigning the website and says outreach makes them anxious.

Answer:

Client wants the goal but another legitimate obligation repeatedly receives priority.

Answer:

Client continues a course solely because they already paid \$4,000 for it.

Answer:

Client cannot decide which of 18 tasks to begin and switches repeatedly.

Answer:

Client delays submission because two required approvals are missing.

Answer:

PART 18 — INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTIC EXERCISE

Client Goal:

Launch a photography business.

Current Commitment:

Contact five prospective commercial clients each week.

Six-week results:

Week 1: 1 of 5 Week 2: 0 of 5 Week 3: 0 of 5 Week 4: 1 of 5 Week 5: 0 of 5 Week 6: 0 of 5

During the same period, the client:

rebuilt the website;

reorganized the portfolio;

purchased new equipment;

redesigned the logo;

created three pricing sheets;

rewrote the biography;

researched competitors;

reorganized the client database.

Client says:

"I am overwhelmed. There is still so much to get ready before I start contacting people. Five contacts per week may just be unrealistic."

1. OBSERVED FACTS**2. CLIENT FORMULATION****3. EVIDENCE SUPPORTING OVERWHELM****4. EVIDENCE WEAKENING A PURE OVERWHELM FORMULATION****5. EVIDENCE SUPPORTING AN UNREALISTIC-COMMITMENT FORMULATION****6. EVIDENCE CURRENTLY MISSING****7. EVIDENCE SUPPORTING AN AVOIDANCE FORMULATION****8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS THAT REMAIN PLAUSIBLE****9. PRIMARY WORKING FORMULATION****10. CONFIDENCE LEVEL**

Low / Moderate / High

Why?

11. SINGLE BEST DISCRIMINATING QUESTION**NEW INFORMATION**

Client responds:

"I had enough time. Honestly, I kept thinking I should contact people, but then I would notice something else I could improve first. Working on the website or pricing feels productive. Contacting someone means they can actually say no."

12. WHAT FORMULATION BECOMES LESS PLAUSIBLE?

Why?

13. WHAT FORMULATION BECOMES MORE PLAUSIBLE?

Why?

14. DOES THIS PROVE THE FORMULATION?

Why or why not?

NEW INFORMATION

Client says:

"I still want the business. I would be extremely disappointed if I gave it up."

15. WHAT FORMULATION DOES THIS WEAKEN?

16. FINAL WORKING FORMULATION

17. WHAT SHOULD BE RETAINED FOR FUTURE CONVERSATIONS?

PART 19 — DIAGNOSTIC SELF-REVIEW

Review your responses.

When a client misses a commitment, do I tend to assume:

Avoidance?

Unrealistic expectations?

Overwhelm?

Lack of motivation?

Simple non-follow-through?

Which formulation am I most likely to overuse?

Which formulation am I most likely to overlook?

Do I give excessive weight to the client's explanation?

Do I give insufficient weight to the client's explanation?

Do I form conclusions too quickly?

Do I remain uncertain longer than the evidence warrants?

Do I distinguish temporary disruption from repeated pattern?

Do I examine what the client successfully completes, not only what they miss?

Do I revise formulations when contradictory evidence appears?

PART 20 — STAGE 2A COMPETENCY CHECK

Before progressing to response matching, the trainee should be able to answer yes to each statement.

I can distinguish observed behavior from a formulation.

I understand why identical behavioral outcomes can support different underlying formulations.

I can distinguish avoidance from simple non-follow-through.

I can distinguish unrealistic commitments from competing priorities.

I can distinguish overwhelm from selective avoidance.

I can distinguish perfectionism from legitimate quality requirements.

I can distinguish loss of interest from discouragement.

I can identify when several formulations remain plausible.

I can identify the evidence that would distinguish competing formulations.

I can use behavioral history without treating past patterns as permanent explanations.

I can recognize selective failure as diagnostically relevant.

I can distinguish temporary disruption from structural patterns.

I can recognize mixed formulations.

I can revise a formulation when new evidence appears.

I can assign an appropriate confidence level to a working formulation.

I can resist proposing an intervention before I understand the problem sufficiently to select one.

STAGE 2A CORE STANDARD

The trainee has demonstrated Stage 2A competence when they can examine a missed commitment and determine:

What is known?

What is the client's explanation?

What explanation is currently best supported?

What reasonable alternatives remain?

What evidence supports each formulation?

What evidence weakens each formulation?

What information would discriminate among them?

How confident should the current formulation be?

What new evidence would require the formulation to change?

The objective is not certainty.

The objective is disciplined discrimination.

A competent Accountabili-Buddy should neither invent complexity where none is supported nor reduce a meaningful pattern to “they just didn’t do it” when accumulated evidence supports a more specific explanation.

END OF STAGE 2 — WORKBOOK 2A: DIAGNOSTIC DISCRIMINATION