



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



TRAINING
MODULES

STAGE 2 — WORKBOOK 2B RESPONSE MATCHING

PURPOSE

Workbook 2A focused on diagnostic discrimination: identifying what is most likely happening and what evidence supports that conclusion.

Workbook 2B focuses on the next professional task:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do once the formulation is sufficiently clear?

The quality of an accountability response depends on whether the intervention matches the actual problem.

A useful intervention applied to the wrong problem is still a poor intervention.

Examples:

More reminders do not solve avoidance if the client already remembers the task.

Reducing a commitment does not solve perfectionism if the client will apply the same excessive standard to the smaller task.

Better scheduling does not solve loss of interest.

More pressure does not solve an unrealistic commitment.

More analysis does not solve simple non-follow-through.

Encouragement does not resolve a priority conflict the client has not decided.

The objective of this workbook is to train the trainee to move from:

formulation intervention

without skipping the reasoning between them.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this workbook, the trainee should be able to:

select interventions that correspond to the working formulation;

distinguish maintaining, modifying, reducing, pausing, replacing, and closing a commitment;

determine when no intervention is necessary;
avoid changing a commitment simply because it was missed;
avoid preserving a commitment simply because changing it feels lenient;
match accountability intensity to the evidence;
distinguish planning interventions from motivational, capacity, priority, and avoidance interventions;
address perfectionism without dismissing legitimate quality requirements;
respond appropriately to loss of interest and discouragement;
recognize when the next accountable action is resolving a prerequisite rather than completing the original task;
challenge an ineffective client proposal without taking ownership of the decision;
select the least intensive intervention capable of addressing the demonstrated problem.

CORE CONCEPT REVIEW

FORMULATION BEFORE INTERVENTION

Before changing anything, ask:

What problem am I trying to solve?

A missed commitment alone does not tell you which intervention is appropriate.

INTERVENTIONS SHOULD HAVE A MECHANISM

The Accountabili-Buddy should be able to explain:

"If this formulation is correct, this intervention should help because..."

Example:

Formulation:

Poor planning.

Intervention:

Establish two protected work periods.

Mechanism:

The client currently leaves the task to unallocated time. Protected periods directly address that problem.

DO NOT CHANGE THE WRONG VARIABLE

If time is sufficient but the client avoids submission, adding more time changes the wrong variable.

If the goal is no longer wanted, changing the schedule changes the wrong variable.

If the task requires missing technical knowledge, applying more pressure changes the wrong variable.

THE CLIENT STILL OWNS THE DECISION

Response matching does not mean the Accountabili-Buddy dictates the solution.

The Accountabili-Buddy may say:

"The evidence makes me think reducing the target would address the actual capacity problem."

The client still decides whether to adopt that recommendation.

THE LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE RESPONSE IS PREFERRED

Not every problem requires a major intervention.

A single simple miss may require only recommitment.

A repeated pattern may require more substantial review.

A clear legitimate disruption may require no intervention at all.

PART 1 — MATCH THE FORMULATION TO THE INTERVENTION

Instructions:

For each formulation, select the intervention that best fits.

Formulation:

Simple non-follow-through after one isolated miss.

A. Reduce the target B. Explore childhood resistance C. Maintain or recommit if the goal still stands D. Increase reminder frequency

Answer:

Formulation:

Commitment exceeds available capacity.

A. Increase directness B. Recalibrate the commitment C. Challenge avoidance D. Add more monitoring

Answer:

Formulation:

Client has enough time but repeatedly avoids one specific phone call.

A. Schedule more time B. Reduce unrelated goals C. Address the avoided action directly D. Close the goal

Answer:

Formulation:

Seven active goals are competing for attention and the client cannot prioritize.

A. Make all seven smaller B. Reduce or rank the active commitments C. Add reminders for all seven D. Increase accountability frequency

Answer:

Formulation:

Client no longer values the goal.

A. Improve scheduling B. Increase motivation C. Reassess, pause, replace, or close the goal D. Increase consequence severity

Answer:

Formulation:

Client repeatedly revises a functionally complete draft because the standard for “ready” is excessive.

A. Add another week B. Define an appropriate completion standard C. Reduce the number of pages D. Add more reminders

Answer:

Formulation:

Client does not know how to perform the required technical step.

A. Challenge discipline B. Increase consequences C. Identify and resolve the missing knowledge prerequisite D. Reduce the goal permanently

Answer:

Formulation:

A legitimate competing priority temporarily displaced the goal.

A. Shame the client for inconsistency B. Automatically close the goal C. Reassess the current allocation and determine whether the original commitment should resume D. Assume avoidance

Answer:

PART 2 — EXPLAIN THE MECHANISM

Instructions:

For each intervention, explain why it would fit the formulation.

Formulation:

Poor planning.

Intervention:

Schedule two specific work periods.

Mechanism:

Formulation:

Perfectionism.

Intervention:

Define the minimum acceptable standard for the current stage.

Mechanism:

Formulation:

Overwhelm caused by too many active priorities.

Intervention:

Reduce the number of simultaneously active commitments.

Mechanism:

Formulation:

Loss of interest.

Intervention:

Reassess whether the goal should remain active.

Mechanism:

Formulation:

Missing expertise.

Intervention:

Shift the next commitment to obtaining the required information or assistance.

Mechanism:

Formulation:

Simple non-follow-through.

Intervention:

Maintain the same commitment.

Mechanism:

PART 3 — INTERVENTION MISMATCH

Instructions:

Identify why the proposed intervention does not match the demonstrated barrier.

Client has enough time, remembers the task, opens it, and avoids beginning.

Intervention:

Add three reminders.

Mismatch:

Client says the certification no longer matters.

Intervention:

Move study sessions from evenings to mornings.

Mismatch:

Client has only two available workout periods but keeps committing to five.

Intervention:

Increase accountability pressure.

Mismatch:

Client has 12 active goals and cannot identify priority order.

Intervention:

Break every goal into smaller steps.

Mismatch:

Client repeatedly overchecks a draft.

Intervention:

Give the client another full day for revision.

Mismatch:

Client cannot complete software setup because they do not understand the interface.

Intervention:

Tell the client to “just start.”

Mismatch:

Client had one bad week after three months of consistency.

Intervention:

Redesign the entire accountability system.

Mismatch:

PART 4 — MAINTAIN, MODIFY, PAUSE, REPLACE, OR CLOSE

Choose:

A. Maintain B. Modify C. Pause D. Replace E. Close F. More information needed

Client missed one reasonable commitment after eight successful weeks because of an unusual disruption.

Answer:

Client repeatedly completes two sessions against a target of six despite realistic effort and limited available time.

Answer:

Client still values the goal but faces a temporary three-week caregiving demand.

Answer:

Client no longer wants the credential and would not pursue it today.

Answer:

Client wants the underlying business goal but no longer believes cold outreach is the right strategy.

Answer:

Client says they want to quit after one discouraging week.

Answer:

Client completes the goal fully.

Answer:

Client says the commitment is too large, but prior history strongly suggests it is achievable and no changed circumstance is yet known.

Answer:

PART 5 — WHEN NOT TO CHANGE THE COMMITMENT

For each scenario, explain why changing the target may be premature.

Client completes one of four after five successful weeks.

Client had sufficient time but avoided making one phone call.

Client completed the target but says it felt difficult.

Client misses because of a one-time emergency.

Client uses the word “overwhelmed” but the behavioral mechanism is still unclear.

PART 6 — WHEN CHANGE IS WARRANTED

For each scenario, identify what should change and why.

Client commits to ten study hours weekly but has only five available.

Change:

Why:

Client has 11 simultaneous goals and finishes none.

Change:

Why:

Client repeatedly completes the document but cannot submit because the client requires absolute certainty.

Change:

Why:

Client genuinely wants the goal but evening sessions are repeatedly missed while morning sessions repeatedly succeed.

Change:

Why:

Client no longer values the goal.

Change:

Why:

PART 7 — RESPONSE MATCHING: AVOIDANCE

Instructions:

For each scenario, write the response direction first, then the actual response.

Client repeatedly completes website work instead of sending sales emails.

Client says:

"I want to improve the site one more time before I contact anyone."

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client completes every stage of an application except submission.

Client says:

"I just want to look it over one more time."

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client repeatedly postpones one difficult conversation.

Client says:

"I think I need a better time slot."

Relevant context:

Multiple adequate time slots have already been available.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client spends substantial time preparing for a practice exam but will not take it because they fear a low score.

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 8 — RESPONSE MATCHING: UNREALISTIC COMMITMENT

Client commits to six workouts despite having only three available periods.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client commits to writing 10,000 words every weekend and repeatedly produces 2,000–3,000 despite serious effort.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client plans five job applications during a week containing two travel days and three 12-hour shifts.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"I do not want to lower the goal because that means I am weak."

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 9 — RESPONSE MATCHING: COMPETING PRIORITIES

Client repeatedly accepts optional work assignments because promotion is currently more important than the side business.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"My family needs more of my time this month, but I still want the business goal active."

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client has two major goals that both require the same evening hours.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client repeatedly says one goal is the "top priority" while behavior consistently favors another.

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 10 — RESPONSE MATCHING: OVERWHELM

Client has ten active commitments and cannot decide what to do first.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client starts six household projects simultaneously and completes none.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"Everything feels urgent."

Only two items have actual deadlines.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"I want to keep every goal active, but I will just make each one tiny."

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 11 — RESPONSE MATCHING: PERFECTIONISM

Client has revised a first draft seven times.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"I cannot send this until I am completely sure there are no mistakes."

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client repeatedly moves the deadline because “it could still be better.”

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client has a history of overchecking but is currently preparing a regulatory filing with three genuinely unverified figures.

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 12 — RESPONSE MATCHING: LOSS OF INTEREST

Client says:

“I would not enroll in this course if I were choosing today.”

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client continues a degree primarily because two years have already been invested.

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"I want to learn Spanish someday, just not now."

Response direction:

Actual response:

Client says:

"I still want the goal. I just do not think I can succeed."

Is this loss of interest?

Response direction:

Actual response:

PART 13 — RESPONSE MATCHING: SIMPLE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

Client misses one workout after months of consistency.

No barrier identified.

Response:

Client says:

"I had time. I did not do it. Same goal next week."

This is the first miss.

Response:

Client misses one study session and completes the normal schedule the following week without intervention.

What should be concluded?

What should be avoided?

PART 14 — DISCOURAGEMENT REQUIRES DIFFERENT TREATMENT

Although discouragement is not one of the seven primary Stage 2 formulations, it must be distinguished from loss of interest.

For each scenario, write the correct response direction.

Client:

"I still want the race badly, but I feel like I am too far behind."

Direction:

Client:

"I still care about the business. I just feel like nothing I do works."

Direction:

Client:

"If I knew I could finish the degree, I absolutely would."

Direction:

What intervention would be inappropriate in all three?

Why?

PART 15 — PREREQUISITE ACTIONS

Sometimes the correct next commitment is not the original task.

When a prerequisite requires specialized professional expertise, accountability may address completing the prerequisite, but the Accountabili-Buddy does not provide or evaluate the specialized guidance itself.

Identify the prerequisite.

Goal:

Complete software automation.

Barrier:

Client does not know how to configure the system.

Next accountable action:

Goal:

Submit application.

Barrier:

Required third-party document has not arrived.

Next accountable action:

Goal:

Complete tax filing.

Barrier:

Client needs professional clarification about an unfamiliar tax issue.

Next accountable action:

Goal:

Begin exercise plan.

Barrier:

Client has been told by a clinician to obtain medical clearance first.

Next accountable action:

Goal:

Publish website.

Barrier:

Confirmed mobile navigation failure.

Next accountable action:

PART 16 — INTERVENTION AS TEST

An intervention can generate evidence.

For each case, identify:

The formulation being tested.

The intervention.

What success would suggest.

What continued non-follow-through would suggest.

Case 1

Hypothesis:

Poor scheduling causes the miss.

Intervention:

Two protected sessions are scheduled.

If both happen:

If client appears but repeatedly does something else:

Case 2

Hypothesis:

Five workouts exceeds capacity.

Intervention:

Target is reduced to three available periods.

If three consistently happen:

If one still occurs despite available time:

Case 3

Hypothesis:

Evening fatigue contributes to missed study sessions.

Intervention:

Sessions move to mornings.

If completion improves repeatedly:

If morning sessions also fail:

Case 4

Hypothesis:

Too many active goals create overwhelm.

Intervention:

Active goals are reduced from seven to two.

If follow-through improves:

If the same one specific task remains untouched:

PART 17 — CHOOSE THE LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE RESPONSE

Rank the interventions from least to most intensive.

A. Maintain current plan B. Ask one discriminating question C. Modify commitment structure D. Conduct broader pattern review E. Reassess goal status

First isolated miss with no meaningful pattern.

Best response level:

Client says they no longer want the goal.

Best response level:

Six identical misses despite several interventions.

Best response level:

Client gives an explanation contradicted by one important fact.

Best response level:

Commitment clearly exceeds available capacity.

Best response level:

PART 18 — DO NOT OVERCORRECT

For each case, identify the overcorrection.

Avoidance identified.

Accountabili-Buddy response:

Reduce the task until it feels comfortable.

Why this may be wrong:

Overwhelm identified.

Accountabili-Buddy response:

Close every secondary goal.

Why this may be wrong:

Perfectionism identified.

Accountabili-Buddy response:

Require immediate submission regardless of legitimate errors.

Why this may be wrong:

Loss of interest identified.

Accountabili-Buddy response:

Close the goal immediately.

Why this may be wrong:

Unrealistic commitment identified.

Accountabili-Buddy response:

Reduce it to a trivially easy level.

Why this may be wrong:

PART 19 — CLIENT PROPOSES THE WRONG INTERVENTION

For each scenario, respond to the client's proposed solution.

Client:

"I keep avoiding the call, so I think I need more reminders."

Your response:

Client:

"I am overwhelmed by seven goals, so I will make all seven smaller."

Your response:

Client:

"I no longer want the certification, but maybe studying in the morning would fix it."

Your response:

Client:

"I only have three workout windows, but I want to keep five because lowering it feels like quitting."

Your response:

Client:

"I keep overediting, so I think I need another week."

Your response:

PART 20 — CLIENT REFUSES THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE

The Accountabili-Buddy can challenge a decision without controlling it.

Write the response.

Evidence suggests five study sessions is poorly calibrated.

Client:

"I understand your point. I still want to commit to five."

Your response:

Client repeatedly uses preparation to avoid outreach.

Client:

"I still want to spend another week on preparation."

Your response:

Client says they no longer value a goal but refuses to close it because "quitting is weak."

Your response:

Client insists on keeping seven simultaneous goals active.

Your response:

PART 21 — RESPONSE MATCHING WITH MIXED FORMULATIONS

Scenario 1

Client genuinely has limited time and also avoids one specific difficult task during the time that remains.

What intervention needs to address both factors?

Write the response:

Scenario 2

Client has too many active goals and applies perfectionistic standards to each.

What should be addressed first?

Why?

Write the response:

Scenario 3

Client no longer values the current method but still values the underlying goal.

What should change?

What should remain?

Write the response:

Scenario 4

Client sets an unrealistic target and then avoids beginning because the task feels too large.

What is primary?

What is secondary?

What intervention sequence makes sense?

PART 22 — FULL RESPONSE-MATCHING CASES

CASE A

Client Goal:

Complete a certification.

Commitment:

Five study sessions weekly.

History:

Results over six weeks:

2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2

The client has three reliable study periods. The remaining two are consistently displaced by caregiving and work obligations.

Client says:

"I know I should be able to do five. I just need you to hold me more accountable."

Working formulation:

Why the client's proposed intervention may be mismatched:

Recommended response direction:

Write the actual response:

CASE B

Client Goal:

Launch a consulting practice.

Commitment:

Send three proposals weekly.

History:

The client completes preparation and operational tasks reliably.

Proposals remain unsent.

Client says:

"I need a more detailed outreach schedule."

Working formulation:

What does scheduling fail to explain?

Recommended response direction:

Write the response:

CASE C

Client Goal:

Finish a book.

History:

The client has completed a full draft.

For four weeks the client rewrites the first chapter instead of sending the draft to the agreed reader.

Client says:

"I need another two weeks."

Working formulation:

What intervention would reinforce the problem?

What intervention would better match it?

Write the response:

CASE D

Client Goal:

Learn conversational French.

History:

Client has done almost no study for four months.

Client says:

"I still want to speak French someday, but I do not want to spend time on it right now."

Working formulation:

Recommended goal status:

Write the response:

CASE E

Client Goal:

Complete quarterly review.

Client reports overwhelm.

Behavior:

The client has 28 slides, treats each as final quality, repeatedly changes fonts, wording, layout, and chart design, and is behind schedule.

Working formulation:

What intervention would be insufficient by itself?

Recommended response direction:

Write the response:

PART 23 — RAPID RESPONSE MATCHING

Choose the best intervention.

A. Maintain B. Recalibrate C. Clarify priority D. Reduce active demands E. Define appropriate quality standard F. Reassess goal value G. Address avoided action H. Resolve prerequisite I. More information needed

One isolated miss, otherwise stable.

Answer:

Client has three hours available and commits to ten hours.

Answer:

Client repeatedly chooses another important goal instead.

Answer:

Client has 15 simultaneous tasks and cannot prioritize.

Answer:

Client repeatedly revises after functional completion.

Answer:

Client would not choose the goal today.

Answer:

Client completes everything except one feared phone call.

Answer:

Client does not know how to perform required technical step.

Answer:

Client says “overwhelmed” with no additional evidence.

Answer:

Client has all required time but misses once for no identifiable reason.

Answer:

PART 24 — INTERVENTION JUSTIFICATION

For each response below, complete:

This intervention fits because...

Reduce five sessions to three.

This fits because:

Keep three sessions unchanged.

This fits because:

Pause the goal temporarily.

This fits because:

Require a clear “ready enough” standard.

This fits because:

Shift the next commitment from “finish setup” to “contact technical support.”

This fits because:

Ask the client which competing priority they are actually choosing.

This fits because:

PART 25 — INTEGRATED RESPONSE-MATCHING EXERCISE

Client Goal:

Build an independent consulting business.

Current Commitment:

Contact four qualified prospects each week.

Six-week history:

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

During those six weeks the client reliably completes:

- website work;
- CRM organization;
- proposal revisions;
- pricing changes;
- branding;
- bookkeeping setup.

Client says:

“I am overwhelmed. I think the answer is to take outreach off the list for a month and focus on getting everything ready.”

What is the current best formulation?

What plausible alternative remains?

What should NOT happen immediately?

What intervention is the client proposing?

Why may that intervention reinforce the current pattern?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy address first?

Write the response.

NEW INFORMATION

Client responds:

“I do have enough time. Honestly, I keep finding setup work because contacting people means I might get rejected.”

How does the formulation change?

What intervention now fits better?

Write the next response.

NEW INFORMATION

Client says:

"I want to reduce four contacts to one because one feels safe."

Is reduction automatically wrong?

Why?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy determine?

Write the response.

NEW INFORMATION

Client says:

"One is mostly me trying to make sure I cannot fail. Three would actually move the business."

What does this reveal?

What is the best current intervention?

Write the final response.

PART 26 — RESPONSE-MATCHING SELF-REVIEW

Do I tend to change commitments too quickly after a miss?

Do I tend to preserve commitments too long because changing them feels lenient?

Do I default to reminders?

Do I default to scheduling?

Do I default to reducing the task?

Do I default to challenge?

Do I default to reassurance?

Can I explain the mechanism by which my intervention should help?

Do I distinguish a changed goal from a changed method?

Do I recognize when no intervention is necessary?

Do I recognize when the next accountable action is a prerequisite rather than the original task?

Do I preserve client ownership even when I strongly disagree with the client's proposed plan?

PART 27 — STAGE 2B COMPETENCY CHECK

I can identify the accountability problem before proposing an intervention.

Yes / Not Yet

I can explain why an intervention fits the formulation.

Yes / Not Yet

I avoid solving the wrong problem.

Yes / Not Yet

I do not automatically reduce missed commitments.

Yes / Not Yet

I do not automatically preserve ineffective commitments.

Yes / Not Yet

I can distinguish maintain, modify, pause, replace, and close.

Yes / Not Yet

I can address avoidance without coercion.

Yes / Not Yet

I can recalibrate unrealistic commitments without treating reduction as evidence of weakness.

Yes / Not Yet

I can help clarify competing priorities without choosing them for the client.

Yes / Not Yet

I can respond to overwhelm without simply making every task smaller.

Yes / Not Yet

I can respond to perfectionism without dismissing legitimate quality standards.

Yes / Not Yet

I can distinguish loss of interest from discouragement and respond differently.

Yes / Not Yet

I can recognize when simple non-follow-through requires little intervention.

Yes / Not Yet

I can shift accountability to a prerequisite when necessary.

Yes / Not Yet

I can use interventions as tests of a formulation.

Yes / Not Yet

I can challenge a client's proposed intervention while preserving their authority to choose it.

Yes / Not Yet

STAGE 2B CORE STANDARD

A competent trainee should be able to move from:

What is happening?

to:

What response is actually indicated by what is happening?

The governing sequence is:

Observe Formulate Match Test Update

The trainee should not select an intervention because it is familiar, supportive, strict, convenient, or easy to measure.

The intervention should correspond to the mechanism currently supported by the evidence.

The professional question is not:

“What can I do?”

It is:

“What, if anything, needs to change—and why should that change address the problem we actually have?”

END OF STAGE 2 — WORKBOOK 2B: RESPONSE MATCHING