



accountabili-buddy

CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH.



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 1

SIMPLE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Recognize simple failure to follow through without unnecessarily attributing the miss to avoidance, overwhelm, poor goal design, or another underlying mechanism.

The trainee should demonstrate that accountability does not require a sophisticated explanation for every behavioral discrepancy.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Maya

Goal: Improve cardiovascular fitness

Current Commitment: Walk for 30 minutes on Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday.

Maya selected the schedule herself. She has no stated physical limitation affecting the commitment and has previously described three walks per week as manageable.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

This is the first week of the commitment.

There is no established pattern of missed exercise commitments.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: You had three walks planned this week. How did it go?

Maya: I did Monday but not Wednesday or Saturday.

Accountabili-Buddy: What happened with the other two?

Maya: Honestly? Nothing. I was home. I had time. I remembered. I just didn't go.

5. TRAINEE TASK

What would you say next?

What is the most defensible current formulation?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Maya committed to three walks.
- She completed one.
- She reports having sufficient time for the other two.
- She remembered the commitment.
- She identifies no competing obligation or unusual circumstance.
- This is the first accountability period.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Maya does not offer a causal explanation beyond:

"I just didn't go."

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY INFERENCE

No deeper explanation is currently necessary.

There is insufficient evidence to formulate avoidance or any other underlying barrier. Maya did not initiate the walks, but the current evidence does not establish why.

There is also no evidence that the goal was unrealistic, that Maya was overwhelmed, or that she has lost interest.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Simple non-follow-through.

The client made a reasonable commitment and did not execute it.

At this stage, the miss itself is the relevant accountability information.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

Avoidance, poor scheduling, or declining interest could eventually become relevant.

Nothing in the current evidence requires those explanations.

If the same pattern recurs, further inquiry may become appropriate.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

No additional information is necessary before determining the next commitment.

The Accountabili-Buddy already knows enough to proceed.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“Okay. Do you still want three walks as the commitment for this week?”

11. REASONING

The response preserves accountability without manufacturing complexity.

Maya has already answered the relevant causal questions. Continuing to search for a hidden explanation risks turning ordinary non-follow-through into unnecessary psychological analysis.

The next useful question is whether the commitment remains one she endorses.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“Then I wouldn’t change the goal based on this week alone. Do you want to try the same three again?”

This is somewhat more directive but remains professionally defensible because the Accountabili-Buddy explicitly identifies the limited evidence for recalibration.

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“It sounds like you’re avoiding exercise.”

Problem: The response introduces a formulation that is not yet supported by the evidence.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“Let’s make it one walk next week so it feels less overwhelming.”

Problem: Maya has not described the commitment as overwhelming. The Accountabili-Buddy is solving a problem that has not been established.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“Come on, Maya. You had the time. You just have to make yourself do it.”

Problem: The factual discrepancy is already acknowledged. Adding criticism contributes no useful accountability information.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

If Maya recommits to three walks and completes them, the first week may require no further interpretation.

If the same pattern repeats, the Accountabili-Buddy now has longitudinal evidence and may begin examining initiation, scheduling, interest, or avoidance.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Commitment: Three 30-minute walks

Result: One completed

Reported Barrier: None identified

Current Formulation: Simple non-follow-through

Next Commitment: To be determined by client

Pattern Status: None established

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Preserve the distinction between fact and inference
- Avoid inventing a barrier
- Avoid automatically reducing the commitment
- Avoid shame or excessive reassurance
- Return ownership of the next commitment to Maya
- Remain proportionate to a first occurrence