



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 15

SUCCESS AFTER ADJUSTMENT

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Use successful follow-through as evidence about whether a prior intervention addressed the relevant barrier.

The trainee should learn to update confidence in a working formulation without treating one successful result as proof.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Camille

Goal: Complete three weekly study sessions for a professional exam

Current Commitment: Study Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 7:00–7:45 a.m.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

For three weeks, Camille attempted evening sessions and completed only one or two.

She consistently reported fatigue after work.

At the prior check-in, Camille chose to test morning sessions instead after discussing the repeated evening difficulty with the Accountabili-Buddy.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: How did the morning schedule go?

Camille: All three happened.

Camille: It was honestly much easier than trying to study after work.

5. TRAINEE TASK

What does this success tell us?

How should the result affect confidence in the prior formulation?

How should the Accountabili-Buddy respond?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Evening sessions repeatedly produced incomplete follow-through.
- Camille consistently reported fatigue after work.
- Morning sessions were introduced as a deliberate adjustment.
- All three morning sessions were completed.
- Camille reports that the new timing felt easier.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Camille believes morning timing better fits her capacity.

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY INFERENCE

The successful result provides supporting evidence that timing was contributing to the earlier difficulty.

One successful week does not establish that morning sessions will remain workable in all circumstances, but confidence in the timing formulation should increase.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Successful response to a timing adjustment.

The intervention outcome strengthens the working formulation that session timing was contributing to incomplete follow-through.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

The week may also have been unusually favorable or other unobserved factors may have contributed to the improvement.

Additional accountability periods using the morning structure can strengthen, weaken, or complicate the current formulation.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

No additional causal information is required before discussing the next commitment.

The morning structure has enough supporting evidence to be a reasonable option to continue if Camille wants to repeat it.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“That gives us good evidence that timing was contributing. Do you want to keep the same morning structure this week?”

11. REASONING

The response uses successful follow-through as evidence rather than merely celebrating completion.

It appropriately increases confidence in the prior timing formulation without treating one successful week as proof.

It also returns the next commitment decision to Camille rather than automatically continuing or escalating the structure.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“Three for three after moving the sessions to mornings, and you found them easier. That makes the timing adjustment look promising. Does the same structure still make sense for this week?”

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“See? You just needed more discipline.”

Problem: The response replaces evidence about a successful structural adjustment with an unsupported judgment about Camille's personal discipline.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“Great! Let's add a fourth session.”

Problem: The purpose of the accountability period was to test a timing adjustment. Successful follow-through provides evidence about that adjustment; it does not automatically justify increasing the commitment.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“Problem solved.”

Problem: One successful accountability period strengthens the working formulation but does not establish certainty or long-term stability.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

If Camille chooses to repeat the morning structure, the next accountability period provides another test of whether the adjustment remains workable.

If successful follow-through continues, confidence increases that timing was an important contributor to the earlier difficulty.

If follow-through deteriorates, the Accountabili-Buddy should examine the new evidence rather than assuming either that the timing formulation was wrong or that the previous success permanently resolved the problem.

The effective question remains whether the current structure continues to support Camille's goal and circumstances.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Complete three weekly study sessions for a professional exam

Prior Pattern: Incomplete follow-through during evening study sessions

Prior Relevant Factor: Camille consistently reported fatigue after work

Adjustment Tested: Morning study sessions

Result: Three of three completed

Client Report: Morning sessions felt easier

Current Formulation: Timing appears to have contributed to earlier incomplete follow-through; confidence increased after successful morning trial

Next Decision: Camille determines whether to repeat the morning structure

Pattern Status: Promising intervention result; continued evidence needed

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Connect the successful result to the prior intervention
- Use the intervention outcome to update confidence in the working formulation
- Treat success as evidence rather than proof
- Avoid replacing structural evidence with a character judgment

- Avoid automatic escalation after success
- Support continuation of the promising structure when the client chooses it
- Preserve Camille's ownership of the next commitment
- Remain willing to update the formulation as additional evidence develops

