



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 21

RESTART BEHAVIOR

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Recognize when a client unnecessarily treats a lapse as requiring a complete return to the beginning.

The trainee should distinguish **resuming a process** from **restarting a process** and preserve valid prior progress unless there is a functional reason to repeat it.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Morgan

Goal: Complete a 12-week online data-analysis course

Current Status: Completed Weeks 1–5 and approximately half of Week 6.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Morgan completed the first five weeks steadily.

She then traveled for ten days and completed no course work during the trip or the week after returning.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: Where do you want to pick the course back up?

Morgan: I think I need to start from Week 1 again.

Accountabili-Buddy: Why Week 1?

Morgan: Because I've been off it for almost three weeks. It feels like I ruined the whole rhythm. I should probably restart properly.

5. TRAINEE TASK

What should the Accountabili-Buddy examine before accepting the restart?

Does the interruption itself establish that prior work needs to be repeated?

What is the accountability risk of unnecessary restarting?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Morgan completed more than five weeks of the course.
- There was an interruption of approximately three weeks.
- She has not stated that she forgot the prior material.
- She has not identified any course requirement that requires restarting.
- Her stated reason for restarting is that the process no longer feels continuous.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Morgan interprets the loss of continuity as a reason to return to the beginning, even though she has not identified a loss of prior learning.

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY INFERENCE

There is currently no evidence that restarting from Week 1 is necessary.

Restarting may duplicate valid completed work, substantially increase the remaining workload, and delay completion.

Whether any review is actually needed remains unresolved.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Proposed restart following a lapse without current evidence that a full restart is necessary.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

If Morgan no longer understands material required for later modules, some review may be appropriate.

If the course itself requires earlier material to be repeated after an interruption, that requirement would also be relevant.

Neither possibility has currently been established.

Selective review of specific material is different from automatically restarting the entire course.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

The key question is whether the interruption created an actual knowledge deficit that interferes with Morgan's ability to continue.

No broader explanation for the interruption is required before answering the restart question.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“A three-week gap doesn't automatically erase five completed weeks. Before you restart, is there material you've actually forgotten that prevents you from continuing Week 6?”

11. REASONING

The response tests whether restarting serves a functional need rather than accepting the restart simply because continuity was interrupted.

After a lapse, restarting can feel like a cleaner way to resume.

But if restarting is not functionally necessary, it can duplicate completed work, increase the remaining workload, and delay progress toward the goal.

Accountability should preserve valid prior progress unless there is evidence that repeating some portion of the work serves a useful purpose.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“I’d separate losing the rhythm from losing the learning. If you still have what you need from Weeks 1–5, there’s no evidence yet that repeating all five weeks is necessary.”

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“Good idea. A fresh start will motivate you.”

Problem: The response endorses substantial duplicated work without establishing that restarting is necessary or that a fresh start would improve follow-through.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“No, you’re not allowed to restart.”

Problem: The Accountabili-Buddy can challenge the rationale and point out the consequences of unnecessary repetition, but Morgan retains the final decision.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“Just forget the three weeks and move on.”

Problem: The interruption may still contain useful accountability information, and Morgan may genuinely need selective review before continuing. The lapse should not be overinterpreted, but it should not automatically be dismissed either.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

If Morgan retains the knowledge needed to continue, the Accountabili-Buddy can point out that resuming from Week 6 preserves valid progress and avoids unnecessary duplication.

Morgan decides whether to resume there.

If specific prerequisite material has been lost, Morgan may choose to review that material selectively rather than automatically returning to Week 1.

If unnecessary restarting becomes a recurring response to interruptions, the restart pattern itself may later become relevant to accountability.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Complete 12-week data-analysis course

Progress: Weeks 1–5 completed; Week 6 partially completed

Interruption: Approximately three weeks

Client Proposal: Restart from Week 1

Current Formulation: Full restart not currently supported by evidence

Unknown: Whether the interruption created a meaningful knowledge deficit

Next Decision: Determine whether any review is functionally necessary; Morgan retains the decision about where to resume

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Preserve valid prior progress

- Distinguish interruption from loss of learning or competence
- Test the functional reason for restarting
- Avoid assuming that lost continuity requires a complete restart
- Avoid unnecessary duplication
- Consider selective review when supported by evidence
- Avoid controlling Morgan's final decision
- Preserve Morgan's agency over where she resumes

