



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 28

COMMITMENT MISCALIBRATION VS. SIMPLE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Use prior performance to determine whether a missed commitment reflects structural miscalibration or whether the current result is better treated as an anomalous period requiring further discrimination.

The trainee should use historical performance as evidence without treating it as proof of current capacity.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Jamal

Goal: Maintain consistent exam preparation

Current Commitment: Four 45-minute study sessions this week.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Jamal completed four sessions in each of the previous three weeks.

This week, he completed one.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: One of four this week. What happened?

Jamal: I think four was too ambitious.

Jamal: I was tired all week and I just did not have the energy for it.

5. TRAINEE TASK

Does the current evidence support Jamal's conclusion that four sessions were miscalibrated?

What historical evidence matters?

What remains uncertain?

What would you ask next?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Jamal committed to four 45-minute study sessions.
- He completed four sessions in each of the previous three weeks.
- This week, he completed one.
- He reports being tired throughout the week.
- He interprets the four-session commitment as too ambitious.
- The reason for the change in performance has not yet been established.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Jamal interprets this week's result as evidence that the four-session commitment was too ambitious.

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY INFERENCE

Three consecutive weeks of successful completion are meaningful evidence that four sessions have recently been within Jamal's demonstrated capacity.

That history does not prove that four remains realistic under his current circumstances.

However, one substantially lower week is insufficient by itself to establish that the commitment is structurally miscalibrated.

The Accountabili-Buddy needs to determine whether something relevant changed this week and whether that change is likely to persist.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Current evidence does not establish commitment miscalibration. Prior successful performance makes a temporary or anomalous explanation more plausible, but the reason for this week's reduced performance remains unresolved.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

TEMPORARY OR ANOMALOUS REDUCTION

Jamal's fatigue or another temporary circumstance may have reduced his capacity during this particular week.

Under this formulation, the current result does not indicate that the four-session commitment itself requires recalibration.

CHANGED CAPACITY / COMMITMENT MISCALIBRATION

Jamal's circumstances or capacity may have changed materially since the previous three weeks.

If that change is expected to continue, four sessions may no longer be appropriately calibrated even though the same commitment was realistic previously.

SIMPLE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

It is also possible that Jamal retained sufficient capacity for the commitment but simply did not follow through during this period.

The available evidence does not yet establish this explanation.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

The Accountabili-Buddy needs to determine whether this week's reduced performance reflects a temporary condition, a meaningful ongoing change in capacity, or a miss that occurred despite adequate capacity.

The most immediate discriminating information is whether the conditions that made this week different are expected to continue.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“Four has been workable for the last three weeks, so I wouldn't conclude from this week alone that the number is wrong. Was this an unusually low-energy week, or has something changed that makes four less realistic going forward?”

11. REASONING

The response uses longitudinal evidence to challenge Jamal's interpretation without dismissing his current experience.

Three consecutive successful weeks are meaningful evidence that four sessions have recently been achievable.

At the same time, historical capacity is evidence, not proof of current capacity.

The question therefore distinguishes an anomalous difficult week from a meaningful change that could justify recalibration.

It does not insist that Jamal maintain four sessions, and it does not reduce the commitment simply because one week was substantially worse.

Further intervention should depend on what the current change represents.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“Your recent history shows that four sessions have been workable. What was different about this week, and is that difference likely to still be there next week?”

This response uses prior performance as the comparison point while directly testing whether the current circumstances represent a temporary disruption or an ongoing change.

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“You’re right. Let’s reduce it to two.”

Problem: The response recalibrates immediately based on one difficult week despite three consecutive weeks of contrary performance evidence. It also selects Jamal’s next commitment for him.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“No, four is definitely realistic.”

Problem: Historical performance supports four as recently achievable but does not prove that Jamal’s current capacity is unchanged.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“You just need more discipline when you’re tired.”

Problem: The response moralizes the miss and assumes a motivation problem without establishing whether fatigue or another capacity change materially affected Jamal’s ability to follow through.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

If the evidence indicates that this was an unusually difficult week and the relevant conditions are not expected to continue, Jamal may reasonably decide that the existing commitment remains appropriate.

If his circumstances or capacity have changed in a way that is likely to persist, recalibration may be appropriate.

If Jamal appears to have retained adequate capacity and no meaningful structural change is identified, the Accountabili-Buddy can examine the missed execution without treating the commitment itself as the problem.

Jamal retains ownership of the next commitment.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Maintain consistent exam preparation

Commitment: Four 45-minute study sessions

Prior Performance: Four sessions completed for three consecutive weeks

Current Result: One session completed

Client Interpretation: Four sessions may be too ambitious

Relevant Current Evidence: Reported fatigue

Current Formulation: Commitment miscalibration not established; temporary reduction, changed capacity, and simple non-follow-through remain possible

Missing Information: Whether the factors affecting this week's performance are temporary or likely to persist

Next Question: What changed this week, and is that change expected to continue?

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Use prior successful performance as meaningful evidence
- Avoid treating one anomalous week as sufficient proof of commitment miscalibration

- Treat historical capacity as evidence rather than proof of current capacity
- Remain open to a meaningful change in circumstances or capacity
- Avoid assuming simple non-follow-through before adequate capacity is established
- Ask a question that distinguishes temporary difficulty from an ongoing structural change
- Avoid automatic commitment reduction or rigid insistence on the existing commitment
- Leave the resulting commitment decision with Jamal