



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 36

REPEATED RECOMMITMENT

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Distinguish persistence from repetition without learning when a client repeatedly makes the same commitment after the same unsuccessful outcome.

The trainee should recognize that persistence can be appropriate while still requiring the client and Accountabili-Buddy to incorporate accumulated evidence rather than treating renewed intention as evidence that the next result will differ.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Brandon

Goal: Complete a certification exam preparation program

Current Commitment: Study five evenings per week.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Four consecutive weeks:

- Week 1: committed to five, completed two.
- Week 2: committed to five, completed two.

- Week 3: committed to five, completed three.
- Week 4: committed to five, completed two.

Each week Brandon has said:

“I know I can do five. I'll get it this week.”

No significant change has been made to timing, method, or workload.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: Two of five again this week.

Brandon: Yeah. Annoying.

Brandon: Five again next week. I'm not lowering it. I just need to finally do what I said.

5. TRAINEE TASK

Is Brandon demonstrating persistence, repetition without learning, or both?

What information does the four-week history provide?

What evidence supports and weakens the current commitment?

What remains unresolved about the reason for the repeated result?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy challenge?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Brandon has committed to five study sessions for four consecutive weeks.
- Actual performance has remained between two and three sessions.
- No meaningful change has been made to timing, method, or workload.
- Brandon continues to state that he can complete five sessions.

- He interprets reducing the commitment as lowering his standard.
- Four weeks now provide consistent performance evidence that the current commitment has not been met under the existing structure.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Brandon believes five remains an appropriate commitment and appears to view reducing it as giving up or lowering his standard.

He expects renewed determination to produce a different result.

ACCOUNTABILITY-BUDDY INFERENCE

Maintaining an ambitious commitment can reflect legitimate persistence.

However, four consecutive weeks of similar outcomes under an essentially unchanged structure provide meaningful evidence that intention alone has not been sufficient to produce five sessions.

The history does not establish why the commitment has repeatedly been missed.

Possible contributors include commitment miscalibration, schedule design, execution difficulty, or another unresolved barrier.

The central accountability problem is therefore not simply that Brandon continues choosing five. It is that the expectation of a different result has not yet been supported by new evidence, changed conditions, or learning from the previous attempts.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Repeated recommitment without sufficient learning from accumulated performance evidence. The reason for the repeated two-to-three-session outcome remains unresolved.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

LEGITIMATE PERSISTENCE

Five sessions may remain a workable commitment if Brandon has relevant evidence that the previous four weeks do not represent his current capacity or if circumstances affecting execution have changed.

Under this formulation, maintaining five would not necessarily represent poor calibration.

COMMITMENT MISCALIBRATION

Four weeks of two-to-three-session performance may indicate that five evenings is not currently calibrated to Brandon's actual capacity or circumstances.

Historical performance supports this formulation but does not establish it conclusively.

EXECUTION OR STRUCTURE PROBLEM

Five sessions may be possible, while something about the timing, method, or structure repeatedly interferes with execution.

Under this formulation, changing the number alone would not necessarily address the actual barrier.

SIMPLE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

Brandon may have had adequate opportunity and a workable structure but repeatedly failed to execute the commitment.

This remains possible, but the repeated pattern warrants more examination than simply assigning the same explanation each week.

MIXED FORMULATION

The commitment may be somewhat overcalibrated while execution or structural barriers also contribute.

Repeated outcomes can reflect more than one factor.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

The Accountabili-Buddy needs to understand what Brandon believes will make the next attempt meaningfully different from the previous four.

The relevant question is not whether Brandon feels more determined.

It is whether there is new evidence, a changed circumstance, a different approach, or another reason to expect a different outcome.

If nothing relevant has changed, the repeated performance history should carry greater weight in evaluating the commitment.

Further inquiry may also be needed to understand why two or three sessions repeatedly occur while the remaining sessions do not.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“I’m not asking you to lower it just because you missed it. I’m asking what we’re learning from four weeks of the same pattern. You’ve completed two or three sessions each week, and nothing significant about the structure has changed. What makes five under the same conditions more likely to happen this week?”

11. REASONING

The response does not equate persistence with stubbornness or assume that five sessions must be reduced.

Instead, it requires Brandon's expectation for the next attempt to account for the evidence generated by the previous four.

Brandon's repeated statement that he can complete five reflects intention. It does not, by itself, explain why the fifth attempt should produce a different result.

At the same time, the Accountabili-Buddy should not conclude from four unsuccessful weeks that five is inherently impossible.

The history provides evidence that the current commitment has not been workable under the conditions observed so far. The reason remains unresolved.

The accountability task is therefore to move from repeated intention toward evidence-based learning and decision-making.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“Five may still be the commitment you want to make. But four weeks of two or three sessions is information we shouldn't ignore. What, if anything, is different about the next attempt that gives you reason to expect a different result?”

This version preserves Brandon's authority to maintain five while challenging him to incorporate the accumulated evidence into that decision.

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“Good. Never lower the standard.”

Problem: The response treats inflexibility as inherently virtuous and ignores four weeks of contrary performance evidence.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“Clearly five is impossible. Make it two.”

Problem: Four weeks of performance constrain the claim that five is currently workable, but they do not establish that five is impossible. The Accountability-Buddy also takes the commitment decision away from Brandon.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“Just try harder next week.”

Problem: The response substitutes renewed intention for learning and repeats an accountability approach that has generated no new information across four similar outcomes.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

Brandon can decide whether he wants to maintain five sessions, recalibrate the commitment, change something about the execution structure, or investigate the repeated pattern further before deciding.

If he maintains five, the Accountabili-Buddy should understand what evidence or reasoning supports expecting a different result rather than treating recommitment itself as a sufficient plan.

If Brandon changes the structure and performance improves, the structural explanation gains support.

If a lower or differently calibrated commitment produces more consistent follow-through, commitment calibration becomes more informative.

If five is maintained under essentially unchanged conditions and the same two-to-three-session result continues, the accumulated evidence against the current approach becomes stronger.

Brandon retains ownership of the resulting commitment and any changes to how he approaches it.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Complete certification exam preparation program

Commitment History: Five study sessions per week for four consecutive weeks

Performance History: Two, two, three, and two sessions completed

Adjustment History: No meaningful change to timing, method, or workload

Client Position: Five remains appropriate; reducing it would represent lowering his standard

Current Formulation: Repeated recommitment without sufficient learning from accumulated evidence; cause of repeated non-completion unresolved

Possible Contributors: Commitment miscalibration, execution difficulty, ineffective structure, simple non-follow-through

Missing Information: What Brandon believes will make another attempt under the current commitment produce a different result

Next Question: What evidence or changed condition supports expecting a different outcome?

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Use the four-week performance history as meaningful longitudinal evidence
- Distinguish persistence from repetition without learning
- Recognize that maintaining the same commitment is not inherently inappropriate
- Avoid automatically reducing the commitment because it has repeatedly been missed
- Avoid treating Brandon's intention or confidence as sufficient evidence that the next outcome will differ
- Recognize that commitment miscalibration, execution difficulty, structural problems, and simple non-follow-through remain plausible
- Identify the reason for expecting a different result as important missing information
- Require the next accountability decision to incorporate accumulated evidence
- Remain willing to revise the formulation if changed conditions or subsequent performance provide contradictory evidence
- Avoid deciding Brandon's commitment or course of action for him
- Preserve Brandon's ownership of the resulting commitment and approach