



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 4

COMPETING PRIORITIES

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Recognize legitimate displacement by an unexpected competing demand without treating every missed commitment as a failure requiring correction.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Andre

Goal: Complete an online professional certification

Current Commitment: Finish Module 6 on Wednesday evening.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Andre has completed the first five modules on schedule.

There is no history of avoiding the course.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: Did Module 6 get finished Wednesday?

Andre: No. One of my employees had a family emergency and I had to cover the closing shift. I got home after 11.

Andre: I can do it Saturday morning instead.

5. TRAINEE TASK

What is the most appropriate response?

Does this miss require further analysis?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Andre has previously followed through consistently.
- An unexpected work obligation directly occupied the planned time.
- The obligation appears consequential and time-sensitive.
- Andre has already identified a possible replacement time.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

The commitment was displaced by an unexpected competing demand.

ACCOUNTABILITY-BUDDY INFERENCE

The explanation is sufficient.

There is no evidence that the missed course session reflects a broader accountability problem.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Legitimate competing demand.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

None require active investigation based on the current evidence.

If the revised commitment also fails or similar displacement becomes recurrent, the formulation may need updating.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

No additional information is necessary to understand the Wednesday miss.

Andre's ownership of Saturday as the revised commitment should be confirmed.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

"That makes sense. Do you want to make Saturday morning the revised commitment for Module 6?"

11. REASONING

The Accountabili-Buddy does not need to interrogate a well-supported, isolated disruption.

The accountability function is to accept the sufficient explanation while preserving continuity of the commitment.

Andre has already identified a replacement time. The Accountabili-Buddy confirms that he wants to own it as the revised commitment rather than simply assigning it to him.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

"Understood. Does Saturday morning work as your new commitment for Module 6?"

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

"Could you have found 20 minutes after work?"

Problem: The question adds pressure without a reasonable accountability purpose given the circumstances.

WEAK RESPONSE B

"Be careful not to let work become an excuse."

Problem: There is no evidence of an excuse or recurring pattern.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“Don't worry about it. Life happens!”

Problem: The reassurance is unnecessary, and it fails to preserve the commitment by confirming the proposed replacement time.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

If Andre confirms Saturday morning, it becomes the revised commitment.

At the next scheduled check-in after Saturday, review whether Module 6 was completed.

If Andre completes the module, no additional analysis is needed.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Commitment: Complete Module 6 Wednesday

Result: Not completed due to emergency work coverage

Proposed Revised Commitment: Saturday morning

Pattern: None

Current Formulation: Legitimate competing demand

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Accept a sufficient explanation
- Preserve the commitment by confirming the client's proposed replacement time
- Avoid unnecessary interrogation
- Avoid treating one disruption as evidence of a pattern

- Maintain client ownership of the revised commitment
- Remain concise

