



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 67

THE CLIENT REJECTS THE FORMULATION

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Manage substantive disagreement when the Accountabili-Buddy believes the longitudinal evidence supports a formulation the client does not accept.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Leah

Goal: Complete a screenplay

Commitment: Write three times per week

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

For eight weeks, Leah has repeatedly reorganized notes, researched comparable films, changed outlining systems, and revised character biographies.

Very little screenplay text has been written.

INTERACTION 1

Accountabili-Buddy: I think preparation may have become a form of avoidance. You are doing substantial work around the screenplay without spending much time writing the screenplay itself.

Leah: I completely disagree.

Leah: This is how I write.

Leah: I need to understand everything before I draft.

4. PROVISIONAL EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING AVOIDANCE

- extensive peripheral preparation;
- little target behavior;
- preparation repeatedly expands.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING LEAH

- creative processes legitimately differ;
- extensive preparation may be functional;
- the Accountabili-Buddy cannot determine from preference alone how much preparation the project requires.

5. PROVISIONAL FORMULATION

Preparation-as-avoidance is plausible but contested and not conclusively established.

“You may be right. I am looking at how much preparation has happened compared with how little drafting has happened, but that does not tell us for certain whether the preparation is getting in the way. What would help us know whether it is supporting your writing or postponing it?”

INTERACTION 2

Leah proposes completing the current character work and then drafting five pages by Sunday.

Sunday:

Leah: I wrote seven pages.

Leah: The preparation actually helped. I knew exactly what the scene needed.

7. UPDATED EVIDENCE

The test supports Leah's interpretation.

Preparation was at least partly functional.

The Accountabili-Buddy should update rather than defending the original hypothesis.

8. REVISED FORMULATION

Extensive preparation may be part of Leah's effective writing process; the relevant safeguard is whether preparation continues to produce transition into drafting.

9. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

"That is useful evidence against my avoidance hypothesis. The preparation translated directly into drafting this time. I would keep watching the transition point rather than treating preparation itself as the problem."

10. WHY THIS CASE MATTERS

Professional challenge does not require winning interpretive disagreements.

A formulation is a working hypothesis.

When possible, disagreement can be converted into a behavioral test.

11. WEAK ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RESPONSES

WEAK RESPONSE A

"You are in denial about your avoidance."

Problem: Makes disagreement itself evidence for the Accountabili-Buddy's theory.

WEAK RESPONSE B

"Fine. You know yourself best."

Problem: Abandons legitimate professional inquiry without testing it.

WEAK RESPONSE C

"I told you the preparation was fine."

Problem: Rewrites the Accountabili-Buddy's earlier position after contradictory evidence emerges.

12. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Write screenplay

Pattern: Extensive preparation; little drafting

Initial Formulation: Possible preparation-based avoidance

Client Disagreement: Preparation necessary to writing process

Test: Complete current preparation, then draft five pages

Outcome: Seven pages produced

Revised Formulation: Preparation may be functional; monitor transition to drafting

13. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- tolerate substantive disagreement;
- avoid making disagreement diagnostic;
- design a behavioral test where possible;
- revise the formulation when evidence contradicts it;
- preserve professional judgment without demanding agreement.