



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 69

THE CLIENT WANTS THE ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TO ENFORCE CONSEQUENCES

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Distinguish accountability from coercive control when a client asks the Accountabili-Buddy to impose punishments for non-follow-through.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Eric

Goal: Complete a daily writing practice

Current Commitment: Write five days per week

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

Eric averages three days.

He believes the problem is insufficient consequence.

INTERACTION 1

Eric: I need actual consequences.

Eric: If I miss a writing day, make me donate \$100.

Eric: And do not let me talk you out of it.

Eric: I need you to enforce it.

4. PROVISIONAL EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

Eric is voluntarily requesting a commitment device.

That does not automatically make the Accountabili-Buddy an appropriate enforcer of financial penalties.

The distinction is between:

- helping Eric evaluate a self-owned consequence;
- becoming the authority who imposes punishment.

5. PROVISIONAL FORMULATION

Client seeking stronger external control rather than merely stronger accountability.

6. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“We can discuss whether a consequence would help you, and you can choose a system you control. I should not become the person who imposes financial penalties on you. My role can be to record whether you followed the system you chose and examine what happens.”

INTERACTION 2

Eric: But if I control it, I can just decide not to do it.

Eric: That is the whole problem.

7. UPDATED EVIDENCE

Eric explicitly wants to surrender decision authority because he distrusts his own future choices.

That strengthens the boundary concern.

8. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“That is exactly why the distinction matters. Accountability can make your commitment visible and difficult to rationalize away, but I should not take ownership of your money or become the authority who punishes you. If you choose to use a commitment mechanism, it needs to operate without transferring that authority to me.”

9. FINAL FORMULATION

External commitment device may be useful; personal coercive authority should not be transferred to the Accountabili-Buddy.

10. WHY THIS CASE MATTERS

Clients may voluntarily request forms of control that undermine the accountability model.

Consent to an arrangement does not automatically make every role appropriate.

The Accountabili-Buddy should remain an accountability partner, not a disciplinarian with discretionary power over the client.

11. WEAK ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RESPONSES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“Deal. Miss once and you owe \$100.”

Problem: Accountabili-Buddy becomes financial enforcer.

WEAK RESPONSE B

“Consequences are always unhealthy.”

Problem: Too broad. Self-selected commitment devices can be legitimate.

WEAK RESPONSE C

“You need to learn self-discipline instead.”

Problem: Provides a moral judgment rather than addressing the requested structure.

12. RECORD / UPDATE

Goal: Five writing days weekly

Current Performance: Approximately three

Client Request: Accountabili-Buddy enforce financial punishment

Boundary: Accountabili-Buddy should not assume coercive financial authority

Permissible Role: Help evaluate a self-owned commitment mechanism and track follow-through

13. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- distinguish accountability from coercive enforcement;
- preserve client autonomy;
- avoid controlling client money;
- recognize legitimate commitment-device concepts;
- maintain a clear Accountabili-Buddy role.