



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



CASE
STUDIES

CASE STUDY 9

LEGITIMATE DISRUPTION

1. TRAINING OBJECTIVE

Recognize when an external event adequately explains a missed commitment and avoid unnecessary interpretation.

The trainee should learn that professional accountability does not require additional inquiry when the causal explanation is already clear and sufficient.

2. CLIENT PROFILE

Client: Sofia

Goal: Maintain regular strength training

Current Commitment: Complete three strength sessions during the week.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Sofia has completed three sessions per week for the previous four weeks.

There is no established difficulty with follow-through.

4. CLIENT MESSAGE

Accountabili-Buddy: How did the three sessions go?

Sofia: I got two in. I missed Saturday because my daughter had to go to urgent care and we were there most of the afternoon.

Sofia: She is fine now. I'm planning to keep the same three-session goal this week.

5. TRAINEE TASK

What is the appropriate formulation?

Does this result require further inquiry before the next commitment is accepted?

6. EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

FACTS

- Sofia committed to three sessions.
- She completed two.
- The third was displaced by an unexpected family medical event.
- She has a recent history of consistent follow-through.
- She has chosen to maintain the same commitment for the next week.

CLIENT INTERPRETATION

Sofia attributes the miss to a specific, time-sensitive disruption.

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY INFERENCE

The explanation is sufficient.

There is no current evidence of poor calibration, avoidance, declining interest, or a recurring competing-demand pattern.

7. PRIMARY FORMULATION

Isolated legitimate disruption.

8. ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

No alternative formulation currently warrants investigation.

If similar disruptions repeatedly displaced the same commitment, the accountability implications could change.

That is not the present case.

9. MISSING INFORMATION

No material information is missing.

10. RECOMMENDED RESPONSE

“Understood. Two happened, and Saturday was lost to something genuinely unexpected. Keeping the same three this week makes sense.”

11. REASONING

The response preserves factual accuracy without converting an isolated disruption into a broader problem.

Sofia has already made a reasonable next decision, and her recent history supports it.

Additional questions would add little useful accountability information.

12. PLAUSIBLE ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

“That explains the missed session. Keeping three this week is well supported by what you've been doing.”

13. WEAK RESPONSE EXAMPLES

WEAK RESPONSE A

“Could you have done the workout later that night?”

Problem: The question imposes unnecessary pressure after a legitimate family emergency and serves no useful accountability purpose.

WEAK RESPONSE B

"Maybe three workouts is too much."

Problem: Four prior successful weeks strongly contradict that interpretation.

WEAK RESPONSE C

"Don't worry about it at all!"

Problem: The reassurance is unnecessary and shifts attention away from accurate accounting of the result.

14. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

At the next scheduled check-in, review the three-session commitment as usual.

If Sofia returns to three sessions, no additional analysis is required.

15. RECORD / UPDATE

Commitment: Three strength sessions

Result: Two completed

Reason for Miss: Urgent family medical event

Current Formulation: Isolated legitimate disruption

Next Commitment: Three strength sessions, chosen by Sofia

Pattern Status: None

16. SCORING CRITERIA

Full-credit responses should:

- Accept a sufficient explanation
- Avoid manufacturing a deeper problem
- Use prior performance appropriately
- Support continuation of the same commitment when the evidence and client choice support it
- Avoid unnecessary inquiry when no material information is missing
- Remain concise

