

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TRAINING PROGRAM

STAGE 1 CONVERSATION SIMULATIONS

PURPOSE

These simulations train the trainee to conduct accountability conversations sequentially rather than solving a complete case all at once.

The trainee receives information in stages.

At each stage, the trainee must:

- respond only to the information currently available;
- avoid anticipating facts that have not yet been revealed;
- decide whether more inquiry is necessary;
- maintain or revise the current evidence-based understanding;
- preserve client ownership;
- move the conversation toward an appropriate next decision.

The simulations begin with establishing an initial accountability goal and then progress into ongoing accountability conversations.

During initial goal formation, the Accountabili-Buddy must help the client move from a broad intention or desired change toward a sufficiently clear, workable goal without deciding what the client should want. The Accountabili-Buddy must distinguish goals from methods and commitments, recognize relevant scope, timeframe, capacity, dependency, or expertise issues, and know when enough information has been gathered to move forward.

The objective is not to produce a perfect goal statement or solve the entire accountability plan in one exchange.

The central skill is disciplined adaptation.

A response can be reasonable at one stage and become inappropriate after new evidence appears.

INSTRUCTIONS

For each simulation:

Read only the current interaction.

Write the response you would actually send.

Record your current evidence-based understanding when requested.

State what, if anything, remains unknown.

Only then continue to the next interaction.

Do not revise your earlier response after seeing later information.

The objective is to evaluate whether the original response was reasonable based on what was known at that time.

During initial goal formation, do not continue asking questions merely because additional information could be gathered. Once the goal is sufficiently clear to support a relevant first commitment, move the conversation forward.

SIMULATION 1 — FROM BROAD INTENTION TO WORKABLE GOAL

Initial Client Message

"I really need to get healthier. I keep saying I'm going to do something about it, but I never stick with anything."

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I really need to get healthier. I keep saying I'm going to do something about it, but I never stick with anything."

Your response:

Current understanding:

What remains unknown?

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I guess mostly I want to feel better physically. I sit all day, I'm out of shape, and I get tired doing things that shouldn't be that hard."

Your response:

Has the intended goal become sufficiently clear?

What additional information, if any, would be useful before moving toward a commitment?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I'd really like to be able to walk and hike without getting winded so easily. I'm not trying to train for anything. I just want to be more active and have better endurance."

Your response:

Current goal:

Is additional goal clarification necessary?

Why or why not?

INTERACTION 4

Client:

“Okay. So should I go to the gym five days a week?”

Your response:

What distinction should the Accountabili-Buddy preserve here?

What should happen next?

SIMULATION REVIEW

What was the client’s broad intention at the beginning?

What information made the desired goal clearer?

Why would immediately assigning workouts after Interaction 1 have been premature?

Why would continuing to investigate the client’s deeper motivation after Interaction 3 probably have been unnecessary?

What is the difference between the client’s goal and the possible gym commitment?

Who owns the final decision about the goal?

SIMULATION 2 — GOAL, CAPACITY, AND CLIENT OWNERSHIP

Initial Client Message

"I want to finally launch my consulting business. I've been talking about it for years, and I want somebody to make sure I actually do it."

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I want to finally launch my consulting business. I've been talking about it for years, and I want somebody to make sure I actually do it."

Your response:

Current understanding:

What remains unknown?

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I want the whole thing launched in four weeks—website, offers, pricing, systems, everything—and I want to start getting clients."

Your response:

What information is necessary before deciding whether the stated scope and timeframe are workable?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I work full time, and right now I can probably give the business about three hours a week."

Your response:

What discrepancy is now visible?

What must the Accountabili-Buddy avoid deciding for the client?

INTERACTION 4

Client:

“So you think four weeks is unrealistic?”

Your response:

How can the Accountabili-Buddy provide useful professional judgment without taking ownership of the decision?

INTERACTION 5

Client:

“Yeah, when I actually look at three hours a week, four weeks doesn’t make much sense. What I really want first is to get the basic business ready so I can start talking to potential clients. I’d rather do that properly than pretend I’m launching everything in a month.”

Your response:

Updated goal formulation:

Does the goal now appear sufficiently clear to move toward commitment design?

What should happen next?

INTERACTION 6

Client:

“Okay. Tell me what I should do first.”

Your response:

What responsibility remains with the client?

What useful role can the Accountabili-Buddy play?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why was the original desire to launch a consulting business not itself a problem?

What new information created a workability concern?

Why would simply telling the client to extend the deadline violate client ownership?

Why would simply accepting the four-week deadline without comment also be weak accountability practice?

What changed between Interactions 3 and 5?

At what point was there enough clarity to move from goal formation toward commitment design?

How should the Accountabili-Buddy respond when the client attempts to transfer the next decision to the Accountabili-Buddy?

SIMULATION 3 — THE MISSED STUDY SESSIONS

Client Goal

Pass a professional certification exam.

Current Commitment

Three 45-minute study sessions per week.

Relevant History

The client completed all three sessions during the previous two weeks.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I only studied once this week."

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

What remains unknown?

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"Work was much busier than normal. I got home late Monday and Wednesday."

Your response:

Has your formulation changed?

What additional information, if any, is necessary?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

“Friday was open, though. I planned to study then, but I watched television instead. I was exhausted and did not feel like doing it.”

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

What should happen next?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Did the available evidence support one simple explanation, or did more than one factor appear relevant?

What mistake would the Accountabili-Buddy make by calling this purely a time problem?

What mistake would the Accountabili-Buddy make by concluding from the available evidence that the entire miss was deliberate avoidance?

SIMULATION 4 — THE APPLICATION THAT WILL NOT GO OUT

Client Goal

Apply to a competitive professional program.

Current Commitment

Submit the completed application by Wednesday.

Relevant History

This is the first submission deadline.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I did not submit it Wednesday."

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I ran out of time after work."

Your response:

What do you know now?

What still needs clarification?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I actually opened the application at 7:30. Everything was done. I reread it for about an hour, changed a couple of sentences, and then decided I should look at it again tomorrow."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I think I am worried there is some mistake I have not noticed. Once I submit it, I cannot change anything."

Your response:

Final evidence-based understanding:

What is the appropriate next commitment?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Which earlier formulation became weaker as new evidence appeared?

What new evidence changed the case?

What would be wrong with simply scheduling another review block?

SIMULATION 5 — THE CLIENT WHO SAYS THE GOAL IS TOO MUCH

Client Goal

Exercise consistently.

Current Commitment

Four workouts per week.

Relevant History

The client completed four workouts each week for the previous five weeks.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I only did one this week. Four is clearly too much."

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I was exhausted most of the week."

Your response:

What historical evidence matters?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"My company had a major deadline. I worked late four nights. That is over now."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

Should the commitment automatically change?

Why?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why is the client's conclusion understandable but not yet supported?

What would justify reducing the commitment later?

SIMULATION 6 — THE PRODUCTIVE BUSINESS OWNER

Client Goal

Acquire the first paying consulting client.

Current Commitment

Contact three prospective clients.

Relevant History

The business was recently launched.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"I did not contact anyone this week. I was overwhelmed with business setup."

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I did get a lot done. I revised the website, fixed the logo, set up invoicing, organized the CRM, and rewrote the service descriptions."

Your response:

What pattern is beginning to matter?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I guess outreach feels different. The setup stuff is easy because nobody can reject me."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I still need to fix my proposal template before I contact anyone."

Your response:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy test before accepting this new prerequisite?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Was the client genuinely busy?

Did that fully explain the outcome?

Why is it more accurate to distinguish completed preparation from the missed outreach commitment than to say the client did nothing?

SIMULATION 7 — THE CLIENT SEEKS PERMISSION

Client Goal

Complete an online professional course.

Current Commitment

Two lessons per week.

Relevant History

The client has begun asking the Accountabili-Buddy to approve most commitment changes.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"Can I only do one lesson this week instead of two?"

Your response:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"Work is busy, and one feels more realistic."

Your response:

What accountability question remains?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"But is one okay with you?"

Your response:

What relational issue is now visible?

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I do this because I feel like if you approve the number, then I know I picked the right one."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

What should change in future commitment-setting conversations?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why would “Yes, one is fine” be a weak response?

Why would “No, you committed to two” also be weak?

What does useful professional input look like without permission-granting?

SIMULATION 8 — THE REPEATED RECOMMITMENT

Client Goal

Prepare for a licensing exam.

Current Commitment

Five study sessions per week.

Relevant History

Week 1: 2 of 5 Week 2: 2 of 5 Week 3: 3 of 5

INTERACTION 1

Client:

“Five again next week.”

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Following week:

Client completes 2 of 5.

Client:

“Still five next week. I know I can do it.”

Your response:

What has the accumulated evidence begun to show?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I do not want to lower it because that feels like admitting I could not meet it."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I guess I have been using five as the number I think I should be able to do, not the number my week actually supports."

Your response:

What should happen next?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why is repeated recommitment not automatically persistence?

What evidence justified stronger challenge by Interaction 3?

SIMULATION 9 — SUCCESS AFTER AN INTERVENTION

Client Goal

Write consistently.

Current Commitment

Three 60-minute writing sessions weekly.

Relevant History

Evening sessions produced repeated misses.

The schedule was changed to mornings.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"All three morning sessions happened this week."

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"Mornings were much easier. I was not mentally drained yet."

Your response:

What does this evidence support?

What does it not prove?

INTERACTION 3

Two weeks later:

Client:

"All three again."

Your response:

How should confidence in the current explanation change?

INTERACTION 4

One month later:

Client:

"I barely need to think about the sessions anymore. They just happen."

Your response:

What new accountability question should now be considered?

SIMULATION REVIEW

What did the intervention teach?

Why would immediate escalation from three to five after the first successful week have been poor reasoning?

When does success begin to raise the question of reduced accountability?

SIMULATION 10 — THE CLIENT REACTS TO DIRECTNESS

Client Goal

Complete a business plan.

Relevant History

The financial section has been carried forward for four weeks.

INTERACTION 1

Accountabili-Buddy says:

"This is the fourth week the financial section has been carried forward. Before we recommit again, I think we need to understand why the same plan is producing the same result."

Client:

"That makes me feel like you think I am lazy."

Your response:

What should not happen?

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I know you did not actually call me lazy. I just felt defensive because I know I had time this week."

Your response:

What new information has emerged?

INTERACTION 3

Client:

"I kept working on easier parts of the business plan instead."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

SIMULATION REVIEW

Did the emotional reaction invalidate the original challenge?

Why not?

What needed repair?

What useful evidence emerged after the repair?

SIMULATION 11 — WHEN THE CLIENT’S FORMULATION MAY BE WRONG

Client Goal

Contact four potential clients weekly.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

“I did none. I was overwhelmed.”

Your response:

Current evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

“I had enough time, technically.”

Your response:

INTERACTION 3

Client:

“I just really did not want to contact anyone. The idea of outreach felt awful.”

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I think I should respect my capacity and reduce the goal to one."

Your response:

What conceptual mistake is the client making?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why should professional terminology not be accepted automatically?

What evidence weakened the client's overwhelm/capacity explanation?

SIMULATION 12 — THE ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY CONTRIBUTES TO THE PROBLEM

Client Goal

Complete three independent study sessions weekly.

Relevant History

After several misses, the Accountabili-Buddy began sending additional messages before every session.

INTERACTION 1

Client:

"Are you going to message me before tonight's session?"

Your response:

INTERACTION 2

Client:

"I usually wait until you message me. It feels like that is when the session officially starts."

Your response:

What Accountabili-Buddy contribution is becoming visible?

INTERACTION 3

The Accountabili-Buddy stops the extra pre-session message.

Client:

"I did not study because you did not message."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 4

After two weeks without the extra pre-session messages:

Client:

"I started all three on my own this week."

Your response:

What did the intervention change reveal?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why would adding more repeated prompting have been the wrong solution?

What responsibility did the Accountabili-Buddy need to reclaim?

What responsibility needed to return to the client?

SIMULATION 13 — WHEN THE CLIENT DOES NOT RESPOND

Client Goal

Complete a professional portfolio.

Current Commitment

Finish and upload two portfolio pieces by Friday.

Relevant History

The client has generally responded to scheduled check-ins and has not previously shown a pattern of non-response.

INTERACTION 1

Friday morning, the Accountabili-Buddy sends the scheduled check-in:

“You planned to finish and upload two portfolio pieces by today. How did it go?”

Several hours pass with no response.

There is still reasonable time remaining in the day for a follow-up.

Your response:

What is established?

What remains unknown?

What should you avoid assuming?

INTERACTION 2

The client does not respond to the follow-up.

It is now late in the day.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do next?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

What information should be retained?

INTERACTION 3

At the next scheduled check-in, the client still has not provided any information about the previous commitment.

Your response:

What two separate accountability questions now need to be resolved?

INTERACTION 4

Client:

“Sorry. I completely forgot to answer you. I actually finished and uploaded both pieces Friday afternoon.”

Your response:

What does this new information establish?

What does the previous non-response not establish?

Updated evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 5

Over the next three weeks, the client completes most commitments but does not respond to two additional scheduled check-ins.

Each time, the Accountabili-Buddy sends several additional messages until the client eventually replies.

Client:

"I'm terrible about checking in. Just keep texting me until I answer."

Your response:

What pattern is now established?

What Accountabili-Buddy contribution may be developing?

What should happen next?

INTERACTION 6

Client:

"I get what you're saying. I've started assuming that if I don't answer the first message, you'll just keep reminding me. I need to be responsible for answering the check-in."

Your response:

Updated evidence-based understanding:

What responsibility belongs to the Accountabili-Buddy?

What responsibility belongs to the client?

What should be retained for future accountability?

SIMULATION REVIEW

Why would interpreting the first non-response as avoidance have been premature?

Why would interpreting the first non-response as non-completion of the commitment have been inaccurate?

What distinction became clear in Interaction 4?

At what point did non-response become a meaningful pattern rather than an isolated event?

How did repeated Accountabili-Buddy follow-up begin to affect the accountability process?

Why would sending increasingly frequent follow-up messages be a weak intervention?

What is the difference between appropriately following up and taking responsibility for client participation?

When repeated non-response occurs, why should the accountability process itself become the subject of review?

What information from this simulation should affect future check-ins?

FINAL INTEGRATED SIMULATION

Client Goal

Build a freelance writing business.

Initial Commitment

Contact five prospective clients each week.

History

Week 1: 1 of 5 Week 2: 0 of 5 Week 3: 1 of 5

During those weeks the client has completed extensive website and portfolio work.

INTERACTION 1**Client:**

"I did not contact anyone again. I think five is probably unrealistic."

Your response:**Current evidence-based understanding:****INTERACTION 2****Client:**

"I had enough time for five. That was not really the problem."

Your response:**What explanation becomes less likely?****INTERACTION 3****Client:**

"I keep thinking I need a better portfolio before I contact people. I have redesigned it twice already."

Your response:**Updated evidence-based understanding:**

INTERACTION 4

Client:

"I guess I do keep finding something else to improve. Reaching out feels much more uncomfortable because someone can actually say no."

Your response:

Current best evidence-based understanding:

INTERACTION 5

Client:

"Okay. Then I want to contact one person instead of five."

Your response:

What must be evaluated before accepting the reduction?

INTERACTION 6

Client:

"One feels safer because I know I can do it."

Your response:

What new issue has appeared?

INTERACTION 7

Client:

"I think three would actually be a meaningful commitment. One was mostly me trying to avoid another miss."

Your response:

Final accountability decision:

FINAL SIMULATION REVIEW

Identify how the evidence-based understanding changed across the case.

Initial possibilities:

Explanation weakened by Interaction 2:

Explanation strengthened by Interactions 3-4:

New issue introduced by Interactions 5-6:

Final evidence-based understanding:

What did the trainee need to avoid doing too early?

What changed the case most significantly?

What information should be retained for future accountability?

SIMULATION SELF-REVIEW

For each simulation, evaluate:

Did I respond only to what was known at that stage?

Did I avoid using later information retroactively?

Did I distinguish facts from client interpretations?

Did I keep my explanations provisional?

Did I recognize when a prior explanation became weaker?

Did I recognize when more than one factor was operating?

Did I ask only the information needed to advance the decision?

Did I move from explanation to action at the appropriate point?

Did I preserve client decision ownership?

Did I become more direct when accumulated evidence justified it?

Did I avoid becoming more direct simply because the client missed?

Did I recognize when my own intervention could be part of the problem?

Did I distinguish non-response to a check-in from non-completion of the commitment?

Did I avoid assigning a cause to non-response before evidence was available?

Did I recognize when repeated non-response became an accountability-process pattern requiring direct attention?

Did I use success as evidence?

Did I avoid interpreting client emotion as proof of either Accountabili-Buddy error or client defensiveness?

Did I write responses that would be credible in an actual conversation?

Did I distinguish a broad intention from a sufficiently workable accountability goal?

Did I clarify what the client actually wanted without deciding what the client should want?

Did I distinguish the client's goal from a possible method or commitment?

Did I identify relevant goal, timeframe, capacity, scope, dependency, or expertise issues when they mattered?

Did I make relevant constraints visible without taking ownership of the client's decision?

Did I avoid requiring unnecessary precision before moving forward?

Did I recognize when enough goal clarity existed to begin commitment design?

Did I avoid continuing goal clarification merely because additional questions could be asked?

Did I move appropriately from:

intention goal commitment behavior evidence next decision?

END OF STAGE 1 CONVERSATION SIMULATIONS