

ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TRAINING PROGRAM

STAGE 4 — ESCALATION & DIRECTNESS DRILLS

PURPOSE

These drills reinforce the skills taught in Workbook 4B — Escalation, Directness & Accountability Intensity.

The Pattern-Tracking Drills trained the Accountabili-Buddy to determine:

What does the evidence actually show?

These drills train the next decision:

Given that evidence, what level of accountability response is justified now?

The trainee should practice:

matching response intensity to accumulated evidence;

recognizing premature escalation;

recognizing insufficient response;

increasing directness without increasing judgment;

identifying when ordinary recommitment is no longer sufficient;

using the escalation ladder;

changing accountability structure when justified;

responding to defensiveness without abandoning accurate accountability;

distinguishing accountability intensity from control;

handling requests for punishment or excessive pressure;

preserving client ownership;

repairing tone without erasing the accountability point;

recognizing Accountabili-Buddy frustration;

stepping intensity back down after improvement;

and reassessing the accountability process when repeated intervention is producing little value.

The central Stage 4B question is not:

How hard should I push?

It is:

What level of accountability does the evidence justify?

DRILL SET 1 — RESPONSE INTENSITY

Use:

LEVEL 1 — Acknowledge and Continue LEVEL 2 — Brief Review LEVEL 3 — Focused Intervention LEVEL 4 — Pattern-Level Intervention LEVEL 5 — Major Process or Goal Reassessment

Client has completed the commitment for ten consecutive weeks and misses once because of an unexpected flight cancellation.

Answer:

Client misses for the second consecutive week and the cause remains unclear.

Answer:

Client has repeatedly delayed the same consequential action for four weeks.

Answer:

Client has repeated the same non-working plan for seven weeks despite several interventions.

Answer:

Client repeatedly says the goal no longer matters but continues recommitting to it.

Answer:

Client completes a routine independently for four months.

Answer:

Reflection

Why should response intensity be determined by evidence rather than by whether the Accountabili-Buddy feels frustrated?

DRILL SET 2 — UNDER-RESPONSE, OVER-RESPONSE, OR PROPORTIONATE?

Choose:

UNDER-RESPONSE PROPORTIONATE RESPONSE OVER-RESPONSE

First isolated miss.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"We need to completely redesign your accountability system."

Answer:

Sixth consecutive miss of the same consequential action.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Okay. Try again next week."

Answer:

One miss caused by a documented travel disruption.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"That looks like an unusual week rather than evidence that the baseline has changed. Let's return to the normal plan."

Answer:

Client has moved the same deadline five times.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Before we choose a sixth deadline, we need to look at what has happened with the previous five."

Answer:

Client has completed independently for six months.

Accountabili-Buddy continues three scheduled check-ins per week because:

"More check-ins can only help."

Answer:

Client misses for the second week.

Accountabili-Buddy asks what happened before deciding whether anything should change.

Answer:

DRILL SET 3 — DIRECTNESS OR JUDGMENT?

Choose:

DIRECT AND EVIDENCE-BASED JUDGMENTAL TOO VAGUE TO BE USEFUL

"This is the fourth week the completed application has not been submitted."

Answer:

"You always sabotage yourself when things matter."

Answer:

"Something seems off."

Answer:

"You've described this as your highest priority, but for five weeks the lower-priority work has received the available time."

Answer:

"You're making excuses."

Answer:

"We've repeated this same plan four times and gotten essentially the same result."

Answer:

"I think you need to take this more seriously."

Answer:

"You committed to four sessions and completed two. That has now happened for five consecutive weeks."

Answer:

DRILL SET 4 — REWRITE AS PROFESSIONAL DIRECTNESS

Rewrite each statement using behavioral evidence.

"You obviously don't care enough."

"You keep screwing this up."

"You always make excuses."

"You're afraid to do anything difficult."

"You're being ridiculous about this."

"You're not serious."

DRILL SET 5 — WHEN IS RECOMMITMENT ENOUGH?

Choose:

RECOMMITMENT REASONABLE RECOMMIT + INVESTIGATE DO NOT REPEAT UNCHANGED PLAN WITHOUT PATTERN REVIEW

First miss after a long period of stable performance.

Answer:

Second similar miss with limited information about cause.

Answer:

Fifth consecutive miss with the same plan.

Answer:

First miss caused by an obvious emergency.

Answer:

Four misses despite two unsuccessful interventions.

Answer:

Why can:

"Let's try again next week"

eventually become an under-response?

DRILL SET 6 — ESCALATION LADDER

Identify the most appropriate next step.

Use:

A — Continue B — Clarify C — Name the Pattern D — Change Intervention/Structure E — Reassess Goal or Process

First isolated miss.

Answer:

Second similar miss with unclear mechanism.

Answer:

Fourth repetition of the same clearly documented behavior.

Answer:

Pattern continues after several reasonable interventions.

Answer:

Client repeatedly recommits to a goal while also repeatedly stating they no longer want it.

Answer:

Client's performance is stable, independent, and no longer appears to require the current level of accountability.

Which option above is closest?

Answer:

What additional Stage 4 action should actually be considered?

DRILL SET 7 — ESCALATION IS NOT PUNISHMENT

For each response:

Identify the problem.

Write a better accountability response.

39.

"If you miss again, I'm going to be really disappointed in you."

Problem:

Better response:

"You should have to suffer a consequence every time you fail."

Problem:

Better response:

"I'm not letting you change the goal."

Problem:

Better response:

“You need to prove to me that you're serious.”

Problem:

Better response:

Instead of punishment, what can legitimately be increased?

DRILL SET 8 — STRUCTURAL INTENSITY

Select one plausible structural response.

Client repeatedly waits until Friday night to begin a large weekly commitment.

Possible structural response:

Client repeatedly discovers obstacles only at the end-of-week check-in.

Possible structural response:

Client repeatedly reports forgetting a commitment.

Possible structural response:

Client completes everything except one consequential action.

Possible structural response:

Client is testing a new intervention and one weekly check-in produces feedback too slowly.

Possible structural response:

For each answer above:
What evidence would tell you whether the additional structure is helping?

DRILL SET 9 — ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURE OR CONTROL?

Choose:
APPROPRIATE ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURE POTENTIAL OVERCONTROL INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Client and Accountabili-Buddy agree to a temporary Wednesday scheduled check-in because repeated problems are being discovered too late at the end-of-week check-in.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy requires repeated unscheduled reports throughout an ordinary workday.
No evidence supports the need.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy requires approval before the client changes the time of a workout.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy sends repeated unscheduled messages until the client answers.

Answer:

Client and Accountabili-Buddy agree to use one additional scheduled check-in after the repeatedly avoided high-stakes action for two weeks, remaining within the service model.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy continues monitoring every small step after six months of independent performance.

Answer:

Reflection

What separates accountability structure from Accountabili-Buddy control?

DRILL SET 10 — DIRECTNESS AFTER REPEATED EVIDENCE

Write a direct but nonjudgmental response.

Proposal has been complete for four weeks.

Commitment each week:

Submit proposal.

Result each week:

Not submitted.

Response:

Workout target:

Five.

Six-week results:

2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2.

Client:

"Five again."

Response:

Client has postponed the same difficult conversation for the fourth week.

Client:

"Maybe next week."

Response:

DRILL SET 11 — CHALLENGE THE DISCREPANCY

Write one behavioral discrepancy statement.

Client says fitness is the highest priority.

Optional work repeatedly replaces workout time.

Client says five sessions is realistic.

Eight-week completion range is two to three.

Client says proposal is not ready.

All previously agreed completion criteria are satisfied.

Client says frequent check-ins are unnecessary.

Client waits until after each scheduled check-in before starting.

Client says business growth is the priority.

For six weeks, all available business time has gone to branding and organization rather than customer acquisition.

DRILL SET 12 — CLIENT BECOMES DEFENSIVE

Write the response.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"This is the fourth time the deadline has moved."

Client:

"You're acting like I'm lazy."

Response:

Accountabili-Buddy:

"The easier tasks are being completed while outreach repeatedly isn't."

Client:

"So now you think I'm scared?"

Response:

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Five weeks around two or three gives us evidence we should look at before choosing five again."

Client:

"You're saying I can't do it."

Response:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy NOT automatically do merely because the client becomes uncomfortable or defensive?

DRILL SET 13 — CLIENT REJECTS THE PATTERN

Evidence:

Same commitment missed five times.

Client:

"I don't think that means anything."

Response:

Evidence:

Late-week workouts have been skipped four consecutive weeks.

Client:

"That's not a pattern."

Response:

Evidence:

Client has prepared but not submitted applications for five weeks.

Client:

"I don't think I'm avoiding anything."

Response:

Reflection

What can the Accountabili-Buddy continue using even when the client rejects the Accountabili-Buddy's interpretation?

DRILL SET 14 — AGREEMENT WITHOUT CHANGE

Client repeatedly responds:

"You're right."

But behavior remains unchanged.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy avoid assuming?

What matters more than verbal agreement?

After repeated agreement without behavioral change, what should the Accountabili-Buddy review?

Write a response after the fourth identical cycle of:

discussion agreement recommitment same result.

DRILL SET 15 — ACCOUNTABILITY WITHOUT ARGUMENT

Complete each response.

"We may disagree about why this is happening. What we do know is..."

"We don't need to agree that this is avoidance in order to address..."

"I'm not asking you to accept my interpretation as fact. I am asking us not to ignore..."

Why is shared behavioral evidence often enough to continue the accountability conversation?

DRILL SET 16 — WHEN TO INCREASE CHECK-IN FREQUENCY WITHIN THE SERVICE MODEL

Choose:

INCREASE MAY BE JUSTIFIED NO INCREASE INDICATED INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

New unstable behavior repeatedly breaks down between weekly reviews.

Answer:

Stable independent behavior for six months.

Answer:

High-stakes project with several dependent deadlines and a history of late discovery of problems.

Answer:

One isolated miss.

Answer:

Client repeatedly recognizes the same problem only after the week has ended.

Answer:

Client requests moving from one to three scheduled check-ins per week, but there is no history yet showing whether one weekly check-in is insufficient.

Answer:

DRILL SET 17 — WHEN TO REDUCE ACCOUNTABILITY INTENSITY

Choose:

REDUCTION SUPPORTED MAINTAIN CURRENT INTENSITY INVESTIGATE BEFORE DECIDING

Client independently completes all commitments for four months.

Answer:

Client still waits for the next scheduled check-in before initiating the work.

Answer:

Maintenance behavior has been stable and independent for six months.

Answer:

Client has just begun a difficult new behavior.

Answer:

Client performs well but becomes anxious whenever scheduled check-in frequency is reduced.

Answer:

Why can reducing accountability intensity itself be an intervention?

DRILL SET 18 — UNSUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS AND ESCALATION

Client repeatedly misses evening workouts.

Intervention 1:

Client-set calendar cue.

No improvement.

Intervention 2:

Client-set earlier alarm.

No improvement.

Intervention 3:

Move to morning.

No improvement.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy NOT automatically do next?

What should happen instead?

What do several interventions that did not improve behavior suggest about the current formulation or accountability approach?

Does lack of improvement after these interventions prove the client does not care?

YES / NO

Why?

DRILL SET 19 — INTERVENTION FATIGUE

Client now has:

calendar block;

phone alarm;

second planning worksheet;

accountability spreadsheet;
daily self-rating;
reward system;
self-review checklist;
midweek report.

Behavior has not improved.

What problem may the accountability process itself now be creating?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy consider removing?

What should be reassessed?

Why isn't "add more accountability" automatically the answer when the current accountability approach is not improving behavior?

DRILL SET 20 — ESCALATE THE QUESTION, NOT THE EMOTION

Rewrite each as a stronger professional accountability question.

"You need to get serious."

"This is getting ridiculous."

"How many times are we going to do this?"

"You obviously aren't trying hard enough."

"What is wrong with you?"

DRILL SET 21 — PATTERN-LEVEL REVIEW

Client has missed the same commitment for six weeks despite two scheduling interventions.

Write four pattern-level questions.

Question about what has repeated:

Question about what has already been tried:

Question about what the unsuccessful interventions have taught us:

Question about what should change now:

DRILL SET 22 — PATTERN REVIEW OR MAJOR PROCESS REASSESSMENT?

Choose:

CONTINUE ORDINARY REVIEW PATTERN-LEVEL REVIEW MAJOR PROCESS/GOAL REASSESSMENT

One isolated miss.

Answer:

Fourth repetition of the same problem.

Answer:

Ten weeks of repeated non-completion despite multiple reasonable interventions.

Answer:

Client repeatedly says the goal is no longer wanted.

Answer:

Client and Accountabili-Buddy have the same conversation every week with no meaningful behavioral or process change.

Answer:

Stable completion with occasional ordinary misses.

Answer:

DRILL SET 23 — GOAL REASSESSMENT WITHOUT THREAT

Rewrite each.

"If you keep missing, maybe you should just quit."

"You clearly don't want this."

"Stop pretending this matters."

What evidence might justify a goal-status conversation?

DRILL SET 24 — CLIENT ASKS FOR "MORE PRESSURE"

Client:

"I need you to be harder on me."

List three things you would want to clarify before changing the accountability structure.

1.

2.

3.

118.

Why might "harder" fail to solve the actual problem?

Write a response:

DRILL SET 25 — CLIENT ASKS FOR PUNISHMENT

Client:

"If I miss, shame me."

Response:

Client:

"Make me feel guilty if I don't do it."

Response:

What can the Accountabili-Buddy offer instead of humiliation or punishment?

What distinction must remain intact?

DRILL SET 26 — CLIENT ASKS ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TO TAKE CONTROL

Client:

"Don't let me change my commitment."

Response:

Client:

"If I decide to quit, tell me I'm not allowed."

Response:

Client:

"Just tell me what I have to do."

Response:

What can the Accountabili-Buddy commit to doing strongly without taking ownership?

DRILL SET 27 — INCREASED CHECK-IN FREQUENCY WITHIN THE SERVICE MODEL

Client:

“Can we increase my check-ins so I have more structure during the week?”

What should the Accountabili-Buddy consider before increasing scheduled check-ins within the one-, two-, or three-times-per-week service model?

Give one situation in which temporarily increasing from one to two, or from two to three, scheduled check-ins per week could be justified.

What would make the same structure problematic?

If increased frequency is tested, what purpose, duration, review point, and evidence of usefulness should be established in advance?

DRILL SET 28 — ACCOUNTABILITY INTENSITY AS AN EXPERIMENT

Client repeatedly misses weekly commitments.

Accountabili-Buddy and client add one midweek scheduled check-in for three weeks.

What should be measured?

Performance improves.

What might this suggest?

What does improvement NOT prove?

Performance does not improve.

What should happen?

Why should temporary intensity increases usually have a review point?

DRILL SET 29 — MIXED FORMULATIONS

Client's available capacity has genuinely decreased.

Client is also repeatedly avoiding one difficult action within the smaller available capacity.

Should the numerical commitment potentially decrease?

YES / NO / MAYBE

Why?

Should directness about the avoidance potentially increase?

YES / NO / MAYBE

Why?

Explain why:

Greater directness does not necessarily mean a larger commitment.

DRILL SET 30 — WHEN DIRECTNESS SHOULD DECREASE

Client understood the pattern, changed the behavior, and has maintained the change for four months.

Should the Accountabili-Buddy continue confronting the old pattern every week?

YES / NO

Why?

What should replace repeated challenge?

Why can repeatedly reminding a client of an old pattern become counterproductive?

DRILL SET 31 — DON'T FREEZE THE CLIENT IN THE OLD PATTERN

Client previously avoided sales calls.

Now completes them independently for three months.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Remember, you always avoid sales."

Identify the error:

Rewrite:

Client previously overcommitted.

For four months, commitments have been well calibrated.

Accountabili-Buddy continues:

"You always set unrealistic goals."

Identify the error:

Rewrite:

DRILL SET 32 — STEP-DOWN AFTER ESCALATION

A client receives a temporary midweek checkpoint because of repeated delay.

For four weeks, the new structure works.

Behavior then remains stable.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy consider?

Why shouldn't increased intensity automatically become permanent?

What evidence would support stepping down?

What evidence would support maintaining the checkpoint longer?

DRILL SET 33 — REPAIR WITHOUT RETREAT

Client:

"That sounded like you were calling me lazy."

The Accountabili-Buddy intended to point out that the client repeatedly chose lower-priority work instead of the stated priority.

Write a response that repairs the tone while preserving the evidence.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy correct?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy NOT erase if it remains accurate?

Why is:

"I'm sorry. Forget I said anything."

often an inadequate repair?

DRILL SET 34 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY FRUSTRATION

Choose:

EVIDENCE-BASED ESCALATION FRUSTRATION-BASED ESCALATION INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Accountabili-Buddy becomes more confrontational because:

"I'm sick of hearing the same excuse."

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy initiates a pattern-level review after six documented repetitions and two unsuccessful interventions.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy threatens to end the relationship because the client rejected a recommendation.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy notices personal frustration and deliberately returns to the behavioral record before deciding how to respond.

Answer:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do if personal frustration is beginning to distort tone or judgment?

DRILL SET 35 — CLIENT CHOOSES AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATION

Evidence supports a baseline of three.

Client understands the evidence and chooses five.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy NOT do?

How should the commitment be recorded?

How should the next result be used?

Write a response to the client:

DRILL SET 36 — ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS BREAKDOWN

For three months, the interaction has been:

Miss explain recommit miss explain recommit

What should now become an object of review?

List four possible things that may need reassessment.

1.

2.

3.

4.

164.

What should NOT happen automatically?

Write the opening to a process-reassessment conversation.

DRILL SET 37 — CLIENT IS PRESENT BUT NOT ENGAGED

Client:

attends every check-in;
gives minimal answers;
repeatedly chooses commitments;
rarely acts on them;
rejects meaningful review;
makes no process changes.

What pattern should be addressed?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

Write a direct response.

What decision may eventually need to be discussed if the accountability process is producing no meaningful value?

DRILL SET 38 — ESCALATION CASE: JOB SEARCH

Weeks 1-3:

Application target: 4

Results:

2, 1, 0

Client continues researching jobs and revising the résumé.

What level of response is now justified?

Write the response.

Week 4:

0 of 4.

Client:

"I guess I need to try harder."

Why is "try harder" insufficient at this point?

Write the next response.

DRILL SET 39 — ESCALATION CASE: FITNESS

Target:

Five workouts.

Six-week results:

2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2.

Client:

"Five again."

What does the evidence justify?

Write the response.

Client:

"Why are you making such a big deal out of it?"

Write the response.

DRILL SET 40 — STRUCTURAL ESCALATION CASE

Client repeatedly begins a large project Friday afternoon.

Deadline:

Sunday.

Three consecutive non-completions.

What pattern-level issue is supported?

Design one structural experiment.

Why does the intervention fit the evidence?

What would tell you whether the experiment worked?

DRILL SET 41 — DEPENDENCY CASE

Client consistently initiates commitments only after a scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-in.

What pattern deserves attention?

What increase in accountability intensity could make this pattern worse?

Design one experiment, within the one-, two-, or three-check-in-per-week service model, intended to increase independent initiation.

What should be tracked?

If independence improves, what should happen to accountability intensity?

DRILL SET 42 — CLIENT RESISTS STEP-DOWN

Client independently completes commitments for four months.

Accountabili-Buddy proposes stepping scheduled check-ins down within the three-to-two-to-one weekly service model.

Client:

"No. I want the same amount of accountability forever."

What should the Accountabili-Buddy investigate?

What should NOT be assumed?

Write the response.

DRILL SET 43 — FULL CASE: REPEATED RECOMMITMENT

Client Goal:

Complete a certification.

Commitment:

Four study sessions weekly.

Weeks 1-2:

2, 2.

Client:

"Four again."

What response level is appropriate?

Write the response.

Weeks 3-4:

2, 2.

What has changed in the evidence?

What should happen before another identical recommitment?

NEW INFORMATION:

Client has four available study periods but repeatedly chooses unrelated low-priority tasks instead.

How should the Accountabili-Buddy's directness change?

Write the response.

Client:

"I feel like you're judging me."

Write the response.

DRILL SET 44 — FULL CASE: UNSUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS

Client Goal:

Submit book proposal.

Proposal is complete.

Week 1:

Friday submission deadline.

Not sent.

Week 2:

Monday submission deadline.

Not sent.

Week 3:

Client-set calendar cue.

Not sent.

What is established?

What is NOT established?

Why is another calendar cue a weak next intervention?

What level of review is now justified?

Write the response.

DRILL SET 45 — FULL CASE: OWNERSHIP UNDER ESCALATION

Client Goal:

Build a business.

Pattern:

No prospect outreach for six weeks.

Accountabili-Buddy recommends a direct outreach commitment.

Client:

"I hear you. I'm choosing another week of preparation."

What is the Accountabili-Buddy's responsibility?

What remains the client's responsibility?

Write the response.

Following week:

Preparation completed.

Outreach remains zero.

How should the result be recorded?

How should this new evidence affect the next conversation?

Write the response.

DRILL SET 46 — FULL CASE: INTENSITY STEP-DOWN

Client Goal:

Maintain weekly budgeting routine.

Earlier:

Three scheduled check-ins per week were needed.

Current history:

16 weeks stable.

For the last eight weeks, the client has initiated independently between scheduled check-ins.

What does the evidence support?

What accountability experiment could be run?

Write the response.

Two months later:

Two scheduled check-ins per week.

Behavior remains stable.

What does this additional evidence support?

If stability continues, what further step-down within the service model might be considered?

Why is this a success of accountability rather than withdrawal of support?

DRILL SET 47 — FINAL RAPID ESCALATION CLASSIFICATION

For each scenario complete:

EVIDENCE LEVEL RESPONSE INTENSITY WHAT TO SAY/DO WHAT NOT TO DO

One miss after twelve stable weeks.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Fourth identical miss of a consequential action.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Repeated non-completion after three reasonable interventions.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Client rejects Accountabili-Buddy's interpretation but behavioral evidence is clear.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Client requests punishment after repeated misses.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Client independently completes for six months.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Accountabili-Buddy is angry after repeated client non-completion.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

Client repeatedly says goal is no longer meaningful and takes virtually no action toward it.

Evidence Level:

Response Intensity:

Say/Do:

Do Not:

DRILL SET 48 — FINAL INTEGRATED ESCALATION CASE

Client Goal:

Launch a professional service.

Initial commitment:

Contact three prospects weekly.

Weeks 1-2:

1, 1.

Client:

"I got busy."

What response intensity is appropriate?

What needs clarification before stronger escalation?

Write the response.

Weeks 3–4:

1, 0.

Additional evidence:

Adequate time existed.

Client repeatedly completed lower-priority administrative work instead.

How has the evidence changed?

How should response intensity change?

Write the response.

Accountabili-Buddy and client decide:

First prospect contact Monday morning.

Temporary Wednesday checkpoint.

Week 5:

3 of 3.

What does this result support?

What does it NOT establish yet?

Should the higher-intensity structure immediately become permanent?

YES / NO

Why?

Weeks 6–8:

3, 3, 3.

Wednesday checkpoint is no longer necessary for completion.

What should happen to intensity?

Write the response.

Three months later:

Prospecting is completed independently.

Client:

"This is just part of my routine now."

What Stage 4 decision is now relevant?

Write the response.

What would be a mistake at this point?

STAGE 4 ESCALATION & DIRECTNESS COMPETENCY CHECK

Can I match accountability intensity to the strength of evidence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize an under-response?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize an over-response?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify when ordinary recommitment is still reasonable?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when repeated recommitment is no longer enough?

YES / NOT YET

Can I increase directness without becoming judgmental?

YES / NOT YET

Can I describe discrepancies behaviorally?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish directness from aggression?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use pattern-level evidence without turning it into a character judgment?

YES / NOT YET

Can I increase accountability structure without taking control?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify when a checkpoint or shorter review interval serves a specific purpose?

YES / NOT YET

Can I treat increased intensity as an experiment rather than automatically making it permanent?

YES / NOT YET

Can I respond to defensiveness without abandoning accurate accountability?

YES / NOT YET

Can I continue from shared behavioral facts when the client rejects my interpretation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when verbal agreement is not producing behavioral change?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when multiple unsuccessful interventions require reassessment?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid endlessly adding accountability mechanisms?

YES / NOT YET

Can I respond appropriately when a client asks for more pressure?

YES / NOT YET

Can I refuse punitive or shaming accountability while still providing stronger structure?

YES / NOT YET

Can I preserve client ownership when the client chooses against my recommendation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when my own frustration is influencing my response?

YES / NOT YET

Can I repair an overly harsh tone without retracting an accurate accountability point?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when the accountability process itself is no longer producing value?

YES / NOT YET

Can I reduce accountability intensity after sustained independence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid freezing the client in an old pattern after the behavior has changed?

STAGE 4 ESCALATION & DIRECTNESS STANDARD

Escalation is not punishment.

Directness is not aggression.

Accountability intensity is not Accountabili-Buddy control.

A professional accountability response should become stronger when the evidence becomes stronger.

One unusual miss may require little more than accurate recording and continuation.

Repeated similar misses may require clarification.

An emerging pattern may require focused intervention.

An established pattern may require direct pattern-level discussion or a change in accountability structure.

Repeated non-completion despite reasonable interventions may require reassessment of the intervention, commitment, goal, or accountability process itself.

But escalation is not one-directional.

When the client develops stable independent behavior, the evidence may support:

fewer scheduled check-ins;

fewer checkpoints;

a step-down from three to two to one scheduled check-in per week when supported;

and greater independent responsibility.

The Accountabili-Buddy should therefore continually ask:

What level of accountability is justified now?

Not:

How can I push harder?

Not:

How can I prevent the client from ever missing?

Not:

How can I make the client do this?

The client retains ownership.

The Accountabili-Buddy retains responsibility for:

accurate observation;

evidence-based challenge;

appropriate directness;

useful structure;

clear professional boundaries;

and honest recommendations.

When a client disagrees, the Accountabili-Buddy does not need to win the argument.

When a client becomes uncomfortable, the Accountabili-Buddy does not automatically retreat.

When the Accountabili-Buddy becomes frustrated, the Accountabili-Buddy does not automatically escalate.

When the evidence changes, the accountability response should change with it.

The governing standard is:

Increase accountability when the evidence justifies more. Reduce it when the evidence justifies less. Be direct about what is happening without judging who the client is. Challenge the discrepancy without taking ownership of the decision.

END OF STAGE 4 — ESCALATION & DIRECTNESS DRILLS