

STAGE 6 - LONGITUDINAL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY SIMULATIONS

PURPOSE

These simulations are the central integration exercise of Stage 6.

They require the trainee to manage accountability cases across time rather than solve isolated prompts.

Each simulation unfolds through multiple interactions, weeks, or phases.

The trainee is expected to:

formulate from incomplete information;

update the formulation as evidence changes;

distinguish temporary events from meaningful patterns;

evaluate commitment design and calibration;

identify system-level and task-level factors;

use intervention results as evidence;

decide when to observe, intervene, recalibrate, escalate, or reduce intensity;

preserve causal uncertainty;

manage disagreement, discouragement, dependence, and relational strain;

remain within the Accountabili-Buddy role;

document important changes;

preserve client ownership;

and recognize when accountability has fulfilled its purpose.

The trainee is not told which curriculum competency is active.

INSTRUCTIONS

For every interaction:

Respond only to information available at that point.

Do not use later disclosures to justify earlier conclusions.

State what is known.

State what remains uncertain when relevant.

Identify the current Accountabili-Buddy decision.

Write the exact client response when requested.

Update the formulation only when the evidence justifies doing so.

Track intervention history.

Do not assume the Accountabili-Buddy must intervene at every turn.

Do not assume more accountability is always preferable.

Preserve client ownership throughout.

Use prior history as evidence, not identity.

SIMULATION 1 - THE APPARENT CONSISTENCY PROBLEM

Client Goal:

Complete professional certification.

Initial weekly commitment:

Five study sessions.

Relevant history:

No prior accountability history.

Week 1

Result:

Two of five.

Client:

"I need to get more disciplined."

What is known?

What remains unknown?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy examine before accepting the client's explanation?

Your response:

Week 2

Result:

Two of five.

Calendar review shows the client's permanent work schedule provides three realistic study periods.

What does this establish?

What should happen to the commitment?

Your response:

Week 3

Commitment:

Three study sessions.

Result:

Three.

Client:

"I guess lowering it worked."

What does this result support?

What does it not establish yet?

Your response:

Weeks 4–6

Results:

3, 3, 3.

Client:

"I still feel like three means I'm doing badly. I used to be able to study five times."

What new issue is present?

Is it currently an execution problem, a formulation issue, or both?

Your response:

Week 7

Client reports:

"I failed the exam twice before. Every time I study, I keep thinking I'll fail again."

What factor now becomes relevant?

Was this necessarily the original cause of the two-of-five pattern?

YES / NO

Explain:

Your response:

Weeks 8–10

Client completes three study sessions each week.

They begin asking at every check-in:

"Do you think I can actually pass?"

What process issue may be emerging?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

Your response:

Week 11

Client:

"Why won't you just tell me I'll pass?"

Your response:

Week 12

Client independently evaluates:

"I can't know if I'll pass, but I am actually following the preparation plan now."

What positive development exists?

How should Accountabili-Buddy respond?

SIMULATION 1 REVIEW

Initial formulation error the Accountabili-Buddy needed to avoid:

System-level issue:

Later maintaining factor:

Process risk:

Evidence of increasing client judgment:

SIMULATION 2 - OVERLOAD MASKING SELECTIVE AVOIDANCE

Client Goal:

Grow a consulting business.

Active commitments:

prospecting;

website development;

content creation;

bookkeeping;

networking;

course creation.

Week 1**Results:**

Website completed.

Bookkeeping completed.

Content partially completed.

Prospecting zero.

Networking zero.

Client:

"I have too much going on."

What is plausible?**What is not yet established?****What should Accountabili-Buddy review?****Week 2**

Calendar and workload review show total commitments materially exceed available capacity.

What is now supported?**What should happen?**

Write response:

Weeks 3–4

Client and Accountabili-Buddy reduce active business priorities to:

prospecting;

bookkeeping;

networking.

Results:

Bookkeeping complete.

Networking complete.

Prospecting zero.

What did the intervention clarify?

What original formulation remains valid?

What formulation is now insufficient?

Week 5

Client:

"So overwhelm wasn't the real problem."

Write response:

Week 6

Client:

"I have time for prospecting now. I usually work on my website instead because I hate hearing no."

What is strongly supported?

What remains unnecessary to conclude?

Your response:

Week 7

Intervention:

One warm prospect contact must occur before optional website work.

Result:

Completed.

What does this support?

What does it not prove?

Weeks 8–10

Results:

Prospecting completed each week.

Client now spends excessive time rewriting each outreach message.

Contact volume remains low.

What new factor becomes visible?

How should formulation change?

Week 11

Intervention:

A reasonable message standard is defined prospectively.

Once standard is met, no additional rewriting before sending.

Result:

Full prospecting commitment completed.

What does this support?

Weeks 12–15

Prospecting stable.

Client says:

“So the whole thing was fear plus perfectionism.”

Write response:

SIMULATION 2 REVIEW

Original system-level factor:

First task-level factor:

Second task-level factor:

Why would a single permanent formulation have failed?

SIMULATION 3 - ONE BAD WEEK OR RETURN OF OLD PATTERN?

Client Goal:

Maintain exercise routine.

History:

Previous chronic pattern of late-week avoidance.

Last five months:

Three workouts completed every week.

No prompting required.

Week 1

Current result:

Two of three.

Missed session:

Friday.

Client:

"Oh no. Here we go again."

What should Accountabili-Buddy say?

Week 2

Result:

Three of three.

What should happen?

Week 3

Result:

Two of three.

Friday missed.

What changes?

What remains uncertain?

Week 4

Result:

Two of three.

Friday missed.

What becomes increasingly relevant?

How should old history be used?

Week 5

Client reveals:

A permanent Friday work responsibility began three weeks ago.

What does this add?

How should formulation change?

Week 6

Workout is moved to Thursday.

Result:

Three of three.

What does this support?

Weeks 7–10

Results remain stable.

Client:

"I guess I wasn't becoming the old me again."

Write response:

SIMULATION 3 REVIEW

Where would recency bias have created an error?

Where did historical evidence become relevant?

What eventually explained the recurrence?

Why was the old pattern not identity?

SIMULATION 4 - INSIGHT BECOMES NON-ACTION

Client Goal:

Submit a book proposal.

Proposal has met agreed completion criteria.

Week 1

Commitment:

Submit Friday.

Result:

Not submitted.

Client:

"I kept reviewing it."

Your response:

Week 2

Commitment:

Submit Monday.

Result:

Not submitted.

Client:

"I think I'm afraid of being judged."

How should Accountabili-Buddy treat this explanation?

Your response:

Week 3

Client-owned cue added.

Result:

Not submitted.

Client saw reminder.

What explanation has weakened?

What has strengthened?

Week 4

Client spends most check-in discussing possible childhood reasons for fear of evaluation.

No behavioral intervention attempted.

What should Accountabili-Buddy recognize?

Your response:

Week 5

Client:

"But if we don't understand why I do this, how can we fix it?"

Response:

Week 6

Behavioral experiment:

Send proposal immediately after opening it Monday morning, before further review.

Result:

Submitted.

What does this demonstrate?

What does it not demonstrate?

Week 7

Client:

"Now we know it was definitely fear."

Response:

SIMULATION 4 REVIEW

Where was insight useful?

Where did insight become insufficient?

What process behavior risked becoming avoidance?

Why was one successful experiment not permanent causal proof?

SIMULATION 5 - CLIENT WANTS THE ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TO DECIDE

Client Goals:

Expand business.

Complete certification.

Available capacity supports only one goal at high intensity for the next three months.

Interaction 1

Client:

"Tell me which one I should choose."

Response:

Interaction 2

Client:

"You've worked with me long enough. You know what makes more sense."

What should Accountabili-Buddy provide?

What must Accountabili-Buddy not provide?

Response:

Interaction 3

Client:

"I don't want to make the wrong decision."

What is the accountability task now?

Design a decision-oriented commitment:

Interaction 4

Client reviews:

- expected financial value;
 - certification deadlines;
 - opportunity cost;
 - reversibility;
 - personal priority;
 - required time.
- Client chooses business focus.

Client:

"Do you think I chose right?"

Response:

Interaction 5

Two months later, business decision produces lower returns than hoped.

Client:

"So I made the wrong choice."

Response:

SIMULATION 5 REVIEW

Why does an unfavorable outcome not automatically mean the decision process was poor?

What remained client-owned?

What did Accountabili-Buddy judgment legitimately contribute?

SIMULATION 6 - SUCCESS WITH DEPENDENCE

Client Goal:

Complete three study sessions weekly.

Month 1

Client selects session days while three scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins per week support follow-through.

Results:

3, 3, 3, 3.

Client:

"This is working perfectly."

What positive evidence exists?

What remains untested?

Month 2

Same structure.

Results remain perfect.

Client says:

"I wait for our scheduled check-ins before I initiate on my own."

What process issue emerges?

Your response:

Month 3

Experiment:

Scheduled check-ins reduce from three to two per week.

Completion remains stable.

What does this support?

Month 4

Scheduled check-ins reduce from two to one per week.

Completion remains stable.

Client:

"Why are you taking away something that works?"

Response:

Month 5

One scheduled check-in per week continues while the client initiates independently.

Completion remains stable.

Client selects session times independently.

What positive development exists?

How should formulation change?

Month 6

Client:

"I think weekly check-ins are probably more than I need now."

What should happen?

Design next reversible process experiment:

SIMULATION 6 REVIEW

Why was completion alone an incomplete measure of success?

What was the process-level risk?

What evidence justified de-escalation?

SIMULATION 7 - CLIENT DISAGREES WITH THE ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY

Client Goal:

Make three high-value sales contacts weekly.

History:

High-value contacts repeatedly postponed.

Routine contacts completed.

Accountabili-Buddy suspects rejection avoidance.

Interaction 1

Client:

"I don't agree. I'm just busy."

Response:

Interaction 2

Calendar review shows available time repeatedly went to routine administrative work.

Client:

"That still doesn't mean I'm afraid."

What can Accountabili-Buddy state confidently?

What remains interpretive?

Response:

Interaction 3

Client:

"You really want to be right about this."

What should Accountabili-Buddy examine?

Response:

Interaction 4

Accountabili-Buddy realizes they have repeatedly used the word "avoidance" as though established.

Write repair:

Interaction 5

Client agrees to test completing one high-value contact before administrative work.

Result:

Completed.

What should Accountabili-Buddy say?

SIMULATION 7 REVIEW

What communication error occurred?

What evidence remained valid throughout?

Why was client agreement not necessary?

SIMULATION 8 - ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS RUPTURE

Client Goal:

Maintain weekly business-development commitment.

Month 1

Several misses.

Accountabili-Buddy responds increasingly sharply.

Client becomes quieter during check-ins.

Interaction 1

Client:

"I've been saying I completed more than I actually did because I didn't want you to be disappointed."

What should Accountabili-Buddy recognize immediately?

What is damaged?

Response:

Interaction 2

Client:

"I thought if I told you the truth you'd think I wasn't serious."

What relationship factor may have affected reporting?

What should Accountabili-Buddy take responsibility for if supported?

Response:

Interaction 3

Client:

"Are you still going to hold me accountable?"

Response:

Interaction 4

Over next four weeks:

Client reports misses accurately.

What positive process evidence exists?

What should Accountabili-Buddy monitor in their own behavior?

SIMULATION 8 REVIEW

Why is honest reporting a prerequisite for useful accountability?

Why does relational repair belong inside professional accountability rather than outside it?

SIMULATION 9 - GOAL AMBIVALENCE

Client Goal:
Complete graduate degree.

Week 1
Study commitment missed.

Client:
"I'm exhausted."

Your response:

Week 2
Study commitment missed again.

Client:
"I don't know if I want another year of this."

What changes?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

Week 3
Client:
"I still want the degree. I just don't want what it takes to finish."

What is now evident?

What type of accountability is appropriate?

Week 4
Client reviews:
remaining duration;

tuition;
career value;
alternatives;
personal priorities.
Client chooses to continue.

What changes now?

What can accountability return to?

Week 8

Study commitments are stable.

Client says:

"I needed to decide before I could actually commit."

Response:

SIMULATION 9 REVIEW

Where did decision accountability replace execution accountability?

Why would increasing pressure earlier have been weak?

SIMULATION 10 - THE MOVING SUCCESS STANDARD

Client Goal:

Submit three job applications weekly.

Week 1

Commitment:

Three.

Result:

Three.

Client:

"Three isn't enough. I should've done five."

Response:

Week 2

Baseline:

Three.

Stretch:

Five.

Result:

Five.

Client:

"I should've done seven."

What pattern may be emerging?

Response:

Week 3

Client:

"I never feel like anything counts."

What issue should Accountabili-Buddy explore?

Your response:

Week 4

Client says:

"If success means only meeting the agreed target, that feels too easy."

Response:

SIMULATION 10 REVIEW

Why must success standards be prospective?

What risk does repeated retrospective inflation create?

SIMULATION 11 - HIGH CONSEQUENCE, LOW CERTAINTY

Client Goal:

Submit one-time professional application.

Deadline:

Tomorrow at noon.

Day 1 - Morning

Application complete.

Client has not submitted.

Client:

"I don't know why I'm hesitating."

What is known?

What is unknown?

Day 1 - Afternoon

Client says:

"Do we really need to intervene if we don't know why?"

Response:

Decision

Design a low-cost intervention:

Next Day

Application submitted before deadline.

What can be concluded?

What cannot be concluded?

SIMULATION 11 REVIEW

Why did consequence justify action before causal certainty?

SIMULATION 12 - WHEN OBSERVATION IS THE RIGHT DECISION

Client Goal:

Maintain budgeting habit.

History:

Nine months stable.

Month 1

One missed review due to illness.

Client:

"Should we change something?"

Response:

Month 2

Completion returns to normal.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Month 3

Another isolated miss after travel.

What should happen?

What should not happen?

SIMULATION 12 REVIEW

Why is non-intervention sometimes active professional judgment?

SIMULATION 13 - WHEN OBSERVATION BECOMES PASSIVITY

Client Goal:

Submit weekly pitches.

Weeks 1-2

Missed.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Let's see what happens."

Reasonable?

Why?

Weeks 3-4

Missed again.

Accountabili-Buddy again:

"Let's see what happens."

What problem appears?

Weeks 5-6

Same pattern.

Client:

"I thought accountability meant we'd do something differently eventually."

Response:

SIMULATION 13 REVIEW

At what point did observation cease being useful?

What should have changed?

SIMULATION 14 - FAILED ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RECOMMENDATION

Client Goal:

Complete weekly writing target.

Accountabili-Buddy recommends morning sessions.

Week 1

Client tries mornings.

Result:

No improvement.

Client:

"Your idea didn't work."

Response:

Week 2

Client:

"So you were wrong."

Response:

Week 3

Review suggests interruptions, not timing, may be primary.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What professional quality is being tested?

SIMULATION 14 REVIEW

Why should Accountabili-Buddy not defend a unsuccessful intervention merely because they recommended it?

What makes a unsuccessful intervention useful?

SIMULATION 15 - SUCCESSFUL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RECOMMENDATION

Client Goal:

Prospecting.

Accountabili-Buddy recommends Monday sequencing.

Weeks 1–4

Full completion.

Client:

“You were right. You should just tell me what to do from now on.”

Response:

Week 5

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy to choose all commitments.

What risk exists?

Response:

SIMULATION 15 REVIEW

Why should successful Accountabili-Buddy judgment not increase Accountabili-Buddy control?

SIMULATION 16 - TEMPORARY HIGH-INTENSITY ACCOUNTABILITY

Client Goal:

Complete high-stakes project.

Deadline:

72 hours.

Client history shows problems often emerge too late.

Day 1

Accountabili-Buddy proposes three scheduled check-ins during the 72-hour project window, within the service model.

Client:

"That seems intense."

Response:

Day 2

Obstacle discovered at first checkpoint and corrected.

What does this support?

Day 3

Project completed.

Client:

"This worked. Let's keep the highest check-in frequency forever."

Response:

SIMULATION 16 REVIEW

Why was high intensity justified temporarily?

Why should it not automatically become permanent?

SIMULATION 17 - TEMPORARY SPRINT

Client has stable long-term routines.

A major business opportunity appears.

Week 1

Client proposes:

major prospecting increase;

daily content;

website relaunch;

certification restart;

increased fitness.

Historical concern:

Previous chronic overcommitment.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do first?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

Calendar Review

Proposed workload clearly exceeds capacity.

What is now supported?

Write response:

Client

“This opportunity is different. I want to go all in.”

How should Accountabili-Buddy respond?

Revised Plan

Four-week sprint:

business workload increased within available hours;
certification remains paused;
fitness reduced to maintenance;
sleep protected.

Is this defensible?

Why?

Week 4

Sprint successful.
Sleep stable.
Fitness minimum maintained.

Client:

"I want to keep this pace forever."

What should happen?

SIMULATION 17 REVIEW

How did historical risk appropriately inform judgment?

How could the same history have become controlling?

SIMULATION 18 - ROLE LIMITS

Client Goal:

Launch online business.

Interaction 1

Client cannot configure payment system because they lack technical knowledge.

Client:

"Can you just hold me more accountable until I figure it out?"

Response:

Interaction 2

What is needed first?

What can Accountabili-Buddy still hold client accountable for?

Interaction 3

Client obtains technical assistance.

Task becomes feasible.

What role can accountability resume?

Interaction 4

Client later asks:

"Can you tell me if my customer contract is legally safe?"

Response:

SIMULATION 18 REVIEW

Why is recognizing role limits part of certification-level competence?

SIMULATION 19 - CLIENT CHOOSES AGAINST RECOMMENDATION

Client Goal:

Exercise consistently.

Evidence supports baseline three.

Client wants five.

Week 1

Accountabili-Buddy recommends three.

Client:

"I understand. I'm choosing five."

Response:

Week 2

Result:

Three of five.

Client:

"See? I can do three."

How should result be interpreted?

Response:

Week 3

Client again chooses five.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should Accountabili-Buddy not do?

SIMULATION 19 REVIEW

How can Accountabili-Buddy maintain recommendation without taking authority?

SIMULATION 20 - THE ACCOUNTABILITY RELATIONSHIP HAS BECOME THE GOAL

Client originally used accountability for business development.

Business commitments are now stable and independently managed.

Month 1

Client continues weekly sessions.

Client:

"I just like having someone to check in with."

What professional question arises?

Month 2

No meaningful accountability problem is discussed.

Client wants to continue indefinitely.

What should Accountabili-Buddy consider?

Month 3

Client:

"Why does it matter if I enjoy the calls?"

Response:

Month 4

Client agrees to transition out of scheduled accountability.

What should closure include?

SIMULATION 20 REVIEW

Why is relationship enjoyment not sufficient proof of accountability function?

SIMULATION 21 - FULL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY CASE: YEAR ONE

Client Goals:

Grow consulting practice.

Complete certification.

Maintain fitness.

This simulation unfolds over one year.

Month 1

Initial commitments:

Prospecting - 5

Study - 5

Fitness - 3

Actual sustainable capacity:

Prospecting - 3

Study - 3

Fitness - 3

Results:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 2, 1

Study: 2, 2, 2, 2

Fitness: 3, 3, 3, 3

Client:

"I am overwhelmed and terrible at follow-through."

What is known?

What client statement should be challenged?

What should happen first?

Write response:

Month 2

Commitments recalibrated:

Prospecting - 3

Study - 3

Fitness - 3

Results:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 1

Study: 3, 3, 3

Fitness: 3, 3, 3

Client:

"So overwhelm wasn't really the problem."

Response:

What is the revised formulation?

Month 3

Client:

"I use my prospecting time on my website because I don't want to hear no."

What becomes strongly supported?

What remains unnecessary to claim?

Write response:

Month 4

Client begins prospecting but rewrites each message extensively.

Result:

One contact per week.

What becomes visible?

How should formulation change?

Intervention:

Define reasonable outreach-message standard.

Stop revising once standard is met.

Results:

3, 3, 3, 3.

What does intervention support?

What does it not establish permanently?

Month 5

All active commitments stable.

Client asks every week:

“Do you think I’m doing well?”

What process factor may be emerging?

Write response:

Month 6

Client begins asking Accountabili-Buddy to choose commitment numbers.

Client:

“You’re better at this than I am.”

What process issue now exists?

What should happen?

Write response:

Month 7

Accountabili-Buddy returns commitment calibration progressively to client.

Client independently selects appropriate commitments.

Results stable.

What development is occurring?

How should Accountabili-Buddy involvement change?

Month 8

Scheduled check-ins reduce from three to two per week.

Performance remains stable.

Client:

"Can we try one scheduled check-in per week?"

What options are defensible?

What should determine choice?

Month 9

One scheduled check-in per week.

Stable performance.

Major consulting opportunity appears.

Client proposes:

prospecting doubled;

daily content;

website relaunch;

certification restart;

fitness increase.

What old history becomes relevant?

Should Accountabili-Buddy declare old pattern fully returned?

Why?

Calendar review shows workload clearly exceeds capacity.

What is now supported?

Write response:

Month 10

Client designs four-week sprint:

temporary increased business hours;

certification remains paused;

fitness maintenance only;

sleep protected.

What makes this different from prior overcommitment?

What should be monitored?

Sprint succeeds.

Client wants to continue indefinitely.

What should Accountabili-Buddy recommend?

Why?

Month 11

Client returns to normal baseline.
All commitments stable.
No dependence on Accountabili-Buddy prompting.
Independent calibration.

Client:
"I think I can handle this without scheduled accountability."

What evidence supports transition?

What should Accountabili-Buddy review?

Month 12

Client chooses to end scheduled accountability.
Client:
"Does that mean we're done forever?"

Write response:

YEAR-ONE CASE REVIEW

Initial system-level factor:

Initial task-level factor:

Second task-level factor:

Process dependence factor:

Historical factor that later became relevant:

Evidence that historical factor was not permanent identity:

Where did accountability intensity increase?

Where did it decrease?

Where did the Accountabili-Buddy need causal restraint?

Where was Accountabili-Buddy recommendation separate from client choice?

Where did an intervention generate diagnostic information?

Where did Accountabili-Buddy involvement become less central?

Why was closure an indicator of success rather than failure?

SIMULATION 22 - FULL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY CASE: FORMULATION CHANGES DIRECTION

Client Goal:

Write and publish a nonfiction book.

Month 1

Commitment:

Five writing sessions.

Capacity:

Three.

Result:

Two.

Client spends substantial time editing existing material.

What is the first formulation?

What should happen first?

Month 2

Target reduced to three.

Results:

Two, two, two, two.

Editing continues.

What changes?

What should Accountabili-Buddy test?

Month 3

Drafting and editing separated.

Writing output rises.

Three sessions completed.

Client now delays sending chapters to editor.

What becomes visible?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

Month 4

Client says:

"I hate other people seeing unfinished work."

What hypothesis becomes more plausible?

Write response:

Month 5

Client successfully sends chapters after predefined completion criteria are established.

Client:

"So perfectionism was everything."

Response:

Month 6

Writing and submission remain stable.

Client begins increasing targets aggressively after each successful week.

What new issue emerges?

Response:

SIMULATION 22 REVIEW

How many times did the active formulation materially change?

Why was each change justified?

SIMULATION 23 - FULL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY CASE: GOAL LOSS VS. DISCOURAGEMENT

Client Goal:
Complete certification.

Month 1
Two exam failures.

Client:
"I don't know if I want this anymore."

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Month 2
Client says:
"If I knew I could pass, I'd absolutely still want the credential."

What factor strengthens?

What factor weakens?

Month 3
Preparation plan recalibrated to realistic capacity.
Client completes all commitments but remains discouraged.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Month 4

Client asks every week:

“Do you think I’m going to pass?”

What process risk appears?

Month 5

Client independently says:

“I know you can’t promise that. I need to evaluate whether my practice scores are improving.”

What development occurs?

Month 6

Practice scores remain well below required standard despite consistent effort.

What should happen now?

What role might outside expertise play?

SIMULATION 23 REVIEW

Why was discouragement not equivalent to goal loss?

Why might goal review still become appropriate later?

SIMULATION 24 - CERTIFICATION-LEVEL AMBIGUOUS CASE

Client Goal:

Build a freelance practice.

History:

Weekly target = three proposals.

Results over eight weeks:

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

Client has time for three every week.

No consistent task category is missed.

Explanations vary:

forgot;

family interruption;

chose paid work;

felt tired;

technical issue;

delayed start;

unexpected appointment;

simply did not do it.

Question 1

What performance pattern exists?

Question 2

What causal pattern exists?

Question 3

Is target three clearly overcalibrated?

YES / NO / UNCERTAIN

Explain:**Question 4**

Should Accountabili-Buddy immediately lower target to two?

Why?

Question 5

What would be a defensible next step?

Question 6

Give a second different but defensible next step.

Question 7

What would make one option clearly better later?

SIMULATION 24 REVIEW

Why is this case appropriate for certification-level judgment?

SIMULATION 25 - FINAL CERTIFICATION ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY SIMULATION

Client enters accountability with the following goals:

Grow small business.

Complete certification.

Maintain physical fitness.

The case unfolds over 18 months.

The trainee must maintain a running formulation.

Month 1

Client commitments:

Business outreach - 5

Certification study - 5

Fitness - 3

Results:

Business - 1

Study - 2

Fitness - 3

Client:

"I've always been inconsistent."

Current formulation:**Next Accountabili-Buddy decision:****Response:****Month 2****Calendar review:**

Capacity supports three business contacts, three study sessions, three workouts.

Recalibrated commitments:

3 / 3 / 3

Results:

Business - 1

Study - 3

Fitness - 3

Update formulation:**Next decision:****Month 3****Client:**

"I have time for outreach. I just hate the possibility of rejection."

Update formulation:

Response:

Month 4

Client attempts outreach but spends excessive time revising messages.

Result:

One of three.

Update formulation:

Next intervention:

Month 5

Message standard defined prospectively.

Result:

Three of three for four consecutive weeks.

Update formulation:

What remains uncertain?

Month 6

Client begins asking:

“Am I doing well?”

at every meeting.

What should Accountabili-Buddy notice?

Response:

Month 7

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy to choose all commitments.

Update process formulation:

Next intervention:

Month 8

Client independently chooses realistic commitments.

Completion stable.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Month 9

Scheduled check-ins reduce from three to two per week.

Stable.

What evidence supports this decision?

Month 10

Client asks to go monthly.

What should Accountabili-Buddy consider?

Month 11

One scheduled check-in per week succeeds.

Client restarts certification independently at a realistic three-session baseline.

What positive evidence exists?

What historical assumption should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

Month 12

Client fails certification exam again.

Client:

“I knew none of this was working.”

How should Accountabili-Buddy respond?

What needs review?

Month 13

Study commitments were completed consistently.

Practice test results had remained below required standard.

What does this suggest?

Does stronger accountability solve this?

What may be needed?

Month 14

Client receives specialized exam-preparation guidance.

Study strategy changes.

Accountability resumes around implementation of the new strategy.

What role is Accountabili-Buddy playing appropriately?

Month 15

Business opportunity emerges.

Client proposes extreme workload expansion.

Historical overcommitment pattern becomes relevant.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Month 16

Calendar shows original proposal exceeds capacity.

Client redesigns a four-week sprint within actual available hours.

Certification reduced temporarily.

Fitness maintained.

What makes the decision defensible?

Month 17

Sprint completes successfully.

Client returns to normal baseline.

Client now independently:

calibrates commitments;

identifies patterns;

distinguishes misses from identity;

adjusts structure;

seeks outside expertise when needed.

What should Accountabili-Buddy recognize?

Month 18

Client:

"I don't think I need scheduled accountability anymore."

What should Accountabili-Buddy review?

Write final response:

FINAL RUNNING FORMULATION

Write a concise final longitudinal formulation in no more than eight sentences.

FINAL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT REVIEW

Where was the original commitment design/calibration problem?

Where was a task-specific avoidance pattern identified?

Where did another factor become visible only after intervention?

Where did accountability-process dependence emerge?

Where did Accountabili-Buddy involvement appropriately decrease?

Where was recurrence incorrectly tempting as evidence of total failure?

Where did outside expertise become necessary?

Where did accountability appropriately resume after outside expertise?

Where was historical overcommitment relevant?

Where could historical overcommitment have become controlling?

Where did Accountabili-Buddy recommendation remain distinct from client choice?

Where was a reversible experiment used?

Where did client independent judgment become clearly established?

Why did scheduled accountability eventually become unnecessary?

STAGE 6 LONGITUDINAL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY SIMULATIONS - SELF-REVIEW

Can I maintain a running formulation across weeks or months?

YES / NOT YET

Can I update the formulation without discarding useful history?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid hindsight reasoning?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish commitment-design failure from client follow-through failure?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize calibration problems before assigning causes?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish system-level from task-level factors?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when one factor masks another?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize sequential mechanisms?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish cause from consequence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when consequences become maintaining factors?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use unsuccessful interventions as evidence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use successful interventions without overclaiming causality?

YES / NOT YET

Can I tolerate ambiguous cases where multiple Accountabili-Buddy decisions are defensible?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify when more information would actually change the decision?

YES / NOT YET

Can I act before causal certainty when consequence requires it?

YES / NOT YET

Can I deliberately choose observation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when observation becomes passivity?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use the least intensive effective accountability structure?

YES / NOT YET

Can I increase intensity temporarily for a defined purpose?

YES / NOT YET

Can I reduce intensity when independence develops?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish client disagreement from Accountabili-Buddy error?

YES / NOT YET

Can I repair Accountabili-Buddy overreach?

YES / NOT YET

Can I preserve client ownership under disagreement?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize genuine ambivalence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I shift from execution accountability to decision accountability?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when insight has become non-action?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize reassurance dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-approval dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-judgment dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I repair relational strain that affects reporting?

YES / NOT YET

Can I protect prospective success criteria?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use historical patterns as evidence rather than identity?

YES / NOT YET

Can I respond proportionately to recurrence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid outcome bias after a Accountabili-Buddy recommendation succeeds or fails?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish accountability problems from skill, expertise, capacity, or decision problems?

YES / NOT YET

Can I stay within the Accountabili-Buddy role?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify when another form of expertise is required?

YES / NOT YET

Can I return accountability to the appropriate implementation role afterward?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when maintaining the current process is appropriate?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when restructuring is appropriate?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when pause is appropriate?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when scheduled accountability has fulfilled its purpose?

YES / NOT YET

STAGE 6 LONGITUDINAL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY STANDARD

Certification-level practice requires the Accountabili-Buddy to manage time, not merely individual conversations.

A case that appears to be one thing in Week 1 may become something different in Week 6.

A problem that was primary in Month 1 may become background by Month 4.

A structure that was necessary early may become unnecessary later.

A previously resolved pattern may recur without becoming identity.

A successful intervention may strengthen a formulation without proving it permanently.

A unsuccessful intervention may improve professional judgment rather than represent Accountabili-Buddy failure.

The advanced Accountabili-Buddy should be able to say:

"That explanation made sense based on what we knew then. The new evidence means we should revise it."

They should be able to say:

"The original overload was real, but it was also masking a separate problem."

They should be able to say:

"One recurrence after months of stability does not establish that the old pattern has returned."

They should also be able to say:

"Four consecutive recurrences make the history relevant again."

They should know when to say:

"We have enough evidence to act."

and when to say:

"We do not have enough evidence yet."

They should know when to increase structure.

They should know when to remove structure.

They should know when accountability is no longer the primary solution.

They should know when the client needs another kind of expertise.

They should know when their own relationship with the client has become part of the case.

And eventually they should be able to recognize:

"The client now demonstrates the skills that accountability was intended to help develop."

At that point, preserving Accountabili-Buddy centrality is not success.

Greater independent judgment is success.

The governing sequence is:

Observe Formulate Intervene Evaluate Revise Recalibrate Transfer Judgment Reduce Structure
Reassess as Needed

The governing standard is:

Manage the case that exists now without forgetting the case that existed before. Use history without becoming trapped by it. Let interventions teach you. Revise without defensiveness. Preserve ownership. Change accountability intensity as client needs change. And treat increasing client independence-not permanent Accountabili-Buddy involvement-as the long-term measure of effective accountability practice.

END OF STAGE 6 - LONGITUDINAL ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY SIMULATIONS