

SYNTHETIC SAMPLE / NOT A PURCHASED CUSTOMER REPORT

Complete Dating Decision Dossier

Dating regularly / Focus: Intentions

5 of 6 observations answered

Read the interpretation first, then write into the exercises using specific examples from your own life. The example situations illustrate a method; they are not claims about you or the other person.

Your reading guide

- 01 Your decision reading
- 02 Evidence coverage
- 03 Consistency timeline
- 04 Intentions and actions
- 05 Boundaries and response
- 06 The cross-pattern tension
- 07 Intentions deep dive
- 08 Conversation plan
- 09 Your 14-day observation protocol
- 10 Three decision scenarios
- 11 Your non-negotiables worksheet
- 12 Revisit the reading

01 / Your decision reading

This report examines the consistency of your dating partner's words and actions, focusing on your stated priority: understanding his intentions. You have answered five of six core observations, providing a solid foundation while leaving a critical gap-whether his actions match his described intentions. Your responses suggest areas of uncertainty: he consistently follows through on plans and maintains steady effort between dates, but you have not yet observed clear alignment between what he says he wants and what he does. However, he has clearly communicated the kind of relationship he wants, and you feel you can express your needs without making yourself smaller, indicating a foundation of respect and open communication. The missing observation on action-intention alignment is pivotal because it leaves his true intentions unverified. The report will guide you through interpreting known answers, designing conversations to fill this gap, and observing his behavior over the next 14 days. It will also help you identify non-negotiable needs and consider three possible decision scenarios based on how the evidence develops. By the end, you will have a clearer picture of whether this relationship aligns with your values and desired pace.

The pattern here is one of verbal clarity without behavioral confirmation. You feel respected and able to voice needs, and he states his desired relationship clearly. Yet the missing observation on whether actions match intentions leaves a crucial gap: you may be reading goodwill as direction, or his consistency could simply reflect his general reliability rather than specific investment in you.

The interaction between his steady effort and clear verbal intentions matters most. Steady contact can feel like progress, but without observing alignment it may be courtesy, not commitment. His consistent follow-through creates an impression of seriousness that his words alone shouldn't carry. Your own agency in expressing needs makes it easier for him to seem aligned, since the dynamic feels comfortable even while intentions stay unverified.

Example: He says he wants a committed relationship and texts daily. If he also initiates conversations about meeting your friends or adjusting his schedule to see you, that's alignment. If his daily texts stay light and he avoids discussing future plans, the pattern suggests convenience. These are hypothetical illustrations, not actual history.

An alternative reading is that he is genuinely intentional but careful, moving at a pace he believes respects you. His respect for your boundaries could signal seriousness, not passivity. Or his clear statement of desire could be aspirational-what he hopes to feel-while his actions reveal uncertainty. The missing data prevents distinguishing deliberate patience from lukewarm interest, and either is plausible.

Action 1: Ask him directly for a specific example of how he has shown his intended relationship style in past relationships, then compare.

Action 2: Over the next two weeks, note one action each week that either demonstrates or contradicts his stated intention for the relationship.

Action 3: Define for yourself three concrete actions that would show his intentions are real, and track whether any occur.

Your exercise: Setup: Write one sentence describing the relationship he says he wants. Steps: List three small, observable actions that would show that intention (e.g., initiating a future plan, introducing you to a friend, adjusting his routine for you). Over seven days, record any action matching your list.

Observations: Note whether actions feel effortful or effortless.

Counterexample: If he does none of these but maintains steady contact, consider that his words may outpace his intent.

Reflect and record: If his behavior never changed from today, would his stated intentions feel true to you?

02 / Evidence coverage

You answered five of six key observations, leaving only the question of whether his actions match his stated intentions. This gap is central to your focus on intentions. The answered items show a man who follows through on plans, maintains steady effort, clearly states his relationship goals, respects your pace, and allows you to voice needs without shrinking. The unanswered item is not a minor omission-it is the bridge between his words and his reliability. Without it, you cannot verify whether his stated intentions are genuine or merely aspirational.

Your responses collectively suggest a pattern of respectful, consistent behavior that lacks a tested link to deeper commitment. He is reliable and communicative, but reliability alone does not prove romantic intent. Your ability to express needs without making yourself smaller is a strong sign of a healthy dynamic, yet it also means you may be tolerating ambiguity because you feel safe. The missing observation is best addressed through direct observation and conversation, not assumption. Consider how his follow-through on small plans interacts with his stated desire for a specific kind of relationship.

Example: Suppose he says he wants a serious relationship but only initiates casual, low-effort dates and avoids discussing the future. His follow-through on those dates is consistent, and his stated intention is clear, but his actions do not match his words. This would be a contradiction between the two answered observations and the unanswered one. In contrast, if he initiates deeper conversations and plans that reflect his stated goals, his actions would align with his intentions, confirming consistency across all dimensions.

An alternative explanation is that he is genuinely interested but cautious, moving slowly to respect your pace. His clear communication and boundary respect support this view. The missing observation does not necessarily signal deception; it may simply be early in the relationship. Your uncertainty is

valid because intentions are often revealed through time and specific actions. Treat his stated goals as a hypothesis to be tested, not a fact to be accepted. The next chapters will guide you in gathering the evidence needed to resolve this ambiguity.

Action 1: List three recent situations where you expected his actions to match his stated intentions, and note whether they did.

Action 2: Plan one low-stakes request that tests whether his effort reflects his relationship goals, such as asking for a planned future activity.

Action 3: Observe if he initiates conversations about the future or deeper topics without prompting, noting the frequency and depth.

Your exercise: Choose one calm moment in the next week to share a specific need, such as asking for more frequent communication or a planned date. Before speaking, write what you expect him to do based on his stated intentions. After he responds, write what he actually did. Compare the two: did his action align, partially align, or contradict his words? If he aligns, note the specific behavior. If not, what might explain the gap? A counterexample would be him agreeing verbally but not following through, which suggests his actions do not yet match his intentions.

Reflect and record: What evidence would you need to see before you feel confident that his actions consistently match the relationship he says he wants?

03 / Consistency timeline

The two consistency answers sit at neutral, which is meaningful because they are the only relationship-health observations you did not rate strongly. You see follow-through and steady effort, but neither has become a felt pattern yet. Neutral here is not failure; it is the absence of a compelling affirmative.

The relatively stronger scores elsewhere indicate that consistency is the place where your intuition is still asking for more evidence.

Because the focus is intentions, neutral consistency interacts with the missing action-intention answer. You can observe reliability in logistics without seeing whether his steady effort is pointed toward the relationship he described. The boundary answers imply you feel safe enough to notice that gap rather than paper over it. That safety is exactly what allows a clean test over the next two weeks.

Example: a person who sends a daily good-morning text and never cancels a date is showing consistency in communication and scheduling. If he also says he wants a serious partnership, those small consistencies might be offered as proof. But if he avoids discussing a future event three months out or deflects when you mention meeting friends, the consistency is real but not aligned with the stated intention. This is the distinction to watch.

Alternative explanation: his steady follow-through may reflect general politeness, an orderly personality, or simple convenience rather than deepening investment. If consistency stays neutral because nothing feels missing but nothing feels chosen, the likely reading is low-risk companionship, not an emerging partnership. The contradiction will appear if you initiate a conversation about the future and his consistency suddenly wavers.

Action 1: Write down two specific times in the past month when he followed through. Then write what the follow-through cost him: time, money, social risk, or emotional exposure.

Action 2: Choose one small need you have not voiced yet and state it before the next date. Observe whether his follow-through extends to this need or only to plans he already made.

Action 3: Ask one future-oriented question, such as whether he has thought about a shared event six weeks out. Watch for a change in his usual follow-through energy.

Your exercise: Setup: record a neutral observation each time he meets one of your needs or keeps a plan. Steps: for each instance, write whether it required effort beyond minimal decency, and whether it touched emotional or practical territory. Observations: compare these records with how he describes his relationship goal. Counterexample: if all instances are convenient and none require alteration of his routine, the consistency is real but not intention-driven.

Reflect and record: What evidence would you need to move each consistency observation from neutral to strongly agree, and have you directly asked for that evidence?

04 / Intentions and actions

He has said what kind of relationship he wants, and you feel he respects your pace and your no. Yet the missing piece is whether his actions match those words. Without that evidence, his stated intention remains a hypothesis, not a fact. Your strong sense of agency suggests you are not shrinking, so the ambiguity is in his follow-through, not your voice.

His consistent planning and steady effort are real, but they may reflect courtesy rather than deep intent. Because you have not observed actions aligning with his described relationship goal, the pattern is incomplete. The respect for your boundaries, paired with this gap, could mean he is careful and deliberate or passively interested. Watch how he prioritizes you when it costs him something.

Example: Suppose he says he wants a serious relationship, yet two weeks pass with only last-minute plans and no discussion of the future. That would suggest his declared intention is not yet active. On the other hand, if he initiates a conversation about meeting friends or adjusts his schedule to see you, that would be evidence of alignment.

An alternative explanation is that he is genuinely unsure of his intentions and is behaving consistently to avoid conflict, not because he is certain. Your comfort in expressing needs may have accelerated his verbal clarity without his emotional certainty. Uncertainty means you should gather more data rather than conclude his intentions are mismatched.

Action 1: Ask him directly, 'What does a serious relationship look like in action for you?' and note whether his answer includes specific behaviors.

Action 2: Over the next week, observe whether his effort appears when it is inconvenient, such as adjusting plans or initiating contact during a busy period.

Action 3: Before your next date, write down one concrete action you would expect if his stated intention were true, then check if it occurs.

Your exercise: Choose one upcoming week. Each day, record one behavior that you believe shows his relationship intention in action. For each behavior, note whether it matches his stated goal, doesn't match, or is ambiguous. At week's end, review the list. If most behaviors are ambiguous or mismatched, his intention may be unformed; if many match, your concern may be resolved by observation.

Reflect and record: What is the smallest, most ordinary action he could take that would make you feel his words and his behavior are finally in sync?

05 / Boundaries and response

Your answers show he respects your pace and accepts your no, and you can voice needs without shrinking. This mutual respect creates a safe space, but the unknown action-intention link means his boundary respect may be courtesy rather than commitment. A pattern of steady effort plus clear verbal intentions could indicate genuine investment, yet without observed alignment, his respect might be a passive way to avoid defining the relationship.

Because you can already speak your needs, the next step is to test how he responds when a boundary directly challenges his stated relationship goals. If he says he wants exclusivity but you ask to slow physical intimacy, does his follow-through remain warm and consistent, or does it waver? This interaction reveals whether his boundary respect is stable or conditional on getting what he wants.

Example: You tell him you're not ready to meet his family this month even though he's said he wants a serious relationship. If he continues initiating regular dates and communicates openly, his boundary respect supports his intention. If he becomes distant or pressures you to reconsider, that suggests his respect was contingent.

An alternative explanation is that his high boundary respect reflects general agreeableness rather than deep feeling for you. He may be a person who avoids conflict across all relationships, so his acceptance of your no doesn't uniquely signal romantic intent. Your uncertainty about action-intention alignment could stem from his low-key style, not hidden misalignment, so avoid overreading one missing answer.

Action 1: Plan a low-stakes boundary this week: decline or adjust one plan he proposes, then note whether his warmth and follow-through stay unchanged.

Action 2: Ask directly how he feels about a specific pace issue, like time between dates or exclusivity, and watch if his response aligns with his stated intentions.

Action 3: Journal one instance where you voiced a need; record his immediate reaction and any shift in his effort over the following three days.

Your exercise: Set up: Choose one current need you haven't fully voiced.

Steps: (1) Write the need in one sentence without softening. (2) Share it with him within two days. (3) Observe his reaction for 48 hours: tone, follow-through, and whether he brings it up again. Observations: Note if he asks clarifying questions, adjusts behavior, or forgets. Counterexample: If he says he wants a future but dismisses the need as 'too much,' that contradicts his intention.

Reflect and record: What specific action from him would make you feel certain that his respect for your boundaries comes from wanting the same relationship you want, not just from being polite?

06 / The cross-pattern tension

A quiet tension runs through your evidence: his consistency and boundary respect are clear, yet the missing action-intention link leaves a hollow center. You can plan around his reliability, but you cannot yet plan a future with it. This gap is not a contradiction but an unanswered question-does his steadiness serve his stated desires, or merely his comfort? The pattern suggests a man who is careful with his word and consistent in deed, but carefulness can mask passivity. Your own clarity of voice makes this tension survivable: you can ask what the consistency is for.

The interaction between his clear communication (q2) and his consistent effort (q0, q1) creates an odd mirror: he says what he wants, then shows up-but never shows the want itself. Meanwhile, your ability to speak needs (q5) and his respect for your no (q4) form a counterweight of safety. This safety may be why the gap has not felt urgent: you are not being harmed, merely unconfirmed. The missing observation (q3) sits exactly at the crossing point of these two lines-if his actions matched his words, the safety and the direction would align; without it, they run parallel.

Example: a man says he wants a committed relationship, texts daily, keeps every date, and never pressures you physically. Six weeks later, he has introduced you to no friends, made no future plans, and avoids any conversation about exclusivity. His consistency is real but pointed at maintenance, not movement. That is the tension you are guarding against-steadiness without trajectory.

An alternative explanation is that his actions do match his intentions, but his intentions are smaller than his words-he wants a regular companion, not a partner. Or he may simply move slower than you, testing reliability before revealing depth. The uncertainty itself is the finding: until q3 is answered, his consistency is a frame without a picture. Watch whether his effort escalates in meaning, not just frequency.

Action 1: Over the next week, note one specific instance where his action either supports or contradicts his stated relationship goal, and write down exactly what happened.

Action 2: Ask him a forward-looking question about the next month-something that would require him to integrate his intention into a concrete plan.

Action 3: Invite him into a situation where his consistency is tested beyond logistics: an emotional disclosure, a change in routine, or a small conflict.

Your exercise: Create a two-column list: 'What he says he wants' and 'What I have actually seen him do toward that.' Fill each column with specific, dated examples from your time together. Then, draw an arrow from each 'says' item to a 'does' item if you can match them. If a 'says' item has no arrow, mark it 'unverified.' Observations: No arrows, several unverified items.

Counterexample: If every 'says' item has at least two arrows and no unverified items remain after a week, the tension may be resolving.

Reflect and record: If his consistency remained exactly as it is now for another three months, would that be enough for you to feel chosen, or merely accommodated?

07 / Intentions deep dive

His stated intentions are clear, yet your data shows a missing bridge between words and actions. Consistency in plans and effort suggests reliability, but not necessarily romantic intent. Boundaries reveal respect, which can coexist with cautious detachment. The key tension: he says what he wants, but you have not seen it enacted.

Consider how his follow-through might serve different goals. Does he keep plans because he values you specifically, or because he dislikes breaking commitments? Steady effort between dates could mean growing attachment or simply social diligence. His respect for your pace might indicate genuine care or a lack of urgency. Context matters-look for moments where his choices cost him something.

Example: If he reschedules a work commitment to see you after a hard week, that might show you are a priority. But if he only fits you into existing free time, his actions may not match his stated desire for a serious relationship. Both patterns are possible with the same verbal claim.

Alternative explanation: he may be holding back because he is unsure how you feel, or he interprets 'matching intentions' differently than you do. His actions could be his way of showing interest, even if they do not look like what you expect. Uncertainty here is not proof of misalignment; it is an invitation to gather more specific evidence.

Action 1: Ask one focused question: 'When you say you want [his stated goal], what does that look like in daily life for you?' Note whether his answer includes concrete behaviors or stays abstract.

Action 2: Over the next week, track one instance where he chooses between you and another priority. Observe if he mentions you as a reason for his choice without prompting.

Action 3: Reflect on your own definition of 'actions matching intentions' and write two examples. Share one with him if the conversation opens naturally.

Your exercise: Setup: Choose a recent date and list three specific actions he took (e.g., arriving on time, remembering a detail, extending the date). Steps: For each action, write whether it demonstrates effort, interest, or respect. Compare each to his stated intentions. Observations: Note which action felt most aligned and which felt ambiguous. Counterexample: If he arrived on time but left promptly at the planned end, that might show respect for plans but not desire for more time together.

Reflect and record: What one recent action did he take that could be interpreted as either deep interest or mere politeness, and which interpretation feels more true to you right now?

08 / Conversation plan

Your answers show he says he wants a certain kind of relationship and respects your pace, yet you do not know if his actions match those words. This gap matters because consistency in small plans does not prove he will follow through on the relationship he described. Approach the next conversation as information-gathering, not a test.

The only answered intention item, q2, gives a clear verbal statement; q4 and q5 show boundaries are respected. Without q3, the string of dates and steady contact could be courtesy or convenience. Ask for a specific recent example of him doing something that shows the relationship he said he wants, not just talking about it.

Example: You could say, "When you said you wanted something serious, what is a recent choice you made because of that?" If he points to general effort or future talk, ask what action backed it. A specific, modest example like changing plans to support you is more telling than a grand promise.

Alternative: he may act on his intentions in ways you have not named, so your read could falsely flag him as inconsistent. Or his actions may lag because he is deciding; then his words are a hope, not a promise. Keep the question neutral and observe whether his answer fits the pattern you have seen.

Action 1: Ask directly: "What is one action you've taken in the past two weeks that shows the kind of relationship you want?"

Action 2: Before asking, define for yourself two concrete behaviors that would demonstrate action-intention alignment, such as initiating a difficult conversation or adjusting plans.

Action 3: Observe whether his response is specific and timely, or vague and deflecting; note the difference for your next report.

Your exercise: Setup: choose a quiet moment and write down what action-intention alignment means to you. Steps: list three real behaviors from the past month that would have shown his intentions matched his words; mark whether each happened. Observations: note which are missing or replaced by substitutes (e.g., texting instead of planning). Counterexample: a consistent partner might not perform your listed behaviors but still align, so check if your list fits his style before judging.

Reflect and record: If he gives a strong verbal answer but you struggle to name a matching action, what does that reveal about the weight you place on words versus behavior?

09 / Your 14-day observation protocol

He follows through on plans and keeps effort steady between dates, but you haven't seen whether his actions match the relationship he says he wants. Over 14 days, watch how he invests beyond logistics: does he initiate meaningful contact, share personal thoughts, or include you in future plans? His consistency so far may reflect politeness rather than deeper intent.

Your strong boundaries-he respects your pace and you can voice needs-create a safe space to observe without pressure. Example: if he says he wants a serious relationship but only texts about logistics, note that gap. Track specific behaviors: initiating quality time, emotional disclosure, or introducing you to his world. These reveal whether his intentions are lived.

Each observation is a clue, not a verdict. If he asks about your week and remembers details, that suggests genuine interest; if he keeps conversation surface-level, consider whether he's avoiding closeness. Watch for discrepancies: warm words but absent follow-through on emotional availability signal misalignment. Record patterns, not isolated moments.

Alternative explanation: he may be cautious or slow to open up, not disinterested. Your protocol should look for direction over time-is disclosure increasing? If he remains consistently reserved despite your openness, that supports hesitation or mismatch. If involvement deepens, earlier distance may have been pacing, not lack of intent.

Action 1: Note daily whether he initiates contact about something beyond plans-e.g., sharing a thought, asking your opinion, or sending a meaningful update.

Action 2: Observe at least two planned dates: does he introduce future-oriented topics, ask about your life goals, or discuss relationship progress unprompted?

Action 3: Track your own comfort: when you share something personal, note if he reciprocates with equivalent vulnerability or deflects.

Your exercise: Create a simple log with two columns: 'His Action' and 'Matches Stated Intention?' Each evening, record one concrete behavior-text, call, plan made, topic discussed. For each, ask: Does this show he wants the kind of relationship he described? Example: if you write 'He sent a meme about weekend trip,' decide yes/no based on his stated desire for shared adventures. After 14 days, review: how many yes, no, unclear?

Counterexample: a week of only check-in texts without depth would contradict serious intention.

Reflect and record: Which of his recent actions would you point to as evidence that his stated relationship goals are real for him, and how does that compare with actions you might be excusing or over-interpreting?

10 / Three decision scenarios

Your known answers sketch two futures. He follows through on plans and effort stays steady, but you haven't seen if his actions match his stated relationship wants. Your openness about needs and his respect for boundaries make a healthy connection possible, yet intention alignment remains untested. The scenarios below are not predictions; they are structured possibilities based on your evidence.

Scenario one: alignment emerges. During your observation protocol, you notice small but specific instances where his behavior directly supports his expressed goal-perhaps initiating a conversation about next steps or adjusting his schedule to deepen time together. This would lift the ambiguity from your answers.

Example: you decline a weekend trip due to work, and he responds by planning an earlier evening date instead of withdrawing. That would signal his intentions include accommodating your pace, not just claiming to. But one gesture isn't enough; look for a pattern over four or five interactions.

Alternatively, his actions may stay generic. He still follows through on plans and texts between dates, but nothing he does seems linked to his stated relationship goal. Then the missing observation becomes the deciding factor: consistency without intentionality may indicate comfort, not commitment. Your boundary strength lets you walk away without shrinking.

Action 1: List three specific behaviors that would show his actions matching his stated intentions, then note each time you see one in the next two weeks.

Action 2: Plan one conversation where you ask for an example of when he felt his actions matched his words in a past relationship; watch for specificity.

Action 3: If after 14 days no clear pattern emerges, initiate a direct check-in about whether his relationship goal still feels right to him, and observe his response.

Your exercise: Divide a page into three columns: Scenario A (alignment), Scenario B (generic consistency), Scenario C (contradiction). Under each, write two observable behaviors from your actual interactions that would support that scenario. Use only events from the next week. After the week, mark which behaviors actually occurred. If you see one from each column, return to your non-negotiables worksheet and note which scenario feels most like the truth. Counterexample: if you predicted alignment but only recall generic efforts, question whether your hopes colored the observation. This exercise forces you to link evidence to possibilities, not preferences.

Reflect and record: Which of the three scenarios do you find yourself hoping for, and how might that hope be shading what you notice or overlook?

11 / Your non-negotiables worksheet

A non-negotiable is a need you will not trade away, even for otherwise strong consistency or respectful boundaries. Your answers show you can voice needs and feel respected, so use that strength to name what must be present for this relationship to continue. Start with concrete, observable 'must have' behaviors-like planning dates at your pace-rather than abstract traits, because actions reveal intention over time.

His consistent follow-through and steady effort are meaningful, but your unanswered observation about action-intention alignment means you cannot yet verify that his stated relationship goals are backed by behavior. Build your worksheet around what alignment looks like in real moments: does he initiate conversations about the future? Does he adjust plans when your schedule changes without resentment? These are your evidence points.

Example: if your non-negotiable is 'emotional availability,' you might list 'he asks how I'm feeling after a hard day and listens without rushing to fix it.' This grounds the need in a repeatable action you can observe. Avoid listing only feelings he gives you-the worksheet is about his consistent behavior, not just your reaction.

An alternative reading is that he is simply moving slower or less certain than you, not hiding intentions. Your non-negotiables should therefore include time-bound checkpoints: if by a set date you have not seen specific action-intention matches, you will ask directly or step back. This protects you from extending patience indefinitely while leaving room for his genuine pace.

Action 1: Write three non-negotiable behaviors you need to see weekly, e.g., 'he initiates a future plan at least once.'

Action 2: Rank each behavior by necessity: what would make you end dating if absent for two weeks?

Action 3: Share the top two with him in a calm moment using 'I need...' phrasing, then note his response.

Your exercise: Set up a simple table with three columns: non-negotiable behavior, last observed date, and evidence. For two weeks, record each time he demonstrates one of your top two non-negotiables. After 14 days, review: did he meet each at least once? If yes, your anxiety may stem from uncertainty, not absence. If no, you have concrete data for a direct conversation about whether he can meet your needs.

Reflect and record: Which of my non-negotiables is most at risk of being softened by his consistent effort between dates?

12 / Revisit the reading

You tend to follow through and stay steady, while your need for clarity on his intentions sits in the gap where words meet action. Revisiting the reading means testing whether the pattern has changed, not just gathering more examples. The strongest signal now is whether his stated goals show up in small, repeated choices-canceling plans for you, introducing you to friends, bringing up the future without prompting. Watch whether these moments feel voluntary rather than performed.

Your own boundaries and voice scored high, so notice if that ease holds when you ask directly about mismatch. A person whose actions lag behind words may become defensive or vague when pressed. If he welcomes the conversation and offers concrete examples, that is itself evidence of alignment. Use the 14-day protocol to log not just what he does, but how you felt when you observed it-your emotional response is data too.

Example: imagine noticing that he mentions wanting a serious relationship, yet every date is planned last-minute and only when you initiate. That pattern would contradict his stated intention. By contrast, if he starts including you in a recurring activity with his friends without being asked, that is a small action leaning toward consistency. Keep the example hypothetical; your actual observations will be uniquely his.

An alternative explanation for the missing action-intention link is that he shows care through steadiness rather than grand gestures. Some people express intention through reliability and responsiveness. If over two weeks you see dependable follow-through but no move toward deeper integration, consider whether that is enough for you. Uncertainty here is not failure; it is information that invites a direct conversation rather than a verdict.

Action 1: Choose one low-stakes request this week that tests action-intention fit, such as asking him to join you at a specific future event.

Action 2: Record each instance where his behavior either matches or mismatches his stated relationship goal, and note if he initiates or only responds.

Action 3: At the end of the week, ask yourself: if nothing changed from today, would his current level of effort and clarity meet your needs?

Your exercise: Setup: Write the sentence 'I want a serious relationship' on a card. Steps: Each day, list two small actions he did and mark whether each one would make sense for someone who truly wants that sentence to come true. Observations: Note patterns across days; look for actions you didn't have to request. Counterexample: If four days pass with no action that aligns, that is valuable data. Use the card to guide, not to judge.

Reflect and record: What one quiet signal-not a big promise-would make you feel his intentions are real, and have you seen it even once?