Self-application of the model to itself

Full MIPractice_case reading (MIPractice_self_2025_01)

Date: 2025-12-05
Language: en
Confidentiality: anonymised_public
Comm. space (D-module): professional_confidential

Mode full) (Reflection off) (A-band ≈ 7–9 · adult–high

M-band (MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference) ≈ 6–8 · adult–high (designers & institutions)

IA-Box → `functional_asymmetry_with_guardrails_and_residual_IA_risk`

D-module on · banal_to_repeated_strain_potential

CASE SNAPSHOT

The MIPractice_case model is a structured toolbox for analysing maturity, responsibility, power and dignity in practice, with strong guardrails against misuse. This case applies the model to itself, focusing on how it structures asymmetries (IA), protects dignity, and distributes responsibility between individual actors and institutions that use it.

Guiding question:
How mature and responsible is the MIPractice_case model in its own design and guardrails, and where do dignity, asymmetry and misuse risks appear when it is applied in practice?

Actors (roles only):

- **The model as structural tool** – toolbox_model
- **Practitioners and institutions** – apply, embed and govern the model in practice

ACRPD – STRUCTURAL READING

A – Awareness
The model shows high awareness of structural risks: it explicitly names IA, bias, norm change, trajectories and the separation between person and enactment, and reflects on its own potential for misuse. At the same time it flags warning signals such as the need for high practice competence and organisational embedding, and may be relatively blind to non-Western norm systems or to how strongly less privileged actors can actually influence its use.

C – Coherence
Officially, the model is a "toolbox, not worldview" that evaluates enactments, not persons, emphasising trajectories over labels and dignity protection. Structurally, this is backed up by red zones, IA-box, bias and norm-change modules and required documentation of standpoint and information basis. Word–deed coherence is thus high in design, with possible breaks only where users export scoring or D-vocabulary without the guardrails.

R – Responsibility
Responsibility is distributed: designers define guardrails, trainers and institutions embed and enforce them, and analysts must apply the model with humility and transparency. The model shifts undue blame away from individuals under strong structural asymmetry and warns against outsourcing responsibility to "the model" or to AI outputs. Misuse is explicitly counted as an IA/D finding in its own right.

P – Power / agency
Formally, the model is only a conceptual toolbox, but in practice analysts, institutions and AI systems gain considerable interpretive power wherever it is embedded into decisions. It offers alternatives to raw scoring (trajectories, bias documentation, IA-box), yet leaves participatory mechanisms and co-analysis with affected parties largely to local practice, which can limit agency for those being analysed.

D – Dignity in practice (short)
Dignity is central: D0 is defined as untouchable, D in practice is strictly scenic and context-bound, and public pillory formats are explicitly forbidden. The model thereby stabilises dignity in principle, while recognising that any vocabulary of "dignity in practice" can be weaponised in hierarchical settings if red zones and communication spaces are ignored.

IA-BOX – ASYMMETRY CHECK

T · Transparency
The model is highly explicit about its assumptions, parameters, guardrails, application zones and red zones, and it names its own structural risks and limitations.

J · Justification
The expert and institutional asymmetries it relies on are justified by reference to protected goods such as dignity protection, clarity of responsibility and avoidance of shaming or misuse.

TB · Time-bound
Versioning and "last_update" indicate revisability over time, but the schema does not yet mandate explicit sunset clauses or fixed review cycles for its own use.

R · Reversibility
Readings are framed as auxiliary and reversible, scores are bands not truths, D can be kept off, and misuse is itself flagged as an IA/D finding that invites correction.

IA summary:
Overall, the model generates a functional asymmetry with strong transparency, ethical justification and reversibility, while some residual IA risk remains due to only partly specified time-boundedness and dependence on how institutions actually honour its guardrails.

KEY FINDINGS

- The model exhibits high structural awareness (A ≈ 7–9/10), explicitly addressing IA, bias, norm change and its own guardrails.
- Responsibility is distributed between designers, practitioners and institutions, with a clear system axiom that limits unfair individual blame.
- The IA-box for the model itself suggests a functional asymmetry: transparent and justified, largely reversible, but only partially time-bound.
- Dignity in practice is carefully protected through D0 axioms, scenic D readings, red zones, and language hygiene rules, though public misuse remains a risk.
- Trajectory-wise, the model has evolved towards increasing explicitness and ethical self-reflection, with a possible plateau where additional complexity offers diminishing returns.

Conclusion for practice

In sum, the model suggests a mature, ethically conscious way of analysing enactments, power and dignity, provided its guardrails are taken seriously and not reduced to decorative language. For practice, this implies that adoption must go hand in hand with clear institutional agreements, supervision, and participatory safeguards, and that users must resist the temptation to treat scores and D-readings as objective labels. The model is best used as a reflective lens and shared language for learning and structural development, not as a hidden diagnostic apparatus or weapon in power games.

Trajectory hint

Over time, the model appears to have moved from a more implicit maturity language to a fully articulated, guardrail-rich framework, indicating an ascending trajectory in awareness, responsibility structuring and dignity protection, with current work focusing on refining bias handling and transmission.