Maturity in Practice – Model Specification (ACRPD / IA)

A praxeological framework for maturity, responsibility, asymmetry & dignity in practice

Version: 2.0 · Spec basis: `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference.yaml`
Author: T. Zöller · Language: EN · Status: Public model spec (aligned with schema_meta.status = "stable")

---

1. Purpose and scope of this specification

This document specifies the *Maturity in Practice* / IA (inadult asymmetry) model in a concise, technical form. It is based on the YAML file `MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference.yaml` and makes its structure, concepts and guardrails transparent for human readers and software systems. The specification covers:

- the **normative model** (`model_reference`): parameters A–C–R–P–D, submodule matrix, dignity levels (D_0/D_1/D_2), IA-box, scoring logic, bias / intuition / norm-change module, axioms and minimal formal notation;
- the **case schema** (`case`): a uniform template for documenting concrete analyses, including A/M bands, IA-box evaluation, trajectory, optional D-module and a standardised narrative report.
- It also reflects the new "schema_meta" block, which defines the schema version, status and explicit governance constraints: `intended_use_profiles` (*self_reflection, professional_supervision, organisational_audit, training_simulation*) and `not_intended_for` (*public_shaming, clinical_diagnosis, hiring_decisions_without_human_supervision*), as well as the `agent_interface` block, which defines pre-analysis questions and default settings for AI-assisted use (reflection mode, D-module preference, analysis mode, output format).

The intended use of this specification is threefold:

- as a **reference for practitioners** (coaching, organisations, public institutions) who want to apply the model in a structured, dignity-preserving way;
- as a **research and teaching artefact** for philosophy, social sciences, psychology and ethics, where the model can be cited, critiqued and extended;
- as a **governance layer for software and AI systems**, where the YAML file can be treated as a single source of truth for responsible analysis of enactments, roles, asymmetries and dignity in practice.

> **Core idea**
> The YAML file defines both the normative model (`model_reference`) and a structured case template (`case`) for applying the model. This specification makes that structure human-readable, internally consistent and citable as a model definition.

2. High-level structure of the YAML model

2.1 Top-level keys

Key	Description	Role in the model
`schema_version`	A version string identifying the release of the YAML schema (`MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference`). Ensures compatibility across updates and clarifies which model definition a case or implementation refers to.	Versioning / compatibility information
`schema_meta`	Contains versioning, status, and governance information for the schema. In particular: `intended_use_profiles` (e.g. *self_reflection, professional_supervision, organisational_audit, training_simulation*) and `not_intended_for` (e.g. *public_shaming, clinical_diagnosis, hiring_decisions_without_human_supervision*). This block constrains where the model may be used and documents safe default assumptions.	Versioning / governance / safety constraints
`model_reference`	Contains the full normative definition of the IA / ACRPD model: parameters (A–C–R–P–D), submodule matrix, guardrails, modulators, bias / intuition / norm-change logic, dignity levels (D_0/D_1/D_2), IA-box definition, scoring rules, axioms and the minimal formal notation. It functions as the authoritative, machine-readable description of the model.	Normative model: parameters, axioms, guardrails, scoring, notation
`agent_interface`	Defines how interactive agents (e.g. AI systems) should behave before running an analysis. It specifies: `pre_analysis_questions` (whether to ask for reflection mode, D-module preference, analysis depth and output format) and `defaults` (used when such parameters are not explicitly set).	Interaction & governance layer for agent behaviour
`case`	Defines the structured template for analysing concrete situations using the model: meta-information, guardrails, information basis, ACRPD profile, submodules, A/M-band scoring, IA-box evaluation, trajectory, optional D-module, open questions and the uniform report. Every full application of the model is documented inside this schema.	Case template and analysis fields for concrete applications

2.2 Conceptual separation

`model_reference`

The `model_reference` block contains the complete normative and structural definition of the IA / ACRPD framework. It specifies:

- all parameters (A–C–R–P–D) and their submodules;
- dignity levels (D_0/D_1/D_2) and their operationalisation (D-I/D-B/D-R/D-P);
- guardrails and ethics of use, including D-protection and tragedy clause;
- scoring rules for A and M, trajectory patterns and asymmetry classification;
- bias, intuition and norm-change modules;
- axioms and minimal formal notation for consistent implementation.

In short: **this block defines the model itself** and serves as a single source of truth for human and machine interpretation.

`case`

The `case` block provides a fully structured template for applying the model to real situations. It contains:

- meta-information, guardrails and documentation of the information basis;
- the ACRPD profile and optional submodule analysis;
- A- and M-bands, IA-box (T–J–TB–R) and trajectory description;
- the optional D-module with dignity profiles and red-zone flags;
- open questions, analyst reflection and a uniform summary report.

In short: this block defines **how a full analysis is documented** so that results remain structured, reviewable and dignity-preserving.

3. Core rules and guardrails

3.1 Core rules (comment header)

The YAML header defines a set of non-negotiable principles that govern all applications of the IA / ACRPD model. They ensure that the model reads **enactments, not persons**, protects **ontological dignity (D_0)**, and prevents misuse. These core rules include:

- The YAML header includes a condensed "One-page mental model" with DO/DO-NOT guidance and typical misuse patterns. These serve as orientation and guardrail reinforcement for both human users and AI systems.
- **Enactments, roles and structures—not persons—are analysed.** The model explicitly rejects character evaluations or essentialising person labels.
- **Toolbox, not worldview.** The model offers a structured language for reading enactments but does not replace political, religious or philosophical positions; it must not be absolutised.
- **Ontological dignity (D_0) is untouchable.** D_0 can never be rated, withdrawn or compared. Only praxeological dignity (D_1/D_2) may be described, and only in scenic, context-bound form.
- **A- and M-scores are always expressed as bands** (ranges), never as precise or person-defining values. They describe enactments under conditions, not stable traits.
- **The D-module is optional and default-off.** It may only be activated after guardrail checks (trauma, power asymmetry, red-zones, communication space).
- **Misuse is itself an IA/D-finding.** Using the model to shame, essentialise persons, or conduct power games counts as an inadult asymmetry and dignity violation within the model logic.
- **Trajectories matter more than labels.** Maturity is expressed in development lines (ascending, descending, plateau, zigzag), not in static categorisations.
- **Inadult zones are normal material, not defects.** The model assumes that people are never fully adult; praxeological maturity consists in integrating and containing these zones responsibly.

3.2 Guardrails in `model_reference.guardrails`

These fields specify the minimal structural constraints that the model itself must obey. They protect dignity, prevent moralisation and ensure structural reading.

Field	Meaning	YAML location
Focus on structures, not persons	Analyses must avoid character judgements and instead describe **roles, enactments, contexts and distributions**. This enforces the model's core principle: *recognise the action, not the person.*	`model_reference .guardrails .focus_on_structures_not_persons`
D_0 untouchable	Ontological dignity is an inalienable property of persons and cannot be influenced by behaviour. Only praxeological dignity (D_1/D_2) is observable. Ensures clean separation of value (D_0) and enactment (D_1/D_2).	`model_reference .guardrails .dignity_D0_untouchable`
D-module default off	Prevents inflationary or careless use of dignity assessments. The D-module may be activated only when guardrails (trauma, publicness, power asymmetry, communication space) are explicitly checked.	`model_reference .guardrails .D_module_default_off`
System axiom	No enactment is purely individual: behaviour always arises within structures, institutions, roles, rules and dependencies. Scoring and IA-readings must reflect this.	`model_reference .guardrails .system_axiom`

4. Parameter system A–C–R–P–D

4.1 Parameters

The IA / ACRPD model reads enactments along five core parameters. These parameters describe **what is observable in practice**: awareness, coherence, responsibility, power/agency and dignity in practice. They form the structural backbone of the model.

Parameter	Label	Short definition
A	Awareness	How clearly the actor perceives themselves, their role, the context, relevant information and the impact of their actions.
C	Coherence	The degree of alignment between what is claimed, what is done and what the situational norms or roles require; includes narrative, social and institutional fit.
R	Responsibility	How responsibility is taken, shared, carried or shifted; the actor's contribution to burden distribution, ethical stance and consequences for others.
P	Power / agency	How real alternatives, influence and decision options are used, withheld or denied; includes formal and factual power and the ability to act.
D	Dignity in practice	How people treat their own and others' dignity in enactments—operationalised through `D-I` (inner self-treatment), `D-B` (bodily/material self-care), `D-R` (relational treatment of others) and `D-P` (public/symbolic representation). Ontological dignity (D_0) remains untouched and unmeasurable.

4.2 Maturity & inadulthood

The model treats maturity as a **praxeological achievement**, not as a stable character trait. People are never fully adult; they always act with a mixture of adult and inadult zones. Inadult zones—impulse, vulnerability, rebellion, emotionality—are not defects but **raw material** that can be integrated into mature enactments.

In this framework, maturity is expressed when actors:

- create adult zones (clarity, responsibility, coherence),
- hold and contain inadult zones without suppressing or denying them,
- navigate real constraints and asymmetries with awareness and accountability.

Maturity does *not* mean purity, perfection or the absence of inadult tendencies. What matters is **how** inadult material is handled—whether it is channelled into responsible, role-consistent action or spills into inadult asymmetry (IA). Trajectories (ascending, descending, zigzag, plateau) show whether enactments stabilise, deteriorate or change over time.

5. Submodule matrix

Each of the five parameters (A–C–R–P–D) is refined through a set of **submodules** that describe different dimensions of enactment. Every submodule contains three expression ranges:

- **mature expression** — stable, role-consistent and self-aware enactment;
- **inadult / incoherent expression** — unclear, impulsive, avoidant or inconsistent enactment;
- **excessive / distorted expression** — overcompensating, rigid or strategically manipulated enactment.

The submodule matrix (`model_reference.submodule_matrix`) functions as a diagnostic grid for fine-grained reading of behaviour without making psychological or moral claims. It supports pattern recognition, IA detection and dignity-related readings.

5.1 Example: Awareness submodules

Code	Name	Mature expression	Inadult / incoherent	Excessive / distorted
A-I	Inner awareness	Reflective inner life; ability to self-regulate and recognise one's own impulses.	Little self-contact; impulsive actions without reflection.	Hyper-monitoring of oneself; rumination; excessive self-observation.
A-R	Role awareness	Conscious switching and guidance of roles; clarity about one's function.	Unclear or confused about which role one inhabits.	Rigid role-play; loss of authenticity; over-identification with a role.
A-C	Context awareness	Reliable understanding of situational cues and environments.	Context blindness, misreading situations.	Overinterpretation or paranoia about context cues.
A-IM	Impact awareness	Conscious perception of how one's behaviour affects others.	Naïve sense of being ineffectual; ignoring consequences.	Strategic manipulation; calculating others' reactions.
A-P	Public / media awareness	Professional handling of public visibility and impression management.	No sense of public or reputational impact.	Self-surveillance; over-censorship; identity shaped by imagined audiences.

5.2 Dignity-related submodules (D-I / D-B / D-R / D-P)

Dignity in practice (D_1/D_2) is operationalised through four submodules that map directly onto the two dignity domains:

- **D-I — Inner self-treatment** (part of D_1): inner tone, self-talk, realism and kindness towards oneself.
- **D-B — Bodily / material self-care** (part of D_1): everyday care, boundary protection and physical integrity.
- **D-R — Relational dignity** (part of D_2): treatment of others without degrading them; relational respect.
- **D-P — Public / symbolic dignity** (part of D_2): self-representation, avoidance of self-degradation or objectification.

Together, these submodules allow a **D-profile** to be constructed that describes how dignity is enacted in observable behaviour. They do not measure dignity itself (D_0); they describe how D_1/D_2 appear in practice under real conditions.

6. Dignity framework (D_0 / D_1 / D_2)

The dignity framework distinguishes between **ontological dignity (D_0)**, which is unconditional and cannot be influenced by behaviour, and **praxeological dignity (D_1/D_2)**, which describes how dignity appears in concrete enactments. This separation is essential to prevent moralisation, shaming or person-evaluation.

6.1 Levels of dignity

Level	Code	Description
Ontological dignity	D_0	The inalienable, non-comparable dignity of every person—grounded in human vulnerability, self-relation, sociality and embodied existence. D_0 cannot be measured, increased, decreased or withdrawn. It forms the *ethical boundary condition* of the model.
Self-dignity in practice	D_1	How a person treats themselves in enactment, especially under cost or pressure. Operationalised through: • `D-I` — inner self-treatment (tone, realism, self-respect); • `D-B` — bodily/material self-care (boundaries, stability, protection). D_1 describes *visible practice*, not inner moral worth.
Relational / public dignity in practice	D_2	How a person treats the dignity of others and represents themselves in public. Operationalised through: • `D-R` — relational dignity (non-degradation of others, respect); • `D-P` — public/symbolic dignity (self-representation, avoidance of self-objectification). Again, this concerns *enactment*, not person-value.

6.2 D-module and guardrails

The D-module is **optional** and **default-off** to prevent inflationary or inappropriate use of dignity-related analysis. It may only be activated when explicit guardrails are met, as defined in `case.d_module_optional` and the model header.

Activation requires:

- acknowledgement of all D-guardrails (D_0 untouched, no person labelling, scenic/context-bound interpretation only);
- confirmation that no **red zones** apply: acute trauma, psychosis, extreme dependency, or strong public exposure of identifiable individuals;
- a clear **communication space** (self, professional-confidential, aggregated public, structural/public);
- a specific **reason why D is needed** in addition to A/M/IA analysis (e.g. visible self-degradation, unresolved dignity conflict, pattern trajectory).

When active, the D-module produces:

- a **D quick grid** (0–3) describing the intensity and reversibility of the dignity strain;
- a **D-profile** (D-I, D-B, D-R, D-P) with contextual interpretation;
- explicit **red-zone flags** ensuring that dignity evaluations never target persons and remain embedded in structure and enactment.

This ensures that dignity-in-practice (D_1/D_2) can be analysed without compromising ontological dignity (D_0) and without producing moralising or essentialising narratives.

7. IA-Box and asymmetry evaluation

The IA-Box (T–J–TB–R) is the model's central tool for distinguishing **functional asymmetries** from **inadulte asymmetries (IA)**. Instead of evaluating people, the IA-Box evaluates *structures of action*: how power, responsibility, knowledge and options are distributed and enacted.

7.1 IA-Box (T–J–TB–R)

An asymmetry becomes *inadulte* when one or more of the four criteria fail in a way that cannot be repaired or justified in context. Each criterion is evaluated in the YAML case schema under `case.scores_and_ia.IA_box`.

Criterion	Code	Meaning
Transparency	T	The asymmetry is **visible and knowable** to those affected. Hidden rules, invisible power, unpredictable consequences or covert agendas indicate *non-transparent asymmetry* and raise IA risk.
Justification	J	The asymmetry serves a **recognisable, protected or necessary good** (e.g. safety, competence, responsibility chain). If no legitimate reason exists—or if justification is pretextual—IA becomes likely.
Time-bound	TB	The asymmetry is **limited in duration** and does not become permanent or entrenched. When time limits vanish, temporary authority turns into structural domination.
Reversibility	R	The asymmetry can be **undone, appealed, reviewed or exited**. A non-reversible asymmetry (no exit, no appeal, no correction path) signals a structural IA red flag.

7.2 IA labels

After evaluating T–J–TB–R, the model generates an **IA summary label** in `case.scores_and_ia.IA_box.ia_summary_label`. This describes the structural quality of the asymmetry:

- **functional_asymmetry** — all or almost all T–J–TB–R criteria are fulfilled; the asymmetry is legitimate (e.g. teaching, law enforcement, medical hierarchy, organisational leadership).
- **IA_risk** — one or more criteria are *unclear* or partially violated; early warning signs, lack of justification, missing feedback loops.
- **inadulte_asymmetry** — clear violation of T–J–TB–R; reversal not possible, justification missing, opacity high, permanence likely. This describes *structural immaturity*, not a person's character.

These labels summarise the **structural maturity** of the situation. They work together with A- and M-scores and with the D-module, if activated, to provide a coherent picture of the enactment under real conditions.

8. Scoring (A-score, M-score) and trajectories

8.1 A-score

The A-score describes **maturity in practice** for a specific enactment `H`, expressed as a **band** on a 0–10 scale. In the YAML this is defined under `model_reference.scoring.A_score` and applied in `case.scores_and_ia.A_band`. It is always an approximation and must be justified qualitatively.

Formally:

- `range_0_to_10: [0, 10]` — the possible score range;
- `mode: "band"` — scores are expressed as intervals (e.g. 4–6), not single points.

Calibration bands:

- **0–1: collapse** — breakdown, no effective adult stance observable;
- **2–3: inadult** — predominantly inadult enactment, low structural maturity;
- **4–5: mixed** — mixture of adult and inadult elements, unstable under stress;
- **6–7: adult** — robust adult enactment under real conditions;
- **8–9: high** — high maturity in practice, also under pressure;
- **10: ideal** — limit value; rarely used in real cases.

In the case schema, the A-score is documented as: `case.scores_and_ia.A_band.approx_range_0_to_10` with `justification_points` referencing concrete A–C–R–P–D observations. A(H) is always a **snapshot**, never a character verdict.

8.2 M-score

The M-score describes the **shared structural responsibility** of an actor `A` in a given constellation. It is also expressed as a band on a 0–10 scale and defined under `model_reference.scoring.M_score`, with application in `case.scores_and_ia.M_band`. It does *not* measure guilt or moral worth, but the extent to which an actor could and should have acted differently.

Factors in the M-score:

- **knowledge** — what the actor knew or could realistically know;
- **power** — formal and factual ability to influence the situation;
- **predictability** — foreseeability of consequences;
- **alternatives** — real options to act differently, including exit;
- **integration_attempt** — visible efforts to correct, repair or integrate.

A central rule is the **ceiling rule**: `"if predictability≈0 or alternatives≈0 then M<=4"`. Where outcomes were not foreseeable or no real alternatives existed, responsibility cannot be scored in the higher range, even if the outcome is severe. This protects against *victim blaming* and superficial hindsight moralisation.

In the case schema, the M-score is documented as: `case.scores_and_ia.M_band.approx_range_0_to_10` with `justification_points` that explicitly reference these five factors. M(A) is always interpreted together with A(H) and the IA-Box.

8.3 Trajectory patterns

The model treats maturity and responsibility as **dynamic**. Individual A- and M-bands are snapshots; what matters is how they develop over time. Typical trajectory patterns are listed in

`model_reference.trajectory_patterns`:

- **ascending** — enactments become more mature or responsible over time;
- **descending** — structural quality deteriorates; warnings ignored;
- **zigzag** — unstable oscillation between mature and inadult enactments;
- **plateau** — relatively stable level (which may be low or high).

In the case schema, trajectories are documented under `case.trajectory`:

- `key_timepoints` (e.g. t0, t1, t2) with A- and M-bands at each point and short descriptions of the situation;
- `course_in_words` — a short narrative summary (2–5 sentences) of movement, tipping points and structural changes.

This combination of **A(H)**, **M(A)**, IA-Box and trajectory patterns makes the model inherently **reversible and development-oriented**: findings are documented as provisional readings within a course, not as static labels.

9. Bias, intuition and norm change

9.1 Bias module

The model treats **bias** as an unavoidable structural feature of human perception and judgement, not as a moral defect. In the YAML this is defined in `model_reference.bias_module`.

Bias is defined as: *"unavoidable, partly unconscious distortions in perception, memory, interpretation and evaluation."* It limits certainty but does not automatically invalidate a reading. The key requirement is that bias is **named and documented**, not silently ignored.

Typical bias domains:

- perception and memory (what is noticed, what is forgotten);
- role and loyalty (institutional or group loyalties skewing perception);
- institutional interest (pressures, incentives, "house view");
- ideological frame (political, religious, moral lenses).

The bias mitigation protocol specifies concrete steps (see `bias_module.mitigation_protocol.steps`):

- explicitly name relevant bias risks;
- generate at least one counter-reading;
- seek counterexamples to initial impressions;
- separate observation/description from evaluation;
- cross-check with at least one other person/perspective, if possible;
- document which bias risks remain and how they limit the finding.

In the case schema, remaining bias risks are summarised under `case.open_questions_and_blind_spots.distortion_risks`, while `case.biases_case_level` records the analyst's initial intuition, explicit bias risks and a structured counter-reading outline.

9.2 Intuition

Intuition is treated as a **potentially valuable sensor**, not as a verdict. In `model_reference.intuition` it is assigned three roles:

- **sensor** — early signal or pattern detection;
- **trigger** — starting point for analysis;
- **not_judge** — may never replace structured A–C–R–P–D reading.

The model assumes that intuition can carry compressed experience and pattern recognition, but must be treated as **hypothesis, not proof**, especially where strong bias risks are present.

The integration protocol (`intuition.integration_protocol.steps`) requires:

- noting the initial gut feeling explicitly in the documentation;
- translating intuition into clear, testable hypotheses;
- testing these hypotheses against observable enactments (A–C–R–P–D);
- checking for contradicting evidence;
- keeping only those elements that survive contact with data and guardrails.

9.3 Norm change

Norms around maturity, responsibility and dignity are historically and culturally dynamic. The `model_reference.norm_change` block prevents the model from smuggling in fixed or absolutised norms.

Aspects of norm change:

- **dynamic_norms** — norms shift over time;
- **cultural_variation** — different cultures and milieus apply different standards;
- **historical_shift** — what counted as "normal" or "mature" changes historically;
- **field_specific_practices** — professions, scenes, institutions have their own codes.

The guiding questions require each analysis to state explicitly:

- which norms are taken as reference (legal, professional, cultural, subcultural);
- whether these norms are contested or changing;
- which actors benefit from the current interpretation, and which are disadvantaged.

Implications for the model (see `norm_change.implications_for_model`):

- A- and M-readings must state which norm frame they rely on;
- IA-findings must distinguish clear violations from contested norms;
- D-readings must be extra cautious where norms are in flux.

9.4 Working with the model

The block `model_reference.working_with_model` describes both a **protocol** and a **meta-attitude** for responsible use of the model.

Protocol steps (short form):

- clarify roles, context and purpose of the analysis;
- document the information basis (primary and secondary material);
- check guardrails and entry condition (minimal adulthood);
- identify modulators and publicity level;
- build the ACRPD profile from observable enactments;
- estimate A- and M-bands and fill the IA-Box (T–J–TB–R);
- decide deliberately whether to leave the D-module off or activate it;
- describe the trajectory over time where possible;
- note bias risks and intuitive elements explicitly;
- summarise findings in the uniform report in dignity-preserving language and record open questions, blind spots and limits of validity.

Meta-attitude (selected principles):

- **epistemic humility** — findings are revisable, not final truth;
- **reversibility of readings** — formulations must allow correction and development;
- **dignity-preserving language** throughout;
- **focus on structures, not persons** as a constant;
- **willingness to be corrected** by new information;
- awareness of one's own power and interests in the case;
- preference for trajectories instead of labels.

Together, the bias, intuition and norm-change modules ensure that the model is applied in a way that is **reflexive, transparent and critique-ready**, rather than as an invisible moral machine.

10. Axiomatic core

The IA / ACRPD model is grounded in an explicit set of **axioms** that define its ethical, structural and epistemic foundations. These axioms ensure that applications remain transparent, critique-ready and compatible across fields. In the YAML, they are defined under `model_reference.axiomatic_core`.

The axioms clarify:

- the **ontological status of dignity (D_0)**,
- the **strict separation of person and enactment**,
- the **four fundamental parameters of responsible action (A–C–R–P)**,
- the **structure of dignity in practice** (D as four-dimensional and gradual),
- the **indispensability of role and context**,
- the **normality of asymmetry** and the need for IA justification (T–J–TB–R),
- maturity as an **enactment state, not a person type**,
- the role of **tragic residual conflicts**,
- the need for **intersubjective documentation**, and
- the **system axiom** (no enactment is isolated).

The following table summarises the axioms in condensed form:

#	Title	Statement (short)	Implication for use (short)
1	Ontological dignity (D_0) is inalienable	Every human possesses D_0: incomparable, immeasurable, non-increasable and non-losable.	No A/M/D reading may be interpreted as a statement about a person's ontological dignity.
2	Strict separation of person and enactment	The model evaluates actions, role enactments and practices – never the worth of persons.	"Acts without dignity here" is allowed; "is without dignity" is excluded.
3	Four fundamental parameters of responsible action (A–C–R–P)	Every relevant enactment in a social context can be described through awareness (A), coherence (C), responsibility (R) and power-to-act (P).	A-, C-, R- and P-readings jointly shape the observable dignity-in-practice (D).
4	Dignity in practice (D) is four-dimensional and gradual	Dignity in practice appears in four subdimensions (D-I, D-B, D-R, D-P). Each is gradual, situational and reversible.	No permanent dignity status is assigned; only situational dignity profiles (D1/D2 via D-I/D-B/D-R/D-P) are described.
5	Role and context are indispensable	No D- or maturity finding exists without explicit role and context clarification.	The same observable act may have different dignity implications depending on role and context.
6	Asymmetry is normal; IA requires justification	Asymmetries are normal. They become problematic only when they violate the IA-box criteria (T–J–TB–R).	Systematic violations of transparency, justification, time-boundedness or reversibility constitute inadult asymmetry (IA).
7	Maturity is an enactment state, not a person type	Maturity appears in practice and can change; there are only more or less mature enactments, not mature/immature kinds of persons.	Scores are snapshots of enactments; trajectories must remain open.
8	Intersubjective documentation	Serious application requires minimal documentation of standpoint, norms, roles and information basis.	Analyses are situated and must remain open to critique and correction.
9	Tragic residual conflicts	Some conflicts express irreducible clashes of goods even under high maturity.	Analysis must distinguish unnecessary indignity (IA) from structural tragedy.

#	Title	Statement (short)	Implication for use (short)
10	System axiom: no enactment is isolated	Every enactment is embedded in structures, rules, resources and other actors.	A- and M-scores must consider systemic conditions; purely individual attributions violate the model.

11. Minimal formal notation

The model includes a deliberately minimal mathematical notation to ensure consistency, interoperability and extensibility across domains (law, psychology, governance, AI systems). The notation describes **action enactments**, their parameter profiles and associated scores.

11.1 Action tuple

An enactment is represented by the symbol `H`, defined as a **tuple** containing the structural components of action. In the YAML this appears under `model_reference.formal_notation.action_tuple`.

Definition:

```
H = (A, R, C, A_w, C_o, R_s, P, D?, IA)
```

Components:

- **A — actor**: individual or organised actor;
- **R — role**: the role occupied in this context;
- **C — context**: setting, frame, publicity level;
- **A_w — awareness profile**: A parameter + submodules;
- **C_o — coherence profile**: C parameter + submodules;
- **R_s — responsibility profile**: R parameter + submodules;
- **P — power/agency profile**: P parameter + submodules;
- **D? — dignity-in-practice profile (optional)**: D_1/D_2 as expressed via `D-I`, `D-B`, `D-R`, `D-P`. Included only when the D-module is activated.
- **IA — IA evaluation**: the IA-box (T–J–TB–R) as fulfilled / violated / unclear.

In everyday practice, a reduced tuple (without D) may be used whenever the dignity module remains deactivated.

11.2 Scores A(H) and M(A)

The model defines two auxiliary scores that summarise structural qualities of the tuple:

- `A(H)` — maturity in practice of enactment `H`;
- `M(A)` — shared responsibility of actor `A`.

Formal definition:

- **A-score**: `A(H) ∈ [0,10]` representing a **band** (range), not a point value, describing how mature an enactment is.
- **M-score**: `M(A) ∈ [0,10]` representing shared structural responsibility, also as a band.

In joint notation (see YAML `scores.joint_notation`):

```
H ⇒ (A(H), M(A))
```

Both values are auxiliary, reversible and **always** accompanied by qualitative explanation.

The purpose of the notation is not quantification but **traceability**: scores must be linked to observable aspects of A–C–R–P–D and justified in language.

11.3 Extensibility

The formal notation is intentionally minimal. As specified under `model_reference.formal_notation.extensibility`, it allows:

- the addition of domain-specific variables (e.g. legal risk indices, clinical stability markers, organisational KPIs);
- extension of the tuple with new submodules or contextual parameters;
- integration with machine-readable formats (YAML, JSON, schema validators).

Crucially, extensions must not alter the existing tuple structure. This guarantees that all valid IA / ACRPD analyses remain compatible over time.

12. Case schema (`case`)

12.1 Meta & guardrails

The `case.meta` and `case.guardrails` sections document the **framework conditions** under which an analysis is conducted. Their purpose is twofold:

- to ensure that every application of the model is **transparent, traceable and ethically compliant**;
- to prevent misuse (e.g. person-labelling, moralisation, hidden agendas, D-module misuse).

`case.meta` records:

- a unique **case ID** and a descriptive **case title**,
- the **documentation date** (ISO 8601),
- **analysts** and their roles,
- the **language** of the case (e.g. DE, EN),
- the chosen **confidentiality_level** (e.g. internal, confidential, anonymised_public),
- an `analysis_mode` flag (e.g. *ultra_short, short, full*) indicating the intended depth and level of detail of the application,
- an `interaction_profile` for this analysis run, specifying:
  - **reflection_mode** (on/off) — whether the agent should ask reflective questions,
  - **d_module_preference** (auto/on/off) — D-module usage preference within the guardrails,
  - **output_format** (text/yaml) — preferred output format for this analysis.
- the **application_zone** (*green, yellow, red_forbidden*), documenting whether the planned use is recommended, cautionary or prohibited.

`case.guardrails` ensures that:

- the analysis focuses on **structures, roles and enactments**, not persons;
- the **entry condition** ("minimal adulthood") is met;
- **self-implication** of the analyst is acknowledged;
- the **information basis** is clearly separated from assumptions;
- **D_0 remains untouched** and no person is labelled via D;
- the **tragedy clause** is considered (not all pain = IA);
- language is used with **hygiene** (risk/danger/potential/harm; D-related terms);
- if the D-module is activated, communication follows explicit **D guardrails** (red zones, trauma caution, publicity differentiation).

Guardrails therefore function as the **ethical container** for every ACRPD analysis.

12.2 Information basis & snapshot

The model requires precise documentation of the **information basis** to avoid speculation, hindsight bias and the illusion of objectivity. In the YAML this appears under `case.information_basis` and `case.snapshot` .

`information_basis` distinguishes:

- **primary material** — direct quotes, events, transcripts, descriptions;
- **secondary material** — reports, rules, laws, policies, prior analyses;

- **assumptions & inferences** — what the analyst adds beyond explicit evidence. These must be clearly flagged for transparency.

`snapshot` provides:

- a neutral 1–5 sentence **short case description**;
- central actors and their roles (labels only, no personal identifiers);
- the **guiding question** that frames the entire analysis.

These two sections ensure that all subsequent ACRPD, IA and D findings are grounded in **documented material** rather than assumptions.

12.3 ACRPD profile & submodules

The ACRPD profile provides the **core structural reading** of the case. It is defined under `case.acrpd_profile` and describes observable enactments across:

- **A — awareness** (knowledge, blind spots, role confusion),
- **C — coherence** (word–deed fit, narrative consistency),
- **R — responsibility** (carried, shifted, delegated, refused),
- **P — power/agency** (alternatives used or withheld),
- **D — dignity in practice** (brief note only; full treatment occurs in the D-module).

This profile is the **minimal required structure** for every analysis.

When finer granularity is needed, analysts may use the **submodule matrix** via `case.acrpd_submodules_profile`. This allows evaluation of A–C–R–P–D across all submodules such as:

- A-I (inner awareness), A-R (role awareness), A-IM (impact), A-P (public awareness);
- C-S (social coherence), C-N (narrative), C-I (rule coherence);
- R-I (individual), R-S (social), R-E (ethical), R-P (public responsibility);
- P-I (inner agency), P-S (social agency), P-PU (public reach);
- D-I, D-B, D-R, D-P (self- and relational dignity practices).

Use of the submodule matrix is optional but recommended in complex or ambiguous cases. It increases precision without drifting into psychological speculation because each submodule expresses **observable enactment patterns** rather than internal states.

12.4 Scores, IA-Box and trajectory

The section `case.scores_and_ia` summarises the structural quality of the enactment using three elements: the **A-score** (maturity in practice), the **M-score** (shared responsibility), and the **IA-Box** (T–J–TB–R asymmetry evaluation).

A-score (A(H)) is documented as:

- a band on the 0–10 scale: `approx_range_0_to_10`,
- 3–5 brief justification points referencing observable A–C–R–P–D patterns,
- a reminder that the score refers to **enactment**, not character.

M-score (M(A)) records:

- a responsibility band (0–10), shaped by knowledge, predictability, power, alternatives, and integration attempts;

- explanation via justification bullets keyed to these five factors;
- the **ceiling rule** (“predictability ≈ 0 or alternatives ≈ 0 ⇒ M ≤ 4”) which prevents structural unfairness.

IA-Box records the four asymmetry criteria:

- **T — transparency**
- **J — justification**
- **TB — time-bound**
- **R — reversibility**

Each criterion is marked as **true**, **false** or **unclear** together with a short justification. The field `ia_summary_label` classifies the structure as:

- **functional_asymmetry**
- **IA_risk**
- **inadulte_asymmetry**

`case.trajectory` documents maturity and responsibility **over time**. It contains:

- **key_timepoints** (t0, t1, t2 ...): each with A-band, M-band and a 1–2 sentence description;
- **course_in_words**: a compact narrative (2–5 sentences) describing the trajectory, structural shifts, tipping points and stabilisation/deterioration.

Trajectory analysis ensures that findings remain **developmental** and **reversible**, rather than static labels.

12.5 Optional D-module

The `case.d_module_optional` section activates and documents the **dignity in practice (D_1/D_2)** analysis, which is **optional** and **default-off** for ethical reasons. It is used only when there are clear indications of self-devaluation, relational dignity conflict or structural dignity strain.

Activation requires:

- justification (`activation_reason`),
- acknowledgement of D guardrails (no person labelling, scenic interpretation, no sanctioning use),
- red-zone check (trauma, dependency, public exposure),
- clear selection of **communication space** ("self", "professional_confidential", "aggregated_public", "structural_public").

D quick grid (0–3) provides an intensity estimate:

- **0 — banal strain**
- **1 — repeated pattern**
- **2 — chronic difficulty**
- **3 — extreme dignity strain**

The **D-profile** then documents visible dignity enactments across:

- **D-I** – inner tone and self-treatment,
- **D-B** – bodily and material self-care,
- **D-R** – treatment of others, reciprocity and boundaries,
- **D-P** – public representation and symbolic self-treatment.

Red-zone flags (acute trauma, extreme dependency, strong public exposure) may restrict the D-module to

strain-only or *structure-only* readings, or deactivate it entirely.

12.6 Open questions, reflection and uniform report

At the end of each case analysis, three elements ensure transparency, self-implication and a clear external communication format.

1. Open questions & blind spots (`case.open_questions_and_blind_spots`)

- documents what remains unclear,
- lists missing data or missing perspectives,
- records distortion risks (bias, loyalties, institutional pressures, emotional involvement).

2. Analyst reflection (`case.analyst_reflection`)

- captures self-implication: how the analyst's role, power and biography appear in the reading,
- lists possible next steps (structural or practical recommendations).

3. Uniform report (`case.uniform_report`)

- a standardised, readable summary of the analysis,
- 4–7 sentence overview,
- 3–7 key finding bullets (A/M, IA, structure, optional D),
- short maturity, IA-box and — if activated — dignity summary,
- trajectory summary,
- a short conclusion with implications for practice.

The YAML schema also includes `biases_case_level` , which documents the analyst's initial intuition, explicit bias risks and a mandatory counter-reading outline. This section supports transparency and prevents premature convergence in interpretation.

The uniform report ensures that the analysis can be communicated responsibly to supervisors, teams, institutions or public audiences, depending on the selected **communication space**.

13. Implementation notes and licensing

13.1 YAML file and integration

The official YAML specification is provided as:

`MIPractice_case_v2.0_full_with_model_reference.yaml`

This file constitutes the **single source of truth** for:

- the normative IA model (`model_reference`), and
- the structured case schema (`case`).

Any implementation — human or machine — should **consume this YAML directly** rather than reproducing parts of it manually. Its structure makes it suitable for:

- validation of cases against guardrails and ethical constraints,
- automated generation of ACRPD profiles, summaries and uniform reports,
- AI systems that require transparent reasoning templates,
- research settings needing reproducible evaluation frameworks,
- embedding as a governance layer in decision-support systems.

Because the YAML separates **model definition** from **case application**, it can be versioned, extended or tested independently of individual analyses.

13.2 Citation and license

When referencing this model, please cite both the book and this specification:

Primary reference:
T. Zöller (2025): *Maturity in Practice – A Praxeological Anthropology.*

Technical reference:
MIPractice_case v2.0 – Full Schema with Model Reference
YAML Specification and Case Framework.