

Public criticism in a team meeting

Minimal entry case · single scene · organisational setting · didactic example

Date: 2025-12-16

Language: en

Confidentiality: internal

Discipline profile: organisation_leadership

Comm. space (D-module): off

Mode short Reflection off A-band ≈ 4–6 · mixed M-band (Person B · manager) ≈ 5–7 · moderate-high

IA-Box → IA_risk D-module off · not activated (only brief visibility note)

INPUT THESIS & INFORMATION BASIS

Thesis (verbatim):

In a team meeting, Person A is publicly criticised.

Minimal scene:

During a team meeting, Person B publicly criticises Person A's performance in front of colleagues. The situation allows for alternative ways of giving feedback.

Observations (descriptive):

- A manager (Person B) criticises a team member (Person A) during a team meeting.
- The criticism happens in front of colleagues (institutional / semi-public within the organisation).
- The manager has control over timing and the chosen setting (public vs. private feedback).

Assumptions / uncertainties:

- Assumption: a regular internal team meeting with manager–employee role asymmetry.
- Uncertainty: the exact wording and tone of the criticism.
- Uncertainty: whether prior feedback history exists (pattern vs one-off).
- Bias risk: single-scene bias (overgeneralising from one moment).

Model note: This is a structural reading of enactments, roles and conditions — never a global claim about a person.

CASE SNAPSHOT

During a team meeting, Person B publicly criticises Person A's performance in front of colleagues. The situation allows for alternative ways of giving feedback.

Guiding question:

How does public criticism in this setting affect maturity in practice and asymmetry legitimacy?

Actors (roles only):

- **Person A** – team member
- **Person B** – manager
- **Team** – audience / indirectly affected

Context structures:

- Organisational hierarchy and evaluative authority.
- Meeting as an institutional exposure space (reputational dynamics).
- Agenda control and turn-taking asymmetry.

ROLES & ENACTMENTS

Roles:

- Person B – manager (feedback-giver, agenda-holder)
- Person A – team member (feedback-recipient)
- Team – audience (witnesses; indirect affected parties)

Observed / proposed enactments:

- Observed enactment: direct public criticism during the meeting.
- Viable alternative enactment: private follow-up feedback after the meeting.
- Repair enactment option: reframing or clarification to reduce reputational exposure.

STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS

- Hierarchy: manager holds formal evaluative power.
- Publicity: "institutional" exposure (not fully public, but reputationally real).
- Dependency: team member depends on manager evaluations and standing in the team.
- Information asymmetry: manager controls what is said, when, and to whom.

Structures are not "excuses"; they are the action-constraints the model reads against.

ACRPD – STRUCTURAL READING

A – Awareness (A ≈ 4–6/10)

Awareness of the criticism content is present, but awareness of the reputational/public impact appears partial.

C – Coherence (mixed)

Coherence between the stated improvement intent and the chosen public enactment is tensioned: improvement framing can conflict with shaming risk.

R – Responsibility (moderate)

The key responsibility point is the decision to criticise publicly. Responsibility can drift into "transparency rhetoric" if the public setting is not justified.

P – Power / agency (high relative power)

Person B holds formal and factual power (agenda, speaking turn). Alternatives exist (private feedback), indicating agency to choose a less exposing pathway.

D – Dignity in practice (not analysed; module off)

D-module is not activated. A brief visibility note applies: the public setting can imply dignity strain (exposure), without making person-level claims.

IA-BOX – ASYMMETRY CHECK

T · Tension

fulfilled: true

Criticism is openly stated in the meeting.

J · Judgment

fulfilled: unclear

The justification for using a public setting (instead of private feedback) is not explicit.

TB · Toolbox

fulfilled: true

This is a single meeting intervention (bounded in time).

R · Repair

fulfilled: true

A follow-up can reframe, clarify, or move the feedback to a private channel.

IA summary:

The asymmetry is structurally manageable: transparent, time-bounded, and reversible, but justification is insufficiently explicit, producing an IA_risk rather than a clear violation.

TRAJECTORY

As observed:

t0 (before meeting) → t1 (public criticism) shows a drop in effective maturity due to exposure and justification gap.

Alternative trajectory:

If a private follow-up and repair framing occurs at t2, the trajectory can recover (de-escalation and context-sensitive feedback).

Pivot point:

The pivot is the manager's choice of channel and timing: public critique vs. private feedback (and whether repair is performed).

INTERVENTION LEVERS

- Move critical feedback to a private 1:1 setting (reduce exposure).
- If public mention is necessary, make the justification explicit and limit detail (scope discipline).
- Add a repair step: clarify intent, invite response, and offer a private follow-up.
- Set team norms: public meetings for coordination; performance feedback by default in private.

KEY FINDINGS

- Moderate awareness with a blind spot regarding public impact.
- Legitimate hierarchy combined with an avoidable exposure risk.
- Asymmetry shows a manageable IA risk rather than a clear violation.
- Trajectory depends on whether a corrective follow-up occurs.

Conclusion for practice

As a minimal entry case, the scene shows how small choices in power use and context can shift maturity trajectories without invoking deeper diagnostic or dignity modules.

What would change this reading?

Concrete details about wording/tone, prior feedback history (pattern vs one-off), and whether a repair follow-up occurred would shift A/M bands and the IA justification assessment.

