

socratic seminar notes

- CEO who fired 200 people and got a 20 percent raise in his yearly salary
 - If every decision is made by voting, people who are in the minority don't get a say, this can be also attributed to groupthink blindspot
-
- Seven studies using experimental and naturalistic methods reveal that upper-class individuals behave more unethically than lower-class individuals. In studies 1 and 2, upper-class individuals were more likely to break the law while driving, relative to lower-class individuals. In follow-up laboratory studies, upper-class individuals were more likely to exhibit unethical decision-making tendencies (study 3), take valued goods from others (study 4), lie in a negotiation (study 5), cheat to increase their chances of winning a prize (study 6), and endorse unethical behavior at work (study 7) than were lower-class individuals. Mediator and moderator data demonstrated that upper-class individuals' unethical tendencies are accounted for, in part, by their more favorable attitudes toward greed.
 - Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109(11), 4086–4091. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1118373109>
-
- Don't Confuse Solidarity with Empathy! Mathijs van de Sande
 - Paul bloom 'Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion.'
-
1. At 08:55, Paul Bloom states: "We are very in-groupie creatures." What does he mean? How does this relate to the Groupthink blind spot? What are your "in-groups?" (Research: Groupthink blind spot)
 2. Do you think power reduces the ability to empathize? Why? Discuss real-life examples of power hindering or boosting empathy skills. (Research: The relation between power and empathy and real-life examples that show this relation)
 3. In paragraph 4, van de Sande says that we should eliminate the existing inequality between us "by accepting that the majority does not always win the vote and that, in fact, sometimes the minorities should have the final say." What do you think van de Sande means by this? Do you think this idea (the majority does not always win the vote; the minorities should have the final say) runs counter to the idea of democracy? Discuss by giving real-life examples.