7D Individual Assignment

April Semester 2022

Submitted to: Siang Jin Lee

For Partial Completion of: Global Studies (GS1002)

**Replace everything in red**

**Delete everything in blue before submission**

Submitted by: Forbis Fong

Matric No: 2101229I

Global Studies Tutorial Group: TB18

School of: Business

Diploma in: Law and Management

I declare that this work is entirely mine, I have not copied from my own previous work or assignment, and proper referencing have been done for all content sourced from any third party.

Total word count (excluding cover page and references): 1300

**Part 1**

**Universalism - Particularism**

I believe I err on the side of Universalism, given my the high importance I place in absolute fairness across an entire caucus . My own behaviour has shown this in that I generally prefer to set standards and rules as absolutes without exception (unless rationally inconsistent), and have in fact applied this where I treat people who have had rather subjectively good reasons for infractions the same as people who have bad reasons. My belief on this manifests in how I approach retributive justice, where I believe that a person who has done an egregious crime for good reason and a person who has done an egregious crime for no reason other than malice, should both be fundamentally treated the same in terms of the sentencing and post sentence social consideration.

**Individualism – Communitarianism**

I believe I err on the side of Individualism, given the level of individual work I prefer when it comes to work. This has arisen in my behaviour where in group projects, I prefer it if work was pushed and compartmentalised, done by individual people, with them (and I) each making autonomous decisions without having to refer anything back to a collective decision, and would also significantly preferred infact, if I didn’t have group projects in the first place, preferring individually based reports and papers. This manifests in how I view the issue of social welfare – that an individual person’s success (and therefore non-requirement of social welfare) is dependent on his own volition. If he can’t be bothered to put in effort to at least move out of his position, then why should I, and many other individuals have to pick up his deadweight caused of his own volition?

**Neutral - Affective**

I believe I err on the side of Affective, given my tendency towards more passionate displays of my opinions which may even seem vitriolic. Such as how I unknowingly conduct myself during debates, where when defending my position, I use exaggerated language, a loud voice and at times, animated body language when getting my point across. I also sprinkle a liberal amount of sarcastic humour in the course of my debate. This showed itself during a debate competition, in which I was on a public stage in front of an audience of my peers, and a point was made on the opposing benches against one of my arguments. In response, I (as recorded in pictures shown to me) apparently struck a very sour and exasperated face at the opposing bench, and began to at times bury my face in my hands openly to express my disapproval at the argument. The outcome was that while I had won, I had come off as very obnoxious and full of myself.

**Part 2**

**Against Particularists**

I would see the challenges as having to contort rules to fit every unique situation, having to potentially even completely change rules to fit a unique factual matrix, and losing definitely losing the certainty that the rules are meant to bring.

Such an example was when during a group project presentation some years ago, I had two friends come in late. One was late because he genuinely felt ill, the other came in late because he had forgotten we had the presentations the first place. I however, opted to begin with the presentation and issue citations, which carried a penalty to the grades of the both of them. An argument ensued with the remainder of the group against me, centering itself on how I was treating two people with different circumstances identically.

The 7D concept must have been involved in the approaches each person took, specifically in the starting points we viewed from. For me, as a Universalist, my starting point was the fact of the infraction, which naturally led itself to punishment being meted out on that basis, while my groupmates had their beginning point at the excuse given, which would have led to only one being punished, on the basis of presumed fairness. 7D must have therefore been involved in how each person had perceived what was specifically fair in the event of differing circumstances leading to identical outcomes.

**Against Communitarians**

I would see the problems with them as being frustrated at having to clear the opinion of the entire group in order to progress with work, having to myself conform to the total group opinion in order to get things done when I might not agree, and having to continually be mindful of maintaining group relationships.

In the same example as above, I distributed work on the basis of what they were each individually best at, without consideration for what they each actually wanted to do. The argument came up that I had distributed it individually when they had polled on tackling the project on a singular document with each other. I however, believed that the method of individual work was most efficient and best, and so the argument ensued.

Based on a 7D analysis, this fact would have now been obvious – for me, I looked at each person for their abilities and what they could offer individually without considering how they each could operate together, and similarly viewed the parts of the project as “belonging” to an individual. As according to a member of that group, the key difference was that I was pushing for close to complete individual autonomy without interconnection, while everyone was pushing for a tightly integrated and interconnected approach towards the project.

**Against Neutrals**

I would see issues with them as not being able to extract their gauges on the work at hand easily, not being able to tell what opinions they might have on the work, and not being able to keep much of a conversation going with them.

Such has happened before - Some years ago, a group of students on an exchange came to my school from Germany. I happened have studied German, and could also speak German. Irregardless, in every attempt of casual conversation, not once did he laugh, express his approval or disapproval, or even give so much of an inkling of what he felt towards a specific topic, food or joke. It became incredibly hard to keep a conversation going, and so I eventually gave up trying to do so.

Analysis with 7D would find that the reason is that as a neutral, he simply did not come from a culture where showing what he felt was natural, or acceptable. He therefore would have suppressed his emotions or hid them, while I, as an affective, was more open to throwing my actual thoughts and feelings out there openly, and therefore more open to personal response based casual conversation. The 7D here, was what responses consisted of – the German thought it was to consist of facts and rigourous opinion, I thought it was to consist of what I thought and felt.

**Part 3**

Refer to the neutrals issue.

I would have to first acknowledge that my culture here and my orientation on that spectrum errs towards the end where showing emotion is more common, whereas his isn’t. More specifically, it would involve me realising that he does still express his feelings – just not as flamboyantly as I do.

The respect step would involve me having to fundamentally accept his cultural viewpoint as well, and see things through its own lens and through its considerations to understand better where the differences really are. I could’ve spoke to other students on how conversation in Germany works, and then internalising it.

Reconciliation would involve me adapting towards his position of a lack of emotion, and instead ask more questions on a middle ground of personal thoughts and facts, such as by asking for opinions on matters and reasons for those opinions, so as to be able to strike up and continue the conversation.