<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Cultural Trait</th>
<th>Asperger's Symptom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They're unfamiliar with your kind of food, so they eat different food.</td>
<td>They dislike your kind of food, so they eat different food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They're used to a different climate, so they wear more/fewer layers of clothes than you do. Their sense of style differs, too.</td>
<td>They're sensitive to temperature and texture, so they use clothing differently than you do. Their sense of style differs, too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have their own cultural references. You don't get their jokes and they don't get yours.</td>
<td>Their sense of humor is different. You don't get their jokes and they don't get yours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have a different set of cultural values, which are based on experiences you haven't had. The same is true in the other direction.</td>
<td>They have a different set of social values, which are based on experiences you haven't had. The same is true in the other direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their culture teaches them to be interested in some subjects more than others, so their interests and their priorities are different from yours.</td>
<td>They develop strong interests in some subjects and are bored with many others, so their interests and their priorities are different from yours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They're unfamiliar with your local customs and sayings, so they don't understand many of your behaviors. The same is true in the other direction.</td>
<td>They don't process social rules or figures of speech the same way as you do, so they don't understand many of your behaviors. The same is true in the other direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion: Equally valid cultural difference

Conclusion: Mental disorder
Exclusively Inclusive

How Can We Tell What a Meaningfully Inclusive System Looks Like?

Scott Allen, Self-Advocate
The Waisman Center
Madison, WI
Inclusion: Putting It In Context
Visual cuteness is simply how your brain responds to geometry proportionately:

- Larger, rounder “eye” (oval)
- Larger “ear” (triangle)
- Shorter “snout” (lines, rectangle)
- Steeper “forehead” (lines)

Proportionately:
- Smaller, narrower “eye” (oval)
- Smaller “ear” (triangle)
- Longer “snout” (lines, rectangle)
- Shallower “forehead” (lines)

Just different lengths, angles, and sizes.
Beauty is in the eye of the beholder
It is subjective
It cannot be independently measured
It exists in the mind, not in objects or patterns

50 millibeauts on the beautimeter?

90 millibeauts on the beautimeter?
Whence Weirdness?

Weirdness is also in the mind of the beholder.

People who seem weird to you are usually ordinary and predictable to themselves.

The unfamiliarity, the discomfort, and the judgment are in you, not in them.

Yet our society acts as though weirdness (or deficiency, or otherness) is a property of the individual, rather than a property of how others interpret the individual.
Realities of Rejection

Social inclusion is therefore based on the abilities, resources, and judgments of those who choose whether or not to include.

Rejection or inadequate social inclusion is based on the judgments of others (fair or unfair) - not an automatic consequence of the person’s traits.

*How* their traits are judged by others depends on the value systems and logic systems of others.
In other words:

Interpersonal inclusion does have *something* to do with the person on the spectrum, but it has *everything* to do with how others perceive and interpret them.
Inclusion is enforceable only on institutional or family levels, not on the genuine, spontaneous, interpersonal level.

To avoid punishment or to escape bad feelings is an inauthentic motive for socially including others.

Responding to a social pressure is not the same as seeking a mutually meaningful benefit or a reciprocal connection.
The greatest arena of social inclusion is peer-to-peer interactions within mainstream society

This is where the greatest challenges and greatest benefits exist
The “inclusion” of someone who does not meaningfully participate in peer-to-peer interactions in mainstream society will look very different from the “inclusion” of someone who does.

We must be precise about what we really mean by “inclusion.”
The perception of “inclusion” is in the mind of the beholder.

The justifications for why a person should or should not be socially included are also in the mind of the beholder.

We can’t expect everyone to have the same subjective perspectives about people on the autism spectrum.

In order to justify greater inclusion to those who resist it, we must appeal to their subjective values as well as to objective evidence of “best” practice.
“Inclusion” is not a single action, social state, or mental state. It is a complex combination of many actions, social states, and mental states of multiple people.
Elements of Rigorous Inclusive Policy

- We need a consistent **definition** of “inclusion” that meaningfully applies **across contexts**.
- We need to **justify** that definition in ways that are consistent with **evidence** and consistent with our moral, ethical, and social **values**.
- We need ways to accurately **assess** “inclusion” according to whatever definition we collectively use.
- We need to **perform** assessments of “inclusion” validly, regularly, consistently, and ethically.
- We need to **make beneficial changes** based on numerous well-verified assessments of “inclusion.”
In This Presentation:

- Definition
- Challenges
- Belonging
- Institutional Inclusion
- Evidence-Based Policy
- Advocacy
Defining “Inclusion”
Looking for Clarity
We need a clear, consistent definition of what social inclusion is and how we expect to recognize it.

Is “inclusion” how people *behave* toward the target person, or is it how the target person *interprets and feels* about how others treat them?

Or some of each?
“Inclusion” has sometimes been used to mean “a sense of belonging.”

Yet “inclusion” is the act of including; “including” is something that others do to someone/something else.

“Feeling included” is based on how one interprets the actions of others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of belonging</th>
<th>Inclusive acts present</th>
<th>Inclusive acts absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Accurate match between inclusive acts and sense of belonging</td>
<td>Lack of accurate match: no inclusive acts, yet a sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of not belonging</td>
<td>Lack of accurate match: inclusive acts, but no sense of belonging</td>
<td>Accurate match between lack of inclusive acts and sense of not belonging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
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Social inclusion is best thought of as a dynamic between:

1) the intentions and actions of community members toward the target individual

and

2) the way the target individual interprets and feels about the intentions and actions of community members
Challenges:
Looking at Barriers to Meaningful Social Inclusion
People on the autism spectrum are widely perceived as partially or entirely failing to live up to what is deemed valuable or respectable about human life.
“You don't suffer from Asperger's, you suffer from other people.”

-Tony Attwood
Why do ASD-Neurotypical Tensions Exist?

Tensions exist when values and agenda differ. We must ask:

What does mainstream culture consider valuable, and why?

What does mainstream culture devalue, and why?

What assumptions and values in mainstream culture should be questioned and challenged for being unfair?

What assumptions and values in mainstream culture should be reframed so that they extend to people on the spectrum?
A Sampling of Common Values Based on Dubious Assumptions

1) Hard work consistently leads to economic success. (Not always.)
2) Lack of economic success is directly caused by character flaws such as laziness and apathy or genetic flaws such as low intelligence and poor impulse control. (Simplistic.)
3) Societal forces do not contribute to the lack of economic success, so individuals are wholly responsible for their own degree of success. (Absurd, ignores how systems work)
4) Only people with economic success, special talents, official authority, or a high degree of friendliness deserve to be socially respected/desirable. (Unfair and illogical.)
5) Personal worth is based heavily on one's practical competence. (Narrow definition.)
6) Economic success and/or success at gaining high social status is more valid than other forms of success. (Narrow, presumptuous, self-limiting.)
7) Benefits are valid mainly or only when they are earned through personal competence. (Unfair to those who need physical, social, or financial assistance to succeed.)
8) Social status/social connection, happiness, and physical pleasures are the appropriate sources of satisfaction in life, to the exclusion of artistic, intellectual, or social-justice pursuits. (Failure of imagination, self-limiting.)
9) It is appropriate to rank others according to their ability to make tangible economic or social contributions to society. (Judgmental, devalues humanity, dismisses other worth.)
10) It is appropriate to judge others according to first impressions, stereotypes, or on the basis of one or two alleged character flaws. (Judgmental, irrational, often false.)
11) Sexual and/or reproductive success are appropriate measures of social and moral worth. (Unfair and irrational for many reasons.)
12) People who think or feel things not widely thought or felt by others are strange, confusing, and should be avoided or shamed. (Judgmental, presumptuous, irrational.)
Cultural values are subjective.

Cultural values shape much of how people on the autism spectrum are perceived.

To include people on the autism spectrum is to disagree with widespread cultural assumptions, if not resist them.

This is a serious commitment with potential social costs, not a casual preference.
The Bottom Line

People have the right to freedom of association, so social inclusion is granted *at their own discretion*.

Therefore, inclusion cannot simply be demanded. It must be negotiated and built, socioculturally.

Hard, detailed questions that we must ask:
   1) What do we want regarding social inclusion?
   2) Who sets socially inclusive goals, & how?
   3) What measurable goals/outcomes for it?
   4) What actually makes social inclusion happen?
Challenge #1: What do we want?

Social inclusion is about human needs, human potential, and human well-being.

Social inclusion intersects with feelings, skills, rights, normalcy, stability, & support.

Tolerance, understanding, acceptance, preference, & integration are all distinct.

Who determines which specific aspects are most desirable or most achievable?
Challenge #2: How do we make sure our goals are realistic?

Realistically, which forms or venues of social inclusion are the most viable? Who decides this, and how?

Do we consider it realistic to make social inclusion appealing/meaningful to all parties? If so, how?

Do we consider it realistic to overcome misunderstanding & miscommunication, and on what scale?

Degree of assistance:
Dependence vs. independence vs. interdependence
Challenge #3: How do we make our goals measurable?

Examples of measurable benefits of social inclusion:

1) Social, practical, and regulatory skills
2) Stable, beneficial social contacts
3) Economic improvement
4) Realistically positive affirmations of self
Challenge #4: How do we generate change?

Behavior and understanding can be improved on either or both ends.

You can choose to improve your own behavior or understanding; you can’t choose to improve someone else’s.

You can ask, demand, or incentivize them to behave or understand better, but you cannot force them to do so.

Change is our responsibility, too.
Challenge #4, cont': Respect has to be Earned (and so does Full Inclusion)

Change should not be all on the individual or all on society – both must grow from the interaction.

No one is fully embraced by others without earning trust, respect, and familiarity. We on the spectrum must contribute something meaningful to others and show we’re not merely social burdens to be appeased.

This is the core problem of meaningful social inclusion: meaning is subjective. We must find ways to negotiate between ASD & NT meanings. Earning full inclusion requires acting in good faith while giving others reasons to interpret us more favorably.
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Challenge #4, con’t: Making inclusion happen

Research shows attitudes change best when people are exposed to individuals who neither too strongly match stereotypes nor too strongly fail to match stereotypes.

Too close a match, and the stereotype seems to be confirmed.

Too dissimilar, and the individual seems like a major exception to the pattern, not a challenge to it.

The sweet spot is where the individual clearly exhibits some elements of the stereotype, yet clearly contradicts the stereotype in other ways.
Conclusion of “Challenges”

The greatest difficulty is dealing with complexity.

Simple (social) solutions only work for simple (social) challenges.

To turn away from complexity is to turn down the most promising answers.
Belonging:
What Does “Meaningful Social Inclusion” Mean?
Some on the spectrum may not know when, whether, or how they are being socially included.

Miscommunication can be cultural (learned/inherited) as well as psychological.

Interpreting social inclusion in purely social terms tends to marginalize real functional impairments & cultural differences.
“Friendship sure is confusing. I never seem to know who my friends are, which friendships I still have and which I lost.

Ok so case in point - are we friends? Is this a friendship because we're helping each other out, corresponding etc?”

- A real quote from a real friend.
Friendship and a “sense of belonging” are highly individualized sets of social, emotional, and value perceptions.

They mean something different to everyone, and manifest differently in different situations.

Genuine social inclusion therefore must take the individual into account. It cannot be a cookie-cutter, one-size-fits all approach.
Being Invited is Not the Same as Feeling That You Belong

What you say:

“Would you like to come to the football game with us?”

What I hear:

“Would you like to come to the sportsing cathedral to watch enormous men throwing a prolate spheroid made of deceased cattle skin at each other while 60,000 screaming primates turn the air into living thunder?”
Similarities and differences in interests, priorities, and other values determine whether an invitation to be included is meaningful.

Being included in something that you dislike, distrust, or find confusing is not very meaningful.
“Not belonging” is not the same thing as “rejection.”

*Rejection* is a conscious choice of disapproval and the active enforcement thereof.

*Not belonging* is the sense that one cannot relate to others meaningfully even if others do not disapprove.

The experience of being on the autism spectrum is extremely complex and often difficult to explain, so the sense of *not belonging* can result from mutual difficulties in understanding, even without rejection.

Respect and approval are not the same as integration.
Mutuality is the Key . . . and the Question

To be in a fully integrated relationship, people expect you to meet some of their own needs and preferences.

Needs and other expectations have to be appreciated on both sides for a relationship to be mutual.

Mutuality is the key to close, stable relationships.

People on the spectrum usually interpret their culture quite differently than mainstream people do, due to perceptual differences.

Finding mutual points of reference is therefore often hard; extensive cultural integration may not always be feasible.
Components of a sense of belonging:

- Respect for personality
- Respect for contributions
- Respect for tastes & interests
- Respect for goals & ambitions
- Respect for opinions & worldview
- Mutual sense of trust
- Mutual sense of affection
- Mutual sense of individuality
- Mutual or compatible goals & interests
- Mutual desire for meaningful interaction
- Ability to recognize and interpret these things
- Ability to recognize that people value these things in different ways, to different degrees
Componentiality: The state or quality of being a component

Componentiality combats vague ideas that sound good but aren’t clear.

Large categories like “inclusion” are only useful as summaries and reminders.

Large categories aren’t operational unless we break them into smaller components.

It is not enough to have *descriptive* information; we need to have *explanatory* information. For that, we need to see how individual components work, not just the larger picture.
“Be yourself, you don’t need to change for other people.” . . . Really?

Life *is* change.

Changing is hard, but it is not reasonable to place all the burden of change on others. There must be compromise.

If other people need to change for you, you also need to change for them, within reason. No one grows without change.
Society must change if people on the autism spectrum are to be respected, accepted, and included.

People on the autism spectrum must change as they grow and work to overcome their faults and limitations, as do all people.

No one reaches their potential without working on their problems. Nor can society improve without recognizing and addressing its errors and injustices.

Growth must err on the side of presuming the competence to change, whether individually or for society.
A “sense of belonging” must take account of the psychology of the community, the psychology of potential friends and allies, and the psychology of the target person.
Inclusion at the Institutional Level
There is no such thing as a standard human.

There is no such thing as a “wrong” way to be human. There are only more common and less common advantages & disadvantages.

Most of society fails to realize this; = Stigma
Temporary inclusion without permanent growth is like a bandage that will fall off the wound before it is healed.

The wound is not autism; the wound is the conceit and indifference of society.

Institutions are places to grow and heal, not places to reside.
Schools and other institutions are protective; they do not fully reflect, and cannot substitute for, the mainstream world.

Do we know that inclusion at the institutional level promotes inclusion out in the rest of society? How much does this matter?

Should inclusion outside of social institutions be a major goal of social institutions?
YES
Social inclusion in our institutions should naturalistically foster, promote, reflect, and maintain the kind of inclusion that should exist in society.

Institutional inclusion should be a springboard to launch inclusion in other parts of society, not a substitute for it, and not just a temporary crutch.
Institutional goals for meaningful social inclusion should include:

1) To promote skills and situations that accurately reflect other parts of society

2) To help individuals accurately & explicitly interpret the dynamics between themselves and society

3) To teach individuals on \textit{and} off the spectrum how to recognize, question, and challenge unjust social norms
Keys to Pursuing Socially Inclusive Goals

1. Establish Clear Values

2. Emphasize Principles, Not Procedures

3. Promote High Standards for All Involved
1. Clear Values are Essential

**Good:** Accepting people for who they are instead of rejecting them for who they are not.

**Better:** Valuing people for who they are instead of pushing them toward who we want them to be.

**Best:** Promoting people as individuals with the capacity to grow instead of tolerating them as rigid units of obligation.
2. Emphasize Principles, Not Procedures

Don’t just follow rules in order to work within the structure - follow *principles* to work within the framework of the people being helped.

Don’t just “do things right” (i.e. follow procedures). “Do the right thing” (i.e. follow up & ensure the target individuals are actually being helped).

Following procedures well is meaningless if the procedures don’t lead to good outcomes.
Prejudice and discrimination are real, but systemic problems like poor planning, limited funding, or limited data are equally serious.

Existing frameworks are only partly compatible with the needs and goals of this population.

Key questions for institutions: What does this person actually need or want to do? How could they best be helped to do it? When would this help be best?

Rules and procedures should be built around needs, because needs can’t be built around rules or procedures.
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For policies to be effective, they must reflect the real world, not only parts of it.

Don’t oversimplify if you can avoid it!
3. Hold Everyone to (Their Own) High Standards

It’s common to misinterpret what is negotiable versus what is innate for people on the spectrum.

Don’t shame/punish them for things they cannot change, and don’t passively tolerate things they could change.

Are we comparing them to their standards or to those of other people? Are our hopes compatible with their hopes? To what degree? How do we negotiate this?
3. High Standards, con’t

Don’t just *provide* inclusion (i.e., safety/accommodations) - *promote* the ability to evaluate & seek inclusion (i.e., skills & self-knowledge).

Don’t focus on emotionally provocative or high-profile examples; focus on a wider systemic perspective.

Don’t focus on the *form* of assessments or standards; focus on their *content*.
Conclusion of “Institutional Inclusion”

Social inclusion at the institutional level is a training tool for helping individuals develop the skills and connections that will best serve them in society at large.
Evidence-Based Policy & Practice: Proposals for Clear Thought and Effective Action
Evidence-based models of inclusion are key to knowing what a meaningfully inclusive social system looks like.

As professionals, we must be prepared to evaluate the quality of the evidence that our personal practices and institutional policies are based on.
The issue of policy-based evidence versus evidence-based policy:

Evidence is not about one “side” being right and the other “side” being wrong.

Evidence is about the sum total of all available observations, and logical conclusions that are as complete and unbiased as possible.

Unfortunately, policies are often generated by people who see evidence only in terms of supporting their “side.”
Evidence-based models of inclusion are framed in terms of inclusion as a whole, not only some specific aspects of inclusion.
Evidence-based models of inclusion evaluate the root causes of why the culture of a community values and/or devalues people on the autism spectrum, including:

- The person’s degree of 1) physical, 2) sensory, 3) emotional, 4) cognitive, 5) social, and 6) practical ability, as well as their 7) class, 8) race, 9) beliefs, 10) sex/gender, 11) appearance, 12) behaviors, etc., since all of these are judged by others as part of a person’s subjective social worth.

- The sociopolitical system (national, regional, & local factors) that constructs assumptions & definitions about what is or is not a “legitimate” trait, behavior, disability, or person.
Think in Terms of Systems, Not Intuitions

Systems are made of interacting parts; a systemic framework must show how the component parts interact.

Don’t overemphasize developmental, emotional, or social aspects yet neglect physiology, cultural preferences, personal history, available opportunities, larger sociopolitical agendas, existential worries, etc.!
All of these must be investigated and communicated.

Misplaced emphases mean components that actually cause problems for those on the autism spectrum might be ignored, go unaddressed, and remain marginalized.
Generalities are an important starting point.

They are not enough to get from Point A to Point B.

Generalities must be translated into specific, suitable actions if they are to have any substantive effect.

Relying on generalities can turn into “feel-good” ideas without ways to implement them. They then remain generalities rather than becoming realities.

We must insist on specificity and applicability, whenever feasible.
Most Relevant Observations and Principles

Specific Ways to Apply Observations and Principles as Policies

Standardized social conventions and concrete, individualized interventions that support social inclusion
Document the Outcomes

If we’re not documenting the outcomes, how do we know whether the policies are having the desired effect?

Each success and each failure is a potential datapoint that can be learned from and built upon to improve policies that foster inclusion.

Professionals do learn from successes and failures, but being systematic helps clarify larger patterns.
Conclusion of “Evidence-Based Policy & Practice”

Reality of our ideas

Clarity of our definitions

Accuracy of our observations

Consistency of our methods

Justice for the people we serve
Advocacy:
Making Inclusion Happen
Advocating for mainstream people to spend more time with “awkward,” hard-to-understand people is never going to be easy.

Making sure that the time they spend together will be *meaningful* is even harder.

This implies *big* changes in society’s thinking.
Whether personally or professionally, advocacy must reach society at large.

Professionals have a special role in advocacy because they are the most knowledgeable about how our institutions work. Their voices need to be heard.

All advocates must inform, offer reasonable solutions, promote dialogue, and persuade others to change.
People ignore, dismiss, fear, and/or misrepresent that which they don’t understand.

People are not motivated to understand things that do not appeal to them or affect them.

People are also defensive about being told to change their values.

To change attitudes, we must understand, appreciate, and challenge the sociocultural perspectives of others.

We must appeal to their values in order to change attitudes from within their own mental framework.
Deeply entrenched assumptions about human nature, and deeply ingrained values about independence, conformity, and “success,” must be challenged from within if full inclusion and real integration is to be possible across society.

Advocating to socially include people on the autism spectrum means advocating for a quiet revolution in how people in our society choose to interpret, judge, and compete with each other. Selective morality = exclusion.
Keys to Thoughtful Autism-Spectrum Advocacy

Human Values & Human Rights

Principles & Solutions that Dignify the Individual

Rules that Promote Genuine Fairness

Specific Knowledge of Autism-Spectrum Issues

Create a Clear, Concise, Conscientious Etiquette

Foster Social Norms for Moral Accountability
Conclusion of “Advocacy”

Advocating for social inclusion depends on developing an accurate understanding of cultural & psychological factors, in order to persuade people within their own cultural & psychological frameworks.
Elements of Rigorous Inclusive Policy

- We need a consistent **definition** of “inclusion” that meaningfully applies across contexts.

- We need to **justify** that definition in ways that are consistent with **evidence** and consistent with our moral, ethical, and social **values**.

- We need ways to accurately **assess** “inclusion” according to whatever definition we collectively use.

- We need to **perform** assessments of “inclusion” validly, regularly, consistently, and ethically.

- We need to **make beneficial changes** based on numerous well-verified assessments of “inclusion.”
Context: “Inclusion” is a complex combination of many actions, social states, and mental states from multiple people.

Definition: Inclusion is the dynamic between how people act toward a person and how the person interprets those actions.

Challenges: Simple solutions work only for simple problems, and turning away from complexity is to turn away from the best answers.

Belonging: A sense of belonging depends on the psychology of the community in general and of the specific individuals involved.
Institutional Inclusion: Focus on doing the right thing, not just following procedures as expected

Evidence-Based Policy & Practice: Evaluate and promote Reality of ideas, Clarity of definitions, Accuracy of observations, Consistency of methods, Justice for people

Advocacy: Develop accurate understanding of cultural & psychological factors to persuade people within their own cultural & psychological frameworks
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Other material
### Interpersonal Disincentives to Systemic Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Disincentives (Constraints)</th>
<th>Invalid Disincentives (Flaws)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty due to lack of prior exposure to the target group</td>
<td>Uncertainty due to avoidable ignorance, apathy, miscomm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to spend time with people whom one relates to</td>
<td>Desire to shame or exclude those one does not relate to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistaken assumptions taken on good faith from allegedly reputable yet incorrect sources</td>
<td>Mistaken assumptions based on faulty, selfish reasons or from disreputable sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to avoid spending time on undesirable situations</td>
<td>Desire to avoid spending time on others who deserve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to make best use of one’s time and resources</td>
<td>Desire to avoid issues that challenge one’s power/beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Valid Disincentives (Constraints)
- Uncertainty due to insufficient means of collecting data
- Desire to protect reputation from slander or misinterpretation
- Valid personal or institutional agendas that genuinely conflict with needs or rights of others
- Desire to avoid redundant work or needless expenditures
- Desire to juggle multiple competing sets of needs

### Invalid Disincentives (Flaws)
- Uncertainty due to avoidable ignorance, apathy, miscomm.
- Desire to protect reputation despite failure to act rightly
- Invalid personal or institutional agendas needlessly at odds with needs or rights of others
- Desire to avoid necessary effort or legitimate expenditures
- Desire to unfairly prioritize some sets of needs over others
### Interpersonal Incentives for Systemic Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Incentives (Allowances)</th>
<th>Invalid Incentives (Demerits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire to learn about others’ perspectives &amp; experiences for sake of connection &amp; dignity</td>
<td>Desire to learn about others to seem “hip” or appear more knowledgeable than is true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To spend time w/ people to support their needs &amp; rights</td>
<td>To spend time w/ people to uphold preconceived narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting factually &amp; morally correct information for the sake of honesty &amp; compassion</td>
<td>Promoting correct or incorrect information for the sake of inflating one’s status or ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere desire to uphold values of hope, fairness, opportunity</td>
<td>Shallow desire to portray values of hope, fairness, opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to grow by overcoming personal prejudices</td>
<td>Desire to seem morally superior &amp; judge other’s prejudices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Incentives for Systemic Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Valid Incentives (Allowances)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Invalid Incentives (Demerits)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased efficacy thanks to improved accuracy of data</td>
<td>Valuing veneer of objectivity above genuine applicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior reputation for service, competence, &amp; humaneness</td>
<td>Valuing reputation above actual quality or commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to meet practical &amp; ethical goals for this group</td>
<td>Improved ability to pander to trends, regardless of worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cost-effectiveness thanks to improved targeting</td>
<td>Increased penny-pinching allegedly validated by data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to prioritize competing needs fairly</td>
<td>Improved ability to obscure services through bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>