



Dipartimento di Medicina, Chirurgia e Odontoiatria  
"Scuola Medica Salernitana"



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EQUALITY AND EQUITY APPLIED TO  
THE SATISFACTION OF THE WORKING NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH  
DISABILITIES.**

*– Salerno, date –*



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Disclaimer**

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO PROVIDE **EQUALITY** FOR ALL REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES?



WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO PROVIDE **EQUITY** FOR ALL REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES?



Beyond the physical, attitudinal and political barriers that persist within society and are recognised as having a direct impact on the degree to which people with disabilities can participate at work (Graham et al., 2018; Sundar et al., 2018), people with disabilities face challenges with inclusion and integration in the workplace.

# PRISONER'S DILEMMA

<https://www.britannica.com/video/186443/overview-prisoners-dilemma>



# THE SITUATION

- > Two bank robbers, Elizabeth and Henry, have been arrested and are being interrogated in separate rooms.
- > The authorities have no other witnesses, and can only prove the case against them if they can convince at least one of the robbers to betray their accomplice and testify to the crime.
- > Each bank robber is faced with the choice to cooperate with their accomplice and remain silent or to defect from the gang and testify for the prosecution.

# THE SITUATION

- > If they both co-operate and remain silent, then the authorities will only be able to convict them on a lesser charge resulting in one year in jail for each (1 year for Elizabeth + 1 year for Henry = 2 years total jail time).
- > If one testifies and the other does not, then the one who testifies will go free and the other will get five years (0 years for the one who defects + 5 for the one convicted = 5 years total).
- > However, if both testify against the other, each will get three years in jail for being partly responsible for the robbery (3 years for Elizabeth + 3 years for Henry = 6 years total jail time).





## SCORE ALLOCATION SCHEME

- > GROUP 1 WILL HAVE TO DECIDE AT EACH PLAY WHETHER TO PLAY A OR B.
- > GROUP 2 WILL HAVE TO DECIDE AT EACH PLAY WHETHER TO PLAY X OR Y

MATRIX OF SCORE

$AX - AY - BX - BY$



MATRIX OF POSSIBLE RESULTS		<u>GROUP 1</u>	
		<i>Choice A</i>	<i>Choice B</i>
<u>GROUP 2</u>	<i>Choice X</i>	Group 1 = + 5; Group 2 = + 5 	Group 1 = 0; Group 2 = + 20 
	<i>Choice Y</i>		
		Group 1 = +20; Group 2 = 0	Group 1 = +1; Group 2 = +1

PLAY N.	Result	Score group 1	Score group 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
<i>Spokespersons meeting</i>			
8			
9			
10			
Total score			

# CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF 2 GROUPS (5-6 participants)

1 OBSERVER PER GROUP

«Superficially, the analysis of PD is very simple. Although *A* cannot be sure what *B* will do, he knows that he does best to confess when *B* confesses (he gets five years rather than 20) and also when *B* remains silent (he serves no time rather than a year); analogously, *B* will reach the same conclusion. So the solution would seem to be that each prisoner does best to confess and go to jail for five years. Paradoxically, however, the two robbers would do better if they both adopted the apparently irrational strategy of remaining silent; each would then serve only one year in jail. The irony of PD is that when each of two (or more) parties acts selfishly and does not cooperate with the other (that is, when he confesses), they do worse than when they act unselfishly and cooperate together (that is, when they remain silent).»

The exercise is generally aimed at analyzing the cooperative-competitive dynamics that characterize decision making in contexts. The task concerns decision making within a context of extraneousness (the two groups cannot talk to each other)

FUNDAMENTAL FEATURE OF THE EXERCISE: ITS  
STRUCTURE LIKE A VARIABLE SUM GAME  
WHICH, HOWEVER, TENDS TO BE PLAYED AS IF  
IT WERE A ZERO SUM GAME

In the case of the Prisoner's Dilemma, however, the advantage sought by one group does not necessarily imply the loss of opportunities for the other group.

- ✓ IT IS A USEFUL PRE-TEXT TO HIGHLIGHT HOW THE PROGRESS AND OUTCOME OF A RELATIONSHIP IS A FUNCTION OF A WAY OF CONSTRUCTING THE MEANING OF THE RELATIONSHIP IN WHICH ONE IS ENROLLED
- ✓ AND OF THE PREMISES WITHIN WHICH ONE ENTERS INTO RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHERNESS

# DUE PIEDI SINISTRI (TWO LEFT FEET)

