

5 The greater good – instruction UM students

This assignment will allow you to collaborate with students in Bandung, Indonesia. The goals of this assignment are

1. to experience collaboration with others in a virtual setting.
2. to learn about different cultures through social and academic interactions with students from another country and by studying cultural characteristics of Indonesia
3. to learn about humanitarian work psychology

The Millennium development goals state that our society should try to right a series of wrongs, including eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, creating universal primary education, promoting gender equality/women's empowerment, reducing child mortality, improve maternal care, combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria and ensuring environmental sustainability.

What could work and organizational psychologists have to contribute here?

Each team will prepare a presentation illustrating how work and organizational psychologists can contribute to improve practice on the topic your team adopts. You could briefly sketch a humanitarian (research) project you would like to start. To contextualize the assignment, you will focus on current events in Indonesia.

All groups will write a PBL type problem, based on the Indonesian problem description. Make sure to include relevant background information (next to 10+ relevant articles, you can include webpages, links to video's,...). Also list what kind of questions (learning goals) the problem/case triggers. In a separate document, you can indicate how your sources help answer these questions (This document could then be used as a two-page guideline for a tutor/supervisor). Together, all problems/cases would be the building blocks of a PBL module in "Humanitarian Work Psychology in Indonesia". To get an impression of what we are aiming for, you can have a look at last year's problems, which are published on <http://www.gohwp.org>

Here is the road map for this problem:

Week 1 (27 october)

Your tutorial group will split in half. This year, we will create 16 teams of approximately 6 students. Each team will connect with at least 2 students from Bandung, Indonesia, who will collaborate with you on this assignment.

During the first tutorial group meeting on October 28th, we will determine team composition and each team will produce a ranking of seven topics. The tutor will pass the ranking on to the coordinator and later that week, a topic will be assigned to each team. Here are the topics:

- 1 Diplomacy and negotiating conflicts in humanitarian work,
- 2 Disaster management and response,
- 3 Poverty reduction,
- 4 Ethical decision making in humanitarian work
- 5 Developing leaders in humanitarian organizations
- 6 Coping with stress in humanitarian work
- 7 Microfinance and supporting people in developing countries to start small businesses
- 8 Capacity building and training implementation in developing countries
- 9 Displacement/refugees/homelessness
- 10 Trafficking and slavery
- 11 Child labour, child soldiers
- 12 Fair pay (inequity)
- 13 Gender mainstreaming
- 14 How to make aid more effective (Paris Declaration / Accra agenda)
- 15 Corruption
- 16 Social entrepreneurship

You are allowed to adapt to topic of your assignment, if the Indonesian students concur, and if the adapted topic does not overlap with other topics on the list.

Each group will prepare a short presentation to introduce team members using a template that will be posted on EleUM.

A list of topics will be sent to Bandung, and the Indonesian students will be distributed across the topics. Students in Maastricht and Bandung can start sharing interesting materials on <http://padlet.com/herco213/edvv5m1gzahi>

Week 2 (3 November)

In the beginning of this week, groups will receive contact details. Make sure you plan a first meeting (synchronous or asynchronous) to get to know each other, share expectations and to agree on how you can collaborate. Doodle may help you find a good time slot.

Representatives of each group will have a Skype session with representatives of Indonesian students on Monday, November 3rd at 10.00h (UNS40, rm 1.738)

However you decide to communicate (FaceBook, Google+, Skype, e-mail, Twitter, ..), try to get to know your team members, their personal background, values, beliefs, behavioral norms, and behavioral patterns. Please share with your team members what is important for you to know, in order to improve communication, work effectively, and get the most out of the experience in the project.

Remember that the students from Bandung may have a different interest in joining your group (e.g., they might wish to gather materials for writing an article in a local journal). Try to figure out how you can make the interdependence work. Suggestions for team roles will be posted on Eleum.

Save and send evidence of your first meeting (send a printscreen, and a short, 100-200 word report of the meeting to h.fonteijn@maastrichtuniversity.nl). Only one print/report per team is needed.

Week 3 (10 november), Week 4 (17 November), Week 5 (24 November)

Have weekly sessions (synchronous or asynchronous) to evaluate the work that has been done and the group process. At the end of each week, you send evidence of group work (a printscreen, and a short 100-200 word progress report to your tutor and to h.fonteijn@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Week 6

On Monday December 1st, or Tuesday December 2nd, the Maastricht teams will deliver a stunning presentation to convince a fictitious NGO to allocate resources to your (research) project and the work of W&O psychologists involved in it.

On Tuesday December 2nd, the students in Maastricht will test the problem, observe the other team in the tutorial group while they make sense of it, and help them answer questions that arise. You can then fine-tune the problem/case description and mail all products to the coordinator. (Products and presentation will determine 20% of the UM students' grade, see below).

On Tuesday December 2nd or Wednesday December 3rd, we will have an online discussion meeting with students in Bandung to evaluate the collaboration, and the presentations.

Literature

Since this assignment starts off as a problem finding exercise, you should initially search for relevant literature and resources yourself. In the third week of this module, literature suggestions will be published on Eleum.

Grading

The grade for students in Maastricht will be determined by the quality of

1 the elevator pitch (a 7-10 minute presentation) on Monday 1st or Tuesday 2nd. Of course, you can start with a brief overview of the issue itself. You can also briefly mention the problem/case. The presentation should also make clear how work and organizational psychologists (can) make contributions to the issue you selected, and what kind of project you would get involved in. Not all team members need to present (you are all expected to be present, though). Please add a final slide with references to the materials you have found.

2 evidence you have seriously tried to meet the learning goals of this assignment (e.g., through screenprints of Facebook/Skype/chat/Hangout/padlet or other tools), plus a brief individual reflection on learning in a culturally diverse team – how did interaction with students halfway around the globe help you meet the goals of this assignment? What are pros and cons of having participated in this collaboration? Why? How do you think your partners (from abroad) felt about their participation in this assignment? Why? Bring a printed version of this document to the exam and mail the document to the coordinator on December 16th.

3 a problem description (preferably 1 A4, 2 A4 max.), a list of learning resources plus any links to background material (YouTube, websites, .) you deem relevant (about 1 A4), and

4 a guide for someone who is supposed to act as a tutor (2-3 A4, containing possible learning goals, and a brief overview of how the literature/resources your team collected can help answer these learning goals; so think of this document as a short 2-3 page summary of the most important concepts and findings, organized along learning goals).

Please do not hand in sloppy documents (check grammar, etc.)

6 How to slice a pie

Gate Gourmet is the world's largest independent airline catering and logistics provider. In 2005 they made the headlines of all newspapers. This is how they presented themselves:

- We **communicate** in an open way and promote inspiring teamwork
- We **treat** our colleagues, customers and suppliers **with respect and dignity**
- We **pay market competitive salaries** and offer adequate social security
- We **promote performance** oriented and flexible bonus schemes
- We **believe** in management by objectives (MBO) leadership style
- We **engage** in training and coaching
- We **support** our employees in gaining multinational experience
- **We are equal opportunity employer**



(<http://www.gategourmet.com/797/827/861.asp>, downloaded August, 20, 2005)

The Daily Mirror: SECRET PLOT TO SACK BA CATERERS

A CATERING firm's cynical plot to sack its Heathrow workers so they could be replaced with cheap labour was spelt out in brutal terms. In a secret internal briefing entitled "Mile Stones" and marked "Confidential", BA's caterer Gate Gourmet declared: "Recruit, train and security check drivers. "Announce intention to trade union, provoking unofficial industrial action from staff. Dismiss current workforce. Replace with new staff."The shocking move was part of a 15-week timetable, first mooted a year ago, to provoke workers into striking so they could be replaced with cheap East European labour trained at secret bases. A steering committee cited the top risk as "potential for wider Heathrow based disruption".

The sacking plan was drawn up by a tight-knit team of hard-line businessmen from GG's US owners, the Texas Pacific Group. They drafted three options. The most dramatic was the "Mile Stones" plan to provoke unofficial action. Our insider said a solicitor was consulted. The source said: "He said if staff could be provoked into unofficial action they could all be sacked and have no legal redress. It would also mean the company could seek damages from individuals."

(..) After firing staff, directors were told to *continuously release statements simultaneously through the unions and local media stating our intention to resolve any official action. Consistently state our case as being reasonable and willing to reconcile.* It added: *Hard line resolve to staff already dismissed.*" But if the risks were high, so were the rewards. The dossier forecast the £2.5million sacking plan would save up to £6.5 million a year. An insider said: "This is all about pure greed. They deliberately made the workers lives

absolute hell, then told them they were outsourcing their posts to spark a reaction. It's a shocking way to treat people." (..)

Referring to the firm's drivers, the dossier details how staff could be told their working conditions were going to be dramatically worsened, so provoking fury.

Among the threats listed were: "No redundancy packages, no leaving early, no extra pay for extra work, random drug testing, no smoking, eating or drinking in cabs."

The plan also advises how to sack staff. It reads: "Immediate dismissal without legal protection. Collect ID cards, airside passes, locker keys. HR to issue dismissal letters, extra security presence. Security to escort dismissed staff from the premises."

Under the heading "Can we replace employees?" the document lists details of agencies that could recruit staff from Eastern Europe. (..)

We have learned independently that all drivers drafted in last week to replace staff are Polish.

(..)15/08/2005

Socialist Worker: (..) Gate Gourmet employees (..) were sacked by megaphone, handed pre-prepared dismissal notices with just three minutes warning and manhandled off the premises by hired thugs. Pregnant women were dragged out by security guards. People not at work that day, on sick or maternity leave, were sacked. One man found out he was out of a job just hours before his mother's funeral. In their place came scab workers from an agency set up by Gate Gourmet's chief executive eight months ago. (..)

Then, the following morning, came a magnificent response which has been sorely lacking in Britain for over two decades. Hundreds of BA ground staff, on hearing of the brutal sackings, stopped work and within hours had brought the airline's Heathrow operation to a standstill. This was a mostly male, largely white "traditional" workforce bringing industrial muscle to bear in support of a largely Asian, 50 percent female group of abysmally paid workers in the same union.

© Copyright Socialist Worker (unless otherwise stated). You may republish if you include an active link to the original and leave this notice in place http://www.socialistworker.co.uk/article.php4?article_id=7180

TGWU BRIEFING The Transport and General Workers Union today warned British Airways that if it was now seen to be the case that the company "were intent on victimisation of yet more members of the Heathrow family" after the sacking of 670 low paid mainly Asian and mainly women workers at Gate Gourmet, the union would support "legal industrial action to protect victimised members". (..)"The Gate Gourmet workers' case now goes beyond just an industrial dispute," he said. "They are the focus for the trade union movement and the fight for decency and justice in the workplace." (18/08/2005)



The Observer: At the world's busiest airport, anything that disrupts a flight is enormously expensive. When workforce leaders threaten to hold up aircraft, it often makes sound commercial sense for managers to give in immediately, rather than risk seeing a fleet worth billions of pounds grounded. 'From the employer's point of view, it becomes important to minimise the risk of conflict,' says David Coats, policy director of the Work Foundation and a former official at the TUC. (..) (28/08/2005)

The Guardian: August 13, 2005

Gate Gourmet executives and Transport and General Workers Union representatives are now involved in talks at the conciliation service, Acas.

The catering company, which said it lost £22m in the UK last year and could lose £25m this year, insists that it is being forced to take tough action to survive in a fiercely competitive industry.

(..) Earlier, pickets at Gate Gourmet's plant at Heathrow said the company had embarked on a sustained attempt to downgrade their pay and conditions even before last week's flashpoint.

They say the workload was steadily increasing even as staff levels were being eroded.

Workers also cited a recent restructuring, claiming that staff were promoted to management positions and then made redundant, thereby allowing senior officials to say they were pruning the management tier.

Gate Gourmet Press Release: Union Causes Failure of ACAS Talks

Gate Gourmet confirms that discussions with the Transport and General Workers Union through the mediation services of ACAS have broken down as a result of preconditions set out by the union. (16/08/2005)

Guess what happened (next)?

Literature

Minimum study requirements: Consult all texts from list A, and one empirical study from C. Four or five pairs of students select one text from list B; no two pairs study the same text. Taking the learning objectives into account, you search for a fourth text yourself, or you select a text from list C or list D, which contains texts relating to the field of aviation psychology. Each pair of students is expected to post hand-outs containing (selected) slides of their presentation (6 slides per A4, maximum of 12 slides) and present their findings using Powerpoint.

@ denotes the text is available in the e-reader; LRC denotes a text can be found in the learning resources centre; SG refers to books that are available in the library; other texts can be retrieved using library information sources such as EBSCO or PsycInfo, or by accessing the electronic journals directly. Make sure you search within multiple databases by checking the boxes next to for instance EconLit and PsycInfo and PsycArticles.

A

Bazerman, M., & Moore, D. (2009). *Judgment in Managerial decision making*. 7th Ed. Hoboken NJ: Wiley. Ch. 9 Making rational decisions in negotiation. Pp. 151-166. Ch. 10 Negotiator Cognition, pp 168-178.

B

1 Gunia, B., Brett, J., Nandkeolyar, A., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Paying a price: Culture, trust, and negotiation consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 774-789.

2 Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational justice: New insights from behavioural ethics. *Human relations*, 0018726713485609.

3 Shao, R., Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D. P., & Jones, K. S. (2013). Employee Justice Across Cultures A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 263-301.

C

- Arend, R., & Seale, D. (2005). Modeling Alliance activity: An iterated prisoner's dilemma with exit option. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 1057-1074
- Barclay, L., Skarlicki, D., & Pugh, S. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 629-643.
- Barney, J., & Hansen, M. (1994). Trustworthiness as a Source of Competitive Advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 175-190.
- Baron, J. (2000). *Thinking and Deciding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 18. Social dilemmas: Cooperation versus defection. LRC
- Bazerman, M., Curhan, J., Moore, D., & Valley, K. (2000). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 279-314.
- Bollen, K., & Euwema, M. (2013). Workplace Mediation: An Underdeveloped Research Area. *Negotiation Journal*, 29(3), 329-353.
- Brett, J., Northcraft, G., & Pinkley, R. (1999). Stairways to Heaven: An Interlocking Self-Regulation Model of Negotiation. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 435-451.
- Christopher R., & Carnevale, P. (1997). Group choice in ultimatum bargaining. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 72, 256-279.
- Chaiken, S., Gruenfeld, D., & Judd, C. (2000). Persuasion in negotiations and conflict situations. In M. Deutsch and P. Coleman (Eds.). *The handbook of conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. @
- Cialdini, R., Bator, R., & Guadagno, R. (1999). Normative influences in organizations. In L. Thompson, J. Levine, and D. Messick (Eds.). *Shared Knowledge in Organizations. The Management of Knowledge*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. SG
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: a meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199.
- De Dreu, C. (2008). The virtue and vice of workplace conflict: food for (pessimistic) thought. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 5-18. (see also: Tjosvold, D. (2008). The conflict-positive organization: It depends on us. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 19-28.)
- De Dreu, C., Beersma, B., Stroebe, K., & Euwema, C. (2006). Motivated information processing, strategic choice, and the quality of negotiated agreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 927-943.
- De Dreu, C. (2003). Time pressure and closing of the mind in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 91, 280-295.
- De Dreu, C., & Beersma, B. (2005). Conflict in organizations : Beyond effectiveness and performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 105-112.
- Dreu, C. de, & Vianen, A. van (2001). Managing Relationship Conflict and the Effectiveness of Organizational Teams. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 22, 309-328.
- De Dreu, C., & Van Kleef, G. (2004). The influence of power on the information search, impression formation, and demands in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 303-319.

- Dubrin, A. (2004). *Leadership*. 4th Ed. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin. Ch. 12 Communication and conflict resolution, pp. 386-391.
- Folger, R., Ganegoda, D. B., Rice, D. B., Taylor, R., & Wo, D. X. (2013). Bounded autonomy and behavioral ethics: Deonance and reactance as competing motives. *Human Relations*, 66(7), 905-924.
- Giacomantonio, De Dreu, C., & Manetti (2010). Now You See It, Now You Don't: Interests, Issues, and Psychological Distance in Integrative Negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 761-774.
- Gilliland, S., Paddock, L. (2005). Organizational Justice across Human Resource Management Decisions. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 20,149-176. @
- Goldberg, S. (2005). The Secrets of Successful Mediators. *Negotiation journal*, 21, 365-376.
- Greenberg, J. (2000). Promote procedural justice to enhance acceptance of work outcomes. In E. Locke (Ed.). *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. LRC
- Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., & Murnighan, J. K. (2012). Mind Games: The Mental Representation of Conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, -148
- Higgins, C., Judge, T., & Ferris, G. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: a meta-analysis *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 89-106.
- Hyder, E., Prietula, M., & Weingart, L. (2000). Getting to best: Efficiency versus optimality in negotiation. *Cognitive Science*, 24, 169-204.
- Liao, H., & Rupp, D. (2005). The Impact of Justice Climate and Justice Orientation on Work Outcomes : A Cross-Level Multifoci Framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 242-256.
- Kim, P., & Fragale, A. (2005). Choosing the path to bargaining power: An empirical comparison of BATNAs and contributions in negotiation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 373-381.
- Van Kleef, G., De Dreu, C., & Manstead, A. (2004). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 510-528.
- Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1996). What Firms Do? Coordination, Identity, and Learning. *Organization Science*, 7, 502-518.
- Kressel, K. (2000). Mediation. In M. Deutsch and P. Coleman (Eds.). *The handbook of conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. @
- Kwon, S., & Weingart, L. (2004). Unilateral concessions from the other party: Concession behavior, attributions, and negotiation judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 263-278.
- Lammers, J., Stapel, D.A. & Galinsky, A.D. (2010). Power Increases Hypocrisy: Moralizing in Reasoning, Immorality in Behavior. *Psychological Science*, 21,737-744.
- Lind, E., & Earley, P.C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 59, 952-959. Reprinted in L. Thompson (Ed.). (2003). *The Social Psychology of Organizational Behavior*. Hove: Psychology Press. SG
- Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. (1998). The Social Construction of Injustice: Fairness Judgments in Response to Own and Others' Unfair Treatment by Authorities. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 75,1-22.

Lind, E.A., Kulik, C., Ambrose, M., Vera Park, M.de (1993). Individual and Corporate Dispute Resolution: Using Procedural Fairness as a Decision Heuristic. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 224-251.

Loewenstein, J., Morris, M., Chakravarti, A., Thompson, L., & Kopelman, S. (2005). At a loss for words: Dominating the conversation and the outcome in negotiation as a function of intricate arguments and communication media. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 98, 28-38.

Rispens, S., & Jehn, K. (2011). Conflict in workgroups: Constructive, destructive and symmetric conflict. In D. de Cremer, R. van Dick, & J.K. Murnighan (Eds.). *Social psychology and organizations*. New York, NY: Routledge. LRC (online resource)

Robinson, R., Lewicki, R., & Donahue, E. (2000). Extending and testing a five factor model of ethical and unethical bargaining tactics: Introducing the SINS scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 649-664.

Shen, H., Wan, F., Wyer, R. (2011). Cross-Cultural Differences in the Refusal to Accept a Small Gift: The Differential Influence of Reciprocity Norms on Asians and North Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 271-281.

Sinaceur, M., Van Kleef, G., Neale, M., Adam, H., & Haag, C. (2011). Hot or Cold? Is communicating anger or threats more effective in negotiation? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 1018-1032.

Swaab, R., Postmet, T., van Beest, I., & Spears, R. (2007). Shared cognition as a product of, and precursor to, shared identity in negotiations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 187-199.

Taylor, M.S. (2000). Manage conflict through negotiation and mediation. In E. Locke (Ed.). *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. LRC

Thompson, L., Nadler, J., & Kim, P. (1999). Some like it hot: The case for the emotional negotiator. In L. Thompson, J. Levine, and D. Messick (Eds.). *Shared Knowledge in Organizations. The Management of Knowledge*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. SG

Tinsley, C. (2001). How negotiators get to Yes: Predicting the constellation of strategies used across cultures to negotiate conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 583-593.

Tyler, T. (2000). Social Justice: Outcome and Procedure. *International journal of psychology*, 35, 117-125.

Tyler, T., Huo, Y., & Lind, E.A. (2000). Cultural values and authority relations. The psychology of conflict resolution across cultures. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 6, 1138-1163.

Weingart, L., & Jehn, K. (2000). Manage intra-team conflict through collaboration. In E. Locke (Ed.). *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. LRC

Weingart, L., Brett, J., Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. (2007). Conflicting motives in negotiating groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 994-1010.

Weiss, J., & Hughes, J. (2005). Want Collaboration? Accept -- And Actively Manage -- Conflict. *Harvard Business Review*, 92-101.

Vliert, E. van der, (1998). Conflict and conflict management. In P. Drenth, H. Thierry, and C. de Wolff (Eds.). *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology. Volume 3: Personnel Psychology*. Hove: Psychology Press. LRC

Vliert, E. van der, & Mastenbroek, W. (1998). Negotiation. In P. Drenth, H. Thierry, and C. de Wolff (Eds.). *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology. Volume 3: Personnel Psychology*. Hove: Psychology Press. LRC

D

Appelbaum, S., & Fewster, B. (2003). Global aviation human resource management: contemporary employee and labour relations practices *Management Research News*, 26, 56-69.

Blyton, P., Lucio, M., McGurk, J., Turnbull, P. (2001). Globalization and trade union strategy: industrial restructuring and human resource management in the international civil aviation industry. *International journal of human resource management*, 12, 445-463.