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Conceptual foundations

“Humanitarian work psychology” is the application of Industrial and Organizational (I-O) psychology to humanitarian work (including humanitarian workers’ well-being and humanitarian task performance) as well as making work-in-general more humanitarian (promoting what the International Labour Organization calls Decent Work, and meeting responsibilities to multiple stakeholders in wider society). Ethically and practically, humanitarian work psychology promotes humanistic (Lefkowitz, 2010, 2012) as well as humanitarian ends, including the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals (MDGs, Annan, 2000). Finally, to the extent that humanitarian goals (like MDG1 - poverty reduction) entail collaboration between organizations (MDG8 – Development Partnership), humanitarian work psychology is inter-industrial and -organizational in its scope and range (Saner & Yiu, 2012).
Table 1 – Topography of Humanitarian Work Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Humanitarian work</th>
<th>Humanitarian work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.a) Fostering humanitarian</td>
<td>ii.a) Ensuring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worker well-being</td>
<td>decent work for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.b) Enabling humanitarian</td>
<td>ii.b) Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasks for organizational</td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td>towards multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Extracted and adapted from Carr et al (2012)

Table 1 is a conceptual “map” of humanitarian work psychology, providing a way to conceptualize the potential scope of humanitarian work psychology-focused projects. As shown in the left half of Table 1, humanitarian work psychology includes but is not limited to the psychology of humanitarian work, referred to in this paper as humanitarian work psychology. As shown in the right half of Table 1, it also encompasses what we refer to as humanitarian work psychology, which entails efforts to make work, and hence the science of work, more humanitarian in nature. It is important to conceptually distinguish
“humanitarian” from humanistic work psychology. Humanitarianism means having the interests of people at heart whereas humanism is a philosophy that rejects religion in favor of the advancements of humanity by its own efforts (e.g., Collins, 2001). Thus we prefer the term humanitarian | work psychology to denote the advancement of decent work for all (Carr et al, 2012), whilst at the same time recognizing that humanitarian | work psychology may still at times be humanistic, and vice versa (Lefkowitz, 2012).

As Table 1 depicts, humanitarian work psychology in its broad sense focuses on workers as well as work tasks. Some projects and interventions fall clearly into discrete sections of Table 1’s map; others span its boundaries. Thus a project to recruit aid workers is clearly humanitarian work | psychology whilst the same project, if it includes preparatory training for psycho-social wellbeing, overlaps with humanitarian | work psychology, insofar as includes an element of decent (safe) work. Similarly, to the extent that task is often dependent on relations at work, and vice-versa, then the top and lower halves of Table 1 may overlap.
This white paper highlights some relatively prototypical exemplars from each quadrant, charts some of their cross-sector linkages to one another, and concludes with some emerging opportunities for greater inter-organizational partnerships that foster humanitarian goals, including poverty reduction (Berry et al., 2011).

(i) Humanitarian Work | Psychology

i.a) Worker: Fostering humanitarian worker well-being

Historically, humanitarian work psychology has evolved from the upper towards the lower quadrants in Table 1, originally focusing on worker wellbeing. The most prominent work focused on the worker is the field of research that has extensively explored cross-cultural adjustment and culture shock amongst expatriate workers. Though not referred to as humanitarian work psychology, work psychologists as far back as the 1960s were exploring expatriate well-being and adjustment in the United States Peace Corps, including how to select workers more likely to cope with the needed adjustment, thus avoiding early return
By the 1980s psychologists’ attention had shifted away from job selection and towards cross-cultural training as a further way to mitigate expatriate “culture shock” (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Using a variety of methods, from awareness to situational judgment and work sample tests based on critical incidents (MacLachlan & McAuliffe, 2005), cross-cultural training has been seen to improve humanitarian workers’ cross-cultural adjustment (Furnham, 2010). There has also been a burgeoning growth of research into the experiences of expatriates in multinational settings, which may share some similarities with those in humanitarian settings (Fee & Gray, 2012).

Contemporary best practice in fostering humanitarian worker well-being is likely to feature a broad range of I-O activities, including structured job selection, training and support services (Ager & Loughry, 2004).

A key and arguably fundamental development in more recent years, is the recognition that expatriate workers are not the only workers at risk of culture shock, but that host national workers experience it too (McFarlane, 2004; Pastor,
Failing to recognize the impact on host nationals of working in a cross-cultural environment may result in poor working relationships between host and expatriate workers, and may ultimately impede the success of aid initiatives (McWha & MacLachlan, 2011; Toh & DeNisi, 2007). Host workers experience a range of work-related stressors, in addition to cross-cultural and other, everyday communication issues (Wigley, 2006). Such stressors range from job burnout and secondary trauma (Musa & Hamid, 2008) to death threats and other risks to personal safety (Vergara & Gardner, 2011). Thus, ensuring well-being for host national employees in humanitarian work may require a more diverse range of work supports than what is required by their expatriate colleagues, at both individual and organizational levels (Carr, 2013).

A clear and important quadrant of humanitarian work psychology is therefore the wellbeing of individuals engaging in humanitarian work, including both foreign and host country nationals.
i.b) Task: Enabling humanitarian work for organizational goals

Enduring a deeper level of culture shock has been shown to positively predict humanitarian workers’ task performance (Kealey, 1989); therefore, humanitarian work | psychology may have important implications for organizations as well as individuals. Moving down from the worker to the task in Table 1, fostering humanitarian worker well-being spills over into, informs, and enables humanitarian work for organizational goals (MacLachlan & Carr, 2005). Industrial and organizational psychology has the knowledge and tools to impact the structural and task-focused aspect of humanitarian organizations.

One area into which inroads have been made is with incentive systems at work, starting with remuneration. Humanitarian organizational goals by definition include reducing inequality within low-income societies. Consistent with that goal, organizations like the United States Peace Corps have traditionally paid “volunteer” wages. Many others have not. Often “dual salaries,” whereby expatriate humanitarian employees are remunerated with an internationally
competitive salary and benefits package, whilst their local counterparts, who today are frequently equally experienced and well-qualified, receive a fraction of that amount, a “local” salary-and-benefits package (Fechter, 2012).

Dual salaries are awkward for aid organizations because they appear to contravene widely-agreed macro-level policies (Economic and Social Research Council [ESRC], 2010). These include for instance “Alignment” between aid projects and the aspirations of local communities and their workforces (Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, 2005). At an everyday level of workplace teamwork and cooperation however, dual salaries have a potential to de-motivate local workers “at” work (Marai et al., 2010) whilst motivating brain drain (loss of skilled people through emigration) “from” it (Carr, 2010). Thus dual salaries have the potential to detract from humanitarian organizational goals (Table 1).

An impact-generating study of dual salaries involved highly skilled professional humanitarian workers (n=294) from 60 aid organizations (ESRC, 2010). Countries represented were Island Nations Papua New Guinea and
Solomon Islands (Marai et al., 2010), “emergent” economies China and India (Zhou et al., 2010) and land-locked economies in Malawi and Uganda (Munthali et al., 2010). The project methodology was mixed, using critical incidents to help align an inter-organizational survey (Carr et al., 2010). The research team was interdisciplinary, with researchers who were remunerated on a single, equivalent scale of pay (McWha et al., 2012).

This study found that dual salaries did not align with local workers’ aspirations (ESRC, 2010). They were widely perceived as unjust, de-motivating, and linked to cognitions about turnover and mobility (brain drain). In the Island economies, where the international: local salary ratios were greatest, expatriate workers remunerated internationally tended to rate their own abilities higher than those of their local counterparts, even with actual human capital statistically controlled (Marai et al., 2010). To the extent that self-inflated ability leads to reduced effort, these findings suggest that dual salaries may de-motivate both
local and international workers, a “double de-motivation” (MacLachlan & Carr, 2005).

Although the proposition that over-inflated self-belief can reduce motivation is logical, there is also some psychological research to indirectly support the notion that self-inflated ability can lead to reduced effort. In one experimental representation of dual salaries for example, randomly paying Australian individuals double/half each other’s pay, and letting the participants know about the differential, reduced time spent on a voluntary task significantly, compared to both a no-payment control and a dual-payment-without knowledge of the duality condition, for both under- and over-paid individuals (Carr, McLoughlin, Hodgson, & MacLachlan, 1996). In a second experiment, individual differences in “equity sensitivity” were linked to further reductions in effort, independently of whether the individual was under- or over-paid (McLoughlin & Carr, 1997). The latter finding suggests that individuals who are overly sensitive to inequity may find over-payment de-motivating. In a field experiment, individual
workers who felt they were being paid either below or above-market averages for their job were found to be more likely to quit their current job if they won a lottery, suggesting that their intrinsic motivation “at” work had fallen, compared to workers who felt their pay was more equitable (Carr et al, 1996). Finally in Marai’s (2002/3) study of teachers working in international schools in Indonesia, teachers who felt they were under- or over-paid compared to the norm reported being significantly less job-satisfied than their more equitably-paid counterparts in the same job.

In the final phase of the latest (above, ESRC, 2010) project, local subject-matter experts were asked for their best practice recommendations, based on the evidence obtained. Unanimously they recommended structured job analysis and specification, transparent recruitment processes, structured job selection, performance appraisal and career planning/management. In other words, they reported a need for involvement, at an everyday level, by industrial and organizational practice and praxis. Some international Non-government
organizations are currently implementing remuneration reforms, with support from humanitarian psychology. Other task-related foci include developing emergency management systems to assist when volunteer workers are required to be recruited and selected at short notice, either nationally or internationally, in person or online (Ng, Chan & Hui, 2012). Beyond job selection, a further option is to reduce dependence on “technical assistance” from outside the local community through internet-based, “online volunteerism” (Thompson & Atkins, 2010). Provided there is adequate cross-cultural and other preparatory training (for volunteers and their hosts), and suitable technology links (Gloss, Glavey & Godbout, 2012), online volunteerism for humanitarian work has the potential to help meet anti-poverty organizational goals (Atkins & Thompson, 2012). Online volunteering can also enhance career prospects for the volunteer (Wilkin & Connelly, 2012).

To summarize, a second key quadrant of humanitarian work psychology addresses structural, or task issues. Such work helps to align humanitarian work
with organizational goals, for example by reducing workplace inequality, increasing workplace justice, and bolstering job and career identity (MacLachlan, Carr, & McAuliffe, 2010).

(ii) Humanitarian Work Psychology

ii.a) Worker: Ensuring Decent Work for all workers

Moving now to the right half of Table 1 we focus on the second aspect of humanitarian work psychology: Promoting a more humanitarian perspective within work in general. Particularly here, we draw on the International Labour Organization’s policy platform, the Decent Work Agenda (ILO, 2011). Decent work refers to work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men (http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/decent-work/lang--en/index.htm). According to
the ILO: “discrimination at work is continuously diversifying, and new challenges arise” (ILO, 2011, p. ix).

Employment practices, preferences, terms, and conditions, vary across different groups working within the same labor market. Gender, migrant status, religion, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation and disability, are among the factors that may be used to socially differentiate people and can become a basis for discriminatory practices. These practices may be understood as instances of social dominance (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) where the privileged position of one group (the “mainstream”) is allowed to set a social agenda which diminishes the rights of other groups. This occurs not only in employment, but also in service orientated sectors, such as health, education, and welfare (MacLachlan & Mannan, 2013).

Humanitarian work psychology has played a formative role in several projects seeking to promote social inclusion in different sectors (MacLachlan, 2012).

In low-income countries for example, the International Labor Organization (ILO) Project PROPEL (Promoting Rights and Opportunities for People with
Disabilities in Employment through Legislation) seeks to enhance the inclusion of people with disabilities in employment in Indonesia, China, Vietnam, Zambia and Ethiopia. Psychologists have been involved in developing a knowledge management system for this project which includes identifying monitoring and evaluation indicators for results-based management outcomes. A training course for this project also used the well-established work psychology technique of In-Tray or In-Basket analysis (the Humanitarian Work Psychology In-Tray Exercise (MacLachlan, 2013) – to identify work styles and learning opportunities for the country project managers implementing the project. Inclusion awareness training can also be provided to policy makers, who design country policies regarding inclusion for special populations (Amin et al, 2011; MacLachlan et al, 2012).

Humanitarian work psychology projects have thus created and promoted more transparent systems for ensuring inclusion of people with disabilities in the workforce. Exclusion is not confined to any one group or country economies, of course. In higher-income countries for instance, highly-skilled immigrants seeking
a better life and job can often experience dehumanizing “brain waste” (Mahroum, 2000). They wind-up in low-grade, dead-end jobs that waste their qualifications and skills, for no apparent reason based on job specification alone (UNDP, 2009). Studies have found significant co-variation between the extent of brain waste and social dominance orientation (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999), and similarity-attraction (Coates & Carr, 2005). The results of such research can be used to (a) raise awareness (b) advocate for more structured selection and (c) inform training among job selectors and applicants (Mace et al., 2005). Similar recommendations may apply to the millions of lower-skilled “immigrant workers” who face systemic issues of employment-related marginalization and exclusion (Maynard, Ferdman, & Holmes, 2010).

A key new job family, found predominantly in healthcare and to some extent education, in low-income countries, is the “mid-level cadre.” Instead of relying on costly expatriate surgeons, or surgical training, mid-level jobs are created where community nurses (for instance) might be trained to perform the most-needed
operations locally, such as removing cataracts. For obvious reasons, this is called “task shifting.” With little comparable systematic research in the area to date (Mannan et al., 2012) it is essential that the identification of the optimal skill mix and cadre characteristics be evidence-based and use tools for systematic task analysis, specification, staff development and wellbeing (MacLachlan, Mannan, & McAuliffe, 2011). Task shifting is therefore a prime example of where, and how, humanitarian work psychology can be translated into everyday evidence-based practice.

Task shifting can be seen as a form of job enrichment. Crucially however, humanitarian work psychology can also retain its critical faculty, by being ready to question some of its own sacred cows, at least in some work contexts (Lefkowitz, 2012; MacLachlan & Carr, 1994). For example, a systematic review of public service job conditions, for health and education professionals across low- and middle-income countries, revealed that “at” work, many employees encounter what the ILO might describe as “indecent” work conditions (Carr et al,
Included were chronic work overload, extreme resource depletion, irregular and/or non-livable wages, non-recognition for onerous and additional training, and a range of other detractors from otherwise high levels of intrinsic motivation “to” work by helping other people. Under these kinds of conditions, “job reduction” might be a better aligned option than job enlargement. Similarly perhaps, related concepts like job enrichment can actually mean more tightly, intently focused responsibilities, shifting from (too) many lower-level tasks to a single but higher level of skill, and social responsibility. Thus humanitarian work psychology adapts itself to the demands of designing decent work that contributes towards human capabilities at work, and in civil society (World Bank, 2012).

One core area of interest to policy makers in fostering inclusion through access to decent work is business and enterprise growth (World Bank, 2012). The Human Development Report (for 2013) focuses on jobs, including job-creation and the potential for decent work through the development of informal-sector micro-
enterprises into formal sector small-to-medium enterprises. A key question that the report poses is whether entrepreneurs are born or can be made (ibid, p.2). The World Bank’s reason for asking is that enterprise development has not met policy-makers’ expectations, with most entrepreneurs seemingly not being motivated to progress beyond adding an informal income-stream to other income-generating activities (Banerjee & Duflo, 2011).

Work psychology has been investigating enterprise development for some time, beginning with training interventions by D. McClelland and colleagues (McClelland, 1961; McClelland et al., 1969; McClelland, 1987). Largely focused on one trait, Need for Achievement, these were eventually surpassed by wider competency models for entrepreneurial orientation (Frese et al., 2002; 2007). Individual differences in basic cognitive abilities also interact with environmental opportunities to co-enable enterprise development (de Mel, McKenzie & Woodruff, 2008). Included in that environment is the possibility for obtaining bank loans, at reasonable (rather than usurious moneylender) rates. Credit networks
are one possibility, and these have been heavily and creatively utilized by enterprising women (Schein, 2012). Women are also benefiting from a recently-developed psychometric profiler for use by banks who provide small loans to entrepreneurs, who currently refuse many customers simply because they do not have the right paperwork or records (Klinger, 2011). According to this project, culturally competent protocols can be used to help would-be entrepreneurs into rather than out of business opportunities, in the process changing lives and livelihoods.

To summarize, a key focus in humanitarian work psychology is concerned with evidence-informed approaches to developing, and maintaining, decent work; a focus that is not restricted to countries with low, middle, or higher incomes, and extends to all places of work.

**ii.b) Tasks: Meeting Responsibilities towards Multiple Stakeholders**

Again shifting from worker to task focus, we move to the final quadrant in Table 1, and explore humanitarian work psychology projects which aim to
balance the needs of multiple stakeholders. The importance of trust for organizations extends quite naturally from relationships with customers to their employees and shareholders (Lefkowitz & Lowman, 2010). These relationships include the concept of “organizational responsibility” (Aguinis, 2011).

Humanitarian organizations themselves need to responsibly earn (and keep) the trust of (i) their donor public, as well as (ii) the public they serve, for instance.

According to research in humanitarian work psychology, they can do this by foregrounding the perspectives of their wider stakeholders. They can, for instance, (i) gauge empirically the level of overheads that their donor public is willing to tolerate and be transparent about them (Burt, 2012), and (ii) respect the public’s views on how to administer aid projects, including ensuring principles like local ownership and mutual accountability are met, including raising the public’s awareness and knowledge levels where appropriate (Baguma & Furnham, 2012).

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a popularly-termed form of organizational responsibility which entails responsibilities towards employees
(e.g., through decent work), stakeholders, and the environment (Carr, 2013).

Systematic evaluations of the impact of CSR on organizational outcomes indicate that responsible practices not only flow from being prosperous enough to afford them, but also predict higher corporate financial performance (Allouche & Laroche, 2005; Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003), recruitment advantages (Turban & Greening, 1996), and reputation (Godfrey, 2005).

These benefits focus on corporate rather than social outcomes, however (Idemudia, 2009). To-date, there is no systematic evaluation of the impact of corporate social practices on local communities. The implicit model for “CSR” is more Csr, not cSr (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams & Ganapathi, 2007). Humanitarian work psychology is redressing that imbalance by conducting a systematic review of the Social bottom line from CSR (http://poverty.massey.ac.nz/incubate.htm). An example of corporate Social responsibility would be a major computing company providing sustainable health record systems and jobs in resource-deprived settings like rural health clinics, where proper record-keeping facilities
can literally save lives as well as providing local cadres with decent employment (Osicki, 2010).

**Looking Ahead: Creating Inter-Organizational Connections for Humanitarian Goals**

For the humanitarian work psychology in Table 1 to maintain its current momentum and find avenues for greater impact, developing clear connections *between* organizations (e.g., computer companies and health service groups) is going to be critical (Saner & Yiu, 2012). An obvious place to begin is with humanitarian work itself. For instance, the goals of humanitarian work psychology and the United Nations overlap in their emphasis on providing work as a way of reducing world poverty. It is anticipated that the goals of the United Nations will inform part of the humanitarian work psychology agenda and that the contributions of humanitarian work psychology will help the United Nations to achieve its goals. This section briefly describes the work of three United Nations affiliates: The ILO, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the
United Nations Global Compact – multilateral organizations that highlight potential opportunities for psychology to interface with.

With respect to humanitarian work | psychology in Table 1, the UNDP has recently introduced a new initiative called Social Enterprise. The goal is to support private enterprises that reconcile social and economic activities by developing entrepreneurial activities that have a social and thereby humanitarian benefit – for example, providing training for disadvantaged populations and developing cooperatives and associations to benefit the underserved.

With respect to humanitarian | work psychology in Table 1, the ILO has developed a Social Protection Floor which operationalizes its Decent Work Agenda. The Social Protection Floor guarantees to people in all nations adequate health, food, water, education and safety. Research by the ILO indicates that, with some international aid, this floor is implementable by even the poorest nations. Similarly the Global Compact, of which the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) became a member in December 2012, is a
voluntary association of business and non-business organizations that agree to abide by a set of principles that range from upholding universal human rights to protecting the environment (Cruse, 2010). Members share their research and best practices in dealing with issues that will be detrimental to the economy of the world such as global warming, unemployment, energy efficiency and environmental depletion of resources. The Global Compact currently has over 10,000 members, including over 7,000 businesses across 145 countries. Members include Coca-Cola, Intel, General Electric, Microsoft, Nokia, and many others (www.unglobalcompact.org).

The activities of these United Nations entities are relevant to industrial-organizational psychology in general and to humanitarian work psychology specifically because their underlying theme is work, which is the expertise of SIOP members. Developing opportunities for work utilizing the principles of decent work with the underlying support of a floor of social protection, adherence to the 10 principles of the Global Compact, and entrepreneurship and private business
directed at social good: all of these activities have the support of psychological theory and research and should be within the toolkit of I-O psychology practitioners and researchers.

At the level of national development policy, humanitarian work psychology has already made a contribution. Influencing the process of developing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) – a country’s development plan over a 4-5 year period – has been the focus of the African Policy on Disability & Development (APODD) project. A number of familiar work psychology techniques conducted by I/O psychologists, such as Force Field Analysis, Critical Incidents, and the Nominal Group Technique, have been used to contribute to an evidence-base of the most effective advocacy techniques that can be used to get disability on the “development agenda” of government agencies in Uganda, Malaŵi, Ethiopia, and Sierra Leone. While this has resulted in academic publications (e.g., Chataika et al., 2013), the project’s series of policy briefs (Wazakili et al., 2011a, 2011b; Chataika et al., 2011a, 2011b) are directed at civil society and government – the
major agents of change in this sphere. APODD was also able to directly contribute to increasing the representation of disability in Uganda’s most recent PRSP, through the government’s direct invitation for the project team to comment on a draft for the country’s PRSP.

To summarize, humanitarian work | psychology adopts an expansive focus on, and from, industrial and organizational psychology itself. There are ethical and professional values, as well as evidence-based arguments, for adopting a stakeholder model in everyday professional practice and research (Lefkowitz & Lowman, 2010). We can help, and indeed have helped, to make a difference to both corporate Social responsibility, at the level of organizational policy, as well as to national and other plans, in the polity, for human and societal development.
Table 2 – New Diplomacies for Humanitarian work psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian work</th>
<th>psychology</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>work</th>
<th>psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Workers**       | Reduce culture shock, build cultural competencies and capacities online  
|                   | • Recruitment, selection, placement  
|                   | • Cross-cultural training (two-way)  
|                   | • Online assessment centers | Curb brain waste, job analyze task shifting, enable enterprise development  
|                   | • Structured assessment  
|                   | • Customize job characteristics  
|                   | • Inclusive selection/group training for entrepreneurs |
| **Tasks**         | Reduce living wage inequities, increase work justice, bolster job and career identity  
|                   | • Job Evaluation and Job Sizing  
|                   | • Inclusive Staff development  
|                   | • Career management & planning | Enable organizational trust, evaluate corporate and social responsibility  
|                   | • Measurement of CSR  
|                   | • Social Marketing functions  
|                   | • Evaluation of CSR impact on workers AND community |
| **Organizations** | Social Enterprise  
|                   | • Re-framing  
|                   | • Agenda-setting  
|                   | • Policy negotiation | Social Protection Floor, in PRSPs  
|                   | • Standard-setting  
|                   | • Watchdog function  
|                   | • Whistle-blowing |

*Source:* Adapted and abridged from Saner & Yiu (2012)
Conclusion

This paper has reviewed some examples of humanitarian work psychology, organized according to a conceptual map of its scope. Some core achievements have been summarized in Table 2. We believe, however, that humanitarian work psychology has a far more substantive contribution still to make towards promoting a more inclusive society: in the workplace through the provision of services, by influencing national development policy through advocacy efforts, and also by directly facilitating the development of new, or a revision of existing, national and international polices.

Hence some “new diplomacy” competencies are also briefly summarized in Table 2 (for a more detailed exposition, Saner & Yiu, 2012). These authors include some additional concrete examples of areas of contribution that have been, or could be made through humanitarian work psychology in general, and Inter-Organizational new diplomacy skills in particular: Reframing the illicit trade in
blood diamonds by contributing towards a ‘conflict-free’ certification scheme devised between government, industry and civil society organizations; Agenda-setting would include participating in the redesigned, “Post Millennium/2015” development goals; Policy negotiation includes negotiation and bargaining skills, e.g., debt-restructuring for prosperity versus continuing austerity (http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/learning/departments/school-of-psychology/research/poverty/princubate/princubate-projects.cfm). Standard-setting includes promoting evidence-based fair trade; Watchdog functions can incorporate devising reliable and valid measures to gauge corporate social responsibility in the public’s eye; extending to Whistle-blowing if organizational conduct goes morally awry (Idemudia, 2009).
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