

INTERVIEW

# Reflections on the field of Humanitarian Work Psychology

Interview with Stuart C. Carr

[S.C.Carr@massey.ac.nz](mailto:S.C.Carr@massey.ac.nz)



## Introduction and about the interviewee

Today I have the pleasure of interviewing **Stuart Carr (Stu)**, who holds a UNESCO Chair on *Sustainable Livelihoods*, in partnership with Massey University in New Zealand. His specialism is Humanitarian Work Psychology (HWP) and its relevance to the United Nation's primary goal of 'eradicating poverty in all its forms, everywhere. As a co-founding member of the End Poverty and Inequality Cluster (EPIC), Stu conducts applied research as part of a 30-country, 50-year Project GLOW (for Global Living Organisational Wage). GLOW focuses on the links between decent, living wages and well-being, including their role in promoting and supporting wider sustainable livelihoods. A former editor of the *South Pacific Journal of Psychology*, the *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, and more recently *International Perspectives in Psychology*, Stu is a long-term staunch supporter of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which focus on eradicating poverty for example through decent work, towards *Sustainable Livelihoods*. In our interview we will explore how he became involved in humanitarian work research, and how this influenced his orientation towards the study of decent work – and beyond, towards sustainable livelihoods. **Over to you Stu:**

With connecting people in mind, in partnership with Massey University, UNESCO recently created this Chair focusing on sustainable livelihoods, and has entrusted me to occupy it. It sounds individualised but the role is really about facilitating connections. Walking the talk. *Livelihoods* is a far wider, more inclusive concept than a singular, formal, secure, regulated, and secure job, which a vast majority of working people no longer have (if they ever did). Livelihoods become *sustainable* when they do not degrade people's well-being, or the ecosystem that supports it; but instead, when they contribute to the livelihoods of others, both today and into the future, i.e., across generations. The adjective *sustainable* also resonates with the 2016–30 SDGs. These are focused primarily as we saw above on eradicating poverty, in all its forms, everywhere. This includes through *decent work*, which is a key stepping-stone towards making livelihoods more sustainable. That link to the SDGs is central to the research, teaching and service we are doing at the moment – and to the UNESCO Chair. So, it all comes back to tackling poverty, together.

**Angela:** *How and when did your interest in HWP begin?*

**Stu:** It began with my first academic position post-PhD, at the National University of Malawi (UNIMA), in Southern Africa. Malawi was a rich country socially, culturally,

historically, while also being economically – materially – poor. Economic poverty was widespread. Not surprisingly perhaps, there was also a deal of humanitarian aid, and aid work, going on. Surprisingly too however, much of it was – ironically – backfiring.

UNIMA itself was not exempt from the same dynamic. As a Professor of Education pointed out to us when discussing where Psychology research might contribute:

*‘Open your eyes and look around you: Why not research **this corridor**? Look around you; and then look out to the rest of the country, and you’ll see it replicated all over the nation. How can you have teamwork and ‘development cooperation’ when some people are paid 10 or 20 times more than their colleagues for doing the same job? Why don’t you research, and address, that?’*

In our own workplace corridor, all the doors looked virtually the same, except for having different names on them. Some had Malawian (local) names, and others expatriate (expat) names. Behind them there were also different contracts of employment for these very same local and the expat colleagues. Notably, the expats generally earned far more than their local counterparts, despite staff often being no different in their training or experience; and doing largely the same job as each other. Popularly dubbed *dual salaries*, this double *standard* can be found all over the world. In Papua New Guinea, for example, it has even been termed ‘Economic Apartheid’ and, reflecting local wage shortfalls, ‘Zero [Bank] Balance’ (see Marai, 2014).

Our own department like others was a mix of host country nationals and expats, but we had the rarity of all being waged locally, with none being aid-funded. So clearly (for us at least), dual salaries did not *need* to be structured in the way that they were. As it turned out however, the aid wage system was antithetical to teamwork; to aid-workers working themselves out of a job; and ultimately, to eradicating poverty (see ESRC Impact case study). As policy-focused HWP would later document, across a range of sectors, the dual salaries reward system was/is still conducive to a brain drain; to creating yet more jobs for over-rewarded expats, encouraging them to leave, and to creating ever more entry-points for outside ‘assistance’ (for a summary, McWha-Hermann, Marai, MacLachlan & Carr, 2021). More palpably, the wage system itself was denying local people their own sustainable livelihoods.

This is just one of many examples of why, perhaps, some years later a prominent scholar from another African country would say to me: ‘My country could have been far better off without all these aid organizations ever being here.’

So, my interest in HWP began with collectively experiencing and helping to expose the human factor contradictions in, and of, aid work. But it went deeper than just critiquing aid work, much of which was no doubt well-meaning. Malawi also led me/us to start thinking about psychology helping to tackle poverty in more sustainable ways, through Sustainable Livelihoods.

**Angela:** *What was the catalyst that brought you and others work together in the field of HWP?*

**Stu:** As detailed by Emeriti Professor Virginia Schein (in your previous interview), there were some particularly catalytic years between 2008 and 2010. During that time, there were a slew of galvanising speeches at conferences and other meetings, radical (for the time) seminar sessions, new courses and workshops backed and run by leading scholars and practitioners in our field (as mentioned by Virginia), and all of them on HWP concerns. Most of them linked back, in some way or another, to tackling poverty, inequality, and hardship. But the real story of HWP in the 2000s, for me, was the electric buzz that was being generated by and among so many earlier career scholars and grad students. They filled the rooms to overflowing; they came with ideas and energy; they brought and breathed a renewed sense of urgency into the old touchstones, to making a difference, not to economic power but to tackling poverty, inequality, and hardship. Many of them as Virginia has noted have become leading lights in HWP, and a source of inspiration to (and for) us all.

At first much of the interest was around work that is humanitarian. But in the 2020s, that key momentum has been turbo-charged by all the wider humanitarian changes, crises, changes (threats and opportunities) around the world-of-work in *general*. Poverty and hardship, unfortunately, knows no border(s). If the late Kurt Lewin were still with us, he might be describing these times, both within HWP work and across the world of work, as a time of great unfreezing(s). Our whole world of work has changed, we in work psychology have changed, have to, change with it. The pandemic and a range of other crises, from racial injustice and gender inequality/'Me too', to cost-of-living and the overarching threat of destruction of the environment, much of it - let's face it - by organizations and by dirty jobs - have all made HWP even more relevant now than ever before. Students are up for the challenge, hungry to engage, and change the whole world (of work). Why? Perhaps, in part at least, because many of them are working in precarious 'jobs' and because they can see themselves and their own collective futures, and their future of work, reflected in *Humanitarian WP*. In that vein, there is no more pressing a motivator perhaps than goaling sustainable livelihoods?

One obvious way for any society to try and end poverty and inequality is through increased access to decent work; and decent, inclusive, dignified working conditions. Humanitarian work psychology is thereby, at root, about helping to make work, and access to work in *general* more humanitarian. Since then, I think the world has changed in so many ways that the Humanitarian emphasis on work in general has become even more relevant. I mean the students in the classroom have already changed, and we're just playing 'catch up,' in a sense to an increased demand for us to do more for people not just in 'aid' work, but more generally, across all forms of work, across human society globally. Again, it's in the corridor at work: Many of our own students are holding down precarious jobs. They're working at night, in jobs in hospitality for lousy wages; and on zero hours contracts. These are flimsy working conditions that mean they are already stressed just trying to get by. Plus, they've been made to pay for their education, and they are often living in lousy accommodation (or sleeping rough). In New Zealand today we have a housing crisis. People with property have been able to acquire more and more wealth, through speculation and literal rent seeking, from people not on the 'property ladder.' Minimum wages rise, but rents rise higher. Inequality escalates. Poor work and wage conditions are implicated in child poverty. So too is land-lording. We cannot pretend that they are not connected.

**Angela:** *Yes, we are seeing this in the UK with many working people having to use food banks to feed their families.*

**Stu:** Things will have to break unless there is radical reform that redresses these inequities and broken promises. Yes, people are very 'resilient,' but you cannot keep pushing them to cope with more and in the process keep shifting the spotlight away from upstream work systems and structures, including so-called 'free' labour markets that a prominent work psychologist once described (to me) as '*economic slavery*.' For a long time, Economics has been the loudest voice in the room. Psychology has shied away from economics; and even when we have engaged it's arguably often been through nudging and using crude, simplistic models that don't really deal with the complex forces that are involved. But economists' perspectives are diverse, like psychologists', and there are raging battles going on within economics now as well. For example, there is a long-standing argument about minimum wages which is still not resolved. One side is saying, if you promote minimum wages, you will lose jobs overall, and the other side, less and less of a minority voice perhaps, is saying the reverse. The bit that's likely missing is the quality of work that is required for peoples' well-being. Because there's a huge difference between a job that makes you ill, and a job that provides you with a decent, actually more

than that, a sustainable living. It is that kind of differentiation that work psychology can contribute more toward. So, you need economists and psychologists to come together and re-theorise research and re-think the policy implications of the psycho-economic nexus; because who wants to retain jobs when most of them are poor quality, and actually threaten, or least fail to adequately protect, people's well-being?

But how do you create jobs that enable people to have a truly sustainable livelihood? These are germane questions, and there are two sides to every story; and the adult way of dealing with this is probably to try and learn each other's languages; and find a place where you can meet. And it's not just with economics. Public Health has been doing much more than we have to link well-being with raised minimum wages, and we need to talk to them too, much more, I feel, about what psychology can do, and constructively offer, from its small corner of the much bigger (societal) room.

So, there are differences and diversities within disciplines, and also intersections between them that need to be found rather quickly. Especially post pandemic for instance, why are we not involved more in burning Artificial Intelligence (AI) issues? In New Zealand there are robotics engineers being asked to do things like design robots that can pick fruit. Technically they can – and have. But socio-technically, they will have a big impact in small country towns because automating this work may longer-term ruin local businesses. The workers won't be required so the little shops that their wages help to support will go, and the towns may atrophy.

We need to be working with these socially responsible robotics engineers to help them – they are asking us to help them with making the arguments for and against their own technology. Generally, we can do more to help self-managing communities and responsible employers to find better ways of making the automation work 'for' people, and not 'against' them; for instance, by developing complementary and/or replacement livelihood opportunities from and with the technology itself (see Carr, Hodgetts, Potgieter & Meyer, 2020).

**Angela:** *Do you feel we need to be reaching out making connections with other disciplines and domains, like policy studies, with some urgency?*

**Stu:** I've already mentioned Economics and Public Health. But also, when you and I pick up the average work psychology textbook there's still not a lot/enough on intersections with politics and policy, at all levels from organizational to societal and global. Years ago, I was told that 'the real force in most organizations, in most workplaces is political.'

I wasn't convinced, but the advice was right, not only within organizations but also between them, along global supply chains and across whole countries and societies. We have to stop feigning that work is not inherently socio-political, alongside the social and the economic. It's very much political, and about the dynamics of economic power and policymaking at all levels, from micro and macro, through the 'meso' (mid-level), in organizations and communities (Carr et al., 2020).

That dual salaries example we spoke about earlier is a lot about economic power, for instance. The people with the economic power have more; they enjoy the privileges from it; and it's the power structure that needs to be challenged. The same arguably goes for the current world of work, which is characterised by working poverty for the many and an extreme affluence for the elite – including the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) upper wage class. Whenever and wherever the power structure is unjust, the people who have it right are the ones who are calling out that power structure for being unjust. Those voices can come from within any discipline; and there have been many voices speaking; but they have too often been in a/the social minority. Now they're growing in number, because the injustices and the abuses of economic power are becoming more and more flagrant. They stand out in times like this when we've all been going through a pandemic; and the public health crisis has exposed the inequities; raising awareness that the people who have economic power to begin with have ridden out the crisis relatively well. But people like key workers were having to go out, put themselves in the front line for lousy money, then go home and risk infecting their families; that's if they have a home to go to, and are not living in a car or something. I feel we are getting to a critical period now when power bases must change, as a lot of people are very angry with the current system for different reasons. It is about challenging power structures and coming up with constructive alternatives that are more inclusive and fairer. A lot comes back to justice (A. Furnham, in Carr, 2023).

Extant wage models are exploitative, yet there are different ways from to get from A to B; and equality-related and systems theories can give you different routes; but in the longer-term no one wins when profitability for a few puts most others into economic slavery. There are better, more sustainable *win-win* paths. If there is justice, people feel the system is just that's a good foundation for moving forward as a united social entity rather than divided individuals. I know this sounds a bit general, but fairness is a basis for a lot in our society, and our work theories and research going back a long way do show that, and how, fairness is vital for sustainability. I feel we've neglected the material side of what work can fairly deliver, having over-focused on work's middle classes. We haven't

shone our spotlight enough at the lower end of the table, where the majority of workers work. A wafer slim minority enjoys a huge amount of relative benefit and privilege. I think people by and large, including our students, are feeling more and more unhappy with this state. and want to see it changed. So, I'm optimistic because the students are really engaged in realising this future through connecting our discipline with political and policy issues.

**Angela:** *I remember when I was researching a precarious working fifteen years ago (Calvard et al., 2008) where people were working dressed up in costumes to advertise products on the High Street. These were early forms of precarious working, which sadly now are much more common forms of work. It was very hard to get this work noticed or even published, at that time. However, these forms of work are now attracting attention and EAWOP has a Small Group Meeting (SGM) on Precarious employment and work: Understanding the underlying psychological and social processes, in September 2023 to bring together researchers in the field of precarious work. I am really pleased this research is being developed.*

**Stu:** When you/we were presenting on precarious work, the room would be empty, but now the room is full. There's more recognition now, with people seeing themselves and their future, our collective future, in the research.

**Angela:** *Yes, there's been a rather polarised view and minimal view about who's being researched in psychology. Virginia's interview in this issue makes that point too. When you are teaching your students and giving them a good education in psychology, are there ways in which you can increase their understanding of other ways of working that decrease social inequities?*

**Stu:** That's a good question. I don't think it's impossible to do because social inequity in work is all around us. We have to increase our contact with government organizations and union organizations who are there for workers in precarious forms of work. We talk to the *Productivity Commission* here in New Zealand about the links between living wages and well-being as well as productivity per se. Also, we are talking to one another across international boundaries along global supply chains; and we need to get this more into organizational psychology. Instead, we've still got this isolated individualised version; OK, not all the time, but we've been quite insular talking about 'an' organization, 'a' job within that, and 'an' individual who does that job. And I do know we've got teams and work life balance and things like that; but fundamentally we haven't really expanded our own work relations consciousness to take this further in our communities. We need to look at work in our local shop, the café across the road, the cleaners in our buildings;



but also, in the supply chains that deliver T-shirts into the supermarket for 5 bucks, from Bangladesh, and its beautifully sown and quality cotton. It can't just be \$5 - unless somebody's been treated unjustly to deliver that product; some waterway is polluted. Another example is everyday commodities like coffee, which may be ethically certified as fair traded.

All that goes readily into our teaching around the SDGs and sustainable livelihood. You know, I think we need to bring in the consumer, the producing work forces and the small-scale farmers to have a bigger notion of work. To do this we have to expand, and question, some of our sacred *cows*, like *the job* (for instance). There are different ways of making a livelihood, from field to fork, and crop to cup. If you've got a good one-stop 'job,' then great, but many don't make a livelihood from just one job. Sadly, a lot of them are precarious, but it doesn't have to be. You know, if you've got multiple income streams, you can be more robust when a time of crisis/es come(s). We know that from ancient farming practices like cereal *mixing*. So, there are things we can be doing to reinvent some of our core work psychology constructs, to reflect more on making livelihoods more sustainable, and sustainability work more inclusive of how livelihoods are actually braided, interconnected individually and socially. For example, there is a huge amount of unpaid work that contributes centrally to society and the livelihoods of others. If you are a cleaner or a bus driver in the middle of a pandemic - you're contributing centrally to local society, and to livelihoods of others. That's what the street applause was about in the lockdowns, wasn't it? Now, though, it needs to be actioned, e.g., through fixing our broken wage system, e.g., perhaps by re-evaluating job evaluation.

Pick up the average work psychology textbook. To me, it no longer feels relevant enough. So, although we provide undergraduate students with a background textbook, we foreground the SDGs. We zero-in on SDG 8 (decent work) and pan out to wider implications for sustainability across all 17 (such as food, health, homes, energy, climate, security). Meanwhile, our graduate course *Sustainable Livelihood* starts with the SDGs and sustainable livelihoods among them, and, importantly, what are the *new diplomacies* needed for achieving them. It is important to know for example the political structures one must be able to navigate, like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) multinational guidelines on SDGs, and the laws around decent work, fair pay, and so on. The Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development (CSEND) in Geneva have been arguing this for years. Expand how we think about the political side of our discipline; we can't just publish journal articles and expect the world to change. Use at least more policy briefs from major organizational related commissions as set readings;

they're in the real world of work and have topics like living wages. This puts wages back into the curriculum. After all, they matter for well-being when you don't have enough to eat whilst others arguably a small minority have way too much.

We also use a work-well-being lens to look at issues like *global mobility*, climate refugeehood, integration in society through new livelihoods, digital mobility, and so on. A lot of the classes here are very diverse, because this is a country of people who have had to move and integrate. Why call them 'migrants,' I hate that word and challenge it as derogatory. One group gets called the nice name (expats), and another group gets called the not the not so nice name because there is an economic hierarchy there. To change this necessitates speaking truth to power. On the *future of work*, we invite robotics engineers to come in and talk about how they're designing for someone to pick through a field of kiwi fruits in New Zealand from their living room in Fiji, using a gaming console. Then they can get paid a half decent wage without having to uproot from their family as a so-called migrant worker. They talk about the upsides and the downsides of AI and how we need to work together. All of this relies however on having a climate that does not flood the orchards so that the fruit is no longer there in the first place. It's also vital to include informal work; it's the biggest sector in the world; making up almost two-thirds of the world's work. It's not all about the formal sector, with the so-called one-stop shop of 'the job.' The informal sector is often stereotyped as being poorly skilled. Yet as leading work by Mahima Saxena and Charles Tchagneno (2023, in process) has pointed out, many of these people are in fact highly skilled, and they have to be. They may as part of that resourcefulness be engaged in *radical commerce* (Groot & Hodgetts, 2015): How do people make a livelihood out of a street intersection? How do they structure their workplace? What skills do they need? What do councils need to do to make their workplaces and livelihoods safer and sustainable?

So, we've got all these things that we've overlooked, and if you start bringing them into the classroom students see/recognise a wider, more inclusive field.

**Angela:** *Tell us about the research you are doing at the moment?*

**Stu:** I am working with a global network in project GLOW; with hubs from at least 30 countries in it. Set up in 2015 with colleagues in South Africa, GLOW is focused on one core question, 'Is there a global living wage that enables people, organisations and communities to prosper and thrive?' Spanning 50 years, and involving research, teaching, and service hubs in over 30 countries, GLOW has been theorising, researching, and advocating for

living wages across global supply chains, for example in the production and consumption of (fair-trade) coffee.

We have teaching and research hubs in each country, and they kind of do their own things. We got together at the EAWOP SGM at the University of Glasgow in 2019 as a connectivity event and have recently co-produced a short video for The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (see UNESCO). That 2019 SGM was hugely productive and has had ripple effects on policy. Why? When you go to policymakers in our respective countries saying we're part of a 30-country network, and these are some of the things we've been finding, it gives everything much more gravitas and leverage; and it enables us to apply for, and secure, funding, in part because we are advised by 29 other countries and feed back into that network. People are anchored in their own locality but they're also doing interorganizational work that connects workers along global supply chains. That naturally includes Human Resource professionals in those chains.

All these connections work together in research and in teaching. Students will write policy briefs on sustainable livelihoods, and we share these with other students who are writing a policy brief the same space. The student's work is exchanged once its marked anonymously, and they get to see that other students like them, are working on similar issues in different places in their ways. Everything's connected; seamless because everybody respects and learns from everyone else's point of view.

We have applied the same kind of sustainable livelihoods lens to research, theorise, practicalise fair-traded/living-waged coffee, for instance (see, Carr, Meyer, Saxena, Seubert, Hopfgartner, Arora, Jyoti & Marai, 2022). Coffee is first grown and picked, perhaps competes as a cooperative with a multinational, and then goes out through a supply chain into retail and hospitality outlets in countries like New Zealand, where consumers often want to support and taste fairtrade coffee. We predicted that fair traded coffee will taste better, especially when the living wage runs the entire length of the chain (as some chains are now doing). After all, we have decades of research and theory on justice at work, and fair trade connects with that extant literature, and tells us that people will be more motivated at work when they feel that they are being treated fairly. Quality of product, in this case coffee, will go up. And if you have the wage to pay for plastic covers for your beans against the rain, that will keep the quality up too. If the factory worker processing the product is remunerated fairly, and treated in general, they will take more care with quality control; the service in your local café will be better, and your cuppa will taste and feel better – organoleptically and morally. You/we thus become willing to pay more – and so the circle continues.

Projects like this one, and many others, are featured centrally in a forthcoming SIOP Frontiers edited collection *'Tackling work precarity: Toward sustainable livelihoods'* (Carr, Hopner, Hodgetts & Young, in process). Watch this space for more, soon!

**Angela:** *Are today's technologies helping these connections and networks?*

**Stu:** Yes, like the digital platforms we're on now. You can talk to one another across all these different areas; have webinars and all kinds of stuff. That's made a huge difference, of course. The communication consolidates and helps our work; we know each other even better now, even though we are great distances apart. But what also puzzles me is why are we still stuck in that single job-in-an-organization mode, when on some digital platforms are run completely remotely, by just a few people, with perhaps no one in the host country to whom workers can actually talk?

**Angela:** *Looking back on the past few decades, what are your reflections on the field of HWP – is it coming of age?*

**Stu:** Yes, it is. The foundations for this change have been laid by our pioneering predecessors, who as we saw in your previous interview have worked behind the scenes, often at macro-policy levels, to represent our profession at multilateral, national and civil society levels, to help shape human development goals.

Today, I think we are in a new era of HWP, when it reaches more directly into everyday working lives, and work policies. For example, GLOW researchers, teachers and practitioners are having real impact on living wage city council ordinances, and policy shifts at organizational and inter-organizational supply-chain levels. Part of that shift is moving away from formal jobs, which even the World Bank and other UN chapters have said people, even before the pandemic, needed protecting from (see World Bank Group, 2019). Great Resignations and the Quiet Quitting are death knells for this arguably broken institution.

Progress entails focusing more, too, on *social* change. Inside work organizations, that can include tackling inequality at work, between gender groups, class groups, and ethnic groups. Outside of organizations, people who make their living from renting property will have to have their rent-seeking reined in (what use is raising a minimum wage if the gains are rapidly eaten by raised rents?). In an even wider, related vein, we need to start courageous conversations about the role of some occupations in destroying the very ecosystem on which all human life depends – and should respect if the word

*sustainable* is taken seriously. We can start this questioning for example by focusing on the psychology of maximum wages; as well as minimum and living wages. For example, the ratio between CEO and shop floor – hopefully living wage – levels, and how this links to well-being at work, for one and all, as well as the sustainability of the organization itself. Outside of organizations, we are working already in projects which link job satisfaction to housing satisfaction, work policies with social policies, private sector with government departments. In Clean SLATE (Sustainable Livelihoods And The Environment) we are co-designing a new system of occupation evaluation, which ranks diverse forms of livelihood generation for their sustainability (watch this space!). Coal mining for example is antithetical to environmental sustainability, whereas working in green hydrogen generation is the opposite. Such rankings have the potential to resonate with young people as they seek their own livelihoods and may end up informing and helping choices in the right direction for the goals.

**Angela:** *Are there fundamental questions that need to be researched at doctoral level to move this forward?*

**Stu:** Oh, there's no shortage of them! The concept of sustainable livelihoods could be opened out so much more. As automation advances and the number of so-called jobs decreases, we're going to have to think about all the ways (plural) that people can make a livelihood. Things like: Where is our work? What is the psychology of universal income? But psychologists are good at saying "*It might be a good idea, or it might not be?*" So, you need to be more specific about what you want to achieve. Where do you set the actual wage level? How does this interface with other wage structures? What well-being practice can come out of it? There is no use in having an income structure if it just allows (the unscrupulous) employer(s) to say "*Oh, we're going to pay even less now because you've already got those basics covered.*"

What is good employment practice on digital platforms? How are people protected both on the worker side and on the customer side? These are crucial interfaces for human rights; or, ways that living wages are calculated. We need to get much more into the policy debate. We have evidence on the real well-being consequences of decent wages over time; but how does that relate to global mobility? Integration? We need to be humble in front of the issues that are in the world of work now for people; but also, not backward in coming forwards, either. The amount of change needed means that a lot of the things we took for granted, we can't take for granted anymore (like the *steady state job*, the single organizational employer). I'm not being negative – we can rise to these challenges

because that is what we've done in the past. There is a lot going on already. If you look at the young scholars coming through in HWP, they are gravitating to topics like fair trade, and work(ing) in the informal sector. They have experience of helping people through the pandemic; like keeping street stalls going; and they are tackling combating trafficking and slavery. They are the future.

**Angela:** *Can I ask you for some concluding remarks.*

**Stu:** The big challenge for the whole of humanity is Climate Change. We need to get serious now and look forward. We've come of age and can see what is pending. It's already here. It's not pending. It's already here when we look out of the window! Work of various kinds, from organizations through to platforms, in many ways are responsible for a lot of the pollution; the warming, the degradation of the environment, the chopping down of forests and plundering of the seas. We have to get much more real about the interface between work and the biosphere. The ecosystem we all depend on for our well-being, and all the other creatures in the world, as we're not the only species here. The SDGs as a whole speak to these, so let's embrace them – and keep inputting to the next round of them, as they form. While the environmental issue is the Big One, there are so many other big things, like public health, racial justice, gender inequity, conflict, war and poverty. But if the ecosystem collapses, all those things will get exacerbated. Jobs like mining coal, or even driving buses are not helping the ecosystem; and stopping doing these things will involve difficult conversations, particularly as working-class people depend on these jobs and resources. But there are older and newer occupations and livelihood activities that are less harmful, more supportive of human health and well-being (salutogenic) and conducive for the environment, too. The big future direction is going to be *environmental work psychology*. So far, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has arguably been more about corporate green washing than actual change – more C than SR, and that must change up. But corporations too aren't the only form of work organization in town; there are a whole range of different platforms and ways that people can work to make their livelihoods. We need to understand these more.

We've just had the wettest months on record with huge amounts of rain coming into New Zealand; the climate is visibly shifting in front of us and becoming unstable. In many cases areas of the world are going to become uninhabitable, unsustainable. Climate Change requires climate Action (SDG-13). Slow it down; whilst figuring how to reverse it. This is going to need political courage from governments, but *work* has got to be in the conversation, because a lot of the time it isn't. Yes, it's about fossil fuels, but it's also

about consumption; without consumption you don't have production; and they feed each other. Connecting with consumer behaviour and consumer power is a good way to change things. We applied psychologists need to be in that space, as part of that ecosystem. We need to find sustainable production and consumption. That's where the work of the young scholars studying the voyage of the humble but ubiquitous coffee bean, as it connects livelihoods, is really important. You use it as a way of looking into and looking at those bigger issues.

**Angela:** *I think that's a suitable place to end our fascinating conversation looking at some of the positive work being done.*

**Stu:** Yeah, we want our species and others to continue. When the dinosaurs went, life carried on, but the dinosaurs weren't around anymore. Let's not be dinosaurs!

**Angela:** *Thank you so much for your time.*

**Stu:** It's been my pleasure.

## References

- Calvard, T.S., Carter, A.J., & Axtell, C.M. (2008). A tenuous link: Psychological contracts and perspective-taking between a promotion agency and its workers. *EWOP InPractice*, 2, 3–13. <http://www.eawop.org/uploads/datas/4/original/ejournal%202008.pdf?1297012255>
- Carr, S. C. (2023). *Wage and Well-being: Toward Sustainable Livelihood*. Springer Nature.
- Carr, S. C., Hodgetts, D.J., Potgieter, J., & Meyer, I. (2020). *Macro-Psychology for Decent Work: Sustainable Livelihood*. In M. MacLachlan & J. McVeigh (Eds.), *Macro-psychology: A population science for Sustainable Development Goals* (pp. 213–31). Springer.
- Carr, S. C., Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D. J., & Young M. (in process). *Tackling precarious work: Toward Sustainable Livelihoods*. SIOP Frontiers/Routledge.
- Carr, S. C., Meyer, I., Saxena, M., Seubert, C., Hopfgartner, L., Arora, B, Jyoti, D., & Marai, L. (2022). “Our fair trade coffee tastes better”: It might, but under what conditions? *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 56, 597–612. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12416>
- EAWOP Small Group Meeting. Precarious Employment and Work: Understanding the underlying psychological and social processes. University of Glasgow, Adam Smith Business School, UK, 4–6 September 2023.

- EAWOP Small Group Meeting (2019). EAWOP Small Group Meeting on the living wage (2019). See [http://www.eawop.org/ckeditor\\_assets/attachments/1249/final\\_report\\_living\\_wage\\_sgm2019\\_v2.pdf?1575384207](http://www.eawop.org/ckeditor_assets/attachments/1249/final_report_living_wage_sgm2019_v2.pdf?1575384207)
- ESRC Impact case study. See [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08af3ed915d622c0009df/60426-Impact\\_case\\_study\\_discrepancies\\_in\\_aid\\_and\\_development\\_workers\\_salaries\\_tcm6-370661.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08af3ed915d622c0009df/60426-Impact_case_study_discrepancies_in_aid_and_development_workers_salaries_tcm6-370661.pdf)
- Groot, S., & Hodgetts, D. (2015). The infamy of begging: A case-based approach to street homelessness and radical commerce. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(4), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.960984>
- Marai, L. (2014). Dual Salary and Workers' Well-being in Papua New Guinea. In: Reichman, W. (Ed.) *Industrial and Organizational Psychology Help the Vulnerable* (pp. 120–30). Palgrave Macmillan.
- McWha-Hermann, I., Marai, L., MacLachlan, M., & Carr, S. C. (2021). Policy Brief: Developing evidence-based alternatives to dual salary systems. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, 10, pp. 243–6. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2157-3891/a000023>
- McWha-Hermann, I., Searle, R.H., & Carr, S.C. (2021). Striving for more: Work and Organizational Psychology (WOP) and living wages. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(6), 771–776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1972972>
- The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, see [About the OECD-OECD](#)
- UNESCO video see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mz4n3nnqYz0&list=PLWuYED1WVJIMIBakjL-2NML6nEocG-xd9&index=132>
- World Bank Group. (2019). Work Development Report 2018 – WDR 2019 presentations. World bank: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/808261547222082195/WDR19-English-Presentation.pdf> Slide 17, Accessed February 25, 2023