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Correspondence can be replaced with cooperation

When and why group interactions are competitive, and how

Group Interactions 1
replaced with cooperation—a crucial goal for group interactions in organizational settings.

interactions between groups are competitive and how cooperation can be
individuals who must work in or with groups because it details when and why
positive relations between groups. This chapter offers useful tools for
implications for group facilitators, leaders, and members seeking to promote
cumulative evidence relevant to each of these questions and point out
between individuals; and (c) ways to reduce intergroup competition. We review
interactions between groups are often more competitive than interactions
discuss (d) when interactions between groups can create competition; (e) why
implications for intergroup interactions in organizations. Specifically, we
this chapter, we review the literature on the discontinuity effect and discuss his
interactions relative to how groups behave in group-on-group interactions. In
a discontinuity, or discontinuity between how individuals behave in one-on-one
been labeled the interindividual-intergroup discontinuity effect because there is
interactions between individuals in mixed-motive situations. This finding has
interactions between groups are more competitive and less cooperative than
comparing interindividual and intergroup behavior has revealed that
groups are different from the sum of their parts. These decades of research

abstract
or antagonistic, and how competition can be replaced with cooperation. These questions, and discuss when and why group interactions are competitive

Section_in this chapter we review empirical evidence relevant to answering

Why were relations between the WGA and AMPP so contentious? Why did

million in lost wages (Litlogton, 2007).

Pixner, 2008) and cost writers and producers crew members over $340

the strike, cost the Los Angeles economy as much as $2.1 billion (White &

ultimately voted on the contract proposal), and some economists estimate that

first-hand. Over 12,000 writers joined the strike (approximately 4,000 of which

controversy allowed audience members everywhere to witness this hostility.

AMPP were quite hostile during the strike, and the public nature of the

ending on February 12, 2008 (Greyp, 2008). Relations between the WGA and

television producers. The writers' strike lasted 100 tumultuous days, finally

organization that represents the interests of approximately 400 U.S. film and

working in television, radio, and film in the United States; the AMP is a trade

DVIS. The WGA is a labor union that represents the interests of writers

of writers for the use of their material on new media, such as the Internet and

because of failed contract negotiations over various issues regarding payment

against the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers (AMP)

On November 5, 2007, the Writers Guild of America (WGA) went on strike

HOW COMPETITION CAN BE REPLACED WITH COOPERATION

WHEN AND WHY GROUP INTERACTIONS ARE COMPETITIVE, AND
choose Y, Side A receives $1 and Side B receives $4.

other side's decision (X or Y). For example, if Side A chooses X and the monetary payoff are determined jointly by their own decision (X or Y) and the other individual's or groups. In the typical game used in experimental research, each side chooses one option, either X or Y. Each side's outcomes (e.g., a either individually or groups. In the typical game used in experimental research, players and Side B (the outlying player), sides can be comprised of

conflict involving two sides. In Figure 1, these sides are labeled Side A (the game (PDG); see Figure 1). The PDG represents a situation in which there is a based mixed-motive situation, or social dilemma, is the prisoner's dilemma

insko, korschun, & wildschut, 2008). The prototypical example of a laboratory-

scbapker et al., 2001; wildschut, Pringer, veera, insko, & schepker, 2003; woll

(mccallum et al., 1989; scbapker, insko, greer, diggs, & smith, 1997).

 contexts, or situations involving a conflict of interests between two sides and more competitive than interactions between individuals in mixed-motive interactions has revealed that interactions between groups are less cooperative

one-on-one interactions to the behavior of groups in group-on-group

Over three decades of research comparing the behavior of individuals in

THE INTERINDIVIDUAL-INTERGROUP DISCONTINUITY EFFECT

members can use to promote cooperation in interactions involving groups.

the final section, we provide suggestions that group facilitators, leaders, and

illustrating the empirical findings. Throughout the chapter, and particularly in experiments, we will return to the writers' strike example as a way of

Although the findings we review are drawn primarily from social psychology

Group Interactions
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Over 100 experiments have compared group with individual behavior in the

The prisoner's dilemma is an example of a game with a dominant strategy,
resulting in an upper right-hand cell of Figure 1. (For more on the history of
the prisoner's dilemma, see Game Theory, 1992.)

If neither player chooses to defect, both players receive a high payoff. If one
player chooses to defect, the other player receives a low payoff. If both
players choose to defect, both players receive a low payoff. In these
examples, the dominant strategy is to defect. The optimal strategy is to
cooperate, but this strategy does not lead to a mutual agreement.

The PDG matrix was developed by Game Theory in 1950 and is named

It would be a great mistake if everybody did the same thing is likely to be a
situation in which you are tempted to do something, but know
Put simply, "any situation in which you are tempted to do something, but know
over multiple trials, or allowing communication between the two sides or not.
be varied in a number of ways, including having players interact in one trial or
worse off than had they both chosen X (the cooperative choice). The game can
choosing X (the cooperative choice), but if both sides choose X, they will both be
attempt to maximize its own outcomes (i.e., receive the most money) by
The conflict inherent in the prisoner's dilemma is that each side can

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]
The greater discontinuities of interactional behavior is due both to actinic as a
2007; Wingquist & Larson, 2004; Overall, these studies have established that
Morena & Tindale, 2002; Pemberton et al., 1996; Wildschut, Lusko, & Prinster,
of interaction as a group versus interaction with a group (Meyer & Hinsz, 2004;)
Group to one-on-one interactions, but several studies have examined the effects
Most of the studies on the discontinuity effect have compared Group-on-
(Meyer & Hinsz, 2004;)
2002) and situations involving interactional aggression following a provocation
negotiations that have a prisoner's dilemma structure (Morena & Tindale,
Japanese (Takemura & Yuk, 2007), and in different contexts, such as in
cultural groups, such as the Dutch (Wildschut, Lusko, & Prinster, 1996), among various
such as chair studies (Pemberton, Lusko, & Schober, 1996), among various
the PDC matrix, the effect has also been found with non-laboratory methods,
investigated differences in how groups and individuals behave in the context of
each other. While the majority of studies of the discontinuity effect have
how individuals behaved toward each other versus how groups behaved toward
discontinuity effect because there was a discontinuity or discontinuity between
researchers to study this phenomenon, labeled in the interactional-intergroup
whereas individuals are more likely to choose X. John Tindale, one of the first
intergroup interactions, that is, groups are more likely to choose Y,
interindividual interactions, that is, groups are typically comprised of three group members. These studies
have established that intergroup interactions are much less cooperative than
groups (groups are typically comprised of three group members). These studies
compare the behavior of two interacting individuals to that of two interacting
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These groups often interact in order to facilitate day-to-day operations. The management, research and development, marketing, information technology, business, corporations, and organizations are replete with groups (e.g.,

Implications for Working with Groups

Robert
discontinuity effect suggests that if may indeed have been a contributing factor. Lettermans committed was resolved in half the time, but research on the parties. Of course, this is most likely the only reason that WGA is strike of representatives concerned with satisfying the interests of many different lettermen. While the WIMP on the other hand, the WGA was negotiating with representatives concerned primarily with satisfying the interests of one person (David company, and as such the WGA was able to negotiate with representatives the time that it took the WIMP. One possibility is that lettermen owns this company able to work out a cooperative agreement with the WGA in nearly half in 54 days as opposed to 100 (Carter & Creplin, 2007). Why was Letterman's of this idea, the WGA's strike against David Letterman's company was resolved extended because of the group-on-group nature of the interaction. In support while Letterman is strike, it appeared as though both the WGA and throughout the writers' strike, it appeared as though both the WGA and

Writers' Strike Example

"the opponent effect" (Wilschut et al., 2007).

Group Interactions
2001). Competition is rare when both parties’ interests are aligned. That is, competition becomes more positive (Wool et al., 2008) or less negative (Schoepfer et al.) if increased more cooperative as the relationship between each side’s outcomes increases. Generally bad for Side B and vice versa. Interpersonal interactions become more positive when Side A is in a positive relationship between the two sides’ outcomes. What is good for Side A is competitive or selfishly, interpersonal interactions will be just as cooperative as behavior. In situations where there is little or no perceived advantage to acting competitively, not all interpersonal interactions are characterized by competitiveness.

INTERINDIVIDUAL INTERACTIONS

WHEN WILL INTERGROUP INTERACTIONS BE LESS COMPETITIVE THAN

Group to allow them to act as cooperatively as individuals.

Leaders may need some independence or reduced accountability from their subordinates in more detailed later. Group than they feel it is a responsibility to advocate for their group's interests (Furta et al., 2007). As we will discuss in some ways, this interpersonal context could mimic the one-group interactions. In some ways, this interpersonal context would mimic the one-group situation by allowing individuals from other groups to work and interact with individuals from other groups to work and interact while minimizing the group's symptoms. Competitive effect suggests that organizations could avoid creating difficult...
Harvard Law School.

The story involves a man discussing with his nephew what he learned at
William Ury (1993) refers to an anecdote that captures this phenomenon quite
Permutation, 1991; Kelley et al., 2003; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). In Getting Past No,
perceptions of the situation as opposed to the actual situation (Fisher, Ury, &
should also recognize that people are often influenced more by their
While though intuitively structured situations can reduce competition, one
advantage of cooperation is clear.

Continuous if the context of the interaction is changed so that the mutual
have the encouraging implication that interfingroup relations can be made less
cooperation rates were 98% for groups and 97% for individuals. These results
relationship between the two sides’ outcomes. In one such matrix,
interindividual interactions in matrices in which there was a strong positive
100% for individuals). Intergroup interactions were just as cooperative as
between the two sides’ outcomes (cooperation rates were 99% for groups and
then interindividual interactions in the matrices with a negative relationship
sides’ outcomes. Whereas interfingroup interactions were much less cooperative
matrices in which there was a strong positive relationship between the two
strong negative relationship between the two sides’ outcomes (i.e., PDG) and
intergroup and interindividual interactions in a matrix in which there was a
In an attempt to demonstrate this idea, Wolf et al. (2008) compared
other and what is bad for one is bad for both” (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978, p. 12).
cooperation will trump competition when “what is good for one is good for the
Group Interactions
that it was in their mutually shared interest to each refresh some of the

may have been abbreviated had both the writers and producers realized sooner

writers to strike instead of yielding to their requests. The length of the strike

Likewise, the producers believed that they should remain strong and allow the

believed that they should strike instead of accepting the contract specifications.

between the two sides' outcomes. At the outset of the conflict, the writers

conflict of interests—a situation in which there was a negative relationship

the contract negotiation that preceded the strike as a situation with a strong

Wolf et al., 2008) suggests that both the WGA and the AMPT likely perceived

Research on the domain of the discontinuity effect (Cepeda et al., 2001;  

Writers' Strike Example

also by changing how the situation is perceived. Cooperation can be encouraged not only by changing how the situation is perceived, but

should act cooperatively, the other side might view the situation differently.

your interests are aligned with the other party's interests and that you both

understanding how the other party perceives the situation. Even if you think

This anecdote highlights the importance of perspective taking and

not more important, are people's perceptions of those facts. (Utley, 1993, p.

taken me twenty-five years to learn that just as important as the facts, it

that all that counts in life are the facts—who's right and who's wrong. It's

at Harvard Law School. Because what I learned at Harvard Law School is

you know, Bill, it has taken me twenty-five years to unlearn what I learned

Group Interactions 10
There are two main reasons why intergroup interactions are less cooperative than intragroup interactions in intergroup contexts: fear and greed. Compared to intragroup interactions, intergroup interactions are characterized by greater fear of distrust of the other side and greater greed.

**Intergroup Interactions**

**Why Are Intergroup Interactions Less Cooperative Than Competition?**

We revisit this idea in the section that focuses on reducing intergroup competition. Both sides will choose to cooperate, which will benefit them over the long term. When group members perceive in this way increases the likelihood that outcomes may, in fact, be positively related to the other side’s outcomes. How they perceive the situation and can help them recognize that their own costs associated with mutual cooperation and disadvantages of mutual competition can change underlying interests, the benefits associated with mutual cooperation, and the group facilitators’ leaders, and members would be wise to highlight compatible

**Implications for Working with Groups**

Money satisfied their mutual understanding of getting back to work and making less pertinent demands in order to achieve an intergroup agreement that
Wilkschul and Insko (2007) provide a detailed discussion of these motivations. Pursued in order to help one's fellow group members (Pinker et al., 2007), rationalization of the justification that selfish, competitive behaviors are being
(Cohen, Montoya, & Insko, 2006; Wilkschul et al., 2002) and (d) altruistic
what is best for their own group despite potential harm or costs to others
learning norms that encourage group members to "take care of their own" or do
1990; Schopler et al., 1993; Wilkschul, Insko, & Garthal, 2002); (e) ingroup-
for the competitive pursuit of selfish or group-serving behaviors (Insko et al.,
1995); (f) explicit and implicit social support that group members provide
comes from acting as a group member instead of as an individual (Schopler et
multiple sources. These include: (a) anonymity or reduced identifiability that
The greater degree that characteristics of group interactions can arise from
Wilkschul (2009).

Individuals tend to feel toward each other but that groups do not (Rea, Insko,
et al., 1996) and/or from the personal connection or empathic concern that
untrustworthiness, hostile, and abrasive (Hoyler, Pinkney, & Insko, 1989; Pettet
stereotypes or schema of groups that suggests that groups are competitive.

The greater fear and distrust of groups may arise from a
possibly outcome (either in an absolute or relative sense) or because of a
Wilkschul & Insko, 2007 for a review). In the PD, groups are more likely to

Group Interactions 12
competition outweighed by greed and fear can be reduced.

toward the other side. In the next section, we discuss ways in which
by providing social support for pursuing competitive and anergonic action
in that situation. Statements such as these fostered greed and fear motivations.

WGA's statement was posted on a blog, presumably in an effort to
member Joss Whedon, February 6, 2008

what they're trying to take from us. RIGHT. RIGHT. RIGHT. WGA
reason is for the moderates. Remember what they've done. Remember
This is not over. Nor is it close...• On the streets, on the net, I say

animosity and tension felt by many of the writers.

read that the AMPM would exploit them. The following quote captures the
WGA was willing to negotiate in good faith, and on the other side, the WGA
writers' strike was palpable. On one side, the AMPM distributed that the
from several sources, but the distance between the AMPM and WGA during the
The hostile relations between the producers and writers may have resulted

Writers' Strike Example

Groups to engage in greedy group-serving behaviors.

What they share in common is that they all exacerbate or foster the tendency of

Group Interactions: 13
If you choose on trial 2, if their group chooses Y on trial 1, and likewise, what the
other group would do. The questions asked groups to consider what the other side would
interactions with another group of three participants in a PD game similar to
conduct or answer a few short questions prior to repeated
strategy toward demonstrating the technique, Wolf et al. (2009) had groups
own cooperative actions will affect the other side’s future actions. In a
intergroup competition can be reduced by having groups think about how their
Research on the consideration of future consequences has revealed that

**Consideration of Future Consequences**

- Cooperative behavior yields more attractive outcomes than competitive behavior (Wolf et al., 2008).
- Change the situation (or perceptions of the situation) to one in which
  - Finley, 1999;
- Increase empathy toward opposite groups (Cohen, 2008; Stephan &
  - Promote independent leadership (Hunter et al., 2007);
  - Recenter, Rea, Montoya, & Lisko, 2009).
  - Cooperative behavior (Lisko et al., 1998; 2001; Wolf, Cohen;
- Encourage each group to consider future consequences of
  - Cohen & Lisko, 2008 for a review.
  - Research on intergroup relations and the disconfirmation effect has

**Findings and Implications for Working with Groups**

**How Can Intergroup Competition Be Reduced? Research**

Group Interactions 14
future conflict and the costs associated with it. Likely facilitation cooperation because group members will be motivated to avoid affecting the other side's future behavior. These reminders and considerations will could also ask group members to consider how their present behavior could potential for repeated interactions with the other side, leaders, and facilitators likely be influential in future interactions. In addition to highlighting the future, and that any competitive or antagonistic behavior in the present will group members, that they will be interacting with the other group again in the future, and that any competitive or antagonistic behavior in the present will reduce intergroup cooperation in organizations may be to make it salient to multiple settings, not simply in one-shot encounters. Thus, an effective way to Group facilitators, leaders, and members could easily put this strategy into practice. In most organizations, interactions between the same groups occur in short-term benefits.

that the long-term costs of cooperation are often far greater than the potential way to promote intergroup cooperation is to help group members understand. Overall, findings from these experiments suggest that an effective be multiple interactions with the other group, as opposed to just one (Russet et groups (Axelrod, 1984; Russet et al., 1998) and making it salient that there will also be promoted by using a "kill-them-strategy to interact with opposite these questions. Other research has revealed that future-oriented thinking can compete less with the other group compared to groups who were not asked simple questions. Led groups to report less distances of the other group and other side would choose on trial 2 if their group choose X on trial 1. These
A third strategy for improving relations between groups is to foster empathy. This strategy is effective when representing their group's interests and desires. Situations by allowing ethical and trustworthy group leaders to have some facilitation, leaders, and members might be able to avoid difficult group be quite helpful for negotiating cooperative deals with other groups. Group leader is a moral or ethical person, a certain degree of independence is likely to leaders to pursue their own selfish goals. But it is known that a group’s unaccountable, unethical, and reduced accountability allows less ethical, however, because not all leaders will act cooperatively when they are prefer to cooperate (Fineman et al., 2007). This statement needs qualification, freedom to cooperate with those toward whom their more extreme basic might reduced accountability from the members of the group so that they have the cooperative is to allow group leaders to have some degree of independence or leadership suggests that one way to make intergroup interactions more high-leverage statements made during primary election contests. Research on statements made during general election contests with more extreme left- or middle ground when they are forced to reconcile moderates or centrists and centrists outside the group, politicians have to deal with this constellation of loyal group members while still engaging cooperative group leaders often struggle with the dilemma of having to satisfy their independent leadership
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lead to retaliation instead of forgiveness. There has been a prior provocation, considering the other group’s feelings may increase cooperation in some interpersonal interactions, but in situations where contradictory results suggest that feeling empathy for opposing groups may in which groups were recently provoked by the other side, these somewhat promoted cooperation in the previous study increased aggression in a situation aggression, Cohen (2008) found that the same empathy intervention that opposing groups can sometimes backfire. In a study of empathy and intergroup a subsequent study by Cohen (2008), however, revealed that empathy for their tendency to cooperate in intergroup interactions.

This latter finding is important because it demonstrates that empathy concern instructed to consider the feelings of opposing group members (Cohen, 2008). those with low empathy scores were swayed to cooperate when they were empathy were more likely to cooperate with an opposing group. Moreover, found that group members with high scores on a measure of dispositional in a laboratory study of empathy and intergroup conflict, Cohen (2008)
difficult for them to commit anti-social behavior. individuals are able to consider and imagine others’ feelings, making it more (Eisenberg et al., 2002; Graziano, Haidasz, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). Empathic empathy is en important variable in predicting cooperation and helping behavior throughout the world (e.g., Malhotra & Lyngdhe, 2005). Empathic conflicts throughout the world are often employed by peace workshops seeking to resolve protracted intergroup
Getting to Yes: Canterer and Pollard's (2000) research on the Common Interest
Principle (1991) in their classic book on principled negotiation. Other methods for reaching cooperative transformations are discussed by

or reaching mutually beneficial agreements. Of positive results, such as increased profit sharing, for behaving cooperatively example, the possibility of cooperation could be strengthened with the promise of positive results might be one method for reaching such a transformation. For not cooperation might be one method for reaching such a transformation. Rewarding cooperation, but perceived to be more valuable than cooperation. Rewarding cooperation, but

conceptualizing how to change the situation into one in which cooperation is an effective strategy for reducing conflict. The difficulty with this tactic is perceptions of the situation by highlighting compatible underlying interests in relationships between the two sides' outcomes. Changing group members were as willing to cooperate as individuals when there was a strong positive idea earlier when summarizing work of et al, (2006) study that found that groups situation is another way of reducing intergroup cooperation. We discussed this

Finally, changing the situation or group members' perceptions of the

Change the Situation

If the group members are unaccustomed to feeling empathetic concern, for others. This activity might make cooperation between the groups more likely, especially to imagine the feelings that members of the opposition group are experiencing. Proceeded by simple empathy-evaluation exercises that require group members promote cooperation. For example, group-on-group interactions could be

people seeking to avoid difficult group situations could use empathy to

Group Interactions
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personally, but it was more important that we make a deal that

Chapter 13 discusses how the WGA had achieved most, but not all of their goals.

Shortly after the strike ended, Peter Verveen, president of the WGA's West

proposals more reasonable so that the other side could potentially accept them.

recognition may have encouraged the two parties to make their contract

production could resume, and both sides could continue making money. This

interest in settle the dispute so that the writers could go back to work,

the recognition by one or both sides that it was in their mutually shared

was reached upon by both parties. Resolution of the conflict was precipitated by

2008). The strike lasted 100 days, and it concluded when a three-year contract

92.5% of 3,775 writers voted to terminate the strike and return to work (Cleary,

The WGA's strike against the AMPM ended on February 12, 2008, when

Competition

Writers' Strike Example: Ending the Strike by Reducing Intergroup

viewed as more attractive than competition.

instead of differences is one way to change a situation so that cooperation is

are all members of the human race. Highlighting intergroup communalties

organization, all want their organization to succeed—and if nothing else, they

differences, they share many things in common (e.g., all work for the same

improved when members of opposing groups recognize that despite their

changed into cooperative ones. They suggest that intergroup relations will be

Identity Model also offers some insight into how competitive situations can be
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be saddened by what I am about to say: long-time friends will shake
deal. My reasons are good, and they are plentiful. Partic Verone will
I am loyal. I love your Guild. And I voted NO on accepting this
...You may have heard my name. I am a Union guy, I am a Guild guy.'

Billions' response to the Guild contract proposal:
members of the WGA were heeded. Take, for instance, WGA member Harlan
would not have been possible if the opinions of some of the more extreme
AWMP may have allowed him to help the WGA negotiate a contract, which
important because his ability to see the long-term benefits of cooperating with
The fact that Paulie Verone seemed to be an independent group leader is
dispute and rally a contract.
consequences likely contributed to each side's decision to ultimately end the
term costs of a failure to resolve the contract. Thus, a consideration of future
These lost wages and revenues may have led both parties to consider the long-
cost the writers and producers millions of dollars in lost wages and revenues.
consequences of prolonged mutual contraction were realized. The strike had
then competing against them. This realization may have occurred because the
cooperating with the AWMP as, overall, more beneficial for this organization
Verone's statement suggested that by the end of the strike he perceived
Verone, quoted by CNN, 2008)

beneath the membership, the town as a whole, that got people back

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Conclusion

Factors, among others, likely worked in combination to bring about the strikes' independence from group members with more extreme positions. These consequences of a failure to cooperate, and allowed their group leaders to have cooperation was more advantageous than competition, considered the future

cooperate and agree on a contract because one or both sides realized that overall, it seems that the WGA and AMP were ultimately able to

as Ellison's.

given at least some degree of independence from those with opinions as strong

lt seems unlikely that WGA leaders, such as Vertzone, would have been able

like a yellow dog, it is a S** Dead' (Ellison, 2008)

their heads, but this I say without equivocation... they beat us

}
To achieve some insight into how to manage difficult group situations, it is our hope that this chapter will allow individuals who work in or with groups to understand the benefits of cooperation and the mutual costs of competition are highlighted. It is changing the situation or perceptions of the situation so that the mutual promotion independent leadership, fostering empathy toward opposing groups.
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