

Schedule Presentation Group 2
Week 2 Institutions and Values
Henk, Igor, Jun, Olivier, Tim, Talitha

FIRST: Ask the people in the classroom if they can sit in their weekly groups from this subject.

13:15 → Anecdote about begroting Prinsjesdag. Introduce topic of Moral Dilemma between different causes. Followed by introduction of the group and give a short overview on the lecture and the topic. Following is an intro about the whole presentation.

Giving the group a clear outline of the presentation helps keeping the attention. By breaking down the presentation in smaller parts, the audience knows what's coming up and they can organise their thoughts. The anecdote on Prinsjesdag worked because it was recently in the news, and it helped giving everybody a very concrete idea about what problems you could face while making decisions.

13:20 → Introduce theory on Moral overload with some "Would you rather...?" questions. We ask people to walk to one or the other side of the classroom depending on what they agree with. Ask one person from every side why they chose.

A lot of people were very positive about the exercise of "Would you rather...?" questions. After 20 minutes of theory, it re-energized the students by letting them get up and walk around. This idea was also used by week group 5. It was a light exercise to really get people to start thinking.

13:30 → Debate within groups for 20 minutes, after this each group points out a spokesperson that will present his/her group's conclusions to the rest of the class. This last part is takes place during 10 minutes.

Subject: the trade-off between sustainability and profits concerning the oil and gas drilling in Groningen.

Should the Dutch government decide to drill for gas slowly and sustain income, or should they drill quickly to have money available right now but having to deal with costs due to collateral damage.

The subject was too vague for a proper discussion, as there were too many unknowns. During the debates we had to supply additional information on how the money would be spent, which guarantees you could make as a government etc. It was a good illustration to show why you shouldn't make assumptions for decision making. With people in the audience from Groningen, they had strong feelings on this issue, which illustrated that decisions can't be made on facts alone, but are also made with your gut-feeling. Mrs. Nevejan illustrated this by citing the work of an Italian psychologist (not sure who it

was exactly). So it was productive in showing what value emotions hold in decision making, introducing our next topic, but the goal of the debate on the moral dilemma was surpassed.

14:00 → Introduce topic of Emotions, Values and Decision making.
Bridge: How are choices influenced by emotions and values.

The theory from this part lacked PowerPoint slides and a clear structure. In addition, the bridge between theory and the next assignment could have been better organized. This was mainly due to literal last minute changes.

14:05 → Make people write down one time in their lives when emotions influenced an important decision during 10 minutes. In the next 10 minutes people will make pairs and discuss what they wrote down.

It was hard to focus the class for the writing exercise after doing something very interactive, although classical piano music from Yiruma helped the class to concentrate and to think of an experience where emotions played an important role.

After a reflection to how each individual made decisions in the past based on emotional value, the students were asked to discuss their experiences with their neighbour. To come to a final solution we selected some emotions we thought were dominant in decision making, like fear, anger, pride and other emotions, and we asked the group To go to the corner of the room which represented their emotion. It appeared that there were a lot more emotions involved in decision making than we had thought of. This was a very interesting result.

14:25 → Video about the lego/shell partnership. Everything is NOT awesome.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qhbliUq0_r4

Because of time-issues, the lego advertisement where people had to think about the values during the break wasn't reviewed. The video was entertaining, but would probably work better if it would be shown after the theory on values and institutions.

The Greenpeace advertisement against Lego and Shell showed how the institution used emotions to influence decisions. This video was a call for awareness against the plans of Shell for exploring fossil fuel sources in the Polar area. We showed the video before the break to illustrate how institutions are using emotions as well to express their own values. It formed a bridge between the topics emotions and values on the one hand and institutions and values on the other hand.

14:30 → 14:45 BREAK MUCH

14:45 → Introduction to the theory on Values and Institutions.

There wasn't much to say about the information of this part. The example about the corn used in the wood of kitchen cabinets from Henk was a bit unclear because it was going too fast. Furthermore was it a good choice to put the information part again before the interactive part. In that way, we kept the 'red line' throughout our presentation. The idea was to keep it short, but all the information had to be mentioned. Because it was already clear that a large part didn't saw our part of the MOOC, the information had to include all the important parts. Maybe the whole part was going a bit too fast.

14:50 → Introduction to institution game. Every group gets assigned an institution and they have to decide their values based upon what institution they represent.

Because Jun was absent for our presentation, we lacked a solid introduction for the assignment. Jun was supposed to give an introduction to the nuclear power issue in Japan since he had first-hand experience, this is why we couldn't substitute for him on this. The lack of coherence led to some confusion in the beginning of the exercise, another effect of this was that we lost a bit of time on extra explanations for individuals.

15:00 → Everyone gets assigned a playing card. People have to find another person with the same card as them who belongs to another institution. They have 10 minutes to discuss their views with each other and think of possible solutions on how they could help each other.

Institutions: Japanese Government, Greenpeace, Roman Catholic Church, Multinational, Nuclear Energy Company and Civil Movement.

Question: Decide on whether Japan should build a nuclear reactor, even though 70% of the general public opposes it and there are natural disasters that can damage the nuclear reactors. Keep in mind which values you decided upon and with which institutions you can work together.

15:10 → Everyone goes back to their groups and within the groups they get 20 minutes to discuss on how they would solve the issue working together with other institutions.

The game required more time. You could easily fill a whole day with the discussions between groups. Planning a whole day and thinking constructively could possibly lead to very interesting solutions. It could also be valuable to monitor discussions a bit more, if people get stuck with clashing values. People did find this exercise interesting and were entertained to see some pairs of organisations (Government and Church) work very well together, and to see heated arguments between others (Greenpeace and the Nuclear Reactor). The lack of time for thinking about an organisations values, led to some surprising outcomes, with the government supporting the building of a new reactor. More time would probably lead to less contradictory outcomes, but towards more innovative ideas.

15:30 → Theory on the four layer model. The theory is linked to the solutions brought forward by the groups.

- The first level, embeddedness, is characterized by non-calculative, spontaneous reactions that only change every 100-1000 years. The Church and perhaps also Greenpeace are two institutions that fit within this layer.
- The second level, institutional environment, can be seen as the 'rules of the game'. These are the basic laws of any state and are often decided by the state or government.
- The third level, governance, are in a sense the elaboration of the institutional laws. The Japanese Government fits perfectly in this level, as well as the Multinational.
- The fourth level, resource allocation, is the most precise level of institution. A typical institution for this layer was the Nuclear Energy Company since they rely on continuous price changes.

Originally this part of theory was after the institutions exercise, to show the group that there was a fundamental part of theory to back up the discussions they just had. We chose the institutions so that they all fit into one of the four layers. In the end it turned out that not many people had read the MOOC beforehand, so we decided to present this part of theory before the final exercise so that people knew what they should base their values upon.

15:40 → Finish, conclude and extra time for if things take too long.