Section II

Violence types

2.1 The impact of terrorism on the workplace

Benjamin Bader and Birte Manke

Introduction

In the last fifteen to twenty years, businesses and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have increasingly become the focus of potential targets of terrorist acts (Elango, Graf, & Hemmasi, 2008). This is not only true for volatile and politically instable regions (Global Terrorism Database (GTD), 2015; Institute for Economics and Peace, 2016). Targets have been traced all around the globe and many Western nations became victims of terrorist attacks, as several events in the past have tragically shown. Most recently, the bombing in May 2017 in Manchester revealed this development. Such terrorist acts can be defined as "[…] the threatened or actual use of illegal force and violence by a non-state actor to attain a political, economic, religious, or social goal through fear, coercion, or intimidation" (Global Terrorism Database, 2016). As a consequence of the globalization of terrorism, the number of people exposed to the threat of terrorism is increasing as well. In particular, more people who have previously not been exposed to terrorism in their lives make their first encounter (Goodwin, Willson, & Stanley, 2005). The expansion of terrorism has become a threat that puts internationally operating businesses at trail and is a challenge for International Human Resource Management as well (A. K. Bader, Reade, & Froese, 2016; B. Bader & Berg, 2013; Czinkota, Knight, Liesch, & Steen, 2010; Reade, 2009).

Terrorism challenges the organization and its members in a special way. Resilience and other coping skills of the individual employee are tested, while the organization's resources and

processes are put in demand (James, 2011a). Such disastrous occurrences can have severe and lasting effects on the business activities of an organization, like restrictions through new government regulations (Barth, Li, Mccarthy, Phumiwasana, & Yago, 2006; Czinkota, Knight, & Liesch, 2004; Lenain, Bonturi, & Koen, 2002) and increased costs for business transactions (Blomberg & Hess, 2006; Fratianni & Kang, 2006). Yet, the challenges related to a terrorist attack not only affect the organizational level. Therefore, whether or not new challenges lead to lasting negative effects is influenced by several aspects. For instance, individual level effects, such as employees suffering from terrorist attacks and perhaps holding the employer responsible, can occur. Yet, organizations can help and support their employees in times of crisis (B. Bader, Berg, & Holtbrügge, 2015; Sanchez, Korbin, & Viscarra, 1995).

Factors influencing whether organizations are in demand to act after a terrorist attack is a quite complicated topic though. *When* the incident has happened or *how* it affected the workplace might be a first and simple answer to that. However, as the lines between the workplace and the private sphere become increasingly blurred, several new questions arise. For instance, what if an employee is attacked on his or her way to work? What happens if an employee becomes a victim during home office times? What happens when an expatriate is attacked on an international assignment? These exemplary questions show that it is not that simple to draw a direct line between terrorist attack and employer "responsibility". Of course, in most cases the employer is not directly responsible for the attack and anything causing a strike is outside of its scope. However, employees might hold the employer responsible regardless and this might cause problems in the employer-employee relationship.

In this chapter, we discuss theoretical aspects that might allow to anticipate how the role of the employer is seen after an attack. In particular, we offer a new interactionist perspective by focusing on the relationship between the individual employee and the employing organization, because this relationship is especially challenged in times of crisis. Employees

typically expect their organizational leader to act appropriately (Madera & Smith, 2009). To explain a possible change in attitudes towards the organization, we draw on conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), theories related to the meaningfulness and utility of work (Marshall, 1890; Spencer, 2003), and discuss negative employee behavior in the light of psychological contract theory (Rousseau, 1989). By doing so, we develop a conceptual model accounting for factors that might influence the breach of psychological contracts between employee and employer.

Additionally, one important aspect that influences the relationship quality between the employee and the employer is the definition of the workplace. The scope of the workplace was not precisely framed in prior literature on terrorism in the business context. For instance, it is without discussing gray areas to the workplace (see Innes & Barling, 2005). Therefore, in this chapter we also make a first attempt to propose a definition of the workplace that better suits the research context of terrorism and business.

Theoretical background

Understanding the impact of terrorist attacks on employee behavior

Research shows that when terrorist attacks occur in the workplace, they can have severe effects on employees' physical and psychosocial work environment (Skogbrott, Birkeland, & Bang, 2017). This is mostly true for people who have been affected in some way by the terrorist attack, as research results show that there is little to no effect on unaffected witnesses (A. M. Ryan, West, & Carr, 2003). Nevertheless, the individual emotional and behavioral response to a terroristic incident can vary to some extent (A. M. Ryan et al., 2003) and may be influenced by several individual and situational variables. The affective reactions are very impactful as they influence behaviors and attitudes directly (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). In the long run, emotions can manifest themselves in things like job satisfaction, turnover

intentions, or work productivity (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Farooq Malik, Abdullah, & Anak Uli, 2014). As a result, employees can fall short to perform their work within the organization in the aftermath of a terrorist attack. It seems as if in some cases the beliefs about the mutual reciprocal obligations have changed, as organizations failed to provide a safe work environment. These unwritten obligations between employee and employer are manifested in the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989). The fact that employees react differently might be caused by distinctive emotional and behavioral responses of the employees after the disaster. The employee's response tendencies might be located somewhere on a continuum between two possible extremes. One extreme tendency might be that employees feel even more attached towards their organization due to increased cohesion. For example, research suggests that whenever a group is threatened from the outside, the cohesion inside increases (Stein, 1976). More cohesion can even reduce stress in the workplace (Steinhardt, Dolbier, Gottlieb, & McCalister, 2003), as for example, induced by a terrorist attack. A sort of "now more than ever" mentality might evolve.

This would be in line with stress process theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Lazarus and Folkman changed the perspective on the perception of stress, considering it not an 'objective' category. They defined stress as "[…] a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being" (1984, p. 19). With this perspective, they emphasized on strain, which is the individual appraisal of an external stressor. Following the stress process model, violent acts like terrorism in the workplace can be perceived as stressors (B. Bader & Berg, 2014). The individual or organizational response, such as fear of future terroristic incidents, can be considered a form of strain (Schat & Kelloway, 2000). The individually perceived amount of strain then relates to the stress reaction (Byron & Peterson, 2002). To overcome stressful situations there are several strategies called coping mechanisms. For example, social support from others has been identified to be a very common and successful

strategy for coping with stress (Applewhite & Dickins, 1997; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Therefore, turning towards the organization and colleagues for support could be a useful coping strategy after a terrorist attack.

On the contrary, the other extreme reaction tendency might be that employees turn away from their organization. This reaction is more commonly backed by research. People who experienced exposure to terrorism show, in many ways, tendencies to withdraw from their work. For instance, they are less engaged in organizational networking (Kastenmüller, Greitemeyer, Aydin, & Tattersall, 2011). Expatriates were found to reduce their activities in engaging with coworkers in their host country (B. Bader & Schuster, 2015) and terrorism creates general tensions among the workforce (Lee & Reade, 2015). The affected employees tend to be more physically absent in the weeks following the traumatic event (Barling, Rogers, & Kelloway, 2001; Byron & Peterson, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2000) or they are even more likely to consider leaving the organization for good (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997). Overall, they are less satisfied with their jobs (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010).

The same stress process theory mentioned above might explain why people turn away from their organization, as primarily support is often sought from family, friends, or partners (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) instead of the organization. In a study of citizens' reactions after the 9/11 attacks, Huddy, Feldman, Capelos, and Provost (2002) showed that the threat of terrorism made people change their lives to spend more time with their beloved ones. However, the question remains unanswered whether employees turn actively towards their inner circle of friends and family as they provide the best support for them or whether they turn actively away from their organizations as they do not find help there and search elsewhere.

How well they cope with stressful situations depends on their individual coping strategy (Silke, 2003) and their available resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Conservation of resources theory argues that people have limited resources, which they try to maintain (Hobfoll, 1989).

Resources can take many different forms, such as material objects, personal characteristics (e.g., health or self-esteem), and energies. A terrorist attack may threaten personal resources like physical health or economic stability (A. M. Ryan et al., 2003). In the case of a terrorist attack, employees showed withdrawal of time and attention, as they were no longer dedicated and directed towards their organization. Instead, people fill their time with activities such as spending time with their families. This helps them coping with the experienced. Therefore, turning away from the organization might be a simple act to increase personal resources to cope with the situation.

Another possible explanation of this response may be a shift of importance in life (Yum & Schenck-Hamlin, 2005). Faced with mortality salience, people might start to realize that there are more important things in life to them than their work, which has an impact on how much attention they pay to their work (Dunkel, 2002; Greenberg, Simon, Pyszczynski, Solomon, & Chatel, 1992). In other words, they reprioritize what is important to them. Utility theory (Marshall, 1890) can explain such behavior. In economics, the basic assumption about the 'disutility of work' has prevailed (Spencer, 2003), which sees work as something negative that requires a trade-off with leisure time (Becker, 1997). Although research has shown that work can have a lot of positive impacts on an individual, the value of free time and other activities simply might have increased after a terrorist attack. This makes employees decide more often against work in a situation of trade-off and also impacts the employer-employee relationship. In case of a terrorist attack, an individual might feel less obliged to fulfill his or her part of the commitment to the organization and to deliver work and be present. As the opportunity costs for other activities outside work, like spending time with family, have increased their value, the individual needs a lot more motivation (than in previous times) from the organization to spend time at work.

Psychological contract theory (Rousseau, 1989) explains the reaction tendency that draws employees away from the organization (Farooq Malik et al., 2014), as the relationship

between the employee and the employer might be changed due to the terrorist incidents. In the following, we focus on this change of relationship between the individual employee and the employer in the aftermath of terrorist attacks and argue how to secure a good relationship throughout these turbulent times.

Understanding psychological contract change under the threat of terrorism

The relationship between the employee and the employer is defined by exchange (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Social exchange theory (Emerson, 1976) suggests that in every interaction between individuals a cost-benefit analysis takes place, which leads the individuals to choose whether or not to continue the interaction. Although individuals manifest mutual obligations in work relations with official contracts, there remains some subjectivity about expectations between the employee and the organization. The subjectivity can be captured with the construct of the psychological contract, which "[…] refers to an individual's belief regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal change agreement between that focal person and another party [here: the organization]" (Rousseau, 1989, p. 123). These psychological contracts are not necessarily stable over time (Lester, Kickul, & Bergmann, 2007). In fact, they may be subject to change, if there are external triggers. An organization becoming the victim of a terrorist attack might be such an incident in which the relationship gets out of balance.

As with formal contracts, there are situations when parties fail to live up to these expectations. This is quite often the case. Robinson and Rousseau (1994), for instance, surveyed college graduates right after starting their first job and two years after. More than half of the respondents reported some form of disappointment related to promises that had been made and expectations they had formed in the beginning of their employment relation. A similar trend about disappointed promises and expectations was shown in a diary study by Conway and Briner (2002). This is often influenced by the different perceptions of employees and

their managers (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002). Literature calls this a breach of psychological contract. It can be defined as "(t)he cognition that one's organization has failed to meet one or more obligations within one's psychological contract in a manner commensurate with one's contributions" (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, p. 230). Similar to the breach of a formal contract, this is not a problem *per se*, unless the betrayed party acts upon the perceived breach. Hence, the term "violation [is used] for the emotional and affective state that may, under certain conditions, follow from the belief that one's organization has failed to adequately maintain the psychological contract" (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, p. 230). Once employees sense their employer failing to fulfill the professed promises, they feel less obliged to deliver their part of the exchange relationship.

However, different explanations for how the expectations are developed are proposed in literature. Early work, e.g., by Argyris (1960) and Schein (1965), placed importance on individual needs to shape the expectations. Applying this to the research context of terrorist incidents in the workplace, the relevant need would be the need for security. Therefore, the relationship might be moderated by the individually prescribed importance to certain needs. Prior research has already shown that the more important a promise is to the employee, the more negative the reaction will be in case of a breach of contact (Conway & Briner, 2002).

Earlier in this chapter, we introduced the stress process model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Its concept of appraisal becomes relevant in the context of the psychological contract as well. In the second step of this model, the individual makes decisions about accountability and control and decides whether (or not) there are capacities for coping and how the incident will impact the own future. In case of a terrorist attack, which was targeted at the workplace, employees might reflect on the accountability of themselves as well as the employer and think about how the event or the negative effects might have been avoided or buffered. This appraisal turns into emotions. People might appraise the aftermath in case of a terrorist attack, like 9/11, as harmful, as a threat to personal security, and a threat to their way of life, which overall leads

to a negative future outlook (A. M. Ryan et al., 2003). Employers might be expected to secure good working conditions, such as security for their employees. Yet, sometimes these needs cannot be fulfilled by the employer. Therefore, the early work on the psychological contract (Argyris, 1960; Schein, 1965) included the employer's capability to fulfill that need as another important factor that influenced whether a need became part of the relevant set for the psychological contract. Whether an employee perceives its employer as capable to take action depends on the individual assessment of the risk. The risk perception of terrorism is quite unique in that case. The following example demonstrates this. For the year 2015, the Global Terrorism Database (2016) reports 2,268 fatalities in terrorist attacks, which means, on average, each day about six people died from terrorism. On the contrary, in the same year, about 1.3 million people died in road crashes, which means every day more than 3,000 people died in a car accident (World Health Organization, 2016). Comparing these numbers shows that every single day in 2015, more people died in road crashes than people died in terrorist attacks during the entire year. Consequently, considering the absolute numbers, it is far more likely to get involved and die in a car accident than a terrorist attack. Yet, despite the absolute numbers, terrorism is perceived as a quite omnipresent and dreadful threat, while car accidents are considered a normal and acceptable risk by many people[1]. It is in human nature to subjectively assess risks and, against all statistical odds, perceive some risks a lot higher than others (Freudenburg, 1996). For the individual, the 'objective risk' or 'real risk' might be irrelevant because what counts for the mental processing of risk is people's subjective perceptions (Loewenstein, Weber, Hsee, & Welch, 2001). To make sense of how people perceive risks, several approaches have been proposed, such as heuristics (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982), cultural theory (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982), and psychological perspectives (Slovic, 1992; Slovic & Weber, 2002; Weber, Blais, & Betz, 2002). The most common one is the psychometric paradigm (Fischhoff, Slovic, Lichtenstein, Read, & Combs, 1978; Slovic, Fischhoff, & Lichtenstein, 1984). The underlying idea behind this approach is

that every form of risk has a quite unique pattern of characteristics (Slovic & Weber, 2002). Slovic et al. revealed, through factor analysis, a coordinate system with two main factors. They labeled one factor as 'dread risk,' which displays to what extent people perceive lack of control, catastrophic potential, and disastrous consequences of a certain incident. The other factor was labeled 'unknown risk' and manifests whether the risk is perceived as unobservable, new, or unknown (Slovic & Weber, 2002). Following that paradigm, the hazard related to terrorism is perceived high in dread. Consequences are, in general, disastrous, as people either die or suffer from severe injuries, physically, and/or mentally. Information about upcoming events is rarely available in advance (James, 2011b) and there is little intention put in the selection of potential victims (Drake, 1998; Innes & Barling, 2005). Many of them become a victim quite randomly, due to the fact that they were in the wrong place at the wrong time. These events tend to be quite surprising in most cases and individuals have neither control nor decision power whether or not they want to be affected.

The threat related to terrorist attacks scores also high on the second factor, unknown risk. Exposure to terroristic acts is random and more a question of (bad) luck. It is pretty much impossible for an individual to estimate the likelihood of exposure. The psychometric paradigm is one approach to explain why terrorism is such a 'hot topic' and perceived in such an emotional way, despite the fact that the number of casualties is comparably low, relative to other daily life hazards. This theoretical approach could be taken into consideration when anticipating the impact a certain terrorist incident might have had on employees. The employer should reflect on the dread experienced by the incident and the possible control that they might have had over the incident. This might then relate back to the question of accountability in the context of the stress perception model.

We discussed the roots of psychological contracts in form of individual needs and their importance and the employer's ability to fulfill these needs, which was influenced by the risk assessment. However, there is more to the individual contract. A first approach that accounted

for the different aspects influencing the psychological contracts was proposed by MacNeil (1985). Rousseau and McLean Parks (1993) later proposed five dimensions that would locate different types of contracts across a continuum between "relational" and "transactional contracts." They are focus, time frame, stability, scope, and tangibility.

If the focus of the contract was more on economic exchange and primarily extrinsically motivated, the contract would be defined as more transactional. On the contrary, if the focus is (besides economic aspects) also directed at socioeconomic needs and the exchange is motivated intrinsically, it is defined as relational contact. The understanding of the focus of relational contracts is highly relevant for the situation of terrorist attacks because the focus is extended to social and emotional needs. These ideas have been updated by Sels, Janssens, and Van Den Brande (2004), who adapted the model by omitting the focus dimension and, instead, adding aspects of exchange symmetry, i.e., whether it was equal or unequal, and contract level, i.e., whether it was individually or collectively regulated.

Another variable to describe different employment relationships is the time frame, which captures the perception regarding the duration of the contractual relationship (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). The time frame of transactional contracts is rather close-ended or reduced to a specific duration, while relational contracts are open-ended. For a long-lasting good relationship with employees, it is necessary that the organization responds to socio-emotional needs that arise from a terrorist attack.

Further, psychological contracts can vary in their stability and the extent to which the terms are negotiable (McLean Parks, Kidder, & Gallagher, 1998). Stability ranges from quite static forms in case of transactional contracts to dynamic arrangements, which are rather typical for relational contracts (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). This gives employees the opportunity to readjust their expectations, for instance, in response to terrorism.

The concept of tangibility refers to how overt and clear promises are made (McLean Parks et al., 1998; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). Rousseau (1989) started to emphasize on the

role of implicit and explicit signals or promises made from the organization to create the perceived promises. In transactional contracts, promises are quite clear and easily observable, however, in case of relational contracts they are more subjective. The tangibility is quite relevant for the case of terrorism in the workplace, as personal security might not be openly discussed.

The 'duty of care' might be underlying and not openly discussed. Yet, it is a fundamental expectation of the employee. It is important to make sure that the employees of the organization have a safe work environment and are well cared for when they are doing their work (Farooq Malik et al., 2014). Especially in low-risk countries, for example, the traditional, Western work setting, a terrorist attack and with that the threat for personal health and life seems quite out of scope. Hence, the topic might not be discussed explicitly in a job interview. On the other hand, it is more likely that the issue of personal security is discussed, once an employee, for example, is assigned abroad to work in a high-risk country. Research showed that the explicitness of a promise increases the likelihood that the aspect becomes part of the psychological contract and, consequently, becomes something that is expected (Rousseau, 1989; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This is highly relevant if an organization wants to shape the expectations of individuals for cases of extreme events as well.

Another dimension of the psychological contract is the scope. It defines the boundaries between the work and private spheres (McLean Parks et al., 1998) and classifies between a narrower and broader scope (MacNeil, 1985). Transactional contracts are mostly very narrow. In a narrow employment relationship, private and work life are strictly divided (Freese & Schalk, 2000; Sels, Hanssens, Van Den Brande, & Overlaet, 2002). On the contrary, in a broader employment-employer relationship, employers care for the family situation of the employee (Diaz-Saenz & Witherspoon, 2000; Krausz, 2000) and in turn employees are more willing to make sacrifices for their organization (Shah, 2000). They also show more activities that are extra-role (Ang, Tan, & Ng, 2000; Morishima, 2000). In narrow relationships, work is

considered a means to an end (Millward & Herriot, 2000) and the economic interests are predominant (Rousseau, 2000). Therefore, employees show little engagement outside their regular work responsibilities (Kabanoff, Jimmieson, & Lewis, 2000). The scope, therefore, determines the area of accountability for the employee and employer. This is very relevant when discussing the psychological contract in case of a terrorist attack. Besides the individual needs and expectations/perceptions of the situation, the role of the employer is the last component that determines whether the employer is expected to act in a specified way. The scope of the psychological contract is influenced by the understanding of where the employment relationship starts and ends. This is influenced by the implicitly underlying definition of the workplace. A definition that is not only socio-emotional but also with legal implications.

Limits of the traditional workplace definition

Despite its importance and implications, to the best of our knowledge, in the research context of terrorist acts in the workplace, a clear definition of the workplace has not yet been directly addressed in literature. Implicit assumptions have been made though. For example, Innes and Barling (2005) counted any work-related incident as part of the workplace. However, this needs to be further analyzed. The workplace can be defined narrowly as "a place (such as a shop or factory) where work is done" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2017). However, besides this definition, numerous societal, technological, and economical changes occurred, which weakened the explanatory power of this term in the 21st century. Digitalization and globalization made a new perspective on the "workplace" necessary.

For instance, the rise of the knowledge economy (Powell & Snellman, 2004) is an intense driver for change of the workplace. In the knowledge economy, work is managed via information technology, which leads to delocalization and increases trans-nationalization (Beck, 2000). The organization of work has become more flexible and autonomous. Hence, a

big part of the work is suddenly not bound to production lines or crop fields anymore. Work during the times of industrialization and the beginning of mass production was characterized by a high degree of standardization, where jobs were clearly outlined and controlled (Beck, 2000). However, todays' work arrangements differ significantly from those of past times. The digitalization enables even more flexibility of work regarding time and the physical location for doing work (Powell & Snellman, 2004). For the broader public, working from home has become an increasing trend (Moynagh & Worsley, 2005). As a result, the distinction between the work and private sphere is blurred (Wajcman, Rose, Brown, & Bittman, 2010) and in consequence, the definition of the workplace may be blurred as well. A fundamental aspect of prior definitions was the physical location. New work arrangements are not well-covered by this term. This can have an impact on the psychological contract relations as well, since working from home makes the relationship becoming more transactional (Tietze & Nadin, 2011). Transferred to our context, it also raises new difficulties of accountability in the case of terrorist attacks. Traditional location-based workplace definitions fail to account for the role of the employer, for example, when an incident occurs on the way to work, in a home office situation, or on a sales force tour. While these are questions that have already been covered in other disciplines, such as legal (DIN, 2004), in the context of psychological contracts, research neglected a differentiation. As the focus was on the physical aspects of the workplace, it fails to account for the perceived borders related to a psychological phenomenon, like the psychological contract. It is rather the (changing) individual perceptions and understanding that shape the workplace. The physical aspects of the workplace have been widened. Globalization lead to an inter-connected global economy because of the loss of geographical boundaries regarding work and production (Gephart, 2002). Additionally, the potential threat of terrorist attacks does not keep multinational enterprises (MNEs) from expanding into endangered areas and exploiting business opportunities there (A. K. Bader et al., 2016). Moreover, as international working experience became almost a precondition to

climb the corporate ladder and globalization remains enlarging the areas for business operations, instable countries become destinations for expatriate assignments, i.e., places where "work happens" as well. Additionally, increasing protection of governmental facilities make successful attacks harder and inspire a focus shift to less protected targets which are easier to access, like expatriates themselves or the businesses they are working for (B. Bader & Berg, 2014). Consequently, the expatriate population starts to face the hazards related to terrorism, guerilla warfare, and crime (Elango et al., 2008). In some cases, expatriates are even deliberately chosen as targets either due to their financial status or they are taken as surrogates that represent Western culture, values, and life (Drake, 1998). In other words, employees get in the crossfire simply because of their work relationship with their employer and this has severe consequences.

The common workplace definition also fails to capture the risks related to these new work arrangements. For instance, the question arises what happens if an employee becomes the victim of a terrorist attack on a market in a high-risk host country, yet during his or her leisure. The market would clearly be considered a place located in the private sphere in the expatriate's home country. However, if there were no expatriate assignment, the employee would never have been at that market at that time. Hence, it is possible that the expatriate holds the employer accountable in some way or another. We do not intend to answer this question to a full extent, since it is too complex to be discussed in this chapter and possibly no completely satisfying answer could be found anyway. It is a matter of perception. However, this is exactly what is relevant from a psychological contract point of view: to disentangle when the employee potentially holds the employer responsible and a psychological contract breach may occur. Therefore, we make a first proposal of how these questions could be approached. The trends shaping the new work environment, mainly communication technologies, have blurred the criteria of time and location that have formerly clearly defined

the workplace (Stohl, 2001). Traditional framing criteria of the workplace might need some adaption (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2006).

A framework of the workplace and new work arrangements

In the following, we propose a framework to locate the new work arrangements and work-related activities. Based on our previous reasoning, four different quadrants arise between two dimensions. The dimensions are physical distance and perceived individual controllability. Terrorist attacks can be directed at a physical location and cause damage. Therefore, the first dimension of our theoretical outline accounts for the physical distance between the activity at which the employee was caught up in a terrorist attack and the organization. Activities can be located either with a high or low physical distance towards the organization. With this dimension, we account for the globalization and internationalization trend, as work-related activities might happen also physically distant to the organization. This mirrors the extensions of businesses and their workplaces. Activities categorized as being physically close to the organization are all activities within the organization's buildings, such as office work during a workday. Activities that have more distance to the organization's buildings might be, for example, the work within the sales force, i.e., when employees are driving off-site to visit customers. Even farther from the organization is an international assignment. However, since the basic assumption that an individual needs to get to his or her workplace to work and that home and work sphere are separated (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2006) is no longer true in many industries, we introduce another dimension to our framework.

The new work environment changed to a more autonomous and flexible place. Self-management became a key competency in this changed work environment (Powell & Snellman, 2004, p. 335). This new challenge needs to be reflected in the workplace definition as well. We therefore include the construct of perceived controllability as our second dimension. It refers to "the degree of control over the behavior as perceived by the individual"

(Manstead & Eekelen, 1998, p. 1377). For our research context, we are interested in the perceived controllability regarding the allocation and use of resources, in particular the controllability of several work-related resources such as time, location, or activity the employee performs.

The perceived control is high in cases where the individual can decide without external restrictions about the use of resources. For example, an employee can freely decide when to start and end his or her work. The perceived controllability over the resources is rather low when an external power, e.g., the organization, makes binding decisions about appropriate behavior. This aspect of control and with this the causal attribution of the event is especially relevant for research in our context. When people experience adverse events, such as a terrorist attack, they start searching for explanations (Kelley, 1973). When they see the causes of the incident influenced by external forces, the sense of personal power and well-being suffers (Innes & Barling, 2005). We theorize that the feelings of accountability might be influenced by the ascribed 'locus of causality' for the damage of the event. Either the person could feel responsible him- or her-self, when "the actor is perceived as an 'origin' of his or her behavior" (R. M. Ryan & Connell, 1989, p. 749). This would then be an internal locus of causality. Or the reasons for the incident might be ascribed to external forces, such as regulations of the employer, and the "the actor is seen as a 'pawn' to heteronomous forces" (R. M. Ryan & Connell, 1989, p. 749). The question is whether the individual had decision-making power over the time and location in question. In other words, could the employee decide when to be where and if that influenced the outcome of the attack. If the supervisor sends out the employee to pick up a package at the postal office, which is then attacked, the employee is likely to make the employer (at least partly) responsible. This is not the case if the individual goes there on his or her own terms. In cases where employees ascribe, at least partial, responsibility or accountability to their employer for being involved in a terrorist

incident, the relationship between the individual and his or her employer might be severely damaged and the employee may turn away from the organization.

The individual employee can have control over several resources such as time, the location to be and the activity to follow. This can be more or less directed to benefit the organization. For instance, time has always been a fundamental part of workplace definitions, as it was interpreted as currency that is traded between the employer and the employee (Feldman & Hornik, 1981). The most basic categorization is a division between work and leisure time (Becker, 1997). An employee experiences maximum freedom from possible workplace constraints during leisure time, when he or she can freely choose how to spend the time (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2006). Having individual control over one's time means being able to use it freely and flexible. The same is applicable for the location and whether the employee can make independent decisions about where to spend the time. Finally, the content of the work or what we fill our time with can be either rather restricted to work-related purposes or free. These tendencies are, therefore, the extreme end points of the controllability dimension.

<COMP: Place Figure 2.1.1 Here>

As illustrated in Figure 2.1.1, the two dimensions, physical distance and controllability, unfold four quadrants. Yet, regarding operationalization, the lines between the quadrants should not necessarily be considered "set in stone". They reflect tendencies and may rather be seen as a continuum with extreme ends, on which different organizational activities are located along.

Quadrant I

In quadrant I, in the upper-left corner of the matrix, the traditional forms of work arrangements are located. This quadrant entails all work arrangements that are highly controlled by the organization (and hardly by the employee) and the resources are used for work-related purposes. An example would be a classic workday, which has a time frame set

by the organization and a fixed location determined by the organization. The activities during the days are all work related. A terrorist attack that would happen in a work arrangement located in this quadrant would make a response of the organization towards their employees highly expectable.

Quadrant II

In quadrant II, in the upper-right corner, the employee decides whether to do work-related activities and when to do them. However, while doing so, the employee is located near the organization. This quadrant contains all the actions that are in some way related to the organization, however, have more internal control. One example would be the way to work. Although the activity is motivated by the goal to get to work, the employee is free to choose, when and how to get there. While it is recommended to get to work directly, the employee can choose the way, determine how much time he or she wants to spend commuting to work, and what to do during those times. Another activity that falls in this category is a situation in which an employee gets to his or her office, yet does so for personal reasons, for instance, to pick up a jacket that was forgotten there when leaving work. He or she now is "in" the workplace, however, chose an individual time frame and follows a non-work-related activity. Moreover, when a person comes into the office after office hours in order to get a presentation from the computer, which he or she has forgotten to download, he or she spends time in the workplace and follows a work-related activity, yet, when to collect the presentation is a free choice of the employee. While the way to work has clear legal regulations and would make the employer responsible, the other cases are gray zones in case of a terrorist attack. Each situation has to be reflected in more detail to identify a proper strategy.

Quadrant III

Quadrant III has the highest degree of freedom, while also not being located within the organization. The employee decides whether to do work-related or non-work-related activities. Furthermore, he or she decides where to spend his or her time that is not work-related. The time when to do that is free to choose as well. The traditional leisure time is located within this quadrant as this represents the highest degree of freedom regarding the allocation of resources outside the organization. As time may be more freely chosen and the activities and space is free to choose during home office times, they are located in this quadrant as well, even though, these times might be influenced by some restrictions from the employer. Moreover, this quadrant would entail so-called digital nomads.

Quadrant IV

Quadrant IV, in the lower-left corner, is a spatial extension of the traditional workplace definition. The employee performs work-related tasks, maybe even at fixed times, however, is located outside the boundaries of the traditional organization. This is, for example, the case considering the activities in the sales force. Also, work times during international assignments could be located within this quadrant. However, this would be placed a bit further away from the organization than the sales force. Private time on international assignments might be located nearer to quadrant III. Yet, it has to be distinguished from the traditional leisure time in the home country, since the decision to stay in that country is partially influenced by the organization.

The prior considerations illustrated the difficulties of defining the workplace and therefore drawing direct conclusions for the psychological contract. It is hard to find a clear distinction regarding time or space. Therefore, a definition of a 'workplace' might be outdated. We propose changing the perspective from a 'workplace' to a 'work state' definition. With a more dynamic and process-oriented definition, it is possible to capture the work reality to a greater extent. The more employees' management of resources like time, location to be, and content

of work is influenced by the employer and its interests, the more adequate is the description of this state as a work state. If a terrorist attack occurs in a situation of work state, an action from the organization might be recommendable to maintain the employee-employer relations.

Contribution and implications

As terrorist attacks become an increasing part of our daily lives, employers and their employees are facing new challenges. Individual, organizational, and aspects of the interaction of the individual and the organization determine how well the business activity can be maintained after such a disastrous event. Especially, the relationship between the employee and the organization might be tensed in the aftermath. Until now, the individual and the organizational factors influencing the coping with a terrorist attack were discussed. In this chapter, we presented an interactionist perspective by applying psychological contract theory. We discussed how a terrorist attack might affect the relationship, in particular the psychological contract, between the employee and the employer. Four main aspects have been identified to influence the quality of the relationship. In cases where the individual need for security is high and organizational commitment to fulfill this need has been explicitly discussed, the relationship is tensed in cases of terrorist attacks, as the employer does not fulfill the promise for a secure work environment. Further, when the organization, in the eyes of the employee, could have acted differently to avoid or exercise control over the risk, the organization is perceived as (at least partially) accountable. Finally, the perceived definition of the workplace limits or extends the scope of the psychological contract. The proposed model may help to explain to add more explanatory value to the negative reaction tendencies after a terrorist attack. In sum, we pave the way for more refined research dealing with questions of (perceived) employer responsibility and psychological contracts under the threat of terrorism.

Regarding the changes in the nature of work and the respective definition of the workplace, the term needs to be considered from an updated point of view. Nevertheless, it has proven quite difficult to draw a clear physical line between the work and private sphere. Hence, a new approach to better determine the workplace was proposed by focusing on the exercise of control of the employer (and thus the controllability of the employee) on the allocation of resources by the employee while at the same time accounting for the distance to the organization. This new proposal of a workplace framework will hopefully open the discussion about the proper definition for the 21st century.

Yet, this approach is not free of limitations. For instance, there might be other, very relevant variables, to influence the breach of the psychological contract in case of terrorism as well. However, we propose a first framework and open the discussion for further research. The ideas introduced here are developed from a Western perspective, which might limit the applicability of the developed propositions. Accordingly, it might be interesting to adapt and discuss the ideas for other non-Western contexts.

With this framework, there come managerial implications of these insights as well. Organizations should be aware of the organizational culture and its impact on employees' behavior after a terrorist attack. Several action steps to maintain a good relationship with the employee even in case of terrorist attacks can be derived from our framework. First, explicitly communicating the limits of the organization in the capacity to secure a safe work environment may help to avoid forming wrong expectations. Further, managers should be aware of their employees' individual need for security. It may be helpful to take that need into consideration for staffing decisions for example. Taking as much prevention measures as possible and developing emergency plans in advance may help to reduce the perceived accountability of the employer for the dreadful aftermath.

It might also prove beneficial when the employer is aware of the kind of psychological contract they have with their employees, whether it is perceived more transactional or more

relational. In the latter case, for instance, a lot more emotional engagement is expected. A way to find this out could be in yearly review conversations or employee engagement surveys. Employees with high job involvement suffer the most when a psychological contract is broken (Innes & Barling, 2005) – and they are the ones' an organization wants least to withdraw.

Overall, we discussed many gray areas, which could not exclusively be defined as "workplace". Yet, these areas are in particular important as employees and the employer's perception of responsibility in these gray areas may vary. This can be source of conflict. The more supportive and helpful an organization proves after, e.g., a terrorist attack, the more likely it is that a good relationship is maintained. Moreover, the employee's tendency to seek support elsewhere might be reduced, when employees receive suitable (e.g., emotional) support in the work place. Consequently, we are just at the beginning of research in this important field. With regard to the recent development in the world, unfortunately, we will have to focus on the topic of terrorism in the workplace a lot more.

Figure 2.1.1 Conceptual Framework.

References

Ang, S., Tan, M. L., & Ng, K. Y. (2000). Psychological contracts in Singapore. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 213–230). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Applewhite, L., & Dickins, C. (1997). Coping with terrorism: The OPM-SANG experience. *Military Medicine, 162*(4), 240–233.

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Homewood, AL: Dorsey Press.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*(1), 76–86.

Bader, A. K., Reade, C., & Froese, F. J. (2016). Terrorism and expatriate withdrawal cognitions: The differential role of perceived work and non-work constraints. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1–25.

Bader, B., & Berg, N. (2013). An empirical investigation of terrorism-induced stress on expatriate attitudes and performance. *Journal of International Management, 19*(2), 163–175.

Bader, B., & Berg, N. (2014). The influence of terrorism on expatriate performance: A conceptual approach. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(4), 539–557.

Bader, B., Berg, N., & Holtbrügge, D. (2015). Expatriate performance in terrorism-endangered countries: The role of family and organizational support. *International Business Review, 24*(5), 849–860.

Bader, B., & Schuster, T. (2015). Expatriate social networks in terrorism-endangered countries: An empirical analysis in Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. *Journal of International Management, 21*(1), 63–77.

Barling, J., Rogers, A. G., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(3), 255–269.

Barth, J. R., Li, T., Mccarthy, D., Phumiwasana, T., & Yago, G. (2006). Economic impacts of global terrorism: From Munich to Bali. Retreived from SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=892033 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.892033

Beck, U. (2000). *The brave new world of work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Becker, G. S. (1997). *Economic theory*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Blomberg, S. B., & Hess, G. D. (2006). How much does violence tax trade? *Review of Economics and Statistics, 88*(4), 599–612.

Byron, K., & Peterson, S. (2002). The impact of a large-scale traumatic event on individual and organizational outcomes: Exploring employee and company reactions to September 11, 2001. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(8), 895–910.

Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2002). A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and exceeded promises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(3), 287–302.

Czinkota, M., Knight, G. A., & Liesch, P. W. (2004). Terrorism and international business: Conceptual foundations. In G. G. S. Suder (Ed.), *Terrorism and the international business environment: The security-business nexus* (pp. 43–57). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edgar Elgar Publishing.

Czinkota, M. R., Knight, G., Liesch, P. W., & Steen, J. (2010). Terrorism and international business: A research agenda. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(5), 826–843.

Diaz-Saenz, H. R., & Witherspoon, P. D. (2000). Psychological contracts in Mexico. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 158–175). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

DIN. (2004). Ergonomic principles in the design of work systems (ISO 6385:2004). Beuth. Retrieved from: www.beuth.de/de/norm/din-en-iso-6385/67758059

Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). *Risk and culture. An essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers*. Berkley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.

Drake, C. J. M. (1998). The role of ideology in terrorists' target selection. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 10*(2), 53–85.

Dunkel, C. S. (2002). Terror management theory and identity: The effect of the 9/11 terrorist attacks on anxiety and identity change. *Identity, 2*(4), 287–301.

Elango, B., Graf, L. A., & Hemmasi, M. (2008). Reducing the risk of becoming a victim of terrorism while on international business assignments. *Simulation & Gaming, 39*(4), 540–557.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology, 31*(6), 874–900.

Farooq Malik, O., Abdullah, H., & Anak Uli, J. (2014). The effects of terrorism on work attitudes and behaviors: A literature review and a proposed model. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 6*(3), 143–163.

Feldman, L. P., & Hornik, J. (1981). The use of time: An integrated conceptual model. *Journal of Consumer Research, 7*(4), 407–419.

Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., Lichtenstein, S., Read, S., & Combs, B. (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. *Policy Sciences, 9*(2), 127–152.

Fratianni, M., & Kang, H. (2006). *International terrorism, international trade, and borders*. Indiana University, Kelley School of Business, Department of Business Economics and Public Policy. Retrieved from: http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/iukwpaper/2006-13.htm

Freese, C., & Schalk, R. (2000). Psychological contracts in the Netherlands: Dualism, flexiblity, and security. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 176–194). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Freudenburg, W. R. (1996). Risky thinking: Irrational fears about risk and society. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 545*(1), 44–53.

Gephart, R. P. (2002). Introduction to the brave new workplace: Organizational behavior in the electronic age. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 327–344.

Global Terrorism Database (GTD). (2015). National consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). Retrieved May 17, 2017 from www.start.umd.edu/gtd/

Global Terrorism Database (GTD). (2016). Data collection methodology. Retrieved June 18, 2017 from www.start.umd.edu/gtd/using-gtd/

Goodwin, R., Willson, M., & Stanley, G. J. (2005, July). Terror threat perception and its consequences in contemporary Britain. *British Journal of Psychology, 96*, 389–406.

Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Chatel, D. (1992). Terror management and tolerance: Does mortality salience always intensify negative reactions to others who threaten one's worldview? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(2), 212–220.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 874–888.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513–524.

Huddy, L., Feldman, S., Capelos, T., & Provost, C. (2002). The consequences of terrorism: Disentangling the effects of personal and national threat. *Political Psychology, 23*(3), 485–509.

Innes, M., & Barling, J. (2005). Terrorism. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 375–399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Institute for Economics and Peace. (2016). Global terrorism index 2016. Quantifying peace and its benefits. Retrieved from: http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/02/Global-Terrorism-Index-2016.pdf

James, K. (2011a). Introduction to the special issue: Terrorism, disaster, and organizational science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(7), 933–937.

James, K. (2011b). The organizational science of disaster/terrorism prevention and response: Theory-building toward the future of the field. *The Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 32*(7), 1013–1032.

Kabanoff, B., Jimmieson, N. L., & Lewis, M. J. (2000). Psychological contracts in Australia: A "Fair Go" or a "Not-So-Happy Transition"? In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.),

Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives (pp. 29–46). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (1982). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kastenmüller, A., Greitemeyer, T., Aydin, N., & Tattersall, A. J. (2011, January). Terrorism threat and networking: Evidence that terrorism salience decreases occupational networking. *Journal of Organizatinoal Behavior, 977*, 961–977.

Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2006). Time use and the impact of technology. *Time & Society, 15*(1), 57–80.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist, 28*(2), 107–128.

Krausz, M. (2000). Psychological contracts in Israel. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 125–140). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Lee, H.-J., & Reade, C. (2015). Ethnic homophily perceptions as an emergent IHRM challenge: Evidence from firms operating in Sri Lanka during the ethnic conflict. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(13), 1645–1664.

Lenain, P., Bonturi, M., & Koen, V. (2002). *The economic consequences of terrorism.* OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 334, OECD Publishing.

Lester, S. W., Kickul, J. R., & Bergmann, T. J. (2007). Managing employee perceptions of the psychological contract over time: The role of employer social accounts and contract fulfillment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(2), 191–208.

Lester, S. W., Turnley, W. H., Bloodgood, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye: Differences in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attributions for psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(1), 39–56.

Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(2), 267–286.

MacNeil, I. R. (1985). Relational contract: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law Review, 4*(1983), 483–526.

Madera, J. M., & Smith, D. B. (2009). The effects of leader negative emotions on evaluations of leadership in a crisis situation: The role of anger and sadness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(2), 103–114.

Manstead, A. S. R., & Eekelen, S. A. M. (1998). Distinguishing between perceived behavioral control and self-efficacy in the domain of academic achievement intentions and behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(15), 1375–1392.

Marshall, A. (1890). *Principles of economics*. London: MacMillan and Co.

McLean Parks, J., Kidder, D. L., & Gallagher, D. G. (1998). Fitting square pegs into round holes: Mapping the domain of contingent work arrangements onto the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 697–730.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (2017). Workplace | definition of workplace by Merriam-webster. Retrieved June 17, 2017 from www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/workplace

Millward, L., & Herriot, P. (2000). The psychological contract in the United Kingdom. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 231–249). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Morishima, M. (2000). A break with tradition: Negotiating new psychological contracts in Japan. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 141–157). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 226–256.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York, NY, London, Paris, San Diego, CA, San Francisco, CA, Sao Paulo, Sydney, NSW, Tokyo, and Toronto, ON: Academic Press.

Moynagh, M., & Worsley, R. (2005). *Working in the twenty-first century*. Leeds and King's Lynn: Economic and Social Research Council.

Powell, W. W., & Snellman, K. (2004). The knowledge economy. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30*(1), 199–220.

Reade, C. (2009). Human resource management implications of terrorist threats to firms in the supply chain. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 39*(6), 469–485.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(3), 245–259.

Rogers, K.-A., & Kelloway, E. K. (1997). Violence at work: Personal and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 2*(1), 63–71.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2*(2), 121–139.

Rousseau, D. M. (2000). Psychological contracts in the United States: Diversity, individualism, and associability in the marketplace. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 250–282). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Rousseau, D. M., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 15*, 1–43.

Ryan, A. M., West, B. J., & Carr, J. Z. (2003). Effects of the terrorist attacks of 9/11/01 on employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 647–659.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(5), 749–761.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*(2), 224.

Sanchez, J. I., Korbin, W. P., & Viscarra, D. M. (1995). Corporate support in the aftermath of natural disaster: Effects on employee strains. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 504–521.

Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Effects of perceived control on the outcomes of workplace aggression and violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(3), 386–402.

Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sels, L., Hanssens, M., Van Den Brande, I., & Overlaet, B. (2002). Belgium: A culture of compromise. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 47–66). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sels, L., Janssens, M., & Van Den Brande, I. (2004). Assessing the nature of psychological contracts: A validation of six dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(4), 461–488.

Shah, S. (2000). India: Caste, commitments, and change. In D. M. Rousseau & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives* (pp. 104–124). Thousand Oaks, CA, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Silke, A. (2003). *Terrorists, victims, and society: Psychological perspectives on terrorism and its consequences*. Chichester: Wiley.

Skogbrott, M., Birkeland, M., & Bang, M. (2017). The impact of a workplace terrorist attack on employees' perceptions of leadership: A longitudinal study from pre- to post-disaster. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(5), 659-671.

Slovic, P. (1992). Perception of risk: Reflections on the psychometric paradigm. In S. Krimsky & D. Golding (Eds.), *Social theories of risk* (pp. 117–152). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. (1984). Behavioral decision theory perspectives on risk and safety. *Acta Psychologica, 56*(1–3), 183–203.

Slovic, P., & Weber, E. U. (2002). Perception of risk posed by extreme events. *Center for Decision Science (CDS) Working Paper*, 1–21.

Spencer, D. (2003). Love's labor's lost? the disutility of work and work avoidance in the economic analysis of labor supply. *Review of Social Economy, 61*(2), 235–250.

Stein, A. A. (1976). Conflict and cohesion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 20*(1), 143–172.

Steinhardt, M. A., Dolbier, C. L., Gottlieb, N. H., & McCalister, K. T. (2003). The relationship between hardiness, supervisor support, group cohesion, and job stress as predictors of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 17*(6), 382–389.

Stohl, C. (2001). Globalizing organizational communication. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 332–375). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tietze, S., & Nadin, S. (2011). The psychological contract and the transition from office-based to home-based work. *Human Resource Management Journal, 21*(3), 318–334.

Wajcman, J., Rose, E., Brown, J. E., & Bittman, M. (2010). Enacting virtual connections between work and home. *Journal of Sociology, 46*(3), 257–275.

Weber, E. U., Blais, A. E., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A Domain-specific risk-attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 15*(4), 263–290.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (pp. 1–74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

World Health Organization. (2016). Road traffic deaths 2013. Retrieved June 14, 2017 from www.who.int/gho/road_safety/mortality/en/

Yum, Y. O., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. (2005). Reactions to 9/11 as a function of terror

management and perspective taking. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(3), 265–286.

----

[1] We do not intend to defame victims of terrorist attacks or downplay the severity in any way. Moreover, we are absolutely aware of the different "causes" between these fatalities. The numbers presented are solely intended to illustrate the concept of subjective risk perception.