2014

Commodity or Dignity? Nurturing Managers' Courtesy Nurtures Workers' Productivity

Montana Rafferty Moss
The University of Montana

COMMODITY OR DIGNITY?

NURTURING MANAGERS' COURTESY NURTURES WORKERS' PRODUCTIVITY

By

MONTANA RAFFERTY MOSS

Bachelor of Arts, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 1981
Bachelor of Arts, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 2012

Professional Paper

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Communication Studies, Organizational Communication

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2014

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Dean of the Graduate School
Graduate School

Joel Iverson, PhD., Chair
Department of Communication Studies

Moss, Montana, M.A., Spring 2014   Communication Studies

Commodity or Dignity? Nurturing Managers' Courtesy Nurtures Workers' Productivity

Chair: Joel Iverson Ph.D.

Abstract

Dignity is the measure of people's worth determined through social interactions (Neal, 2012). As people must enjoy core capabilities to possess dignity (Ward & Syversen, 2009), work is one activity through which core capabilities provide a sense of worth (Venkatapuram, 2013). Workplace managers must enact dignity affirming discourse so their workers perceive ownership of core capabilities that afford a sense of worth and fulfillment. Dignity disaffirming (or violating) discourse obstructs core capabilities, leaving work unsatisfying and workers physiologically, psychologically, and emotionally damaged. Not only do such people suffer, but so do their organizations (Ghoshal, 2005). This study reveals that women and people who have worked at least four years are more likely to recognize dignity violating discourse, being sensitized to such discourse through several possible phenomena. Also, people tend not to recognize certain dignity violating discourses, which could hamper control efforts. Finally, people perceive they treat or are treated with dignity by others only moderately and dignity is only moderately important to them. This study culminates in a university-level course intended to raise awareness of dignity violating discursive behaviors and their consequences, and to offer training in dignity promoting discourse that nurtures worker dignity while supporting organizational productivity and profitability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you, Dr. Joel Iverson, for your unflagging guidance and support. Your expertise and enthusiasm in a wide assortment of Organizational Communication topics have been an inspiration to me throughout my academic career at the University of Montana. I will strive to keep reading and learning about these topics and contributing to the discussion. I appreciate your faith in me to accomplish everything I ever set out to do in this program, especially this paper.

Thank you, Dr. Alan Sillars, for teaching me quantitative analysis against my will. You never minced words goading me to do my best. You were my Yoda when it came to SPSS, neither holding my hand through the data analysis nor leaving me to fend entirely for myself. I finally found the force I needed to interpret my survey results on my own. Had you done the work for me, I would never have felt as proud of this accomplishment.

Thank you, Dr. Daisy Rooks, for agreeing to be on my committee and for your thoughtful input at my defense. I worked hard to channel your wisdom. I hope I succeeded.

I could not have produced this paper without Joel and Alan, yet I also thank Dr. Greg Larson for expanding my understanding of organizational identity, without which this paper would have been incomplete. He provided me with a lot of wonderful literature to base my study upon as well as tremendous insight on the subject. Also, I thank Dr. Betsy Bach for introducing me to the science of pedagogy. I discovered that I love to teach and I deeply enjoyed designing a course that could improve the quality of people's lives and would make an excellent addition to the Communication Studies curriculum. Perhaps one day the course will be taught.

Finally, I owe a debt of thanks to my husband, Gene, for putting up with my piles of papers, late nights, long sessions before the computer screen, and general grouchiness. Thank you, Gene. Yes, you were my muse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction/Rationale

Business schools need to stop doing what they currently do in order to keep managerial practices from damaging worker incentive and diminishing organizational success. Ghoshal (2005) believes that economic theories taught in business schools ignore the fact that human behavior can be influenced by motives other than "perfunctory compliance" inspired by autocratic control (p. 83). Those other motives arise from a sense of intrinsic worth. Ghoshal (2005) is certain that organizations are as capable of thriving when they attend to what workers value as when they do not (p. 81). Paying attention to what personal resources workers can bring to an organization requires paying attention to workers' dignity (Venkatapuram, 2013).

Dignity is a human characteristic that guides motivations and behaviors and can lead to a sense of personal fulfillment and worthwhile contributions to community life. That said, dignity is a fragile thing. It can be diminished, damaged, or destroyed. Just as we sense our dignity through discursive interactions with others, our dignity can also be put in question through discursive interactions. If others violate our dignity by humiliating, disregarding, or objectifying us, or otherwise causing us to question our worth, then our psycho-social, physiological, and emotional well-being can be disrupted, leading to lowered intellectual or work quality and diminished health and enjoyment of life (Jacobson, 2009). These consequences ought to be of concern to organizations, despite the fact that dignity does not seem to be a compelling argument for treating workers with respect (Clarke, 2011). However, dignity is not considered a suitable basis for legal intervention in U.S. courts of law, making it difficult for workers to use the judiciary to protect themselves from indiscretions in the workplace against their personal sense of worth, and further empowering organizations to mistreat them (Clarke, 2011).

Not only is worker performance and effectiveness put at risk through the abuse of dignity, but so are those of the organization, according to Ghoshal (2005). This is a very salient issue in terms of managerial treatment of workers. Managers create the environments in which workers perform profit-driven or service-oriented duties. The workers bring to the workplace their self-concepts, or identities; their capacities to perform expected functions, or health; and their own expectations for fulfillment and of making valuable contributions to the organization, or dignity (Venkatapuram, 2013). Managerial behaviors that threaten worker dignity create adverse work environments and dire consequences for those workers' identity and health.

Organizations have a duty of care to safeguard worker dignity for the simple reason that harm to worker identity and health translates into reduction in the quality and quantity of worker performance. This has a negative impact upon organizational productivity and profitability. To counteract this phenomenon, organizations need to provide an environment in which workers' dignity is affirmed and promoted, ensuring their willingness and ability to achieve organizational expectations. Managers must be willing and able to discursively interact with workers in such ways that promote and protect worker dignity for their benefit as well as that of the organization.

Dignity promoting behaviors tend to be preceded by an understanding of dignity and an ability to recognize and perceive dignity violating behaviors (Jacobson, 2009). I propose through this paper to study people's understanding of dignity and to what extent they recognize and perceive dignity violating behaviors. I want to learn how people perceive socially enacted dignity-violating discursive behaviors in workplace settings as well as whether or not they recognize such inappropriate behaviors. The results of my study will culminate in a college-level course about dignity in the workplace and how to discursively enact dignity promoting behaviors in the workplace. As students leave academia poised to enter the work environment, it is

important that they understand the concept of dignity. It is also important that they recognize and perceive dignity violation in its many discursive forms against each of the core capabilities (Ward & Syversen, 2009). A heightened knowledge and perceptual awareness of worker dignity may help managers discharge their authority more humanely. Such knowledge and awareness may also help workers themselves recognize when their dignity is being violated by managers and be less willing to tolerate the inappropriate behaviors. Instead, future managers and workers may have the skills to behave toward one another in appropriate dignity affirming ways, for their own benefit and for the benefit of the organizations where they work.

Chapter One

Literature Review

The literature review first looks at the three states of being through which humans perceive of themselves and others: the dignity, identity, and health states of being. Then, it looks at the domain of work in which all three states of being are manifested and externally influenced. The literature review subsequently explores the influence of dignity violations on identity work as well as the environments that encourage dignity violations. It then examines the consequences of dignity violations for workers and the workplace. A short discussion follows on the discourse through which dignity violations occur and how this discourse may arise through pedagogy. This overview leads to research questions about which the study is interested and intends to answer.

The Dignity State of Being

Dignity as a social issue. The topic of human dignity is in part a social issue. Kant was one of the first modern philosophers to connect the concept of dignity to the "absolute inner worth of a person, 'by which he exacts respect for himself…'" (as quoted in Horton, 2004, p. 1084), whereas being "in turn bound to respect every other" (as quoted in von der Pfordten, 2009, p. 387). Put simply, all people possess dignity and ought to be treated as such. To Kant, humankind possesses "morally relevant" dignity, unlike all other earthly creatures, seen in a natural autonomy based in moral law (as quoted in von der Pfordten, p. 384). That is, only people can make decisions about their behavior, and those decisions are based upon man-made laws that govern behavior rather than natural laws. Further, human dignity is tied to the notion of natural equality, as advanced previously by Pufendorf.

To Pufendorf, not only do people obey moral laws rather than natural laws, but people are also equal under an obligation to obey those moral laws. That is, people have similar "innate"

responsibilities toward one another as a result of moral law (as cited in Saastamoinen, p. 41).

Pufendorf asserts that people are physical entities imbued by "moral entities," specifically God, with attributes such as right, esteem, authority, and obligation (as cited in Saastamoinen, p. 45). These attributes not only imbue all people with dignity, but also cause "[people's] lives and actions to be tempered by principles" that impose moral (or natural) duties toward others with respect to dignity (as quoted in Saastamoinen, p. 45). Because such duties are similar for all, natural equality is implied, and, since "human nature belongs equally to all [people]," natural equality ties to the inherent characteristic of dignity that all people ought to possess (as quoted in Saastamoinen, p. 48). Kant concurs with Pufendorf in that as human nature is an end in itself, and not a means to an end, so dignity is an absolute state that all ought naturally to enjoy (as cited in Saastamoinen, p. 48; as cited in von der Pfordten, 2009, p. 387).

The enjoyment of dignity by all people is made manifest through social interactions. To Pufendorf, natural equality is "implicit in the principle of sociality" (as cited in Saastamoinen, 2010, p. 55). People by nature live in community and interact communally, and therefore must deal with each other in a manner that reflects natural law (as cited in Saastamoinen, p. 55). Summing, people have a natural obligation to treat each other with dignity equally under the law.

To Pufendorf, a social focus on dignity arises because people want to be esteemed by others of their species. Pufendorf asserts that "what all humans highly value in themselves is the idea of being a member of the human [race]" (as quoted in Saastamoinen, 2010, p. 57). Echoing this, Kant stresses that people must not be treated as mere objects by others (as cited in von der Pfordten, 2009, p. 375). However, in the end, Kant defines dignity as a characteristic possessed by "rational being[s]" who live by the golden rule (as quoted in von der Pfordten, p.382). To Kant, the individual who treats others as he or she would be treated is rational, being the "*author*

of his [or her] own ethical restrictions" (as quoted in von der Pfordten, p. 383). Kant suggests that people's ability to treat others with dignity may be limited to those individuals reasonable enough to recognize the moral duty to do so. The apparent caveat that only reasonable people treat others with dignity is troubling. All in all, although early modern philosophers dealt with dignity from the standpoint of social obligation based in natural equality or rationality, they appear to have failed to account for dignity as a personal issue or as a matter of personal choice.

The concept of dignity has remained largely unchanged since Pufendorf and Kant's contributions to its understanding. However, others like Neal (2012) claim Pufendorf and Kant's arguments that a social obligation under natural equality or rationality alone determine human dignity is insufficient. One diverging point of view asserts Pufendorf and Kant fail to consider that people are subject to human vulnerability, a personal phenomenon (Neal, 2012).

Dignity as a personal issue. Neal (2012) ties the concept of dignity to people's dual nature: that of being fragile and finite while also aspiring toward sublimity. All people are subject to physical laws, such as hungering, lusting, and dying, as well as transcendent laws, such as imagining, creating, and communicating. To have dignity is to possess a unique character that balances a fear of personal extinction with a hope of immortality (Neal, p. 194). Delsol adds, "each of us makes a claim for dignity to the extent that we are proud of living well with our insecurity and uncertainty" (quoted in Lawler, 2009, p. 158). This notion surpasses those of Pufendorf and Kant in that people's inherent dignity is not so much tied to natural equality or the ability to live by the golden rule as it is to the ability to accept one's own and others' dual nature, and consider both parts of that dual nature of equal importance—as a moral imperative (Neal, 2012, pp. 194, 197).

Neal (2012) agrees with Pufendorf and Kant that dignity is a moral imperative. To Neal (2012), however, dignity impels all people to strive toward equilibrium in handling their own and others' vulnerability. For instance, a patient with dementia *must* be bathed and fed, but also *must* be treated kindly, called by name, and helped to reminisce about his or her past. Summing, dignity's moral imperative requires all people to treat others with dignity from the standpoint that we are individual as well as social beings (Neal, p. 198). To this end, Neal (2012) echoes Jacobson (2009) in that dignity exists on two levels—individual and social. Dignity is perceived individually as well as socially in its functions (Neal, 2012). First, people use dignity when they admire positive achievements in themselves or others. Second, they use dignity when they esteem their own or others' intrinsic worth as vulnerable beings. Finally, they use dignity when they enact it as a moral imperative.

Thus, dignity as a moral imperative may best be understood in terms of the various constitutive elements of human vulnerability. To Ward and Syversen (2009), dignity may be conceptualized in at least five distinct core capabilities that are tied to human vulnerability. First, Ward and Syversen (2009) argue that dignity is a way of functioning in everyday life. They also argue that dignity is self-determination, or the freedom to turn one's intentions into actions. Dignity is social acceptance as well, providing social norms are met. In addition, dignity is flourishing and fulfillment. Finally, to Ward and Syversen (2009), dignity is liberty, to include fair treatment by others and the abilities to act un-coerced or unrestrained and to express oneself. Summing, dignity lies in people's individual capacity "as prospective agents" to pursue interests through personal decisions and actions, keeping in mind that they must also have the capabilities and resources to do so (Ward & Syversen, pp. 97-98). Without these latter requisites, people lack agency, and their dignity is impaired by what they are not individually able to be or do.

Dignity's moral imperative requires people to also help others have agency toward their own worthwhile lives (Ward & Syversen, 2009). That is, since dignity is tied to core capabilities, it creates an obligation to protect not only one's own core capabilities, but others' as well. However, people may not comply with such an obligation. Reviewing Neal (2012), dignity is a uniquely human quality that is used to evaluate or esteem one's own or others' characteristics, behaviors, or accomplishments. Such evaluations are communicated through social interactions and perceived by their recipients in either dignity affirming or disaffirming ways. For instance, when an audience gives Yo-yo Ma an ovation, the audience communicates to him they are delighted with his performance. Yo-yo Ma perceives appreciation for his skills, and the musician's dignity is affirmed. Yo-yo Ma's perception of dignity may be associated with the core capability of self-expression. Were the audience to remain silent after the performance, Yo-yo Ma might perceive displeasure and feel humiliated that his great talent was unrecognized. His dignity would be disaffirmed. The audience is under a moral obligation to clap, according to Ward and Syversen (2009), in support of the artist's capacity to express himself.

Members of Yo-yo Ma's audience have the right through their human vulnerability to decide whether or not they appreciate his performance, enough so to participate in an ovation. Choices such as this one exemplify that one's own sense of vulnerability, and hence dignity, may or may not coincide with another's. That is, per Neal (2012), the importance people assign to their own core capabilities may not be equivalent to the importance assigned to others'—it may be greater or less. So, evaluations socially enacted between people may not match expectations.

All social situations are communicative interactions that produce perceptions about core capabilities that either affirm dignity or disaffirm it. Dignity disaffirmation produces negative

effects for another human state of being, that of identity, also a social as well as personal phenomenon. A discussion of dignity cannot be complete without exploring human identity.

The Identity State of Being

Identity as a personal issue. To reach a fuller understanding of the importance of human dignity, it is necessary to recognize how dignity is connected to people's personal sense of self. Individuals cannot experience dignity without an identity that they hold "critical" (Jaussi, Randel, & Dionne, 2007, p. 248). Jacobson (2009) found through interviews with people that a valuable self-concept is tied to a perception of dignity. This goes beyond Pufendorf's notion that people value being members of the human species; people also value themselves as unique beings whose distinctiveness give them their sense of individual and social worth (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008, Saastamoinen, 2010). To Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo, and Scabini (2008), the search for a clear and coherent identity is a core component in humankind's search for meaning, making people distinct from one another as well as distinctly human.

To McCullagh (2008), the self is a "reflexive project for which the individual is responsible" developed over time through daily activities and self-reflection, and continually revised (p. 6). People's identities are composed of goals, values, beliefs, and other attributes that they each regard as their own (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Jaussi, Randel, & Dionne, 2007). However, people cannot develop identity in a vacuum; they develop their sense of self through social interactions. In fact, to Mutanan (2010), there may be no such thing as a personal identity; identity is developed socially with others because people are "political animals" (p. 32).

Identity as a social issue. Identity is also a social phenomenon. Social identity is developed and maintained at the intersection of group talk and an individual's personal story acting upon each other (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008). How individuals understand themselves is

shaped by the social contexts in which they interact. These contexts give individuals certain "vocabularies, norms, pressures, and solutions," all of which influence their sense of self in clear or subtle ways (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008, p. 11). Social identity theory suggests that the self "takes a back seat" to social identity (Alvesson, et al., p. 13). That is, an individual's social identity tends to be more important than the discrete self, since social identity is the construct through which people relate to their social environments while also being a product of those environments (Mutanan, 2010).

The concept of social identity has implications for the workplace. Interactions between managers and workers are social in nature, and this is impactful in terms of self-concept. As social relationships determine social identity, so too do relationships between managers and workers. The ways in which managers interact with workers reflect upon how those workers see themselves in the workplace (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008).

Identity as a worker issue. To Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo, and Scabini (2008), workers' self-construction and reconstruction is the result of "identity motives," or "pressures toward certain identity states and away from others" based on how those workers are treated by their managers (p. 1166). Workers relate to their managers in positive or negative ways from some level of compatibility between their respective goals, values, beliefs, and other attributes (Alvesson, et al., 2008), which are tied to the core capabilities (Ward & Syversen, 2009). Workers are also motivated toward positive relationships with their managers due to discursive interactions that support the core capabilities, or toward negative relationships with their managers due to their frustration (Vignoles, et al., 2008). Workers' identities are thus connected to the affirmation or disaffirmation of their dignity by managers, or through dignity promoting or dignity violating discursive behaviors enacted by those managers toward the workers.

Workers' identities are influenced by the manners in which they are treated by their managers. Dignity violations leading to the obstruction of workers' core capabilities have negative consequences for those workers. This phenomenon arises in the second state of being associated with dignity, that of health. As health is the state of being through which symptoms of dignity violations reveal their effects on workers' identity, a brief look at health is in order here.

The Health State of Being

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was developed in 1948 to safeguard dignity, as it is susceptible to damage by virtue of being a social phenomenon (Jacobson, 2009). Jacobson (2009) divides dignity into two types: dignity-of-self and dignity-in-relation (p. 3). Dignity-of-self is a quality of self-respect and self-worth seen in characteristics like confidence and integrity (Jacobson, 2009, p. 3). Dignity-in-relation refers to how respect and worth are communicatively enacted and perceived between people (Jacobson, p. 3). Such enactments and perceptions of dignity between people can harm identity and health, and this is a serious problem. For Jacobson (2009), a threat to an individual's dignity is a threat to the dignity of society itself (p. 8).

Jacobson (2009) developed a taxonomy of dignity encounters between people that describes dignity-promoting and dignity-violating behaviors. Her purpose was to develop "a coherent vocabulary and framework" which characterizes dignity through a substantial list of communicative behaviors that either affirm or disaffirm it (Jacobson, 2009, p. 2). Dignity-promoting behaviors include recognition, acceptance, courtesy, and the like. Dignity-violating behaviors include rudeness, indifference, condescension, and the like (Jacobson, 2009).

Dignity violations occur most often in situations where people are in asymmetrical positions, with one having more power, knowledge, or influence than the other (Jacobson, 2009, p. 4). Generally, according to Jacobson (2009), dignity violation is connected to an "order of

11

inequality" (p. 4). In contrast, dignity promotion is connected to an "order of justice," or a social order that echoes the moral imperative (Jacobson, 2009, p. 4). Whereas dignity promotion aids well-being and health, dignity violation leads to negative health consequences.

Dignity violations lead to diminished health. To Jacobson (2009), dignity violation begins in a "dwindling spiral" of harm and loss with early experiences of dark emotions like fear, embarrassment, and anger that eventually deteriorate into destructive feelings like humiliation, apathy, and worthlessness (p. 7). The person whose dignity is violated experiences the loss of core capabilities such as efficacy, respect, confidence, and self-esteem, all signs of identity damage (Jacobson, 2009, p. 7). This sense of loss can lead to depression and even premature death (Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo, & Scabini, 2008, p. 1169).

To Venkatapuram (2013), health is correlated with dignity under the moral imperative. Venkatapuram (2013) asserts that dignity is the capability of a person to be and do certain things tantamount to moral entitlements, including experiencing good physical health, enjoying meaningful and respectful relationships, and having control over one's "material and political" environment (p. 276). These are all aspects of a broad sense of health, or "a person's ability to achieve or exercise a cluster of basic human activities or [core] capabilities" (Venkatapuram, 2013, p. 272). Loss of one's core capabilities produces harm to dignity, identity, and health. The workplace is one place where dignity violating discourse damages these three states of being.

Work—A Domain of Dignity, Identity and Health

Since work is essential to living for many people, it is important to understand that work is the realm in which all three states of being—dignity, identity, and health—have the potential for full human enjoyment. Dignity, identity, and health are all influenced by a worker's ability to control his or her material environment (Venkatapuram, 2013). Such control involves being

engaged in work for which one is compensated. To Baxter (2004), not only does a worker possess inherent dignity, but also a sense of work arising from "creative and purposive action" (p. 16). Lucas (2011) echoes this idea by asserting that dignity is not associated with a job, but rather with the worker performing it. This sense of dignity is salient in its absence: Participants in a study by Ayers, Miller-Dyce and Carlone (2008) admitted that service work is "demeaning" if it is accompanied by "mistreatment and dehumanization on the job" (p. 266). The International Labor Organization asserts that "decent work" is productive "in conditions of freedom, equality, security, and human dignity" (quoted in Abadi, 2011, p. 658). A worker's identity is expressed in respectable job performance and full manifestation of health (Abadi, p. 659).

Ideally, to Hirschi (2012), a worker experiences decent work as a calling, gaining from it "a [deep] sense of meaningfulness and identity" (p. 483). Work perceived as a calling gives a worker greater motivation and enthusiasm than a job in which he or she receives not enduring intrinsic rewards and so feels no commitment (Hirschi, 2012). Work should be satisfying and contribute to a power-filled sense of identity, a strong sense of self-worth, and full health. A worker should get from a job such things as recognition, self-development, fair treatment, agency, efficacy, stability, achievement, expression, trust, and managerial leadership, all reflecting core capabilities (Abadi, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011; Ward & Syversen, 2009). Under the moral imperative, all workers have a right to enjoy such capabilities as those mentioned. The possession and enjoyment of such capabilities is positively correlated with human dignity, identity, and health (Venkatapuram, 2013).

However, although workers deserve to be treated with dignity in the workplace, managers may enact dignity violating discursive behaviors toward their workers. Following is a discussion of workplaces that obstruct core capabilities and how workers handle that using identity work.

Dignity Violations in the Workplace and Identity Work

A job that fails to support the capabilities associated with a dignified life is most likely performed within a workplace environment that does not value dignity or support identity, and contains a climate detrimental to health (Venkatapuram, 2013). In this workplace, managers or peers attack workers' sense of self through dignity violations that can lead to systematic bullying and erosion of the workers' health and well-being. Although workers typically perform some identity work in an effort to optimize work performance and satisfaction, they must perform excessive amounts of identity work when under attack by dignity violating behaviors.

Identity work is a sort of ongoing introspection that people do to maintain a sense of self that is coherent, distinctive, and positively valued (Thomas, 2009). People typically perform identity work when they interact with others, allowing themselves to be transformed by the interactions in some meaningful way. To counteract typical discrepancies between workers' values and goals and those of their organizations, workers must perform identity work. Identity work helps workers align their personal identity to the mission and objectives of the workplace while daily constructing, reconstructing, and sustaining a sense of self consistent with their own core concept (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Kuhn, 2006; Lucas, 2011; Thomas, 2009).

In a workplace that promotes dignity, a worker performs minimal identity work, whereas in a workplace that violates the worker's dignity, the worker does so much identity work that health is eventually adversely affected. It is the difference between being unselfconscious and self-conscious, and the degree and extent to which one acts self-consciously determines the degree and extent to which health is harmed (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002, p. 626). In fact, to Alvesson and Willmott (2002), if a worker's sensation of "'being myself'" is unsettled by dignity violations, feelings of tension, anxiety, shame, or guilt emerge. If that sensation is of "'being

myself'" is unsettled repeatedly, as through bullying, identity work fails to restore a coherent, distinctive, and positively valued identity, and health and well-being are damaged or lost (p. 626). Workplace bullying leads to the most harm to dignity, identity, and health.

Workplace bullying involves behaviors ranging from isolation, insults, intimidation, and threats (De Cuyper, Baillien, & De Witte, 2011; Ramsay, Troth, & Branch, 2011). Ramsay, Troth, and Branch (2011) assert that workplace bullying is unethical, unjustifiable, exploitative and rule-breaking. They define rule-breaking in this context as an intentional violation of social rules to gain advantage over someone with less power. This may be regarded acceptable for managers, so as to accomplish organizational goals or protect hierarchical position, although it invariably leads to negative consequences (Ramsay, Troth, & Branch, 2011).

Certain organizational structures and ideologies promote dignity violation. Following is a discussion of workplaces that create environments in which dignity violation thrives.

Environments that Promote Dignity Violation

Managers are seen to be the most typical dignity violators against workers (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010). Occasional dignity violations by managers may escalate in frequency and acerbity to create what are known as employee-abusive organizations (EAOs) (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). These organizations allow continual unfair, unjust, and unwanted hostile and abusive communicative behaviors against workers by managers and peers.

Philosophical and ideological factors. Organizations that discourage worker voice and fail to resolve dignity violation issues may possess a laissez-faire managerial philosophy (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010; Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008; Salin, 2003). In workplaces where management maintains a "'hands-off'" policy toward worker complaints, dignity violations continue unabated until workers leave or are terminated due to negative

15

impressions caused by the dignity violations (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). Formal evaluations in such places may cast bullied workers in a bad light and bullies in a good light, thus rewarding dignity violating behaviors (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). Yet, a laissez-faire philosophy is not the only factor leading to unresolved dignity violation issues.

Beyond a laissez-faire management philosophy, other factors contribute to worker abuse through dignity violations. An organization's at-will employment philosophy may have a part in workers' inability to stop such abuse (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008; Martin, Lopez, & LaVan, 2009). Also, a philosophy that puts managers and workers on separate moral planes may be to blame, as well as the notion of the lazy worker (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). Yet, economic ideology plays a large role in promoting dignity violations.

Factors arising out of a prevailing ideology of investor-driven management play an important role in worker abuse through dignity violation. One such factor is "institutional isomorphism," or the tendency of organizations to imitate others that embrace capitalistic and individualistic philosophies (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). To Lutgen-Sandvik and McDermott (2008), in cultures such as the United States where individualism, meritocracy, and aggressiveness are admired, institutional isomorphism produces "survival of the fittest" organizations that favor dignity violations. Dignity violation of workers is also promoted by "syncretic superstructures" like employee-abusive organizations (EAOs), in which complex and culturally embedded values and beliefs become indistinguishable from "natural and normal" managerial behaviors that favor dignity violation (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008, p. 317). In such workplaces, concern for worker dignity, identity, and health is "framed as antithetical to the organization's bottom line" (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, p. 319). Although dignity

violation of workers may be associated with philosophical or ideological factors, dignity

violation of workers may also be related to environmental factors.

Environmental factors. Workplaces that function chaotically have dire consequences for

workers. Coherent and cohesive procedures and processes are needed for worker effectiveness

and the maintenance of worker dignity (Roscigno, Lopez, & Hodson, 2009). Chaotic workplaces

achieve the opposite, promoting dignity violations against workers (Roscigno, Lopez, & Hodson,

2009). According to Roscigno, Lopez, and Hodson (2009), chaos is characterized by ambiguity,

confusion and contradiction. These characteristics translate into role ambiguity and role conflict

for workers, leading to greater work pressures and higher performance demands by managers

and less control over one's own work (Agervold, 2009; Balducci, Cecchin, & Fraccaroli, 2012).

Such workplaces damage worker dignity and lead to identity and health issues (Agervold, 2009).

Frequently, personality factors are to blame for dignity violations by managers against

workers. To Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, and Einarsen, an autocratic leadership style tends to

lead to worker abuse. A prominent personality factor likely in managers who use an autocratic

leadership style is high social dominance orientation (SDO) (Parkins, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006;

Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Some people who become managers consider

themselves superior to the workers they manage, and they tend to behave in an authoritarian

manner toward those workers, lacking empathy and communality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth,

& Malle, 1994). Another factor that may lead to dignity violating behaviors is an inability to take

another person's perspective (Parkins, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006). Managers who cannot take

workers' perspectives are unable to recognize that their dignity violating behaviors as hurtful.

However, there is little evidence to suggest that workers themselves induce or provoke bullying

behaviors in their managers (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010).

Although attempts have been made to pinpoint how workers provoke dignity violating attacks from managers, no general victim personality profile indicating vulnerability to dignity violations has been found (Glaso, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007). In fact, research indicates that personality disorders in bullying targets linked to bullying may not have caused the bullying but may have arisen as a result of it (Glaso, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007).

Ramifications for the Worker

Workers who endure dignity violations suffer consequences in all three states of being, but the health consequences are the most acute. Dignity violation results in health issues for workers marked by increased absenteeism and reduced organizational commitment, productivity, and work satisfaction (Ramsay, Troth, & Branch, 2011). Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2010) assert that ongoing and escalating dignity violation as bullying threatens psycho-social needs and leads to anxiety and depression. Psychosomatic and psychological stress symptoms, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and suicidal tendencies are due to prolonged dignity violation or bullying (Balducci, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2011; Hallberg & Strandmark, 2006).

Ramifications for the Organization

Dignity violations, especially by managers, have serious negative consequences not just for workers, but also for their organizations—in high financial costs. It leads not only to higher absenteeism and health costs, but also reduced commitment, productivity, and work satisfaction (Ramsay, Troth, & Branch, 2011). Workplace bullying leads to psychological trauma (Balducci, Cecchin, & Fraccaroli, 2012; Hallberg & Strandmark, 2006) as well as strained physical health, both of which harm the organization due to poor task performance and high turnover (Griffin, 2012). Resistance behaviors by workers are another way in which the organization pays a heavy penalty for dignity violations by managers against workers.

Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) argues that bullied workers tend to engage their bullies in a dialectic of control: "Abuse and resistance produce an ongoing struggle to stress different agendas and push them to the forefront" (p. 409). Resistance is a way for bullied workers to gain control over a situation, however illusory. Rubin (2004) warns that workers resist managers' malfeasance in the absence of opportunities to engage in creative and autonomous activity. Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) categorizes resistance behaviors as quitting, labor withdrawal, working to rule, withholding information from or avoiding the bully, and retaliation. However, as such behaviors themselves are antithetical to deriving a sense of dignity from work, resistance leads eventually to diminished employee citizenship, which is a preference to behave in constructive and productive ways (Rothschild, 2004). Resistance can also lead to feelings of guilt or shame, which also contribute to dignity, identity, and health damage.

Dignity violations by managers and negative responses by workers all occur through discourse. The following is a discussion of how such interactions in an organization occur.

Organizational Discourse and Dignity Violation

Discourse is the means whereby an organization conducts business and managers interact with workers. It is also the means whereby workers' dignity may be harmed. Organizational structure, objectives, and activities occur most frequently through discourse (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008). That is, the management of workers who perform the services and produce the commodities that drive business is conducted through discourse. To Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012), there are two types of discourse in the workplace: that of everyday conversation and interpersonal interactions, and that comprised of "social forces embedded in macro-level communication" (p. 9). Macro-level communication within an organization consists of historical, cultural, structural, economic, and social systems of meaning that serve and support the

organization and its goals. At the same time, macro-level discourse contains bundled belief systems of consistently held opinions, values, and customs that may make the organization unable to recognize those managerial behaviors that do not support worker identity and dignity (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008; Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). Thus, organizational discourse may tend to encourage dignity violations by managers against workers in everyday discursive interactions, which is harmful if workers are made mute.

A disconnect between organizational and workers' values and goals may arise through organizational discourse. This is made salient in the construction of organizational hierarchy: Hierarchy creates levels of "voice" that tend to render workers voiceless when they try to stop dignity violations (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012, p. 23). To Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012), organizational discourse may enable power relationships that disenfranchise workers, leaving them vulnerable to dignity and identity harm, by labeling "bullies as truth tellers and targeted workers as troublemakers" (p. 8). Organizational discourse has a propensity to objectify workers, labeling them "solely as producers" and robbing them of their individuality (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011, p. 357). As identities are considered discursive constructions created and negotiated in interaction (Kuhn, 2006, p. 1344), they can be damaged under such discourse.

According to Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012), organizational discourse is the dominant discourse. As such, it informs and shapes meaning, enabling particular organizational interests to hold and expand power at the expense of lesser ones. Voice concentrated in powerful interests is used to frame bullying in ways that make targets inconsistent and bullies consistent with normative expectations in the organizational discourse (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011). Bullying targets tend to have no say against bullying, seldom receive the help they need to end it,

and suffer serious dignity, identity, and health consequences due to "colonizing"—repetitive sensemaking that leads to guilt and shame (Lugten-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011, p. 349).

When communicating, people are participating in the creation of their social universe (Lucas, 2011, p. 350). Dignity violations in the workplace that develop into bullying constitute psychic harm in that they are prolonged and persistent communicative attacks on workers' dignity and identity. Workers try to make sense of bullying through a process of sensemaking, in which perceptions of the bullying are confirmed, causes and solutions are considered, and the self is reevaluated (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008). Yet, sensemaking about bullying typically results in framing of the bullying in ways that institutionalize it. Lutgen-Sandvik and McDermott (2011) assert that such sensemaking can actually increase workers' feelings of helplessness, leading to incoherence and heightened affect. Workers who tell an emotional and confusing tale of bullying may not be regarded as credible (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). Also, organizational discourse can create language and policy barriers that make it easy for employee advocates such as human resource workers to dismiss workers' experiences of abuse. That is, if such experiences do not fall within defined parameters, they may be ignored. If complaints are made within established mechanisms that disallow a face-to-face encounter, they may go unacknowledged and be lost. If workers are told to follow a chain of command, complaints may ultimately stop with the bully.

Ghoshal (2005) points blame for this phenomenon at the way in which management theories dictate organizational practices that marginalize workers, making them vulnerable to objectification and managerial abuse. Management theories that guide business school pedagogy have led to the emergence of managers who routinely participate in dehumanizing discursive practices (Ghoshal, 2005). Human intentionality is relegated to a chosen few whose objectives rest in pleasing stockholders. As a result, managers act opportunistically, guided by a dominant

organizational discourse that promotes profitability over ethical standards and human agency, sacrificing human capital. A trustworthy manager is the one who conforms to the "liberal" mantra of investor-driven business ethics (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 77). As managers exercise "fiat" over workers, focusing attention on nonproductive self-serving behaviors, they encourage such behaviors while reducing productive resource expression in such forms as creativity and positive employee citizenship (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 85). Self-serving managers may have learned to enact dignity violating behaviors in academic programs that reflect investor-driven ideologies.

Pedagogy and Dignity Violating Discourse

The business ideologies that are taught in management programs determine managerial discourse toward workers. Since investor-driven management is the prevailing ideology of organizations, it is the ideology transferred through pedagogical practices to future managers (Ghoshal, 2005). Ghoshal (2005) pinpoints the underlying philosophy of investor-driven management theories that produce dignity-violating managers: profit shareholders must benefit at the expense of human capital. What is then taught in business schools are "ideologically inspired amoral theories" that promote dignity violations against workers (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 76). Waldron (2012) concurs that dignity has not been an important focus in academia (p. 1118).

Richmond, Wagner, and McCroskey (1983) broached the topic of dignity instruction from a business perspective with a focus on training managers to change the way they see their organizational role and to communicate in dignity-promoting ways toward workers. Their work informs us that managers need to be educated in how to treat workers, and this entails instruction on the importance of dignity and the discourse that promotes dignity. Such instruction might occur on the job, but might more likely occur in the realm of academia. This recommendation ties in to a study conducted by Wiesenfeld, Rothman, Wheeler-Smith, and Galinsky (2011).

This study by Wiesenfeld, Rothman, Wheeler-Smith, and Galinsky (2011) implies that management students perceive management as more effective when delivered in a dignity-violating manner than when delivered in a dignity-promoting manner. Furthermore, those students' beliefs imply that such behavior is legitimate and tolerable (Wiesenfeld, Rothman, Wheeler-Smith, and Galinsky, 2011). This tolerability toward dignity-violating behaviors is in keeping with the notion that it is okay to do whatever it takes to turn a profit. According to Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, and Einarsen (2010), "from the leader's perspective, such use of force … [is] motivated by meeting organizational outcomes (p. 455). In workplaces where dignity violations occur, stopping them is hard to do since they are unpredictable and variegated, and could be seen as legitimate compliance-gaining behavior (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, and Einarsen (2010). The implications for students in management programs are enormous.

Students who do not adequately understand and use dignity-promoting discourse are at risk to become dignity-violating managers. Students who are taught to accept liberal business theories, an ideology of investor-driven management, and organizational discourse that permits dignity violation, are likely to communicate in dignity-violating ways toward workers (Ghoshal, 2005). To Ghoshal (2005), management theories and ideologies that promote opportunistic behavior legitimize dignity-violating behaviors in managers (p. 77). Business schools need to stop teaching management theories and ideologies that promote the commodification of workers and a workplace environment ripe for dignity violation (Ghoshal, 2005). Harkening back to Neal (2012) and Ward and Syverson (2009), Ghoshal (2005) asserts individual intentionality makes causal or functional management theories untenable. That is, workers ought not be subjected to impersonal and deterministic social forces (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 79), as it is not in their nature to behave mechanistically. Ghoshal (2005) suggests incorporating instead a "stewardship theory" in

business school curricula that acknowledges the interests of workers, makes moral arguments, and offers practical knowledge (p. 82), asserting, "if the trend in management theory is to be reversed, only business school academics can do so" (p. 87). Yet, a shift away from dominant theories requires "relegitimizing pluralism," or the teaching of various perspectives (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 88). Such an endeavor may be daunting. A simple course may do the trick.

A Course on Dignity in the Workplace

Although it is not feasible to overhaul management school curricula to provide pluralism, it is feasible to develop and teach a course to general student populations at the undergraduate level on dignity in the workplace. It is possible to raise students' awareness of the issue of dignity violation and how to recognize when dignity is violated. By focusing on the negative effects of dignity violation in the workplace and ways to shift workplace discourse from dignity violating language to dignity promoting language, a course might provide students with the skills needed to interact positively as workers and managers with others. Such a course could help create wholesome work environments that stimulate quality production and worker satisfaction.

Toward the development of a course on dignity in the workplace, this research project studies what people in college think and feel about dignity and its violation. This project explores the level of emphasis on dignity in college courses as well as the extent to which dignity is perceived in relationships. Also, the project touches upon the recognition of dignity violations in interactions between managers and workers as well as the perception of dignity violations in those interactions as inappropriate. With this in mind, I hope to answer the following questions:

RQ 1: To what extent do people's work experience, education, relationships, or other factors contribute to their perceptions of dignity and its violation?

RQ 2: How do people recognize and perceive dignity-violating discursive behaviors by leaders toward workers?

Chapter Two

Method

This research study explores people's understanding of dignity in the workplace. This study reveals what communication behaviors people recognize as inappropriate behaviors and how strongly they perceive those behaviors being dignity violating. Dignity violating behaviors are important for all of us to recognize because dignity, along with identity and health, is a vital human state of being, which when disturbed can lead to a damaged self-image and diminished health. Understanding dignity is an important factor in effectively managing workers (Baxter, 2004, p. 15). Those who now manage and future managers need to understand and appreciate dignity and to develop communication skills that promote dignity, as both of these are key to the success of their organizations and the well-being of the workers they manage.

Respondents

Data was collected with an anonymous paper-and-pencil questionnaire administered voluntarily to students in 12 public speaking classes at a mid-sized mountain university campus. The questionnaire was distributed on a take-home basis and for extra-credit points in the respondents' respective public speaking classes. Five demographic questions asked about age, gender, year in school, major, and amount of work and/or volunteer experience, in years generally and in years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year.

Age, gender, and year in school. There were 114 total respondents. More females (58%) than males (42%) completed the questionnaire. Of all respondents, 64% were freshmen, 22% sophomores, and 14% juniors. The remaining 6.5% of respondents consisted of seniors and post-baccalaureate, exchange and transfer students. As these respondents did not comprise a category large enough to produce significant statistical comparisons, they were deleted from the year-in-

school demographic. By age, 18 and 19-year-olds comprised the bulk (61%) of the respondents, whereas 18% were 20 to 21 years old, and 20% were 22 and older.

Major. As respondents were dispersed across a broad spectrum of college majors, they were grouped according to individual departments. As a result, respondents' majors were coded according to five distinct university schools and colleges. Twenty-one percent of respondents were taking College of Humanities and Sciences courses. Another 22% were in programs in the College of Education and Human Sciences. Thirteen percent were enrolled in the College of Health Professions or Missoula College Health Professions. Whereas only 9% of all respondents were taking classes in the College of Forestry and Conservation, the majority of respondents (36%) were students of the School of Business Administration.

Work and volunteer experience. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had ever worked or volunteered, and to provide the number of years they had done so as well as the total number of years they had worked or volunteered twenty or more hours per week for most of each year. Of all respondents, 86% had worked and 37% had volunteered. This data was put into two groups—one of respondents who had worked or volunteered for less than one year to three years, and another of respondents who had worked or volunteered for four or more years. Of those who had worked, about 53% had done so for less than one year to three years and 47% had done so for four or more years.

Table 1 below shows the spread by age across years worked. Seventy-five percent of respondents who had worked less than one year to three years were 18 to 19 years old. Forty-six percent of respondents who had worked four or more years were also 18 to 19 years old. Many members of both these two respondent groups may have only worked minimal hours, however.

26

Table 1:

Age to Years Worked

		Years Worked		Total
		Less than 1 Year to 3 Years	4 or More Years	
Age	18-19	39	21	60
	20-21	10	9	19
	22 and older	3	16	19
Total		52	46	98

Of respondents who had worked twenty or more hours per week for most of the year, 75% had done so for less than one year to three years whereas 25% had done so for four or more years.

Table 2 shows the spread by age across years worked at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year. Again, 18 to 19-year-olds comprised 75% of the demographic group who have worked less than one year to three years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year. However, sixty percent of all those respondents who have worked four or more years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year were 22 or older.

Table 2:

Age to Years Worked at 20 or More Hours per Week for Most of the Year

		Years Worked at 20 or More Hours per Week for Most of the Year		Total
		Less Than 1 Year to 3 Years	4 or More Years	
Age	18-19	55	5	60
	20-21	14	5	19
	22 and older	4	15	19
Total		73	25	98

A cross-tabulation of work experience by year in school revealed a similar pattern. Seventy-three percent of all those who had worked less than one year to three years were freshmen, and 52% of all those who have worked four or more years were also freshmen. However, more freshmen (44%) worked four or more years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year than either of the other two grade levels, indicating that some respondents 22 and older were freshmen.

Of those who had volunteered, 62% had done so for less than one year to three years. About 38% had volunteered for four or more years. Whereas this data is useful to the study, the data for time volunteered over the course of a year is not. Ninety-five percent of respondents indicated they had volunteered 20 or more hours per week for most of the year for less than one year to three years. Only 5% had volunteered 20 or more hours per week for most of the year for four or more years. This data set was excluded from the time-volunteered demographic.

Respondents 18 to 19 years old indicated they comprised 71% of all respondents who had volunteered, 38% during a period of less than one year to three years and 33% for four or more years. Freshmen indicated the highest percentage (64%) of volunteer work done, 33% during a period of less than one year to three years and 31% for four or more years.

More female respondents (42%) had worked less than one year to three years compared to male respondents (19%); however, this demographic balanced out at 24% for both genders having worked four or more years. Forty-seven percent of respondents who had worked less than one year to three years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year were females and the other 27% were males. This disparity shifted in favor of males (16%) over females (10%) for those who had worked four or more years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year.

As to volunteer work, female respondents had volunteered (42%) over male respondents (20%) over a period of less than one year to three years and 24% to 13% for four or more years. Unlike time worked by gender, volunteer experience did not shift in favor of male respondents.

Instrument

The primary instrument consisted of three parts (see Appendix A). The first two parts dealt with levels of perceived dignity violation in the workplace and the third part dealt with the extent to which dignity was perceived in coursework and a variety of relationships. The first two parts consisted of two distinct workplace scenarios, *Joy* and *Scott*, in which a supervisor enacts a variety of dignity-violating behaviors toward a subordinate. After reading each scenario, respondents were asked to rate on a Likert-type scale from *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree* their perceptions of ten evaluative statements about the supervisor's behavior. One such statement after the *Joy* scenario read: "Under the circumstances, Joy should have given Dee the chance to argue her case." Another read: "Joy inappropriately accused Dee of unprofessional behavior while discussing her phone conversations." One statement after the *Scott* scenario read: "Scott should have handled discussing the issue with Jeff more discreetly." Another read: "Scott was justified in using strongly judgmental language toward Jeff."

Five of the evaluative statements were presented in reversed format, forcing respondents to consider an opposing selection, in order to ensure these statements were not rated blindly. The statements were written to either make the workers appear to be at fault for the situation incurring the managers' dignity violations or make the managers' dignity violating behaviors appear to be appropriate.

After each scenario and its evaluative statements was an open-ended question soliciting suggestions from respondents as to ways Joy and Scott might have acted toward their workers

under the circumstances. These questions were to learn further if respondents had recognized

dignity violations for what they were and which dignity violations were perceived as such.

The third part of the questionnaire asked respondents to share their own perceptions on

the topic of human dignity. Respondents were asked to rate on a Likert-type scale from *Not at All*

to *Great Extent* the extent to which classes in their major, or generally, discuss concepts related

to dignity as defined in the questionnaire. Then, they were asked to rate the extent to which

classes in their major, or generally, emphasize the importance of dignity. Following these were a

series of questions to which respondents were asked to similarly rate their perceptions of being

personally treated with dignity in a variety of social relationships, particularly family, friends,

professors, supervisors, and coworkers. Respondents were also asked to rate their perceptions of

personally treating others with dignity in those relationships. Finally, respondents were asked to

what extent they feel being treated with dignity is important in each relationship.

Analysis

The questionnaire responses were analyzed using SPSS statistical software. Demographic

groups such as age and gender comprised the independent variables, and respondent ratings in all

three parts of the primary instrument comprised the dependent variables.

The dependent variables depicted in the first two parts of the instrument described

negative acts similar to those listed in Jacobson's (2009) taxonomy of dignity violations. These

negative acts reflect violations of core capabilities indicative of a life worthy of human dignity

(Ward & Syversen, 2009). In the workplace, such core capabilities are addressed through worker

recognition, development, equity, agency, efficacy, stability, achievement, expression, trust, and

leadership (Abadi, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011). These capabilities are

manifest when managers are discreet as well as open and honest, give constructive feedback,

take responsibility, share a trusting relationship, provide resources and autonomy, encourage voice, and act equitably and consistently. In the scenarios, the managers enact behaviors that violate the workers' sense of dignity tied to each of the core capabilities. Respondents indicated their recognition and perceptions of the dignity violating behaviors when they rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the evaluative statements following each scenario.

The data sets for these dependent variables were compared across total demographics, resulting in a separate set of means for the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios. Means were then calculated for these two sets of means, resulting in a *Joy* mean and a *Scott* mean. These two final means were compared across separate independent variables to ascertain group influence upon results.

Answers to the open-ended questions following the two scenarios were categorized according to the core capabilities listed above. Each answer addressed one or another core capability. Up to six data sets were created for multiple answers, considering numerous respondents provided more than one. Frequency tables were created for individual answers, reflecting the number of times each related core capability was addressed. The frequency of each distinct answer indicated the extent to which the violation of a core capability was recognized by participating respondents.

Chapter Three

Results

Table 3 reflects the mean perception of dignity violation captured in respondent ratings of each evaluative statement for both scenarios across all the demographic groups. The dignity violating behavior is listed rather than the evaluative statement associated with it.

Table 3

*Overall Means for Dignity Violations Within **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios*				
Dignity violation	*Joy* scenario		*Scott* scenario	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
--being indiscreet	3.65	1.23	4.45	.80
--withholding information	3.60	1.16	4.27	.84
--avoiding responsibility	4.19	.90	2.65	.97
--discouraging voice	3.92	.88	2.74	1.13
--giving negative feedback	3.87	.96	4.02	1.19
--denying resources	2.89	1.08	4.39	.78
--behaving inconsistently	3.78	.97	2.89	1.11
--suppressing autonomy	2.70	.99	3.58	.92
--failing to trust	3.38	1.14	3.92	1.08
--acting unfairly	4.04	.97	4.25	1.05

As mentioned earlier, five evaluative statements were reversed in each scenario to imply that either Joy or Scott was behaving appropriately or the worker (Dee or Jeff) was at fault for the situation that incurred dignity violations on the part of the manager. For instance, as shown in Table 3, under the dignity violation of *denying resources*, respondents overall somewhat agreed that Dee was unjustified "in expecting Joy to tell her beforehand about her decision." They did not perceive Joy committing a dignity violation by making a general announcement about a promotion Dee anticipated but did not receive. The onus appears to be on Dee, not Joy. Also, under the dignity violation of *suppressing autonomy*, respondents overall somewhat agreed that

Dee "should have worked more closely with Joy while developing connections," thereby forcing Dee to surrender independent self-development to Joy's micromanagement. Once again, the onus is on Dee. Respondents did not perceive Joy committing any dignity violation by wanting to control Dee's work-related activities.

Likewise, as shown in Table 3, under the dignity violation of (the manager's) *avoiding responsibility,* respondents overall somewhat agreed that Jeff "should have accepted blame for his unauthorized actions" rather than Scott. Jeff was considered at fault for Scott's issue with a premature press release. Also, under the dignity violation of *discouraging voice,* respondents overall somewhat agreed that Jeff "should have refrained from making excuses and not argued with Scott." Scott was not perceived as having committed a dignity violation toward Jeff even though Jeff was discouraged from standing up for himself with valid reasons for his actions.

At the end of each scenario, respondents were invited to suggest ways that Joy and Scott could have behaved differently toward Dee and Jeff in the scenarios. Of all respondents who gave answers, 75% offered suggestions for Joy and 83% for Scott. The answers given in Table 4

Table 4

Open-Ended Question Responses for **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios			
What could Joy have done differently?		What could Scott have done differently?	
Treat others equitably.	58%	Give constructive feedback.	65%
Share information.	44%	Accept responsibility.	63%
Give constructive feedback.	32%	Share information.	40%
Encourage self-defense.	31%	Be discreet.	30%
Be discreet.	26%	Provide resources.	19%
Accept responsibility.	25%	Act consistently.	11%
Provide resources.	7%	Encourage self-defense.	9%
Act consistently/Allow autonomy.	1%	Allow autonomy.	1%

reflect that these respondents considered each scenario separately and offered alternative behaviors based upon each manager's actions. That is, respondents' answers revealed their perceptions of distinctly inappropriate behavior by each manager toward his or her worker. Respondents who answered the open-ended questions offered one or more suggestions for either or both scenarios. Table 4 shows the percentage of each answer to overall answers for the two scenarios. For instance, 58% of all answers to the open-ended question after the *Joy* scenario were suggestions that Joy treat Dee more equitably than she was perceived to be treated in the scenario. Sixty-five percent of all answers to the open-ended question following the *Scott* scenario were suggestions that Scott give Jeff constructive feedback, indicating perceptions that Jeff was not given such feedback in the scenario.

Table 5 below shows the mean ratings for the extent to which respondents perceived dignity as being discussed or emphasized in college course work, the extent to which they perceived themselves being treated with dignity in relationships, the extent to which they perceived themselves treating others with dignity in those relationships, and the extent to which dignity is important in such relationships. Table 5 indicates that respondents on average felt that dignity was discussed or emphasized only to a very small extent in college courses. Also, respondents perceived professors treating them with less dignity than they perceived themselves treating their professors.

Table 5

Overall Means for Perceptions of Dignity in Coursework and Relationships		
Coursework	*M*	*SD*
Discussion of dignity	2.45	.89
Emphasis on dignity	2.58	.87
Relationships		
--your being treated by others with dignity:		
Family	3.70	.53
Friends	3.43	.61
Professors	2.90	.78
Supervisors	3.13	.87
Coworkers	3.04	.87
--your treating others with dignity:		
Family	3.72	.50
Friends	3.61	.53
Professors	3.29	.74
Supervisors	3.47	.70
Coworkers	3.39	.70
--importance of dignity:		
Family	3.85	.50
Friends	3.77	.52
Professors	3.60	.65
Supervisors	3.71	.62
Coworkers	3.67	.60

Having discussed overall results with respect to perceptions of dignity and dignity violations, it is also important to look at how perceptions of dignity violation compared across demographics. The overall means (with standard deviations in parentheses) for the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios were 3.60 (.50) and 3.37 (.53), respectively; these means were compared across demographics, as shown in Tables 6 through 13. Each of these tables shows the means for perceived dignity violations in the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios compared across each of the demographic groups. Table 6 shows how the means for the two scenarios compare across the age demographic.

Table 6

Age Means Compared to Overall *Joy* and **Scott** Scenarios						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Age	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
18-19	70	3.59	.47	70	3.70	.58
20-21	21	3.58	.55	21	3.73	.37
22 and older	23	3.66	.57	23	3.82	.51

Although three times as large, the youngest demographic group did not perceive either scenario as dignity violating to the same extent as the oldest demographic group. However, the one-way ANOVAs for the *Joy* scenario (F = .20, p = .82) and the *Scott* scenario (F = .39, p = .68) with respect to the age means in Table 6 fail to demonstrate statistically significant differences between the three groups in general for either scenario. The age of the respondents does not seem to have a noticeable bearing upon perceptions of dignity violation.

Table 7 does reveal a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents (t = -2.441, p = .016), however. Female respondents tended to perceive the *Scott* scenario to be dignity violating more so than male respondents. The t test for the *Joy* scenario is

Table 7

Gender Means Compared to Overall *Joy* and **Scott** Scenarios						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Gender	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Male	47	3.60	.54	47	3.58	.55
Female	66	3.60	.49	66	3.82	.50

not as statistically significant (t = -.08, p = .94), on the other hand, showing that both genders perceived the *Joy* scenario similarly.

As with the age demographic and as shown in Table 8, there does not appear to be a statistically significant difference between respondents based upon their year in school. The one-

way ANOVAs for the *Joy* (F = .87, p = .42) and *Scott* (F = .02, p = .98) scenarios confirm that

students in different grade levels do not seem to perceive dignity violations differently.

Table 8

Year in School Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Year in School	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Freshman	73	3.61	.51	73	3.74	.60
Sophomore	25	3.51	.43	25	3.71	.36
Junior	16	3.72	.56	16	3.74	.52

Likewise, as reflected in Table 9 below, respondents' majors do not seem to make much

of a difference in perceptions of dignity violation. As before, the one-way ANOVAs for the *Joy*

(F = 1.31, p = .27) and *Scott* (F = .81, p = .52) scenarios support that there is no statistically

significant difference between respondents based upon their majors.

Table 9

Major Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Major	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
CHS	21	3.58	.49	21	3.74	.55
CEHS	22	3.60	.43	22	3.65	.59
CHP/MCHP	13	3.32	.53	13	3.76	.32
CF&C	9	3.60	.43	9	3.99	.31
SBA	36	3.69	.58	36	3.67	.54
CHS = College of Humanities and Sciences; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; CHP/MCHP = College of Health Professions/Missoula College Health Professions; CF&C = College of Forestry and Conservation; SBA = School of Business Administration						

Unlike several of the previously mentioned demographics, and as demonstrated in Table

10, the number of years respondents had worked appears to have an influence upon perceptions

of dignity violations. Students who had worked four or more years apparently perceive dignity

violations in both the *Joy* (t = -2.48, p = .02) and *Scott* scenarios (t = -1.74, p = .09) more so than

do students who had worked less than one year to three years. However, as seen through these t

tests, the difference in this years-worked demographic is statistically significant for the *Joy*

scenario, whereas it only approaches statistical significance for the *Scott* scenario.

Table 10

*Years Worked Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios*						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Years Worked	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than three	52	3.51	.49	52	3.64	.54
Four or more	46	3.75	.48	46	3.83	.54

Table 11 confirms that respondents who had worked four or more years at 20 or more

hours per week for most of the year tend to recognize dignity violations more readily than

respondents who had worked less than one year to three years at 20 or more hours per week for

most of the year. Again, t tests for the *Joy* (t = -1.87, p = .06) and *Scott* (t = -2.59, p = .01)

Table 11

*Years Worked at 20 or More Hours per Week Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios*						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Years Worked 20 or More Hours/Week	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than three	73	3.57	.47	73	3.65	.57
Four or more	25	3.78	.55	25	3.97	.37

scenarios reveal that, whereas the demographic difference is statistically significant for the mean

of the *Scott* scenario, it only approaches statistical significance for the *Joy* scenario.

Unlike respondents who had worked for pay, and as seen in Table 12, a noticeable

difference between means for those students who had volunteered less than one year to three

years and those who had volunteered four or more years is not apparent. Likewise, a statistically

significant difference does not exist with respect to either the *Joy* or *Scott* scenarios. T tests for

the *Joy* (t = -.285, p = .78) and *Scott* (t = .16, p = .87) scenarios confirm that a demographic

difference for years volunteered is not significant over the means of the two scenarios.

Table 12

*Years Volunteered Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios*						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Years Volunteered	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than three	28	3.60	.49	28	3.66	.41
Four or more	17	3.65	.53	17	3.64	.51

Lastly, data for years volunteered at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year

shows that a statistically significant difference exists between the two time-volunteered groups

with respect to both *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios. This is due to the relative size of the groups, as

shown in Table 13. T tests for the *Joy* (t = -2.17, p = .04) and *Scott* (t = -2.84, p = .01)

Table 13

*Years Volunteered 20 or More Hours per Week Means Compared to Overall **Joy** and **Scott** Scenarios*						
	Joy scenario			*Scott* scenario		
Years Volunteered 20 or More Hours/Week	n	*M*	*SD*	n	*M*	*SD*
Less than three	41	3.58	.50	41	3.60	.41
Four or more	2	4.35	.51	2	4.44	.31

scenarios reveal a significant difference between the two demographic sub-groups; however,

only two respondents comprise one of them. For this reason, this demographic comparison over

the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios is not valuable to this study. Too few of the respondents had

volunteered four or more years at 20 or more hours per week for most of the year to allow for an

accurate comparison of demographic means over the means of the two scenarios.

To summarize, the overall means for the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios indicate that respondents' perceptions of the dignity violations within the scenarios ranged widely, resulting in a more or less neutral rating that only tended toward agreement or disagreement on the inappropriateness of the managers' behaviors. With respect to individual dignity violations, however, certain inappropriate behaviors were indeed recognized as such and perceived more strongly than others, as indicated by higher ratings overall demographically. Certain other inappropriate behaviors were apparently not recognized at all, as indicated by lower ratings overall demographically. The open-ended question answers give further evidence of dignity violation recognition, although the answers indicate only those dignity violations that were recognized and perceived as such.

Female respondents perceived dignity violations more strongly than male respondents only with regard to the *Scott* scenario. Other than this statistically significant result and those for longer-term workers, most demographic groups do not seem to differ much at all in their perceptions of dignity violations in the two scenarios.

Respondents' perceptions of dignity overall in coursework and relationships provide further evidence that dignity awareness can stand to be raised. Respondents indicated that, although they valued dignity highly, dignity promoting behaviors occurred to a lesser extent in their relationships. Dignity was perceived by respondents to be discussed or emphasized to only a low extent in college coursework. The dignified treatment of respondents by professors was also perceived to only a low extent. These results reveal an attitude among respondents that higher academia is wanting when it comes to addressing dignity issues and supporting it.

Chapter Four

Discussion

From a dignity perspective, both of the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios should have been perceived by all respondents as greatly dignity violating. The mean for each scenario reflects a wide range of perceptions, however. This fluctuation has been shown in Table 1. The means indicate that many respondents failed to perceive the scenarios as dignity violating. Had such respondents a greater awareness of what constitute dignity violations, their ratings of Joy and Scott's behaviors would have contributed to higher overall means. What can be learned from this is that some people do not have a good grasp of either what constitute dignity-violating behaviors or of the consequences (Jacobson, 2009) for workers toward whom they are enacted.

Demographic Effects

Gender. Strong demographic effects occurred with respect to only gender and work experience. With respect to gender, the *Joy* scenario was not considered very dignity violating by respondents of either gender overall, unlike the *Scott* scenario. This disparity may be due to the comparative subtlety of the *Joy* scenario, but this could not be ascertained through survey results. Whereas neither male nor female respondents overall perceived the *Joy* scenario dignity violating, female respondents overall perceived the *Scott* scenario dignity violating significantly more so than did male respondents overall. Since Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez (2006) do not notice any clear gender differences among bullying targets (bullying being an extreme form of dignity violation), male and female respondents might be expected to perceive dignity violations similarly. However, this was not the case with the *Scott* scenario, according to survey results.

A possible reason why female respondents overall more readily and strongly perceived Scott's behavior toward Jeff as inappropriate has to do with the prevailing social-structural

41

concept of female communality (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Women are socialized in a stable system of inequality to have communal traits; that is, women are expected to be nice, helpful, thoughtful, and sensitive (Rudman & Glick, 2001). As a result, women would tend to perceive inappropriate behaviors very readily, since they would not conform with communal traits. That male respondents overall failed to perceive Scott's behavior as inappropriate to the same extent as female respondents overall might be related to the complementary concept of male agency. As women are considered to have communal traits, men are considered to have agentic traits; that is, men are expected to be aggressive, forceful, and competitive (Rudman & Glick, 2001). As Scott acts aggressively, forcefully, and competitively toward Jeff, male respondents overall might not perceive this behavior as inappropriate (nonconforming to agentic traits), whereas female respondents overall would. To determine which dignity violating behaviors could be perceived by respondents based on communal or agentic orientation, it is worth looking again at the overall demographic perceptions of the various dignity violations within the two scenarios. Recognized dignity violations as well as those that went unrecognized could be compared across both scenarios applying the concepts of female communality and male agency.

Whereas Scott was moderately perceived overall to be indiscreet, disparaging, and untruthful, Joy was not. This discrepancy suggests that such dignity violations as indiscretion, disparagement and untruthfulness could be considered nonconforming, or inconsistent, with communal traits, if not agentic ones. That is, female respondents appear to have recognized these behaviors in the *Scott* scenario whereas they did not notice them in the *Joy* scenario, matching overall survey results. As male respondents overall did not appear to recognize dignity violations in either scenario, these particular inappropriate behaviors of being indiscreet, disparaging, and untruthful thus might not be inconsistent with agentic traits.

On the other hand, although Joy was moderately perceived overall to avoid responsibility and to discourage Dee from defending herself, these same dignity violations were not recognized at all in the *Scott* scenario over all demographics. Clearly, both male and female respondents overall failed to perceive these particular dignity violations in the *Scott* scenario. Therefore, such dignity violations as avoiding responsibility and discouraging voice might not be inconsistent with either communal or agentic orientations. The same conclusion might be drawn from the evidence that shows both Joy and Scott moderately perceived overall to act unfairly toward their workers, whereas neither male nor female respondents perceived any dignity violation to even a moderate extent in the *Joy* scenario. Therefore, the dignity violation of acting unfairly might also be inconsistent with both communal and agentic orientations.

Communal and agentic traits thus might produce gender effects on perceptions of dignity violations. Had the *Joy* scenario been as overtly and apparently dignity violating as the *Scott* scenario, such gender effects might have been more noticeable across both communal and agentic orientations. Had Joy behaved aggressively, forcefully, and competitively toward Dee, male respondents might have strongly perceived her behavior as dignity violating since these behaviors are stereotypically male (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Female respondents might have perceived such behaviors as inappropriate as well, from a communal orientation perspective.

Studying the data from the standpoint of female communal and male agentic orientations might suggest that stereotypical gender behavior is a sturdy foundation for such exploration. On the contrary, gendered explanations cannot be construed only from expected social-structural stereotypes, as this implies that all females think a certain way and all males think another. However, the evidence advocates for the possibility of a link between communality being a predominantly female orientation and agency being a predominantly male orientation. Further

research using scenarios in which managers enact dignity violations obviously nonconforming to gender roles might lend support to such a stance. Nevertheless, another theoretical perspective discussed below may be used to compare gendered perceptions of the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios.

That female respondents more strongly perceived the *Scott* scenario as dignity violating than male respondents could also be viewed from a status perspective. Roscigno, Lopez, and Hodson (2009) make the case for status differential when supervisors pick on those who threaten their sense of superiority or make them feel vulnerable. For instance, Scott is put into a position of vulnerability by Jeff's unauthorized actions; he feels threatened and his behavior toward Jeff is distinctly inappropriate. Scott's behavior may be due to a status differential readily noticed more so by female respondents sensitized to such a differential from having worked under male supervision (Roscigno, Lopez, & Hodson, 2009). To support this conclusion, Lewis and Orford (2005) assert that "gender may be a hidden issue in power relationships" (p. 43). Lewis and Orford (2005) assert that gendered status differential plays a large role in sensitization toward dignity violations. That females may be more sensitized to dignity violations could be due to their greater propensity for sexual harassment or to male and female occupational differences (Roscigon, Lopez, & Hodson, 2009). Berdahl (2007a) states that "because harassers are likely to target less powerful individuals and because men, on average, are more powerful than women, men more than women will harass and women more than men will be harassed" (p. 649). Also, women tend to be harassed more as they move up in an organization or move into roles typically or traditionally held by men (Berdahl, 2007b), such as management.

Although status-based harassment by males on males occurs as well (Berdahl, 2007a), that male respondents failed to perceive to any noticeable extent Scott's dignity violations suggests that these respondents (and possibly their peers) might not have reached a level of status

threat to superiors. All in all, an argument in favor of status differential effects on perceptions of dignity violations might be stronger if the scenarios had Joy and Scott enacting inappropriate behaviors toward workers of the opposite gender. Male respondents might have finally taken umbrage had Joy treated Jeff in dignity violating ways, and female respondents might have recorded a stronger perceptual response if Scott had treated Dee inappropriately.

All in all, little research has been done on gender effects on dignity violation perception. This lack of research hampers the ability to ascertain why female respondents perceived Scott's behavior toward Jeff as dignity violating to a greater extent than male respondents. Certainly, this gender difference is of value in understanding awareness level for dignity violations. The difference could possibly lie in gendered valuation of the core capabilities adversely affected by dignity violation. That is, sensitivity to the core capabilities could be gendered. As this concept was not addressed in this study, it is beyond the scope of the present discussion. However, this difference could be explored later on and utilized to formulate ways to raise awareness of dignity violation for the purpose of controlling this behavior and instead promoting dignity affirmation.

Work and volunteer experience. The length of time in years and number of hours per week over the course of a year that a respondent had worked has a direct effect on perceptions of dignity violation. Respondents 22 years old and older had worked 20 or more hours per week for most of the year for a longer period of time than others in that demographic group, and evidence that is statistically significant or approaches it indicates that these workers most readily and strongly perceived dignity violations in both the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios. The jobs held by such respondents may be low-status service positions acquired before or during college. Such positions may sensitize respondents over time to dignity violations. Per Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez (2006), low-status service positions are especially vulnerable to workplace bullying, so

the longer and more often a respondent interacts with others in such a workplace, the more likely dignity violations will be experienced or witnessed.

That time is a factor in developing perceptions of dignity violation is not surprising. It may be difficult to recognize dignity violations when they occur, according to Jacobson (2009); she asserts that dignity violations are noticed rather in their consequences. That is, recognition of dignity violations depends upon how noticeable their consequences are. Such consequences manifest initially as negative emotions such as embarrassment or anger (Jacobson, 2009). However, over time, dignity violations in fact begin a "dwindling spiral of damage and loss" (Jacobson, 2009, p. 7) that lead to deeper feelings such as hostility, dread, and depression, all of which are difficult to disregard. The ability to perceive dignity violations depends upon the sensitization over time to these longer term experiences of "being wounded" (p. 7).

Respondents may also begin to more readily perceive particular dignity violations in the workplace when such behaviors are enacted toward them or toward coworkers persistently over time or with increasing intensity, evolving thus into bullying (De Cuyper; Baillien, & De Witte, 2012; Glaso, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007). In either case, a negative behavior spiraling out of control over time is a recognizable characteristic of dignity violation, be it the behavior of the victim or that of the perpetrator. Workers who observe or experience either consequential behaviors or bullying behaviors eventually become sensitized to dignity violations.

As for volunteer work experience, a similar conclusion cannot be drawn. Both of the demographic groups that had volunteered less than one year to three years and four or more years perceived the overall dignity violation in both the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios to the same neutral extent. It would be easy to surmise that both groups may not encounter dignity violations where they volunteer—this phenomenon might follow the altruistic nature of volunteerism. Comparing

46

the means for the volunteers and the means for paid workers who had worked four or more years across both the *Joy* and *Scott* means, the volunteers' mean ratings of their overall perceptions of *Joy* and *Scott* dignity violations fall short. In fact, the volunteers' mean ratings for the two scenarios are similar to that of paid workers with less than one year to three years' work experience. It might be said that respondents who had volunteered for any length of time do not encounter dignity violations that they recognize as such any more so than do respondents who had been shorter-term paid workers. However, this conclusion does not infer volunteer environments that are dignity promoting—only that volunteers overall are less likely to notice dignity violations than longer-term paid workers, for reasons not addressed in this study.

As for the other demographic groups, neither age, year in school, nor major, had any real effect on perceptions of dignity violations. The survey sample was fairly homogeneous as to age and year in school, so this conclusion is not surprising. On the other hand, respondents' majors were initially thought to contribute a substantial influence over perceptions of dignity violation, so statistical test results to the otherwise are surprising. With respect to this demographic, had the size of the separate groups been more balanced, perhaps a more noticeable difference in dignity violation perceptions would have been recorded. Although two groups in this demographic were significantly smaller, this disparity may have played a role in the lack of statistical significance.

Perceptions of Dignity Violations

Following each scenario was a list of evaluative statements that the respondents were asked to rate according to their perceptions of the dignity violations being evaluated. For each statement, a mean was calculated across all respondents. The mean reflects the average rating and represents an overall perception of the dignity violation.

Although Joy and Scott's behaviors overall were not perceived to be very dignity violating (respondents' mean ratings for both were more or less neutral), survey results reveal which of Joy and Scott's behaviors were most easily recognized by respondents who somewhat perceived that the behaviors were dignity violating. For the *Joy* scenario, one such behavior respondents somewhat perceived to be dignity violating was *avoiding responsibility*. Another was *acting unfairly*. For the *Scott* scenario, one such dignity violation respondents somewhat perceived to be dignity violating was *being indiscreet*. Others were *denying resources*, *acting unfairly*, *withholding information*, and *giving negative feedback*.

In both scenarios, a handful of dignity violations were not at all recognized since the associated managerial behaviors were not perceived to be inappropriate. That is, overall, more respondents somewhat perceived the managers' behaviors to be appropriate. For Joy, these were *denying resources* and *suppressing autonomy*. For Scott, they were *behaving inconsistently*, *discouraging voice*, and *avoiding responsibility*.

Each recognized and somewhat perceived dignity violation in the two scenarios is addressed in the following section, together with a brief discussion of the reasoning that may have led to this level of respondent rating. The next section will look at the unrecognized dignity violations that were somewhat perceived to be appropriate, and that section will also discuss the ramifications of that level of respondent rating.

Recognized dignity violations. Respondents clearly recognized Joy's inability to act responsibly. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Joy "failed to properly question Dee's phone use before blaming her for wasting time." Joy put blame for her own poor decision not to promote Dee as expected on her subordinate instead, making it appear to be Dee's fault. Also, respondents clearly recognized that Joy treated Dee unfairly. Overall, they somewhat perceived

that Joy "should not have given Dee's new job to someone obviously less qualified." It was apparent to most respondents that Joy hired her inexperienced future sister-in-law over Dee.

Likewise, respondents clearly recognized Scott's public embarrassment of Jeff. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Scott "should have handled discussing the issue [of a premature press release] with Jeff more discreetly." That Scott gruffly called attention to his spontaneous meeting with Jeff before the entire office humiliated Jeff. Respondents also clearly recognized that Scott failed to provide Jeff with proper instructions, leaving him to make his own decision based upon earlier similar actions. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Scott "should have warned Jeff to hold off on the press release or not do it at all." Jeff was left confused and uncertain about his job responsibilities. Furthermore, respondents clearly recognized that Scott berated Jeff over his own premature announcement, leaving Jeff feeling blameworthy for Scott's actions. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Scott "should have been straightforward with Jeff about the messy situation" he himself had caused. That Jeff learned of Scott's own humiliation from a coworker left Jeff feeling righteously unjustified.

Respondents clearly recognized that Scott used negative and unconstructive feedback in his comments to Jeff. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Scott was not "justified in using strongly judgmental language toward Jeff," even though the statement was reversed to appear that Scott was justified in doing so. Jeff was left feeling disempowered by Scott's treatment. Respondents also clearly recognized that Scott was treating Jeff unfairly. Overall, they somewhat perceived that Scott "spoke to Jeff in an inappropriately condescending manner." This was made clear to respondents through Scott's threat to fire Jeff even though Jeff had done nothing wrong.

Although it is encouraging to see respondents perceived some dignity violations, other dignity violations were not perceived as inappropriate behaviors. Although all dignity violating

49

behaviors are inappropriate and need to be stopped, unrecognized dignity violating behaviors may likely lead to bullying if they are not perceived and controlled. Following is a discussion of the unrecognized dignity violations within the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios, which were perceived to be appropriate, with arguments supporting the need for greater awareness of such behaviors.

Unrecognized dignity violations. Whereas a number of scenario statements were clearly perceived to be dignity-violating to some extent, five of them elicited mean respondent ratings that indicated Scott or Joy's behavior was not recognized overall to be dignity violating at all. Two reversed statements in the *Joy* scenario that most respondents failed to perceive as dignity violating focused on Dee's behavior, and the manager appeared to be harmed by the situation.

First, respondents perceived overall that Dee was not justified in expecting Joy to tell her beforehand about her decision to hire someone else. The dignity violation embedded in this statement is that Dee was not apprised of her shortcomings and prepared emotionally for rejection. Dee was deprived of self-efficacy, or the competence to successfully fulfill the tasks associated with her job and merit upward mobility (Hirschi, 2012). This dignity violation could be connected to autocratic leadership, where employee involvement in decision-making is considered unnecessary (Hoel, Glaso, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010).

Second, respondents perceived overall that Dee should have worked more closely with Joy while developing connections she could later use in her new role. The dignity violation embedded in this statement refers to micromanagement. Joy was remiss in not allowing Dee autonomy to develop networking skills. That Joy knew Dee was doing so without her approval further added to Joy's failure to reach out and support Dee's initiative. Rothschild (2004) would lump Joy in with "power-hungry managers who cannot or will not relinquish any parcel of control, even where greater worker voice and autonomy would improve the work product" (p. 5).

In the *Scott* scenario, three reversed statements that did not seem dignity-violating to many respondents were focused on the worker, Jeff, who was blamed for a problem Scott had caused. The statements were worded to make Scott appear to be harmed by the situation, thereby perhaps eliciting unwarranted sympathy for him. First, respondents perceived overall that Jeff should have accepted blame for his unauthorized actions. The dignity violation in this is associated with Scott's own refusal to accept blame for the mistake he had made that led to Jeff's actions. Blame should have been shared between them—instead, Jeff was left shouldering the burden of guilt. This has serious future implications as Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2011) note, "Because [bullying] targets are blamed for their own mistreatment, they often remain silent. People regularly do not talk about experiences that undermine their preferred identities" (p. 23).

Second, respondents perceived overall that Jeff should have refrained from making excuses for his behavior and for arguing with Scott. Jeff's voice was stifled, even though he had valid arguments to defend his actions, such as a clear expectation that Scott would have approved of them. This is clearly a dignity violation. According to Hsiung (2012), "voice behavior is a [sign] of employee authenticity" (p. 358). Lack of voice harms a worker's sense of identity and self-worth, and can lead to workplace bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011).

Finally, respondents perceived overall that Jeff made Scott look inconsistent by going around him with the press release. Scott appears to have been exonerated by respondents for not giving Jeff the same latitude he had given Jeff in the past with regard to press releases. Scott's inconsistency was his own problem, not Jeff's, and it creates a dignity violation by leading to confusion on Jeff's part about his job responsibilities. Such a situation, marked by "ambiguity, confusion, and contradiction" can lead to bullying (Roscigno, Lopez, & Hodson, 2009, p. 1578).

These overall respondent perceptions show that focusing on worker behavior tends to validate dignity-violating managerial behavior. This phenomenon could be due to ambiguity on the part of the statements themselves. All in all, however, respondents failed to recognize dignity violations embedded within some of the statements that focused on Jeff and Dee's behaviors. This failure prompts concern that managers may be able to attack certain core capabilities without repercussions because those dignity violations are not perceived as such. That is, many perpetrators of dignity violations are not aware they are engaging in it, mainly because "they receive no feedback on the repercussions of their behavior, thus making it difficult for them to consider themselves in the wrong" ((Escartin, Rodriguez-Carballeira, Zapf, Porrua, & Martin-Pena, 2012, p. 200). Also, focus on the workers whose dignity is being violated may reduce the strength of perception of dignity violations even if they are recognized as such.

Perceptions of Dignity in Coursework and Relationships

Overall neutral respondent perceptions of dignity violations in the *Joy* and *Scott* scenarios are concerning, but so are respondent perceptions of coursework and relationships. On average, respondents felt only to a low extent that dignity is discussed in their courses or emphasized in course materials. These results were not consistent with results for dignity in relationships, so it seems likely that respondents were not just blindly rating their perceptions.

As for dignity in relationships, respondents felt most moderately that dignity in relationship with family, friends, professors, supervisors, and coworkers is important. Yet, this overall perception of the importance of dignity in social relationships is seen to be higher than that associated with actual experiences of dignity. Respondents perceived overall that they treated others in those relationships with more dignity than they perceived themselves treated. All of these results indicate that people understand what dignity is, recognize its relative absence

in their education, and perceive variance in social importance and actual enactment of dignity. That respondents perceive to only a moderate extent the presence and importance of dignity in their everyday lives shows that people need to develop a greater awareness of appropriate dignity discourse, and the dignity, identity, and health benefits that derive from it.

The Course

This study goes beyond Jacobson's (2009) grounded theory study that resulted in her taxonomy of dignity violations. This study examines people's perceptions of discursively enacted dignity violations and measures the strength of such perceptions. From measuring perceptions, a deeper understanding of how people feel about dignity violations as well as what they perceive to be dignity violations may be gained. The next step would be to show people how to recognize dignity violating behaviors as they are enacted. It is likely that the development of intentional awareness can facilitate behavior change, prompting dignity promoting behaviors in place of dignity violating ones.

Out of this study, a course has been developed that presents, first, dignity as a basic human right; second, ways in which it is discursively violated; third, consequences of such violations; and, finally, tools to use to create positive and proactive workplace discourse that discourages dignity violating behaviors. The course is intended to promote discussion on these dignity topics and to lead students to develop an understanding of the phenomenon of dignity violation as well as an ability to apply that understanding to discursive interactions. With such applied knowledge, people who enroll in such a course can then take appropriate and dignity promoting discourse into the workplace as both managers and workers to foster dignity-affirming environments for their benefit and the benefit of their organizations.

Chapter Five

Conclusions

Dignity is a human characteristic we all possess under a moral imperative. Dignity is one of three human states of being: dignity, identity, and health, each of which nurtures and supports the other two. If our dignity is violated, our sense of self is jeopardized as well as our health and well-being. As dignity is manifest in our lives as core capabilities, the diminishment or denial of any of these core capabilities through dignity violations can rock the foundation of our human experience. It is thus imperative that we uphold and support our and others' dignity. This is particularly necessary with respect to work, since work is one realm in which all three human states of being have the potential to reach full enjoyment.

Understanding what dignity encompasses, what constitute dignity violations, and how intolerant we ought to be toward dignity violation in general may lead to discursive enactments of only those behaviors that promote and support dignity. Recognizing what behaviors violate dignity as well as our own perceptions about them is the first step in developing appropriate and empowering discourse. In any workplace, the development of awareness and interaction skills that support and sustain dignity for all who work there leads inevitably to higher quality work and greater productivity. This process is key to improving organizational profitability and success as well as contributing to the personal fulfillment of each individual worker.

Study Limitations

One limitation of the research study was the sample size. As it was a convenience sampling, respondents were accessed through a limited number of classes, and only about a third of all the surveys were returned. The study was also hampered by the homogeneous composition of the sample. Most if not all respondents were in the 18 to 22 year age range, and this narrow

age range did not yield in respondents a heterogeneous exposure to diverse life experiences and long-term manager/worker relationships rich in work-related interactions.

The study did not control for response bias or survey fatigue. Some respondents may have rated their perceptions of dignity violation as well as their perceptions of dignity in relationship based on social desirability bias, particularly with respect to the treatment of others with dignity and the importance of dignity. Likewise, for some respondents, perceptions of dignity in relationship may have been rated inaccurately due to the repetitive nature of the questions. Those respondents may have simply circled the highest or lowest possible rating throughout in order to expedite completion of the questionnaire.

As no published survey was found that addressed the research questions adequately, a survey was created for the study. A few scenario statements may not have been self-explanatory and their rating may not have reflected true perceptions of the situation as a result. Respondents may have selected the "Neutral" rating as a default due to lack of clarity. Also, reversed statements tied to each scenario may have been ambiguous or unintentionally misleading, resulting in inaccurate ratings by respondents.

Future Implications

Additional demographic information could reveal ethnic or racial perceptions of dignity. However, such demographic data would require a larger and more diverse survey sample. Also, demographic information about the type of paid or volunteer work in which respondents are engaged could provide a better idea as to why longer-term paid workers might perceive dignity violations more significantly than shorter-term paid workers and volunteers generally. This information could also be applied to explain significantly different perceptions between female and male respondents of overall dignity violations in gendered scenarios, if any.

The survey questionnaire could be revised and refined to capture more accurately the essence of respondent understanding of dignity and perceptions of dignity violation. The use of focus groups or interviews could yield richer and thicker data for a more comprehensive understanding of the topic. Such data could lead toward the development of communication processes in the workplace intended to encourage dignity promotion rather than dignity violation, with the goal of improving the quality of work life.

A study could look more broadly at a gendered view of the core capabilities. Males and females may value core capabilities differently (some more so than others), and this could influence how we perceive dignity violations. Some dignity violations may be more apparent to us than others based upon which core capabilities we consider important. Gendered emphasis on core capabilities could lead to our selective awareness of dignity violations against others' core capabilities, especially those that we ourselves may not value highly. As a variety of core capabilities are applicable in the workplace (Abadi, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011), and are all necessary for a life worthy of human dignity (Ward & Syversen, 2009), it is imperative that we explore the possibility that we promote dignity violation against others through selective awareness. A co-phenomenon that could be studied as well pertains to gender sensitivity. For instance, how respondents become desensitized to dignity violations may be connected to gender stereotypes that lead to reification of those dignity violating behaviors that then become unrecognizable as such and difficult to manage. The devaluation of agentic women's social skills is an example of this (Rudman & Glick, 2001).

Future research could focus on dignity violations as they are enacted in organizational life. The study could focus on managers' and workers' understanding of dignity and perceptions of dignity violations as enacted in hypothetical scenarios. Or, the study could address actual

enactments of dignity violation in the workplace, to determine which are recognizable and which are not as well as how strongly the dignity violations are perceived as such by managers, targets, and witnesses. Such a study could be either quantitative or qualitative, and could be used to explore the topic from the level of grounded theory.

An exploration could be conducted into how managers discursively enact dignity promotion or violation "in situ," observing the organizational work processes in which the behaviors occur to see if there is a correlation between work processes and dignity enactment of either type. Such work processes could include workload (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2010), role ambiguity or conflict (Balducci, Cecchin, & Fraccaroli, 2012), or illegitimate tasks (Semmer, Tschan, Meier, Facchin, & Jacobshagen, 2010) that tend to compromise a worker's core capabilities. The study could also examine dignity violating managers' personalities to see if traits such as social dominance orientation or the inability to perspective take (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) are factors that predispose managers to inappropriate behavior. The research could also look to see if dignity violating managers' behaviors are negatively related to managerial attributes such as competence (du Gay, Salaman, & Rees, 2010).

Conclusion

Overall, this study looks at the three states of being that make human beings unique from all other creatures. One of these states of being is that of dignity, the violation of which causes harm to the other two states of being, those of identity and health. As work is a human activity that contributes to an overall sense of fulfillment and well-being, the ways in which work is discursively enacted between managers and workers either support or hamper the full enjoyment of dignity. Dignity is supported through dignity promoting discursive behaviors, and dignity is hampered through dignity violating discursive behaviors.

The study explores to what extent people perceive dignity violations as they are enacted in workplace settings. Research reveals that gender and work experience are factors for recognizing dignity violations. Women appear to be better able than men to perceive dignity violations based in part upon female communality traits and gender status differential, two perspectives brought to bear upon this result. Workers with more than four years of experience at better than part-time hours appear to be better able to recognize dignity violations than shorter-term and part-time workers. Those workers who more readily perceive inappropriate discursive behaviors appear to be employed in low status service jobs that are prone to workplace bullying, and have time on their side to develop the ability to notice the spiraling emotional consequences of dignity violation or the escalating violence of bullying.

The study also indicates that some dignity violations are more recognizable than others. In fact, research reveals that some dignity violations are not recognized at all if focus is put on the worker's discursive behavior rather than on the dignity violating manager's. As unrecognized dignity violations have a proven tendency to lead to bullying, this revelation points to the need for raising awareness of all the various ways in which a person's dignity can be damaged.

Finally, the study exposes how important people consider dignity and the extent to which it is enacted in their lives. College coursework appears to mostly ignore the concept of dignity. Also, professors appear to treat students with less dignity than others in their social relationships. This study shows that, although dignity is rated rather highly in importance by people, it is not enacted to any great extent as part of daily life. This disconnect can have negative ramifications in the workplace, where dignity violation can not only ruin people's lives but can cripple organizations and contribute to the failure of an entire economy to thrive.

As a result of this study, a course has been developed that teaches the concept of dignity, raises the issues associated with dignity violating behaviors, and offers alternative behaviors that promote dignity and provide for empowered and productive work environments. The course calls for discussion of a variety of dignity related topics, leading participants to develop in the process dignity promoting discursive skills that they can then take into the workplace to transform it.

Dignity violation in the workplace is a serious issue that obviously warrants further exploration to determine root causes of dignity violating behaviors as well as ways to change the discourse so that it promotes dignity instead. Not only do individual workers benefit by shifting the talk from inappropriate language that threatens their core capabilities to language that supports and nurtures them—organizations themselves benefit in the long term. Workers thrive under dignity promoting discursive behaviors and are motivated through core capabilities to be creative and productive, leading to overall organizational success and economic durability.

References

Abadi, S. R. (2011). Decent work from the perspective of the right to development and human development. *U.S. China Law Review, 8*: 657-668.

Agervold, M. (2009). The significance of organizational factors for the incidence of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 50*: 267-276.

Alvesson, M., Ashcraft, K.L., & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organizational studies. *Organization, 15*(1): 5-28.

Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(5): 619-644.

Ayers, D., Miller-Dyce, C., & Carlone, D. (2008). Security, dignity, caring relationships, and meaningful work: Needs motivating participation in a job-training program. *Community College Review, 35*: 257-276.

Baillien, E., De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2010). Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two-wave test of Karasek's job demand control model for targets and perpetrators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(1): 191-208.

Balducci, C., Cecchin, M., & Fraccaroli, F. (2012). The impact of role stressors on workplace bullying in both victims and perpetrators, controlling for personal vulnerability factors: A longitudinal analysis. *Work & Stress, 26*(3): 195-212.

Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. (2012). Workplace bullying and its relation with work characteristics, personality, and post-traumatic stress symptoms: An integrated model. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 24*(5): 499-513.

Baxter, V. (2004). The elusive pursuit of dignity. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of*

Reviews, 33(1): 15-17.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007a). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender

    hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2): 641-658.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007b). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*

    92(2): 425-437.

Clarke, J. A. (2011). Beyond equality? Against the universal turn in workplace protections.

    Indiana Law Journal, 86(4): 1219-1287.

De Cuyper, N., Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2012). Job insecurity, perceived employability,

    and targets' and perpetrators' experiences of workplace bullying. *Work & Stress, 23*(3):

    206-224.

du Gay, P., Salaman, G., & Rees, B. The conduct of management and the management of

    conduct: Contemporary managerial discourse and the constitution of the 'competent'

    manager. *Journal of Management Studies, 33*(3): 263-282.

Escartin, J., Rodriguez-Carballeira, A., Zapf, D., Porrua, C., & Martin-Pena, J. (2012). Perceived

    severity of various bullying behaviors at work and the relevance of exposure to bullying.

    Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations, 23(3): 191-

    205.

Franke, K. (2012). Dignifying rights: A comment on Jeremy Waldron's *Dignity, Rights, and*

    Responsibilities. Arizona State Law Journal, 43: 1177-1200.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices.

    Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4(1): 75-91.

Glaso, L., Mattheisen, S. B., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace

    bullying portray a general victim personality profile? *Scandinavian Journal of*

61

Psychology, 48(4): 313-319.

Griffin, B. (2012). Multilevel relationships between organizational-level incivility, justice and

    intention to stay. *Work & Stress, 24*(4): 309-323.

Hallberg, L. & K. Strandmark, M. (2006). Health consequences of workplace bullying:

    Experiences from the perspective of employees in the public service sector. *International*

    Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 1(2): 109-119.

Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The relative impact of workplace bullying as a

    social stressor at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 51*(5): 426-433.

Hirschi, A. (2012). Callings and work engagement: Moderated mediation model of work

    meaningfulness, occupational identity, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of*

    Counseling Psychology, 59(3): 479-485.

Hodson, R., Roscigno, V., & Lopez, S. (2006). Chaos and the abuse of power: Workplace

    bullying in organizational and interactional conflict. *Work and Occupations, 33*(4): 382-

    416.

Horton, R. (2004). Rediscovering human dignity. *Lancet, 364*(9439): 1081-1085.

Hoel, H., Glaso, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership styles as

    predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of*

    Management, 21(2): 453-468.

Hsiung, H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level

    psychological process. *J Bus Ethics, 107*(3): 349-361.

Jacobson, N. (2009). A taxonomy of dignity: A grounded theory study. *BMC International*

    Health and Human Rights, 9(3): 1-9.

Jaussi, K. S., Randel, A. E., & Dionne, S. (2007). I am, I think I can, and I do: The role of

    personal identity, self-efficacy, and cross-application of experiences in creativity at work.

Creativity Research Journal, 19(2-3): 247-258.

Kuhn, T. (2006). A 'demented work ethic' and a 'lifestyle firm': Discourse, identity, and workplace time commitments. *Organizational Studies, 27*(9): 1339-1358.

Lawler, P. A. (2009). Chantal Delsol on human rights and personal dignity. *Perspectives on Political Science, 38*(3): 157-165.

Lewis, S. & Orford, J. (2005). Women's experiences of workplace bullying: Changes in social relationships. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15*(1): 29-47.

Lucas, K. (2011). The working class promise: A communicative account of mobility-based ambivalences. *Communication Monographs, 78*(3): 347-369.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2006). Take this job and …: Quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. *Communication Monographs, 73*(4): 406-433.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2008). Intensive remedial identity work: Responses to workplace bullying trauma and stigmatization. *Organization, 15*(1): 97-119.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & McDermott, V. (2008). The constitution of employee-abusive organizations: A communication flows theory. *Communication Theory, 18*(2): 304-333.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & McDermott, V. (2011). Making sense of supervisory bullying: Perceived powerlessness, empowered possibilities. *Southern Communication Journal, 76*(4): 342-368.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & Tracy, S. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(1): 3-47.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Riforgiate, S., & Fletcher, C. (2011). Work as a source of positive emotional experiences and the discourses informing positive assessment. *Western Journal of*

Communication, 75(1): 2-27.

Martin, W. M., Lopez, Y. P., & LaVan, H. N. (2009). What legal protections do victims of bullies in the workplace have? *J. Workplace Rights, 14*(2): 143-156.

McCullagh, K. (2008). Blogging: Self presentation and privacy. *Information & Communication Technology Law, 17*(1): 3-23.

Mutanen, A. (2010). About the notion of identity. *LIMES, 3*(1): 28-38.

Neal, M. (2012). "Not gods but animals": Human dignity and vulnerable subjecthood. *Liverpool Law Rev, 33:* 177-200.

Novak, M. (2009). A salute to Jacques Maritain. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 21*: 124-142.

Parkins, I., Fishbein, H., & Ritchey, P. (2006). The influence of personality on workplace bullying and discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(10): 2554-2577.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4): 741-763.

Ramey, S. (2012). Fighting for a society that respects each person's dignity. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, 24*(1): 54-60.

Ramsay, S., Troth, A., & Branch, S. (2011). Work-place bullying: A group processes framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(4): 799-816.

Richmond, V. P., Wagner, J. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1983). The impact of perceptions of leadership style, use of power, and conflict management style on organizational outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 31*(1): 27-36.

Roscigno, V., Lopez, S., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and

organizational context. *Social Forces 87*(3): 1561-1589.

Rothschild, J. (2004). Managers' conduct and workers' dignity: Making the sociological link. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, 33*(1): 5-7.

Rubin, B. (2004). An understructured conception of dignity at work. *Contemporary Sociology, 33*(1): 8-10.

Rudman, L. & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4): 743-762.

Saastamoinen, K. (2010). Pufendorf on natural equality, human dignity, and self-esteem. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 71*(1): 39-62.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56*(10): 1213-1232.

Semmer, N., Tschan, F., Meier, L., Facchin, S., & Jacobshagen, N. (2010). Illegitimate tasks and counterproductive work behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*(1): 70-96.

Thomas, R. (2009). Critical management studies on identity: Mapping the terrain. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (pp. 167-184). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Venkatapuram, S. (2013). Health, vital goals, and central human capabilities. *Bioethics, 27*(5): 271-279.

Vignoles, V. L., Manzi, C., Regalia, C., Jemmolo, S. & Scabini, E. (2008). Identity motives underlying desired and feared possible future selves. *Journal of Personality, 76*(5): 1165-1200.

Von der Pfordten, D. (2009). On the dignity of man in Kant. *Philosophy, 84*(3): 371-391.

Waldron, J. (2010). Dignity, rights, and responsibilities. NYU School of Law, Public Law

Research Paper No. 10-83.

Ward, T. & Syversen, K. (2009). Human dignity and vulnerable agency: An ethical

framework for forensic practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*: 94-105.

Wiesenfeld, B. M., Rothman, N. B., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). Why fair

bosses fall behind. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from

http://hbr.org/2011/07/why-fair-bosses-fall-behind/ar/pr

Appendix A

Leader Communication Study

I. Welcome—Information and Consent

Hello! You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating how students perceive communication interactions between managers and subordinates in workplace situations. This survey does not ask about your own personal work experiences. Instead, you will be given a couple of hypothetical scenarios and asked questions about the communication interactions occurring within them. Your responses will help us better understand how college students perceive leader communication behaviors toward workers.

Your decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide to take part in this study, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Although there is no anticipated risk involved in completing this survey, if you are uncomfortable at any time doing so, you may stop and withdraw.

As an incentive to participate, please note that you will receive FIVE extra credit points from your COMX 111A instructor. Upon completing the survey, there will be a short paragraph of instructions and a space in which to provide your name and section number. Your name WILL NOT be connected with your survey. You need to be 18 years or older to take this survey.

Your participation in this study will be anonymous. Your name will not be connected with your responses. Only the researcher, research advisor, and other approved research members will have access to the data. The results of this research may be publicly presented and/or submitted for publication, but the names of the participants will not be connected to the research results.

If you have any questions about the research after completing the survey, please contact Montana Moss at (406) 243-6604 or montana.moss@umontana.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the IRB through the University of Montana Research Office at (406) 243-6670.

Statement of Consent:
I have read the above description of this research study. I have been informed of the risks and benefits involved, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. Furthermore, I have been assured that any future questions I may have will also be answered by a member of the research team. By taking this survey online, I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Thank you so much!

II. Now, please tell us a little bit about yourself.

1. Age: _____

2. Gender (circle one): 1 Male 2 Female 3 Other (Please specify: _____)

3. What year in school are you? (select one)
   1 Freshman _____   2 Sophomore _____   3 Junior _____   4 Senior _____

   5 Other (please explain): _____

4. What is your major? (If you do not have one, write "undeclared") _____

5. Have you ever worked for money during some part of the year?   1 Yes _____ 2 No _____

   If no, continue on to 5c.

   a. If yes, how many years total have you worked for money during some part of the year?

   _____

   b. If yes, again, how many of those total years did you work 20 or more hours per week during most of the year?

   _____

   c. If no, did you participate in a volunteer position?   3 Yes _____ 4 No _____

   If no, continue on to Part III.

   d. If yes, how many years total have you worked as a volunteer during some part of the year?

   _____

   e. If yes, again, how many of those total years did you work as a volunteer 20 or more hours per week during most of the year?

   _____

Please continue on to the next page.

III. Now, you are going to read the first of two scenarios that describes a situation in which a manager reprimands a subordinate over a work-related issue. Then, you will be asked to select responses rating your perceptions about the manager's communication behaviors.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

"Jeff, I need to see you in my office immediately," Scott announces loudly as he strides past Jeff's desk. Everyone in the office looks up and at Jeff. He climbs out of his chair and follows Scott toward his office. As he passes Tim's desk, Jeff shrugs, "I guess I'm not getting Scott's Seahawks tickets this weekend." Everyone watches the door to Scott's office close behind Jeff.

Scott pores over a paper as Jeff takes a seat before his desk. "Who in hell told you to issue a press release about the Simons building project?" Scott asks loudly. "Since when did you start doing stuff without my approval?" Jeff clears his throat and responds, "You've let me put out press releases before without approval—I just figured—you sent out that email congratulating our department—" Scott quickly corrects Jeff, "Oh, and that authorized the premature public notice?" Jeff responds, "But, Scott, you announced it already—" Scott argues, "What if something went wrong? What if the deal didn't go down? We'd look like fools! That was really stupid!" Jeff doesn't know what to say, "I'm so sorry. I didn't think I—" Scott continues, "This is going in your record. Don't go around me again, you hear? I'll can you so fast…" He waves his hand as he turns away from Jeff. "Now get back to work."

Jeff hurries to the men's room and dashes into a stall. He rushes past Gary, who is washing his hands. Gary announces, "Hey, Jeff—did you hear Scott got chewed out big time by corporate for pushing the Simons deal? He failed to consider one little item—they filed Chapter 13 bankruptcy papers a week ago…" Gary laughs as he strolls out, leaving Jeff alone in his stall.

Now that you have read the scenario, please read the following instructions carefully:

On the next page, you will find a matrix in which are listed comments on the manner in which Scott interacted with Jeff in this scenario. Please read each comment and select the response beside it that most closely matches your perceptions of Scott's communication behaviors. We simply want to know about your perceptions regarding the communication behaviors the manager enacted toward the subordinate that you read about in the scenario. For each item, please circle the scale response you feel is most appropriate.

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6.	Scott should have handled discussing the issue with Jeff more discreetly.	5	4	3	2	1
7.	In this situation, Jeff should have accepted blame for his unauthorized actions.	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Scott should have been straightforward with Jeff about the messy situation.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Jeff should have refrained from making excuses and not argued with Scott.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Jeff made Scott look inconsistent by going around him with the press release.	5	4	3	2	1
11.	Scott should have acknowledged Jeff's initiative in putting out the press release even if it was done prematurely.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Due to his embarrassment, Scott was entitled to hide his mistake from Jeff.	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Scott spoke to Jeff in an inappropriately condescending manner.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Under the circumstances, Scott should have warned Jeff to hold off on the press release or not do it at all.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Scott was justified in using strongly judgmental language toward Jeff.	5	4	3	2	1

16. Do you think Scott should have done anything differently in his interaction with Jeff?

Yes _____   No _____ (If no, please move on to the next page.)

If yes, what? (Please provide a brief explanation)

_____

_____.

Now, please move on to the next page on which you will find the second scenario.

IV. Now, you are going to read the second of two scenarios that describes a situation in which a manager explains a job-related decision to a subordinate. Then, you will be asked to select responses rating your perceptions about the manager's communication behaviors.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

The once-a-month department meeting is getting under way. Sandra leans over to Dee beside her and whispers, "Did you hear that Joy's brother just proposed to Angela?" Dee shakes her head. She whispers back, "I heard Joy is going to announce the new marketing rep for north county." Sandra grins at her, "Shall I say congratulations now?"

Joy, the manager, welcomes everyone and goes over new issues and policies quickly. She looks like she is nervous and in a hurry, checking the clock on the wall from time to time. As she wraps the meeting up, Joy suddenly announces, "Oh, and as of next Monday, Angela will be our new marketing representative for the north county area. Let's all congratulate her, shall we?" Joy begins clapping and everyone slowly joins her, as Angela beams. Some glance at Dee, who isn't clapping. Dee raises a hand but Joy ignores her. Instead, she stands, gathers her papers, and hurries out. Some employees like Sandra stay frozen in their seats, digesting the news. Dee gets up and follows after Joy.

Dee finds Joy in her office. She says, "I was the only one who applied for that job, Joy—" Joy responds, "I do not have to justify my decisions to you, Dee." Dee responds, "I work really hard around here and I deserve that promotion—" Joy responds, "Well, I disagree with you on that. You spend a lot of time chit-chatting on the phone." Dee responds, "Those are our customers. I'm developing relationships—" Joy responds, "It sure sounds like personal stuff to me." Dee responds, "Well, I wish you had asked me what I was talking to them about. And since when do you listen to my phone conversations?" Joy responds, "I just want to be sure people are doing their jobs." Dee responds, "I am doing my job. Everyone expected me to get that promotion. What do I tell them?" Joy responds, "Tell them I chose someone with proper qualifications." Dee responds, "Angela? She's just been here four months—"

Now that you have read the scenario, please read the following instructions carefully:

On the next page, you will find a matrix in which are listed comments on the manner in which Joy interacted with Dee in this scenario. Please read each comment and select the response beside it that most closely matches your perceptions of Joy's communication behaviors. We simply want to know about your perceptions regarding the communication behaviors the manager enacted toward the subordinate that you read about in the scenario. For each item, please circle the scale response you feel is most appropriate.

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17.	Joy handled announcing the new marketing position quite appropriately.	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Joy failed to properly question Dee's phone use before blaming her for wasting company time.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Dee was not justified in expecting Joy to tell her beforehand about her decision.	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Under the circumstances, Joy should have given Dee the chance to argue her case.	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Joy knew Dee anticipated getting the job and she should have acted in a more predictable manner.	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Dee should have worked more closely with Joy while developing connections.	5	4	3	2	1
23.	Joy should not have given Dee's new job to someone obviously less qualified.	5	4	3	2	1
24.	Under the circumstances, Joy's concerns about Dee's phone use justified her eavesdropping.	5	4	3	2	1
25.	As manager, Joy did not need to explain to Dee her decision not to promote her.	5	4	3	2	1
26.	Joy inappropriately accused Dee of unprofessional behavior while discussing her phone conversations.	5	4	3	2	1

27. Do you think Joy should have done anything differently in her interaction with Dee?

Yes _____ No _____ (If no, please move on to the next page.)

If yes, what? (Please provide a brief explanation)

_____

_____.

Now, please move on to Part V. Once you have completed that section, you will be done!

V. Now, please share your thoughts and experiences on the topic of human dignity.

I would now like to ask you a few questions about your perceptions on the topic of human dignity. For the purpose of answering these questions, consider the following definition of dignity: Human dignity, or self-esteem, is reflected in how we treat one another. We promote our and others' dignity by helping, recognizing, accepting, supporting, and empowering each other to be ourselves, and by treating each other fairly, respectfully, and considerately.

Now, I would like for you to rate the extent to which classes within your major, or generally …

	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
28. discuss concepts related to dignity as defined above.	4	3	2	1
29. emphasize the importance of dignity as defined above.	4	3	2	1

Now, to what extent is *your* being treated with dignity, as defined above, emphasized in your current and recent relationships with …

	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
30. family?	4	3	2	1
31. friends?	4	3	2	1
32. professors?	4	3	2	1
33. work or volunteer supervisors (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1
34. coworkers (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1

Please continue on to the next page.

Now, to what extent is treating *others* with dignity, as defined above, emphasized in your own current and recent relationships with …

	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
35. family?	4	3	2	1
36. friends?	4	3	2	1
37. professors?	4	3	2	1
38. work or volunteer supervisors (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1
39. coworkers (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1

Now, to what extent do you believe being treated with dignity, as defined above, is important (*regardless of actual experiences*) in your current and recent relationships with …

	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
40. family?	4	3	2	1
41. friends?	4	3	2	1
42 professors?	4	3	2	1
43 work or volunteer supervisors (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1
44. coworkers (if applicable)?	4	3	2	1

That's all! You did great! Your input is sincerely appreciated! Please move to the next page.

To Receive Extra Credit for participating in this survey—please fill in your name and section number below, detach this page from the survey packet, and return it to your COMX 111A instructor.

If you would like to receive extra credit in your COMX 111A class, please provide your full name and course section number. This information WILL NOT be connected to the survey you just completed. The survey and extra credit information are automatically separated to protect your anonymity.

Your name is: _____

Your COMX 111A section number is _____

Thank You Again for Your Participation!

Ref: MM

Appendix B

COMMUNICATION _____: Communicating Dignity at Work
Course Location   Course Day(s) and Time   CRN#
Semester, Year

Instructor Name:
Office: _____
Office Hours: _____
Office Phone: _____
Email: _____

Course Description

Dignity is a human characteristic that guides motivations and behaviors and can lead to a sense of personal fulfillment and worthwhile contributions to community life. That said, dignity is a fragile thing. It can be diminished, damaged, or destroyed. Just as we sense our dignity through discursive interactions with others, our dignity can also be put in question through discursive interactions. If others belittle or humiliate us, or otherwise cause us to question our worth, then our psycho-social, physiological, and emotional well-being can be disrupted, leading to lowered intellectual or work quality, or diminished health and enjoyment of life.

These consequences should be of concern to all organizations, considering that dignity is not a compelling reason for treating workers with respect. Organizations have a duty to safeguard worker dignity for the simple reason that harm to worker dignity translates into reduction in the quality and quantity of worker performance. This can have a negative impact on organizational productivity and profitability. To counteract this, organizations need to provide an environment in which worker dignity is affirmed and supported, ensuring workers' willingness and ability to achieve organizational expectations. Managers must discursively interact with workers in ways that promote and protect worker dignity for their benefit as well as that of the organization.

This course is a discussion forum in which communication issues and solutions with respect to worker dignity are examined. We will look at scholarly perspectives on the topic of dignity, how dignity may be expressed through work, and how dignity may be violated in the workplace. We will discuss discursive behaviors by managers that diminish worker dignity, and how this affects productivity and profitability as well as workers' sense of identity and health. Finally, we will explore ways in which worker dignity may be affirmed and supported in organizational life.

Required Materials
Weekly readings listed on the Moodle course supplement

Course Requirements

Attendance/Punctuality/Participation
The course will be discussion intensive. It is therefore important that you come to class prepared to discuss the assigned readings for the day. As much of the work in this class is reading, your attendance each class period to discuss and debate the readings is essential to the success of the

course. You will receive a grade for your participation in daily class discussion. Absences that are documented to my satisfaction are the only ones for which I may consider other alternatives to some daily participation points.

Special Assistance
If some extenuating circumstances beyond your control prevent you from meeting my attendance and performance expectations, I expect you to contact me immediately. It is important that you contact me sooner rather than later. No or late contact signals a lack of interest and commitment, and this could reflect poorly upon your assignment and/or course grades.

Notice to Students with Documented Disabilities
I encourage students with documented disabilities to discuss with me, after class or during office hours, appropriate accommodations that might be helpful to make your classroom experience comfortable and effective.

Due Dates
Discussion leadership must be performed on its scheduled day as there may not be another opportunity to accomplish this required course component. Other arrangements may be made with a documented excuse acceptable to me.

Essay assignments must be turned in by 5:00 on Friday of the week in which they are due. A late essay assignment will be penalized one full grade for each day it is late unless arrangements are made with me beforehand. Essays must be typed and proofread, and contain appropriate APA or MLA citations and a bibliography. Disorganized and poorly spelled essays, or ones in which no source materials are used or cited, communicate a lack of interest and commitment to the course. Such assignments will be returned ungraded, and left up to the student to do an appropriate rewrite for grading within a time frame I consider acceptable. The rewritten assignment may receive a lesser grade. I will only allow for a rewrite of the first essay with no grade reduction.

Outside readings must be made available to the course community as indicated under this course component description. The grade on late submissions will be docked 25% per day.

Original Work
Each assignment turned in must be your own original work and should be done completely by you. You are expected to follow university policies and, as always, you are responsible for knowing what those policies are.

Back-up Copies
You are responsible for keeping back-up copies of all work that you do for the course. I do not consider "my computer crashed and I lost my essay" an acceptable excuse.

Academic Honesty
You are expected to practice academic honesty. Academic misconduct is subject to an academic penalty that I am allowed to impose and/or disciplinary sanction by the university. You need to be familiar with the Student Conduct Code, which is available for review at:
http://www.umt.edu/SA/VPSA/index.cfm/page/1321

Outside Research
Outside research, beyond the assigned readings, is required for this course.

Civility and Professionalism
I hope to develop a collective, civil, and scholarly community in this course. Certain actions can help promote this goal, such as coming to each class prepared to make thoughtful, appropriate, and supportive contributions to the discussion. This also means attending to others' discussion contributions in thoughtful, appropriate and supportive ways.

Other actions that promote my goal include submitting timely and professional work and being ethical. This includes being honest and giving appropriate credit to others' ideas and efforts.

Other actions include avoiding electronic, visual, or aural distractions, arriving to class on time and not leaving early without my prior notice, and not engaging in other behaviors that are offensive or distracting to the rest of the community.

Requirements for the Course/Grading

Assignment:	Points available
Participation	100
Essay papers (5 at 20 points each)	100
Discussion leadership (1 scheduled opportunity)	100
Outside readings (5 at 20 points each)	100
Total points possible	**400**

Letter grades are figured as follows:
A = Outstanding: goes beyond expectations
B = Good: above average
C = Satisfactory: meets minimum requirements
D = Unsatisfactory: does not meet some requirements
F = Failing: does not meet any requirements

Grade	Percent
A	92-100%
A-	90-91%
B+	88-89%
B	82-87%
B-	80-81%
C+	78-79%
C	72-77%
C-	70-71%
D+	68-69%
D	60-67%
F	Below 60%

Course Components

Participation (25%)
This course focuses on group discussion in which ideas are generated and analyzed by all members of the course community. You will share the responsibility of facilitating and guiding the conversation. I will lecture briefly during each class session on the required readings, but most of the time will be spent in group discussion. Your participation is therefore essential to the success of the course.

Each week I will keep notes about each person's participation, and use those notes to make my final assessment of individual contribution. Points will be earned through thoughtful and appropriate comments that further an ongoing conversation about the topic as well as thoughtful and appropriate nonverbal and verbal responsiveness to others' comments.

Do the required readings prior to the class session for which they are due, take notes, and come ready to ask questions, raise issues, offer ideas, and otherwise contribute to the discussion.

Essay papers (25%)
In this course, I will not administer tests. However, I will require thoughtful reflection on the required reading materials. I want to learn to what extent you are thinking about the concepts and understanding them. Through the semester, you will complete an essay assignment over all readings assigned during each of five weeks of your choice. You will sign up for the weeks in which you want to do these essays. The essays are to be 5-7 pages in length, and should reflect and demonstrate comprehension of the reading materials for that particular week.

Your grade on each essay will be based upon how well you interpret the associated readings and complete *at least* one of the following:
1) analyze the arguments, comparing and contrasting them across readings, showing patterns or relationships, or demonstrating integrity in terms of credibility or relevance;
2) evaluate the arguments in terms of consistency, reliability, and generalizability;
3) synthesize the arguments into objectives operable in real-life situations.

Discussion Leadership (25%)
You will volunteer and be scheduled for a day in which you will lead class discussion on that day's required readings. As discussion leader, you will prepare beforehand several multi-part questions for the class to reflect upon and discuss, based on required readings. You should be prepared to draw on concepts and arguments within the readings, ways to extend what the readings say about the week's topic, or ways in which the readings pertain to real-life situations.

Depending upon class size, discussion leadership on any day may be shared by two people or other activities or forums may be arranged to complement and extend topical discussion. These may include small group activities with hypothetical scenarios or panel debates, depending upon the discussion materials.

As discussion leader, you will need to upload your discussion questions onto a shared Moodle forum for classmates to view at least three days prior to your scheduled class session.

Outside Readings (25%)
This course component involves locating reading materials outside the required readings. These complementary readings should focus on ways in which concepts learned under any given weekly topic may be used in real-life workplace situations or provide additional ideas that can be used toward workable solutions to problems presented in the required readings.

This component requires accomplishing the required readings and then finding other outside sources that expand those required readings in some developmental or transformative way or offer tangible solutions to issues presented.

You are required to locate five such readings in connection to weekly topics over five semester weeks of your choice. You will need to upload the reading onto a shared Moodle forum at least three days prior to the end of the week. With the reading, you are to provide a paragraph or two explaining why you feel the reading is useful or appropriate to the week in which it is presented.

Course Schedule

Week #1: (August _____ or January _____): The Dignity of Work

Lucas, K. (2011). The working class promise: A communicative account of mobility-based ambivalences. *Communication Monographs, 78*(3): 347-369.

Week #2: (September _____ or February _____): Decent Work and Human Dignity

Horton, R. (2004). Rediscovering human dignity. *Lancet, 364*(9439): 1081-1085.

Ayers, D., Miller-Dyce, C., & Carlone, D. (2008). Security, dignity, caring relationships, and meaningful work: Needs motivating participation in a job-training program. *Community College Review, 35*(4): 257-276.

Abadi, S. R. (2011). Decent work from the perspective of the right to development and human development. *U.S. China Law Review, 8*: 657-668.

Week #3: (September _____ or February _____): Dignity as a Social Phenomenon

Ramey, S. (2012). Fighting for a society that respects each person's dignity. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, 24*(1): 54-60.

Jacobson, N. (2009). A taxonomy of dignity: A grounded theory study. *BMC International Health and Human Rights, 9*(3): 1-9.

Week #4: (September _____ or February _____): A Complementary Relationship

Hodson, R. & Roscigno, V. (2004). Organizational success and worker dignity: complementary or contradictory? *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(3): 672-708.

Jaussi, K., Randel, A., & Dionne, S. (2007). I am, I think I can, and I do: The role of personal identity, self-efficacy, and cross-application of experiences in creativity at work. *Creative Research Journal, 19*(2-3): 247-258.

Week #5: (September ____ or February ____): Managing Managers

Sveningsson, S. & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations, 56*(10): 1163-1193.

Rothschild, J. (2004). Managers' conduct and workers' dignity: Making the sociological link. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, 33*(5): 5-7.

duGay, P., Salaman, G., & Rees, B. (1996). The conduct of management and the management of conduct: Contemporary managerial discourse and the constitution of the 'competent' manager. *Journal of Management Studies, 33*(3): 263-282.

Week #6: (September ____ or March ____): Employee Abusive Organizations

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & McDermott, V. (2008). The constitution of employee-abusive organizations: A communication flows theory. *Communication Theory, 18*(2): 304-333.

Salin D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56*(10): 1213-1232.

Week #7: (October ____ or March ____): Chaos and Power

Hodson, R., Roscigno, V., & Lopez, S. (2006). Chaos and the abuse of power. *Work and Occupations, 33*(4): 382-416.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & McDermott, V. (2011). Making sense of supervisory bullying: Perceived powerlessness, empowered possibilities. *Southern Communication Journal, 76*(4): 342-368.

Week #8: (October ____ or March ____): Organizational Factors that Lead to Bullying

Agervold, M. (2009). The significance of organizational factors for the incidence of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 50*: 267-276.

Roscigno, V., Lopez, S., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and organizational context. *Social Forces 87*(3): 1561-1589.

Liefooghe, A. & MacDavey, K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4): 375-392.

Week #9: (October ____ or March ____): Leadership Styles that Lead to Bullying

Richmond, V., Wagner, J., & McCroskey, J. (1983). The impact of perceptions of leadership style, use of power, and conflict management style on organizational outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 31*(1): 27-36.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L., & Malle, B. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4): 741-763.

Week #10: (October ____ or April ____): Self-Protection When There is no Protection

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2008). Intensive remedial identity work: Responses to workplace bullying trauma and stigmatization. *Organization, 15*(1): 97-119.

Martin, W., Lopez, Y., & LaVan, H. (2009). What legal protections do victims of bullies in the workplace have? *J. Workplace Rights, 14*(2): 143-156.

Week #11: (November _____ or April _____): Health Consequences of Workplace Bullying

Venkatapuram, S. (2013). Health, vital goals, and central human capabilities. *Bioethics, 27*(5): 271-279.

Hallberg, L. & Strandmark K., M. (2006). Health consequences of workplace bullying: Experiences from the perspective of employees in the public service sector. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 1*(2): 109-119.

Escartin, J., Rodriguez-Carballiera, A., Zapf, D., Porrua, C., & Martin-Pena, J. (2012). Perceived severity of various bullying behaviors at work and the relevance of exposure to bullying. *Work & Stress, 23*(3): 191-205.

Week #12: (November _____ or April _____): Responses to Bullying

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2006). Take this job and…: Quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. *Communication Monographs, 73*(4): 406-433.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & Tracy, S. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(1): 3-47.

Week #13: (November _____ or April _____): Bad to Good Management Practices

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(1): 75-91.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Riforgiate, S., & Fletcher, C. (2011). Work as a source of positive emotional   experiences and the discourses informing positive assessment. *Western Journal of Communication, 75*(1): 2-27.

Week #14: (November _____ or April _____): Voice and Effective Influence

White, C., Vanc, A., & Stafford, G. (2010). Internal communication, information satisfaction, and sense of community: The effect of personal influence. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 22*(1): 65-84.

Hsiung, H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process. *J. Bus Ethics, 107*(3): 349-361.

Week #15: (December _____ or May _____): Trust and Relationship Building

Campbell, K., White, C., & Johnson, D. (2003). Leader-member relations as a function of rapport management. *The Journal of Business Communication, 40*(3): 170-194.

Thomas, G., Zolin, R., & Hartman, J. (2009). The central role of communication in developing trust and its effect on employee involvement. *Journal of Business Communication, 46*(3): 287-310.

Week #16: (December _____ or May _____) Finals week: Final activity to be determined

The above policies, readings, assignments, and schedules are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances or by mutual agreement between me and the course community.