Dignity at Work

By

Tabatha Thibault

A Dissertation Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology

August 2, 2022, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved: Dr. E. Kevin Kelloway
Supervisor

Approved: Dr. Mark Fleming
Committee member

Approved: Dr. Lori Francis
Committee member

Approved: Dr. Jane Mullen
Committee member

Approved: Dr. Kate Dupré
External examiner

Date: August 2, 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Dignity at Work

by Tabatha Thibault

Abstract: Workplace dignity has been an emerging topic in psychology in the last decade and is theoretically tied to employee well-being (Khademi et al., 2012; Utriainen & Kyngäs, 2011). However, dignity at work has been difficult to assess due to the lack of a clear definition and the fact that no measure of workplace dignity is available (Lucas et al., 2013). The purpose of this study was to develop and validate a measure of workplace dignity, demonstrate that it is a unique construct, and examine its relationships to pre-established organizational constructs. Based on the current definitions and theorized aspects of dignity at work, a more extensive definition of workplace dignity was offered: Dignity at work involves both self-respect and respect from others, a feeling of worth and value, and a sense of autonomy and control over one's own behaviour. Study 1 produced a 12-item, four-factor scale where each factor demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency (control; work and value; respect from others; self-respect). Study 2 found that the factor structure roughly held up in a sample of working students and that it predicted employee engagement above and beyond other workplace constructs. Study 3 found that psychological safety longitudinally predicted three of dignity's dimensions over time (two time lags). Study 4 found that the scale's factor structure held up over time (three time lags) in a retail sample. Each study examined antecedents (e.g., workload, leadership) and outcomes (e.g., stress) of workplace dignity. Implications for theory and practice are discussed.

Keywords: workplace dignity, scale development, psychometrics, mental well-being, leadership, respect

August 2, 2022

Dignity at Work

Dignity is fundamental to society (Marmot, 2022). We spend most of our adult lives at work. It is thus important that we have dignity at work. Workplace dignity has been an emerging topic in psychology in the last decade and is thought to be related to employee well-being (Khademi et al., 2012; Utriainen & Kyngäs, 2011). However, dignity at work has been difficult to assess (Hodson, 1996; Lucas et al., 2013). The main problems with assessing this new construct are the lack of a clear definition and the fact that no measure of workplace dignity is available (Lucas et al., 2013). In his seminal work, Hodson (2001) defined dignity as "the ability to establish a sense of self-worth and self-respect and to appreciate the respect of others" (p. 3).

However, Hodson (2001) and other dignity researchers focused on organizational constructs related to a lack of dignity (e.g., management abuse and overwork) instead of the actual construct of workplace dignity itself. In other words, despite trying to capture dignity, the literature tended to examine either indignity (a lack of dignity) or the antecedents thereof. This focus on, or overlap between, related constructs when defining a new construct is not new. For example, one approach to defining workplace engagement seems to overlap with job involvement and satisfaction (Schaufeli, 2013). In fact, the main engagement scale using this definition, Gallup's Q^{12} survey (more details on the scale can be found in Harter et al., 2002) assesses the antecedents/predictors of engagement more than engagement itself (Schaufeli, 2013). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to offer a definition of the construct of workplace dignity, develop and validate a measure of workplace dignity, and finally, show the usefulness and importance of the construct of workplace dignity in organizational psychology literature. This contribution will allow for a greater understanding of the concept of workplace dignity and allow researchers to assess outcomes of this emerging construct.

In this four-part study, I demonstrated that workplace dignity is distinct from other established organizational constructs but is related to and predicts important organizational outcomes. Workplace dignity has its place in organizational psychology and management research. I examined dignity's antecedents and outcomes both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. The examination of dignity's antecedents can inform research and practice on how to increase employee dignity. Examining workplace dignity's outcomes can provide further evidence to its importance.Defining Dignity

Various dignity researchers have stated that workplace dignity (and overall, non-context-specific dignity; Jacobs, 2017; Kane & de Vries, 2017) is difficult to define (Hodson, 1996; Lucas et al., 2013). Some went as far as to label dignity an 'elusive' construct (Hamilton et al., 2019). That said, some have tried their hand at defining dignity and dignity at work.

Focusing on global or human dignity, some definitions or models have been posited. For instance, a two-dimensional conceptualization of dignity can include absolute (or inherent) dignity (the type that cannot be altered and is a human right) and social dignity (the type that is changeable and can be gained or lost based on someone's actions or other social factors such as their social position; Sabatino et al., 2016). Nordenfelt (2005) theorized four 'notions' of dignity, which included: dignity of merit (relating to a person's malleable social status), dignity of moral stature (tied to a person's behaviours), dignity of identity (dignity that is attached to a person's self-image but can be altered), and dignity of *Menschenwurde* (innate and immutable dignity as a human). Although unpublished, a global measure of dignity in adults was created in 2003 by Wiegman (Sturm & Dellert, 2016). Wiegman's scale contained four dimensions: autonomy, self-

respect/self-worthiness, other-respect, and other-worthiness.[1] However, these dimensions were collapsed to create one overall scale score (Sturm & Dellert, 2016).

Moving towards a definition of workplace dignity, Yalden and McCormack (2010) developed a construction of dignity at work that included self-respect, recognition from others, and engagement. Somewhat similarly, Lucas (2015) discussed three components of dignity, which included inherent dignity (a desire for respect in one's interactions), earned dignity (a desire to be recognized for one's contributions to the workplace), and remediated dignity (a desire for others' protection or an injured value to be rectified by others). Lucas went on to posit that workplace dignity is different and distinct from global dignity.

There appears to be one primary aspect of dignity that is continuously discussed: respect (Sayer, 2007). Respect is a major component of dignity - specifically, being respected and respecting oneself (Hodson, 2001; Lawless & Moss, 2007; Noronha et al., 2020; Sayer, 2007). To have dignity at work is to have your inherent worth and value recognized (Lucas, 2011). Noronha et al. discussed a relational view of dignity that involves not only being respected by others but also respecting others in turn. Sayer listed several terms to help explain or understand dignity: respect, integrity, pride, recognition, worth, control, and standing or status.

Dignity can also be earned (or increased) through actions that are worthy of dignity (Hodson, 2001; Lucas et al., 2013). In fact, Lucas (2011) found three central themes from interviews on workplace dignity: 1) all jobs are important and valuable, 2) dignity is based on the

[1] Note: A copy of the unpublished Wiegman (2003) could not be found. Sturn and Dellert (2016) did not provide definitions for these dimensions

quality of the work/job not the status of the job (i.e., based on performance and not the job title), and 3) dignity arises through behaviours and through the way people are treated and treat others. Lucas's qualitative findings showed that any employee can have dignity at work regardless of position or status. Lucas's themes also emphasized an employee's agency in establishing their dignity at work. While it is clear that dignity can be diminished by being mistreated, it also seems dignity can be diminished by the way an employee behaves and treats others.

In Western cultures, dignity is considered as an inherent or fundamental human right (Lawless & Moss, 2007; Lucas et al., 2013). In Eastern cultures, dignity is considered as something that is earned based on one's behaviours (Lucas et al., 2013). Based on the current definitions and theorized aspects of dignity at work, I offer a more extensive definition of workplace dignity. As respect continuously came up in the literature as a central aspect of workplace dignity (Hodson, 2001; Lawless & Moss, 2007; Lucas, 2015; Noronha et al., 2020; Sayer, 2007; Yalden & McCormack, 2010), it must be featured in the definition of the construct. Worth, be it finding the worth or the value in what you do or in the quality of your work, or feeling or becoming worthy, was also a common theme and merits a place in the final definition (Hodson, 2001; Lucas, 2011; Lucas et al., 2013; Sayer, 2007). Finally, control or autonomy in your work behaviours (and behaviour that impacts your work) that provides you with that earned respect and sense of worth should also be part of workplace dignity (Hodson, 2001; Sabatino et al., 2016; Sayer, 2007). Dignity at work involves self-respect and respect from others, a feeling of worth and value and being recognized by others, and a sense of autonomy and control over one's own behaviour.

Workplace dignity, and efforts to maintain or regain dignity, can help us understand employee behaviour and well-being (Kelloway, 2017). Two prominent job stress theories, the

conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and the job-demands resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001) discuss the importance of resources and how a lack of resources coupled with demands can result in stress and strain (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Kelloway (2017) posited that dignity is a core resource and that demands threaten employee dignity. Theory and qualitative evidence have shown that dignity at work is important in and of itself. This dissertation adds quantitative data to this growing body of evidence. Organizations should work to promote workplace dignity and should assess workplace dignity as it is important that they know whether their employees have dignity at work.

Constructs Related to Dignity

Literature on dignity at work began as a response to workplace bullying and harassment (Sayer, 2007). Recently, dignity diminishing practices have been the focus of workplace dignity research (e.g., Khademi et al., 2012; Lucas et al., 2013). For instance, Sayer (2007) discussed shame, stigma, humiliation, lack of recognition, lack of trust, and being mistreated or taken for granted as workplace indignities. Dignity research has also discussed the negative impact of the 'human capital' view of employees (Islam, 2013). This refers to the notion of treating employees simply as part of the production line, or cogs in a machine (Lucas et al., 2013). Organizations often view employees as human resources, or something to meet the organization's needs, instead of as human beings (Islam, 2013; Lucas et al., 2013; Sayer, 2007). When employees feel that they are not viewed as human beings, their dignity is threatened (Islam, 2013).

The primary dignity diminishing practices (i.e., dignity or indignity antecedents) studied are those empirically derived by Hodson (2001), specifically, mismanagement and abuse, overwork, incursions on autonomy, and contradictions of employee involvement. These practices are said to deflate morale and create conflict. Recently, Lucas et al. (2013) used these categories

to classify the indignities experienced by employees at a specific manufacturing factory. Examples of mismanagement and abuse included subhuman treatment, constantly being controlled, and use of punishment. Examples of overwork included long hours, overtime, and being worked like machines. These examples highlight the negative impact of the 'human capital' view of employees. Examples of incursions on autonomy included a strong sense of distrust (e.g., body scans and security, even to go to the bathroom), being forbidden from expressing frustrations or emotions, or even the ability to talk to coworkers while on the job. Finally, the primary example of contradictions of employee involvement was being forced to attend company-sponsored events.

Studies have discussed and examined other dignity diminishing practices in other organizational settings (e.g., Crowly, 2012). In a sample of nurses, four types of violations of nurses' dignity were found: irreverence (i.e., abuse and violence, humiliation, and being ignored), coercion and violation of autonomy (i.e., imposition and rigidity and violation of personal privacy), ignoring professional and scientific ability, and denying the value of the nurse/care (i.e., effort/benefit imbalance, and care in the shadow of treatment; Khademi et al., 2012). Similarly, Crowly (2012) discussed how coercive control can reduce aspects of dignity in manual work.

While many studies focused on the workplace indignity, others have discussed dignity enhancing behaviours in the face of these indignities. Specifically, Hodson (2001) discussed four strategies that employees use to defend their dignity at work. These strategies included resistance to attacks on their dignity, citizenship behaviours, the creation of independent meaning systems, and the development of social or group relations at work. Hodson (2001) stated that these acts of resistance fostered dignity in the workplace and were a way of taking back one's dignity. For

example, while home-care providers engage in ‘dirty work’ like bathing their client, care providers can take pride and find meaning in this work as they are helping someone (Stacey, 2005). Cruz and Abrantes (2014) highlighted the importance of social relations at work for employee dignity. Similarly, Hodson (1996) discussed solidarity, peer training, and social friendships to indirectly measure dignity in various workplace organizations.

Hodson (1996) listed positive and negative work behaviours employees use to protect and maximize their dignity (i.e., industrial sabotage, withdrawal of cooperation, and defending work practices to allow for pride in one’s work). However, Lucas et al. (2017) examined Hodson’s ethnographic data and noted mixed evidence for the link between workplace dignity and counterproductive work behaviours (CWB). Specifically, they found either a positive, negative, or null relationship between CWB and their dimensions of workplace dignity. That said, these dimensions included autonomy (what many would call an antecedent of dignity), job satisfaction (a likely outcome of dignity), and voice (defined as expressing one’s views in order to improve, challenge and change organizational policies in a constructive way, often considered an aspect of organizational citizenship behaviour; OCB; Podsakoff et al., 2011; which has been theorized to be a dignity enhancing behaviour) among the dignity dimensions that may in fact represent dignity (e.g., respectful social relations, learning and development).

Despite lacking a clear definition of workplace dignity, sources of dignity at work have been explored in various types of work (e.g., Stacey, 2005). Based on qualitative interviews and direct observation, Stacey (2005) found three sources of dignity in home-care work: 1) practical autonomy on the job, especially relative to previous work in the service sector (e.g., creating and managing one’s environment within certain constraints, and some freedom on the job), 2) skills building (i.e., the belief that one is gaining valuable skills), and 3) pride and honour in dirty work

(i.e., taking pride in the service provided to others because the job involves improving the lives of clients). However, these may be more dimensions of dignity than actual sources of dignity. Crowley (2012) stated that dignity can be gained through client interactions in the service industry. Similarly, Cruz and Abrantes (2014) said that providing something (a service or product) for others that they cannot easily provide for themselves can be a source of dignity in service work.

Other, broader sources or aspects of dignity have also been discussed in the literature (e.g., Crowley, 2012). For instance, Hodson (2001) discussed how dignity can be achieved through social relationships with coworkers. Crowley listed autonomy, creativity, commitment, effort, abuse, pride in work, stress, and ambiguity as expressive, behavioural, and emotional aspects of workplace dignity. Cruz and Abrantes (2014) also listed autonomy and social relations as sources of dignity but added secure employment to the list of sources of dignity. This would imply that dignity can be gained simply by having job security. Task-related aspects of one's job can also be sources of dignity, such as job knowledge, skills, and the amount of effort an employee must expend, as well as job satisfaction and pride in one's work (Hodson, 1996). Khademi et al. (2012) linked autonomy and control to dignity by stating that dignity exists when a person is capable of making his/her own decisions and being in control of him or herself. In other words, control may be as aspect of dignity or that job autonomy may (also) influence dignity. Affirmation and recognition have also been discussed in the dignity literature (Byars-Winston, 2012; Islam, 2013; Lucas, 2011).

Although many researchers have focused on the possible theoretical antecedents of workplace dignity, some have started to examine outcomes of dignity at work. Specifically, Sturm and Dellert (2016) found that dignity was positively related to well-being (although via a

one-item measure of well-being), work satisfaction, and self-esteem in a sample of nurses. This could imply that dignity could be an important new avenue to examine when discussing workplace and employee outcomes.

In summary, much of the literature on dignity focused on its antecedents (e.g., mistreatment, overwork; Hodson, 2001; Khademi et al., 2012; Lucas et al., 2013). Positive leadership behaviours and friendships at work should increase workplace dignity while abuse, shame, and lack of recognition should reduce workplace dignity (Cruz & Abrantes, 2014; Hodson, 2001; Sayer, 2007). An employee's own behaviours also impact their dignity, such as taking pride in one's work (Hodson, 1996).

Study 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to develop a new scale measuring dignity at work, to assess the structure and psychometric properties of the scale, and to establish the construct validity of the scale by examining its nomological net. Earlier, I defined workplace dignity as self-respect and respect from others, a feeling of worth and value and being recognized by others, and a sense of autonomy and control over one's own behaviour. Respect, both being respected and respecting oneself, features prominently in the dignity literature (Sayer, 2007; Yalden & McCormack, 2010). Finding worth, meaning, or value in one's job or tasks (Hodson, 2001; Lucas, 2011; Lucas et al., 2013) and having control over one's own work and work behaviours (Hodson, 2001; Sabatino et al., 2016; Sayer, 2007) were also common themes.

H1: I hypothesized that the Dignity at Work scale will contain 4 dimensions: self-respect, respect from others, control, and work and value. These separate dimensions or factors will all be positively correlated with one another.

Very little research on workplace dignity has been purely quantitative (Rubin, 2004). The seminal research on dignity at work was conducted by Hodson (2001). Hodson's (2001) definition of dignity at work and other components of the concept of dignity were based on extensive ethnographic data. Ethnographies are the systematic study of people and cultures where the ethnographer spends a certain period of time (six months to a year or more) deeply immersed in the particular setting (the workplace, in this case). Hodson's (2001) work is described as quantitative analyses and coding of qualitative data, but is not without its limits (Rubin, 2004). While ethnographies and other qualitative approaches provide rich descriptions, the examination of causal effects and statistical analyses are severely limited. Workplace dignity literature has remained mostly qualitative in nature. The development of a quantitative Dignity at Work scale would prompt additional and novel research.

The construct validity of the new scale was studied by examining the relationships between the new Dignity at Work scale and organizational constructs that correspond with previously examined sources of dignity, dignity diminishing practices, and dignity enhancing behaviours. Sources of dignity (i.e., antecedents that increase dignity) examined in the current study include autonomy and psychological safety. Dignity diminishing practices (i.e., antecedents that reduce dignity or increase indignity) examined in the current study are supervisory and coworker workplace incivility (i.e., demonstrating a lack of respect for someone) and workload. Dignity enhancing behaviours are behaviours an employee engages in to increase their own dignity at work (i.e., organizational citizenship behaviours and counterproductive work behaviours).

Psychological safety refers to the perception that employees are safe to make mistakes, ask for help, and take risks without fear of judgment or punishment (Edmondson, 1999).

Mismanagement and abuse, including subhuman treatment and the use of punishment, are discussed as dignity diminishing practices (Hodson, 2001; Lucas et al., 2013). These dignity diminishing practices are the opposite of a psychological safe workplace. Job autonomy refers to a perceived sense of control over one's work environment (Breaugh, 1989, p. 1034). The literature discussed control as an aspect of dignity (Hodson, 2001; Sabatino et al., 2016; Sayer, 2007). Job autonomy as its own construct (and measure) was included to determine if the proposed 'control' dimension of dignity at work is distinct from workplace autonomy.

H2: Dignity at work will be positively related to and predicted by autonomy and psychological safety.

Workplace dignity has been theoretically tied to mistreatment such as bullying and harassment (Sayer, 2007). Incivility is defined as rude or discourteous behaviours with somewhat ambiguous intent (e.g., ignoring or excluding a coworker; Leiter et al., 2011). While incivility is a lower grade form of mistreatment, it will likely still impact employee dignity. Workplace dignity literature discussed how an unmanageable workload, overwork, overtime, 'working like machines,' and overly long hours can all negatively impact employee dignity (Hodson, 2001; Lucas et al., 2013; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019; Winchenbach et al., 2019).

H3: Dignity at work will be negatively related to and predicted by coworker incivility, supervisor incivility, and workload.

Dignity enhancing behaviours examined in the current study include organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB; individual behaviour that is discretionary and that supports the organizational, social, and psychological environment in the workplace) and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB; voluntary behaviour that harm or is intended to harm the organization and/or its members). Equity theory posits that one's inputs and outcomes are evaluated in

relation to the inputs and outcomes of others (Adams, 1965). Inequity, or perceived inequity, occurs when a person is receiving (or perceives to be receiving) fewer outcomes for the same amount of input as others. People may then engage in certain behaviours in order to reduce this perceived inequity. An employee may reduce his/her inputs (i.e., reduce their productivity/performance) due to perceived pay inequity in comparison to a coworker. Equity theory is typically applied in justice literature (e.g., Sweeney, 1990). However, it may help explain the relationship between dignity and counterproductive work behaviours. For example, an employee may perceive that their supervisor respects them less than one of their colleagues. As such, this first employee may begin to engage in a type of CWB like social loafing (e.g., slacking off on a team assignment). Kelloway et al. (2010) argued that CWB may be a form of protest that employees engage in when they are dissatisfied and/or are experiencing injustice. In fact, Hodson listed withdrawal of cooperation as one such negative behaviour an employee may engage in to protect their dignity. Employees may engage in CWBs as a form of retaliation or act of protest to restore their justice or dignity (Kelloway, 2017).

Equity theory can also flip the other way when an employee feels they may have more of something than someone else (depending on how equity sensitive a person may be). If an employee feels they are being respected by their colleagues but may not deserve it as much as others, they could engage in OCBs in order to raise themselves up to merit that level of respect. As OCB and CWB are described as a response to current levels of dignity, they could be seen as outcomes of dignity. However, given that these behaviours would be employed to try to change or "get back" one's dignity according to dignity literature (Hodson, 2001; Lawless & Moss, 2007), OCB and CWB could also serve as antecedents to dignity as engaging in these behaviours should influence subsequent feelings of dignity. If an employee's efforts are recognized and/or

they are respected by others, that employee may engage in OCB, which would then lead to more recognition and more respect from others (Kelloway, 2017).

Conservation of resources (COR) theory posits that strain outcomes are more likely when a person does not have the necessary resources (both personal and organizationally provided) to counteract these strains and meet work demands (Halbesleben et al., 2014). COR theory suggests that employees engage in deviant behaviours (e.g., CWB and workplace aggression) when negative workplace events lead to negative emotions (e.g., anger or frustration; Penney et al., 2011). In other words, negative emotions brought on by a lack of personal or organizational resources lead to deviant behaviours. When COR theory is applied to psychological strain, it is said that strain is a result of resource insufficiency. Penney et al. (2011) noted that behaviours such as CWB (or 'behavioural strains') may arise from a deliberate resource investment strategy to address a perceived stressor or to obtain necessary resources. Engaging in CWB could be a way to gain back lost resources. Francis et al. (2015) found that workload moderated one's response to email incivility. High workload exacerbated the effect of received incivility on the incivility in people's response emails. In other words, employees may be more likely to engage in deviance when they lack the necessary resources to cope with negative experiences at work. The expected direction of the relationships between dignity and OCB and CWB was clear, but an argument could be made for dignity being both an antecedent and an outcome of OCB and CWB. As such, Study 1 includes analyses with dignity as both an antecedent and outcome of these behaviours.

H4: Dignity at work will be positively related to OCB.

H5: Dignity at work will be negatively related to CWB.

Based on both theory (e.g., Crowley, 2012) and empirical findings (e.g., Sturm & Dellert, 2016), mental well-being should be an outcome of workplace dignity. For instance, Utriainen and Kyngäs (2011) discuss dignity and respect as a component of well-being for nurses. Somewhat similarly, Thomas and Lucas (2019) found that their measure of indignity positively predicted burnout.

H6: Dignity at work will be positively related to and predict mental well-being.

Love of job is comprised of three dimensions based on Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love (1986, 1987): affective commitment to the organization, passion for the work, and intimacy (supportive relationships) with coworkers (Inness et al., 2022; Kelloway et al., 2010). Similar to Sternberg's notion of consummate love, it is suggested that the greater the extent to which each of these components is experienced, the greater the worker's love of their job. Like workplace dignity, love of job is not well-known and is an under-studied construct. Love of job dimensions are beneficial to employee well-being (Kelloway et al., 2010). While it is expected that dignity influences employee well-being on its own, determining other indirect avenues to improve well-being is also important.

The literature has discussed dignity's link to commitment, both directly and indirectly (e.g., Kelloway, 2017). Crowley (2012) noted that commitment was one of several 'aspects of' workplace dignity. Although they do not specifically associate dignity with commitment, Stievano et al. (2019) discussed how commitment is associated with caring for patients at the end of their lives in their paper on nurses' professional dignity. In their work on dignity in tourism, Winchenbach et al. (2019) conferred that meaningful work influences turnover rates and poor working conditions can lead to dissatisfaction and resignation (where both meaningful work and poor working conditions are noted to be strongly tied to workplace dignity). More topically,

Tiwari and Sharma (2019) posited that dignity at work would be associated with employee retention. Kelloway (2017) posited that dignity should be positively associated with organizational loyalty and affective commitment and negatively associated with turnover. Finally, Thomas and Lucas (2019) found that their measure of indignity positively predicted turnover intention.

H7a: Dignity at work will be positively related to and predict affective commitment to the organization.

Experiencing dignity may make a job more enjoyable, paving the way for employees to experience passion. Several workplace dignity researchers discuss the importance of pride (or pride and honour; Stacey, 2005) in work (e.g., Crowley, 2012; Hodson, 1996). For example, home care workers may feel like their work is helping people and that they're improving their clients' lives thus leading them to take pride in providing their services (Stacey, 2005). Although pride and passion are not synonymous, they are related to one another (Swanson & Kent, 2017), and employees may experience similar emotions tied to these ideas. Having dignity in one's work, especially placing value in work, may lead an employee to experience more passion in what they do.

H7b: Dignity at work will be positively related to and predict passion for the work.

The link between workplace dignity and relationships with colleagues has been discussed at length in the literature (e.g., Hodson, 2001). On the negative side of things, dignity-violating factors can include suppression of friendships at work (Winchenbach et al., 2019). A lack of dignity can arise from the denial of coworker relationships (e.g., not being allowed to talk to your colleagues; Lucas et al., 2013). On the positive side of things, dignity can be gained through having relationships at work (Cruz & Abrantes, 2014; Hodson, 2001; Winchenbach et al., 2019).

Utriainen and Kyngäs (2011) found that nurse-nurse interaction (i.e., cohesion, giving/receiving support or assistance, being with other nurses, and working in pairs) was a main dimension of dignity and respect in aging nurses. Hodson (1996) discussed the importance of solidarity, peer training and social friendships for dignity at work. Similarly, Winchenbach et al. (2019) noted that collaboration, collegiality, and solidarity are tied to dignity.

H7c: Dignity at work will be positively related to and predict intimacy with coworkers.

Method

To reiterate, the purpose of Study 1 was to develop a measure of workplace dignity. This included assessing the measure's structure and psychometric properties and establishing construct validity. To establish construct validity, the relationships between the new dignity at work scale and the theoretical antecedents and outcomes of workplace dignity were examined.

Upon an initial review of literature pertaining to dignity at work, a preliminary set of 43 items was created. These included items with positive (e.g., "I feel like I have autonomy at work") and negative valence (e.g., "I have no power at work"). Items were reviewed and modified after discussions around possible initial definitions of workplace dignity. The scale then included items relating to self-respect, respect from others, worth and value, recognition/affirmation, and autonomy and control. After a more thorough review of the literature, and a finalized definition of the construct, scale items were further reviewed, modified, and removed to conform with the new definition. This led to a 24-item scale that reflected various aspects of dignity at work, specifically self-respect (e.g., "I stand up for myself"), respect from others (e.g., "People in authority listen to my opinions"), work and value (e.g., "My work has value"), and control (e.g., "I have enough influence on my job"). The 24 Dignity at Work items and all other measures used are presented in Appendix A.

Participants

Four hundred and twenty participants (68.1% female) were recruited through Qualtrics, an online survey system using the Qualtrics panel service. Participants were recruited by, and compensated by, Qualtrics. It was required that each participant be 18 years of age or older, fluent in English, and currently employed. The age of the participants ranged between 18 and 82, with a mean of 40.68 years (*SD* = 11.85 years). Organizational tenure ranged between 0.08 years (1 month) and 41 years, with a mean of 9.13 years (*SD* = 8.34 years).

Measures

Autonomy was assessed using a 9-item scale developed by Breaugh (1989) with 3 items per subscale (work method autonomy, work scheduling autonomy, and work criteria autonomy). Example items include: "I am free to choose the method(s) to use in carrying out my work" and "I have control over the scheduling of my work". Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 7 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .94 for work method autonomy, .85 for work scheduling autonomy, and .88 for work criteria autonomy.

Workplace incivility was assessed using a scale developed by Cortina et al. (2001), containing 14 items; 7 items for supervisor incivility and 7 items for coworker incivility. Example items include: "Put you down or was condescending to you" and "Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you". Values ranged from 0 for *never* through to 6 for *daily*. The current study yielded a Cronbach's alphas of .97 and .96 for each of the subscales, respectively.

Workload was assessed using 4 items (e.g., "I have too much work to do") developed by Kelloway and Barling (1994). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 7 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .85.

Participants' love of job was assessed using a 10-item scale developed by Inness et al. (2022). This measure contains three subscales: affective commitment to the organization (e.g., "I love the organization for which I work"), passion for the work (e.g., "I adore what I do at work"), and intimacy with coworkers (e.g., "I feel very close to the people at work). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 7 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .88, .95, and .92 for each of the subscales, respectively.

Psychological safety was assessed using six items (e.g., "When someone in our organization makes a mistake, it is often held against them"; Edmondson, 1999). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 7 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .74.

Participants' organizational citizenship behaviour was assessed using a 14-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). This measure contains two subscales: organizational citizenship behaviour directed at individuals (OCB-I) and directed towards the organization (OCB-O). Example items include "I help others who have been absent" for OCB-I, and "I give advance notice when I am unable to come to work" for OCB-O. Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .85 and .70 for each of the subscales, respectively.

Participants' counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) was assessed using a 19-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). This measure contains two subscales: counterproductive work behaviour directed at individuals (CWB-I) and directed towards the organization (CWB-O). Example items include "Made fun of someone at work" for CWB-I, and "Taken property from work without permission" for CWB-O. Values ranged from 1 for *strongly*

disagree through to 5 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .96 and .98 for each of the subscales, respectively.

Mental well-being was assessed using the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ; Banks et al., 1980). Participants were asked how often in the last three months they experienced each of the 7 situations (e.g., "felt that you couldn't overcome your difficulties"). Values ranged from 1 for *not at all* through to 7 for *all of the time*. The current study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Procedure

Once recruited, participants were directed to a consent form and were prompted to respond with "Yes, I agree and wish to participate" if they wanted to proceed with the survey. If they did not want to proceed with the survey, participants could either close the survey or respond with "No, I do not wish to participate". If consent was obtained, participants began the study.

The survey began with a short demographics section including age, sex, organizational tenure, and position (management or employee). Next, participants answered the 24 items that were developed for the new Dignity at Work scale followed by other measures of organizational constructs. Once participants had completed the study, they submitted it online. After completion, a feedback form that elaborated on the full purpose of the study was provided.

Results

Scale Construction and Factor Structure

An initial unrotated Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was conducted. Based on the Kaiser method with eigenvalues greater than one, a 4-factor model was extracted that explained 64.63% of the total variance in the scale. To identify the best items for each of the Dignity at Work dimensions and reduce the number of items, a series of factor analyses using an orthogonal

varimax rotation were conducted. Cross-loading or construct irrelevant loading items (using a .3 threshold) were deleted (two items at a time[2]) resulting in a final set of 12 items.

I then conducted a final set of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998 - 2017) contrasting a one-factor model, three-factor model (based on the Kaiser-Guttman, eigenvalue greater than 1 rule), and a four-factor model based on the conceptual definitions of the scale. The 3-factor ($\chi^2(N = 420, 33) = 222.34$, $p < .05$; CFI = .92; RMSEA = .12, $p < .05$) model did not quite reach acceptable model fit. The 4-factor model provided good ($\chi^2(N = 420, 24) = 35.53$, $p = .06$; CFI = .995; RMSEA = .03, ns), and better ($\chi^2_{difference}(9) = 186.81$, $p < .001$), fit to the data. The 4-factor model also fit the data much better ($\chi^2_{difference}(30) = 761.10$, $p < .001$) than did the 1-factor model ($\chi^2(N = 420, 54) = 796.63$, $p < .05$; CFI = .69; RMSEA = .18, $p < .05$). Therefore, I retained the 4-factor model. Standardized parameter estimates for the four-factor model are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Study 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis (Promax Rotation) of the Dignity at Work scale

	Factor			
Items	1	2	3	4
21. I have a say in how my work gets done.	**.73**	.05	-.08	.04
22. I can make my own decisions.	**.82**	-.07	.06	-.06
20. I have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making.	**.59**	.11	.07	.00

[2] Note: The two most ill-fitting items were removed for each iteration. This was done in case removing the worst-fitting items resulted in other ill-fitting items having improved fit once the worst-fitting ones were removed.

18. My work has value.	-.09	.02	.01	**.90**
15. My job is meaningful.	.10	.13	-.00	**.59**
17. My work affects other people.	.07	-.04	.09	**.71**
7. I am treated like a person.	-.00	**.71**	.11	.06
9. My supervisor(s) respects me.	.10	**.66**	-.00	-.07
8. My coworkers respect me.	.02	**.91**	-.06	.06
3. I am knowledgeable about my job.	-.10	.11	**.73**	.05
1. I think that I do a good job.	.05	-.01	**.86**	.01
6. I take pride in doing a good job.	.05	-.08	**.82**	.02

Note. N = 412; Numbers in boldface indicate dominant factor loadings

Each of the four subscales of the Dignity at Work measure demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency (control α = .85; work and value α = .84; respect from others α = .82; self-respect α = .77).

Construct Validity

Correlations between the new Dignity measure and pre-established construct scales are presented in Table 2. Each of the four dignity subscales are positively correlated with one another. Each dignity subscale is positively correlated with each dimension of autonomy, each dimension of love of job, psychological safety, organizational citizenship behaviour (both OCB-I and OCB-O), and mental well-being. The disattenuated correlations (corrected for measurement error) between dignity's control dimension and the three dimensions of work autonomy are not close to one (.75 for method, .73 for scheduling, and .69 for criteria), indicating that they are not

measuring the same thing. Each dignity subscale is negatively correlated with supervisor and coworker incivility and workload. The disattenuated correlations between respect from others and supervisor and coworker incivility were also not close to one (-.48 and -.51, respectively; confirming that respect from others was distinct from (in)civility). Work and value, respect from others, and self-respect are all negatively correlated with counterproductive work behaviour (both CWB-O and CWB-O), but control is not significantly correlated with either form of CWB.

Table 2

Study 1: Descriptives and Correlations Between the New Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

				Dignity at Work		
	Mean	SD	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Control	3.86	0.91				
Work and value	4.25	0.74	.45***			
Respect from others	4.17	0.76	.55***	.53***		
Self-respect	4.54	0.56	.37***	.53***	.41***	
Work method autonomy	5.52	1.35	.67***	.40***	.47***	.37***
Work scheduling autonomy	5.10	1.42	.62***	.35***	.41***	.22***
Work criteria autonomy	4.71	1.51	.60***	.34***	.38***	.21***
Supervisor incivility	1.92	1.41	-.25***	-.26***	-.43***	-.30***
Coworker incivility	2.19	1.43	-.22***	-.31***	-.45***	-.26***
Workload	3.11	1.31	-.15***	-.15***	-.27***	-.20***
Love of job – Commitment	4.60	1.64	.50***	.47**	.49***	.21***
Love of job – Passion	4.79	1.68	.47***	.58***	.43***	.24***
Love of job – Intimacy	5.12	1.47	.39***	.43***	.54***	.22***
Psychological safety	4.58	1.12	.53***	.46***	.60***	.23***

OCB-I	3.98	0.66	.30***	.33***	.39***	.39***
OCB-O	3.96	0.63	.11*	.24***	.22***	.37***
CWB-I	0.54	1.16	-.02	-.16**	-.13**	-.31***
CWB-O	0.53	1.09	-.06	-.21***	-.13**	-.35***
Mental well-being	5.18	1.16	.38***	.39***	.45***	.36***

Note. $N = 417$; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Criterion-Related Validity

Multiple regressions were conducted to determine if some of the theoretical antecedents to dignity could predict the dignity dimensions. Relative importance analysis was also conducted using the RWA web Shiny App (https://www.scotttonidandel.com/rwa-web) to examine the relative importance (raw relative weights, ε) of the correlated antecedents on dignity and the correlated dignity dimensions on each outcome (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Raw relative weights can be interpreted as measures of relative effect size (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Relative importance analysis is a useful supplement to multiple regression as it more accurately allows for variance partitioning when the predictors are correlated (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Presenting relative weights is now recommended in tandem with traditional regression analyses, especially when the research question is in the form “Does A or B better predict the outcome” (for more details, see Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Results of these analyses are presented in Table 3.

Control was positively predicted by each dimension of autonomy, psychological safety, and CWB-I. Work and value was positively predicted by psychological safety, OCB-I, and CWB-I, and was negatively predicted by coworker incivility and CWB-O. Respect from others was positively predicted by work method autonomy, psychological safety, and OCB-I and

negatively predicted by both sources of incivility (i.e., supervisor and coworker incivility). Finally, self-respect was positively predicted by work method autonomy and both forms of OCB, and negatively predicted by CWB-O.

Table 3

Study 1: Potential dignity antecedents

	Final Standardized Betas			
Predictor	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Work method autonomy	.30***	.10	.14*	.22***
	(.156)	(.042)	(.056)	(.050)
Work scheduling autonomy	.20***	.05	.06	.02
	(.129)	(.033)	(.043)	(.014)
Work criteria autonomy	.15**	.10	.01	.02
	(.111)	(.034)	(.032)	(.014)
Supervisor incivility	-.09	.12	-.17*	-.07
	(.015)	(.011)	(.055)	(.016)
Coworker incivility	.06	-.15*	-.19**	.08
	(.009)	(.024)	(.064)	(.009)
Workload	.05	.06	-.02	-.05
	(.005)	(.004)	(.019)	(.010)
Psychological safety	.22***	.28***	.30***	-.04
	(.095)	(.088)	(.133)	(.009)
OCB-I	.04	.11*	.16***	.24***
	(.022)	(.039)	(.055)	(.076)
OCB-O	.02	.07	.03	.15**
	(.005)	(.018)	(.012)	(.052)
CWB-I	.21*	.26*	-.03	.10
	(.005)	(.009)	(.007)	(.026)
CWB-O	-.17	-.37**	.19	-.31**
	(.004)	(.019)	(.008)	(.041)
Total R^2	.55***	.30***	.49***	.32***

Note. N = 418; * < .05, ** < .01, *** <. 001, numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

Predictive Validity: Multiple Regressions

Multiple regressions were conducted to determine if the new dignity measure had predictive validity. Relative importance analysis was also conducted in RStudio to examine the

relative importance (raw relative weights, ε) of the correlated dignity dimensions on each outcome (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Results of these analyses are presented in Table 4. Together, the dignity dimensions explained between 26% and 41% of the variance in expected outcomes and between 11% and 22% of the variance in organizational variables that could be either outcomes of dignity or antecedents of dignity (i.e., OCB and CWB; as either outcomes or dignity enhancer or way of taking back dignity).

Dignity on its own. All four dignity dimensions uniquely and positively predicted mental well-being (R^2 = .26, F(4,414) = 36.85, p < .001). All four dignity dimensions uniquely and positively predicted love of job - commitment (R^2 = .36, F(4,414) = 58.90, p < .001). However, the dignity dimensions differed in their predictive ability for love of job – passion (R^2 = .41, F(4,414) = 70.23, p < .001) and love of job – intimacy (R^2 = .33, F(4,414) = 51.83, p < .001). Control and work and value both uniquely and positively predicted passion (β = .25, p < .001, sr^2 = .04 / β = .50, p < .001, sr^2 = .14) and intimacy (β = .11, p < .05, sr^2 = .01 / β = .22, p < .001, sr^2 = .03). Respect from others positively predicted intimacy (β = .40, p < .001, sr^2 = .10) but did not predict passion (β = .09, p = .09, sr^2 = .004). Finally, both passion (β = -.15, p < .01, sr^2 = .02) and intimacy (β = -.10, p < .05, sr^2 = .01) were negatively predicted by self-respect.

Interestingly, only three of the four dignity dimensions predicted engaging in OCB and/or CWB. Work and value did not explain any significant variance in OCB or CWB. Control uniquely predicted CWB-I (β = .15, p < .01, sr^2 = .01) above and beyond the other three dignity dimensions (ΔR^2 = .11, F(4,412) = 12.80, p < .001). Respect from others uniquely predicted OCB-I (β = .22, p < .001, sr^2 = .03) above and beyond the other three dignity dimensions (ΔR^2 = .22, F(4,412) = 28.61, p < .001). Finally, self-respect uniquely predicted OCB-I (β = .24, p < .001, sr^2 = .04), OCB-O (β = .33, p < .001, sr^2 = .08; ΔR^2 = .15, F(4,412) = 17.77, p < .001),

CWB-I (β = -.33, p < .001, sr^2 = .07), and CWB-O (β = -.35, p < .001, sr^2 = .09; ΔR^2 = .14, $F(4,412) = 16.09$, p < .001) above and beyond the other three dignity dimensions.

Dignity above and beyond other organizational variables. Hierarchical regressions were conducted on these same theoretical dignity outcomes with the other organizational variables entered at Step 1 and Dignity at Work dimensions entered at Step 2 (see Table 5). Dignity predicted each outcome above and beyond Step 1 variables. Work and value positively predicted all three love of job components (C sr^2 = .02; P sr^2 = .09; I sr^2 = .01). Respect from others positively predicted LOJ commitment (sr^2 = .01), LOJ intimacy (sr^2 = .03), CWB-I (sr^2 = .01), CWB-O (sr^2 = .03), and OCB-I (sr^2 = .10). Self-respect positively predicted mental well-being (sr^2 = .01), OCB-I (sr^2 = .06), and OCB-O (sr^2 = .05), and negatively predicted LOJ passion (sr^2 = .01), CWB-I (sr^2 = .03), and CWB-O (sr^2 = .04). However, control did not significantly predict any of the outcomes above and beyond Step 1.

Table 4

Study 1: Dignity dimensions predicting outcomes

	Standardized Betas and Raw Relative Weights							
Predictor	Mental well-being	LoJ Commit.	LoJ Passion	LoJ Intimacy	CWB-I	CWB-O	OCB-I	OCB-O
Control	.14**	.29***	.25***	.11*	.15**	.11	.06	-.09
	(.059)	(.130)	(.108)	(.063)	(.007)	(.004)	(.031)	(.004)
Work and Value	.12*	.28***	.50***	.22***	-.02	-.07	.06	.04
	(.057)	(.108)	(.208)	(.088)	(.012)	(.022)	(.038)	(.022)
Respect from others	.24***	.24***	.09	.40***	-.08	-.01	.22***	.11
	(.092)	(.111)	(.069)	(.170)	(.010)	(.007)	(.069)	(.022)
Self-respect	.15**	-.14**	-.15**	-.10*	-.33***	-.35***	.24***	.33***
	(.054)	(.014)	(.020)	(.014)	(.081)	(.102)	(.079)	(.099)
Total R^2	.26***	.36***	.41***	.33***	.11***	.14***	.22***	.15***

Note. N = 418; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001, numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

LoJ = Love of job; Commit. = Commitment

Table 5

Study 1: Dignity dimensions predicting outcomes above and beyond other workplace variables

	Standardized Betas							
Predictor	Mental well-being	LoJ Commit.	LoJ Passion	LoJ Intimacy	CWB-I	CWB-O	OCB-I	OCB-O
Work method autonomy	.05 (.023)	.06 (.040)	.09 (.039)	-.02 (.017)	-.02 (.005)	-.08 (.009)	.05 (.016)	.10 (.010)
Work scheduling autonomy	-.04 (.011)	-.13* (.028)	-.06 (.028)	-.03 (.020)	-.03 (.002)	.06 (.005)	-.08 (.007)	.01 (.006)
Work criteria autonomy	.04 (.013)	.25*** (.072)	.18** (.053)	.06 (.020)	.08 (.005)	.10 (.007)	.09 (.013)	-.29*** (.028)
Supervisor incivility	-.15* (.077)	.03 (.006)	.08 (.005)	.23*** (.013)	.36*** (.171)	.39*** (.175)	.16* (.005)	-.16* (.044)
Coworker incivility	-.19** (.081)	.03 (.009)	-.08 (.013)	-.22*** (.035)	.34*** (.162)	.30*** (.152)	-.08 (.008)	-.11 (.038)
Workload	-.15*** (.058)	.07 (.005)	.06 (.003)	.09* (.006)	.01 (.017)	.06 (.026)	.06 (.002)	-.00 (.007)
Psychological safety	.20*** (.065)	.41*** (.148)	.29*** (.101)	.44*** (.163)	.11* (.009)	.12* (.010)	.26*** (.053)	.12* (.014)
Total R^2	.42***	.45***	.38***	.41***	.40***	.42***	.16***	.19***
Control	.07 (.025)	.08 (.052)	.07 (.043)	-.01 (.028)	.08 (.005)	.01 (.004)	-.05 (.013)	-.02 (.005)

Work and Value	.07	.18***	.41***	.10*	-.03	-.10	-.01	.04
	(.032)	(.066)	(.149)	(.052)	(.010)	(.018)	(.024)	(.017)
Respect from others	-.02	.11*	-.03	.25***	.18**	.24***	.15*	-.04
	(.030)	(.058)	(.034)	(.097)	(.012)	(.016)	(.041)	(.009)
Self-respect	.12*	-.07	-.10*	-.01	-.23***	-.24***	.30***	.29***
	(.034)	(.008)	(.013)	(.009)	(.053)	(.067)	(.078)	(.079)
ΔR^2	.03**	.04***	.10***	.05***	.05***	.07***	.10***	.07***
Total R^2	.45	.49	.48	.46	.45	.49	.26	.26

Note. N = 418; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights; LoJ = Love of job; Commit. = Commitment

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to develop and validate a measure of workplace dignity. The results produced a 12-item scale containing four dimensions (3 items per dimension): control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect. Exploratory factor analysis demonstrated that the data fit the hypothesized 4-factor model. Additionally, the four dimensions comprising the scale demonstrated acceptable Cronbach's alphas supporting the reliability of the dimensions. The four factors were all positively correlated with one another, although not substantially so. These dimensions were also significantly correlated (and in some cases, differentially so) with theoretical antecedents and outcomes of workplace dignity. Based on a series of regressions, the theoretical antecedents were able to predict the dignity dimensions and the dignity dimensions were able to predict the theoretical outcomes (and in some cases, above and beyond established organizational variables). These findings both support and add to the literature on dignity at work.

Limitations

The current study relies on cross-sectional, self-report data. The use of sole-source data raises the possibility of these findings being contaminated by common method variance (CMV; which can inflate relationships artificially or otherwise bias the data in some way; Doty & Glick 1998; Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Malhotra et al., 2017). However, this concern is at least somewhat mitigated. The EFA supported a multifactor solution, while CMV would enhance the likelihood of support for a unidimensional, rather than multidimensional, factor solution (Harman, 1976). Lindell and Whitney (2001) argue that CMV should impact all correlations the same way. The presence of non-significant correlations (e.g., between control and CWB-I and CWB-O) would be evidence of a negligible effect of CMV (Lindell & Whitney, 2001).

Moreover, Siemsen et al. (2010) showed that any influence of CMV is substantially reduced in multivariate linear prediction. Finally, there is new research emerging showing that self-report cross-sectional data only produces small increases in correlations compared to self-report longitudinal data suggesting that CMV may not be as much of an issue in cross-sectional data as previously thought (or that time lags do not control for CMV; Kelloway, 2022).

Implications and Future Research

The current study developed and assessed the reliability and validity of a measure of workplace dignity. However, further study is warranted. First, a confirmatory factor analysis should be done to confirm the 4-factor structure of the scale using a different sample.

A longitudinal design would be especially helpful to determine if OCB and CWB are antecedents (i.e., ways of regaining one's dignity, meaning that dignity could change based on these behaviours) or outcomes of workplace dignity (i.e., behaviours simply as a response to one's level of workplace dignity). It is possible that the relationship between dignity and OCB and CWB is more of a cyclical relationship where collecting data over several time periods would be ideal.

The four dimensions of the Dignity at Work scale are all positively correlated with one another. Further research will need to examine whether workplace dignity is a four-dimensional construct or a higher order construct. It is also important to distinguish the Dignity at Work scale's dimensions from pre-established constructs. The control dimension seems very similar to work autonomy. However, the disattenuated correlations between control and each dimension of work autonomy range between .69 and .75. This would lend some evidence that these are separate constructs. Somewhat similarly, the respect from others dimension may be akin to workplace civility. Again, the disattenuated correlations do lend evidence for construct

distinction. The respect from others dimension is negatively related to both supervisor and coworker incivility but the disattenuated correlations are only -.48 and -.51, respectively.

As much of the previous research on workplace dignity focused on a specific subset of jobs (i.e., those involving "dirty work"; e.g., Hamilton et al., 2019), it would be interesting to compare individuals' responses to the Dignity at Work questionnaire between industries. It would also be of value to determine the scale's response range between these industries. In theory, those in these "dirty jobs" would score low on a measure of dignity while positions high in prestige would score higher. However, if this is not the case, it would be interesting to examine why. Do those in "dirty jobs" truly find ways to take back and regain their dignity? Can this new scale detect changes in one's workplace dignity before and after engaging in these behaviours over a period of time?

As workplace dignity (and even dignity in general; Jacobs, 2017) is difficult to define (Lucas et al., 2013), this scale can aid in creating not only a definition of workplace dignity, but also a consensus on a definition. This new scale can also aid in the assessment of workplace dignity, which is severely lacking in the current literature (Hodson, 1996; Lucas et al., 2013). The creation of a workplace dignity scale will facilitate research on the construct of dignity at work. As can be seen in the current study, workplace dignity is related to important outcomes such as mental well-being, as such, further research on this construct may allow for new paths and ideas to improve on said important outcomes.

Study 2

A second sample was collected to ensure the theoretical and empirical factor structure of the new Dignity at Work scale. Additionally, dignity's relationship with other organizational

constructs were further examined. Some of the variables examined in the current study are the same as the previous study while others are additional measures.

H1: I hypothesized that the Dignity at Work scale will have a 4-factor structure (self-respect, respect from others, control, and work and value). It is further hypothesized that these items will load onto one higher-order factor of dignity at work.

Dignity and Leadership

Leadership has been linked to various employee outcomes such as psychological well-being, stress, and workplace accidents (Kelloway & Barling, 2010). Much of the dignity literature on leadership focuses on how poor leadership can harm employee dignity (e.g., Sayer, 2007). For example, dignity research discussed bullying (Sayer, 2007; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019), harassment (Sayer, 2007; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019), humiliation (Khademi et al., 2012; Sayer, 2007; Winchenbach et al., 2019), abuse and violence (Hodson, 1996; Khademi et al., 2012; Winchenbach et al., 2019), shame (Sayer, 2007), and stigma (Sayer, 2007). While these harmful behaviours and experiences do not necessarily refer to leader behaviour, researchers also discuss what happens to worker dignity when workers (especially in dirty jobs) are treated inhumanly or are being dehumanized (Khademi et al., 2012) and are being mistreated (e.g., Sayer, 2007). Mistreating and dehumanizing employees are specific leader behaviours, abusive leader behaviours to be precise. Abusive supervision can be specifically defined as *sustained* leader (verbal and non-verbal) behaviour directed at employees that is hostile in nature (Tepper, 2000).

There is a lack of research on the relationship between dignity and positive leader behaviour. This study hopes to start rectifying that by examining the relationship between workplace dignity and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership consists of four dimensions: (1) idealized influence (i.e., acting as an admirable role model), (2) inspirational

motivation (i.e., setting high yet attainable goals for individuals and groups and challenging one's employees), (3) intellectual stimulation (i.e., encouraging innovation and critical thinking), and (4) individualized consideration (i.e., caring about individual employees' needs; Hildenbrand et al., 2018; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

H2a: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by transformational leadership.

H2b: Furthermore, dignity will be negatively related to and be predicted by abusive supervision.

Dignity and Other Workplace Variables

Thomas and Lucas (2019) suggest that workplace dignity is likely linked to emotional labour. Emotional labour occurs when employees, typically customer-service employees, work to express or display only socially desirable emotions while hiding negative emotions (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). Emotional labour contains two dimensions: surface acting (i.e., when an employee changes the emotions they outwardly display and likely does not show what they are truly feeling) and deep acting (i.e., when an employee alters their emotions to actually feel the emotions they 'should' be feeling; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). When discussing one of Hodson's categories of dignity-diminishing practices, incursions on autonomy, Lucas et al. (2013) describe how some workplaces do not allow employees to express their emotions and frustrations. Being unable to express emotions at work takes a toll on employees and should lower employee dignity.

H3: Dignity will be negatively related to and be predicted by emotional labour.

As discussed in Study 1, workplace dignity has been theoretically tied to workload (e.g., overwork; Hodson, 2011). In Study 1, I found that all four Dignity at Work dimensions were

negatively correlated with workload. However, in Study 1 I also found that none of the Dignity at Work dimensions were predicted by workload. Study 2 re-examined the relationship between dignity and workload to determine whether Study 1 results were spurious or whether past theory could be supported.

H4: All four dimensions of dignity at work will be negatively related to workload.

Skill use (i.e., when an employee is presented with opportunities to use skills and/or learn new ones) has been at least loosely theoretically tied to workplace dignity (e.g., Hodson, 1996). Dignity-promoting factors in the literature have included meaningful work, interesting work, efficiency, responsibility, and job knowledge and skills (Cruz & Abrantes, 2014; Hodson, 1996; Winchenbach et al., 2019). Skill building and the perception that one has gained skills has been seen as a source of dignity (Stacey, 2005).

H5: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by skill use.

Recognition has been discussed in workplace dignity literature a fair amount (e.g., Islam, 2013). Some have referred to recognition as a theme or aspect of workplace dignity (Stievano et al., 2019; Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Others believe that recognition (or affirmation) is tied to or leads to dignity (Byars-Winston, 2012; Islam, 2013; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019; Winchenbach et al., 2019).

H6: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by recognition.

As discussed in Study 1, dignity has been theoretically tied to stress and well-being (Crowley, 2012; Utriainen & Kyngäs, 2011). In Study 1, I found that all four dimensions of dignity at work were positively correlated with mental well-being. Similarly, all four dimensions of dignity at work individually, positively predicted mental well-being. Respect from others had the strongest predictive ability of the four dignity factors.

H7: All four dignity at work factors will be negatively related to and predict perceived stress.

Several dignity papers have noted that workplace dignity (or constructs that may be tied to dignity) should be theoretically tied to engagement (e.g., Stievano et al., 2019; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019) or even that engagement may be part of dignity at work (Yalden & McCormack, 2010). Winchenbach et al. (2019) suggest that belonging and meaningful work should influence engagement and that poor working conditions lead to disengagement. Furthermore, Thomas and Lucas (2019) found that their workplace dignity scale positively predicted workplace engagement. Engagement is a positive, work-related state of mind and can be defined through its three dimensions: vigor (i.e., being energized while working), dedication (i.e., a personal involvement or pride in work), and absorption (i.e., being fully engrossed in work and undistracted while working; Schaufeli et al., 2006).

H8: Dignity will be positively related to and predict engagement.

Method

Participants

Five hundred and thirty-one participants were recruited through Saint Mary's University SONA system. As an incentive, participants received a 0.5% bonus point on their final mark in one of their psychology classes at Saint Mary's University. It was required that each participant be 18 years of age or older, fluent in English, and currently employed and/or employed over the previous summer.

The survey also included three attention checks. Those that did not meet the inclusion criteria or failed any of the attention checks were not included in the analyses. Furthermore, there were many SONA ID codes that were duplicated in the data indicating that some completed the

survey more than once (in full or in part) and thus their data were removed from any future analyses as most of these included those that originally failed the inclusion criteria, but then changed their answers (so their data quality cannot be determined). This led to a sample of 388 participants.

To ensure that the current study was able to capture accurate workplace perceptions, those participants that were not currently working (but worked over the previous summer) were also removed from the analyses. This led to a final sample of 287 working students (82% female). Participants worked 3 to 50 hours per week with a mean of 19.11 hours/week (*SD* = 9.16). Note that many participants included a range instead of a single number for number of hours worked so the mean of the upper and lower range was used in place of the reported range. The majority of participants (92%) were full-time students. Participant age was not measured in this survey.

Procedure

Once recruited, participants were directed to a consent form and were prompted to respond with "Yes, I agree and wish to participate" if they consented to and wanted to proceed with the survey. If they did not want to proceed with the survey, participants could either close the survey or respond with "No, I do not wish to participate". If consent was obtained, participants began the study.

The survey began with the inclusion criteria, followed by a short demographics section including sex, whether they are currently employed and if so their average amount of hours worked per week and whether they were employed over the previous summer and their average amount of hours worked per week. Next, participants answered various questions relating to personality and organization constructs including the new Dignity at Work scale. Note that this

survey was part of a larger research project and only those measures relevant to the current study are discussed. Once participants had completed the study, they submitted it online. After completion, a feedback form that elaborated on the full purpose of the study was provided.

Measures

The newly developed 12-item measure of Dignity at Work was included. Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*. The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .88 for control, .83 for work and value, .87 for respect from others, and .70 for self-respect.

Participants rated their leaders using two scales: Global Transformational Leadership (GTL; Carless et al., 2000) and abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000). Transformational leadership was assessed using 7 items (e.g., "Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future") with values ranging from 1 for *rarely or never* through to 5 for *very frequently, if not always*. Abusive supervision (e.g., "My supervisor ridicules me") was measured using 15 items with values ranging from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *always*. The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .95 and .95 for each of the scales, respectively.

Work engagement was assessed using the 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Values ranged from 0 for *never* through to 6 for *always*. The subscales consisted of vigor (e.g., "At my work, I feel bursting with energy"), dedication (e.g., "I am enthusiastic about my job"), and absorption (e.g., "I feel happy when I am working intensely"). The current study yielded Cronbach's alphas of .81, .89, and .85, respectively, and a total UWES alpha of .94.

Emotional labour was measured through a 6-item scale that asked participants how often they engage in each behaviour in their average workday (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). Specifically,

3 items assessed surface acting (e.g., “Resist expressing my true feelings”) and 3 items assessed deep acting (e.g., “Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others”). Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *always*. The current study yielded Cronbach’s alphas of .87 and .89 for each of the subscales, respectively.

The well-being measure used in the current study was the 10-item Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988). Participants were asked how often they experience each statement (e.g., “In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?”) in the last month. Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *very often*. The current study yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .86.

Workload, recognition, and skill use were all assessed using scales from Kelloway and Barling (1994). Workload was measured using 4 items (e.g., “I have too much work to do.”). Recognition was measured using 3 items (e.g., “I usually hear if I’ve done a good job.”). Skill use was measured using 4 items (e.g., “My job allows me to learn new things.”). Each construct was measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). The current study yielded Cronbach’s alphas of .83, .83, and .87, respectively.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

All model tests were based on the covariance matrix and used ML estimation as implemented in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998 - 2017). Fit indices for the models tested are presented in Table 6. A one-factor model (i.e., all 12 Dignity at Work items on one factor), a four-factor model (i.e., control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as separate factors), a higher order model (i.e., control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as subfactors that all load on a higher order factor), and a bi-factor model (i.e., control, work and

value, respect from others, and self-respect, plus a fifth factor onto which all items load) were tested. Both the four-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(6) = 609.44$, $p < .001$) and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(4) = 606.02$, $p < .001$) fit better than one-factor model. There was not a significant difference ($\chi^2_{difference}(2) = 3.42$, $p > .05$) between the 4-factor model and the higher order model. Finally, the bi-factor model fit better than the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(12) = 107.22$, $p < .001$). Somewhat supporting H1, the bi-factor model provided the best fit to the data and its fit indices were acceptable. A bi-factor model allows each scale item to load onto an overall dignity factor and their dignity dimension factors (Dimoff & Kelloway, 2019). Specifically, the overall factor in a bi-factor model accounts for the shared variance in each item but other, smaller factors (i.e., the dignity dimensions) still contribute to the common variance within each group of items (i.e., items within each dimension) beyond the overall factor. A bi-factor model could suggest that an overall, total dignity score can be used (Dimoff & Kelloway, 2019; Reise et al., 2010). Cronbach's alpha for the full Dignity at Work scale is .88.

Table 6

Dignity at Work: S2 CFA Model Comparisons

Model	χ^2	*df*	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
1 factor	806.98	54	.60	.51	.22	.11
4 factors	197.54	48	.92	.89	.10	.07
Higher order	200.96	50	.92	.89	.10	.08
Bi-Factor	90.32	36	.97	.95	.07	.04

Note. $N = 287$; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Construct Validity

Correlations between the Dignity at Work measure and pre-established construct scales are presented in Table 7. Each of the four dignity subscales were positively correlated with one another. Overall dignity was related to every variable except for emotional labour – deep acting. Each dignity subscale was positively correlated with transformational leadership (H2a), skill use (H5), recognition (H6), and all three engagement dimensions (H8). Each dignity dimension was negatively correlated with perceived stress (H7) and emotional labour – surface acting (H3). Three of four dignity subscales were linked to abusive supervision (H2b) and workload (H4). None of the dignity dimensions were linked to emotional labour – deep acting (contrary to H3).

Table 7

Study 2: Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Dignity at Work				
			Overall Dignity	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Overall Dignity	3.95	0.63					
Control	3.66	1.03	.82***				
Work and value	3.69	0.95	.79***	.48***			
Respect from others	4.21	0.72	.75***	.45***	.45***		
Self-respect	4.24	0.54	.68***	.45***	.38***	.46***	
Transformational leadership	3.79	1.03	.59***	.45***	.46***	.58***	.29***
Abusive supervision	1.44	0.70	-.42***	-.29***	-.34***	-.56***	-.06
EL- Surface acting	3.10	1.05	-.37***	-.30***	-.30***	-.36***	-.16**
EL- Deep acting	3.01	0.98	.06	.04	.03	.09	.01
Workload	4.47	1.34	-.15***	-.12*	-.10	-.12*	-.12*
Skill use	5.10	1.53	.63***	.45***	.67***	.41***	.31***
Recognition	4.55	1.61	.45***	.34***	.33***	.50***	.20**

Perceived stress	3.07	0.68	-.29***	-.20**	-.28***	-.22***	-.19**
UWES-VI	4.34	1.07	.59***	.42***	.57***	.40***	.41***
UWES-DE	4.08	1.45	.66***	.48***	.71***	.41***	.34***
UWES-AB	3.94	1.24	.52***	.36***	.53***	.33***	.34***

Note. N = 287; EL = emotional labour; UWES = engagement; VI = vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption; * < .05, ** < .01, *** <.001

Criterion-related Validity

Multiple regressions were conducted to determine if some of the theoretical antecedents to dignity could predict overall workplace dignity and its dimensions. Results of these analyses are presented in Table 8. Both overall workplace dignity and the control dimension were positively predicted by transformational leadership (H2a) and skill use (H5) and negatively predicted by emotional labour (surface acting; H3). Work and value was positively predicted by transformational leadership (H2a) and skill use (H5), and was negatively predicted by recognition (contrary to H6). Respect from others was positively predicted by transformational leadership (H2a) and negatively predicted by abusive supervision (H2b) and emotional labour (surface acting; H3). Finally, self-respect was positively predicted by transformational leadership (H2a), abusive supervision (contrary to H2b), and skill use (H5).

Table 8

Study 2: Potential dignity antecedents

	Final Standardized Betas				
Predictor	Overall Dignity	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Transformational leadership	.33*** (.154)	.29*** (.089)	.20** (.081)	.27*** (.125)	.28*** (.053)
Abusive supervision	-.01 (.065)	.05 (.019)	-.01 (.030)	-.27*** (.127)	.24** (.015)
EL- Surface acting	-.12* (.044)	-.12* (.033)	-.07 (.029)	-.11* (.043)	-.04 (.009)
EL- Deep acting	.02 (.002)	.02 (.002)	-.03 (.002)	.08 (.008)	-.02 (.001)
Workload	-.05 (.010)	-.04 (.005)	-.05 (.003)	.03 (.004)	-.08 (.008)
Skill use	.43*** (.187)	.28*** (.104)	.61*** (.313)	.08 (.051)	.25*** (.063)
Recognition	-.02 (.053)	-.01 (.029)	-.13* (.027)	.11 (.074)	-.00 (.014)
Total R^2	.50***	.28***	.49***	.43***	.16***

Note. *N* = 286; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001, numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

EL = emotional labour

Predictive validity

Multiple regressions and relative importance analysis were conducted to determine if the Dignity at Work measure had predictive validity. Results of these analyses are presented in Table

9. Together, the dignity dimensions explained between 9% and 54% of the variance in expected outcomes.

Interestingly, while Dignity at Work significantly predicted each outcome, there was no outcome that was uniquely predicted by all four dignity dimensions. Contrary to H7, only work and value (β = -.21, p < .01, sr^2 = .03) negatively predicted perceived stress (R^2 = .09, F(4,282) = 7.35, p < .001). Partially supporting H8, work and value (β = .41, p < .001, sr^2 = .12) and self-respect (β = .16, p < .01, sr^2 = .02) positively predicted UWES vigor (R^2 = .38, F(4,281) = 43.20, p < .001). Control (β = .16, p < .01, sr^2 = .02) and work and value (β = .61, p < .001, sr^2 = .25) positively predicted UWES dedication (R^2 = .54, F(4,281) = 81.83, p < .001). Only work and value (β = .43, p < .001, sr^2 = .13) positively predicted UWES absorption (R^2 = .31, F(4,281) = 31.70, p < .001).

Table 9

Study 2: Dignity dimensions predicting outcomes

Standardized Betas and Raw Relative Weights				
Predictor	Perceived stress	UWES-VI	UWES-DE	UWES-AB
Control	-.04	.11	.16**	.08
	(.014)	(.067)	(.096)	(.047)
Work and Value	-.20**	.41***	.61***	.43***
	(.047)	(.190)	(.348)	(.183)
Respect from others	-.09	.09	.07	.05
	(.020)	(.055)	(.060)	(.037)
Self-respect	-.05	.16**	.01	.11
	(.013)	(.069)	(.034)	(.044)
Total R^2	.09***	.38***	.54***	.31***

Note. N = 286; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001, numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

Commit. = Commitment; UWES = engagement; VI = vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption

Hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to see if overall workplace dignity would predict these same outcomes above and beyond other organizational variables (see Table 10). Overall Dignity at Work did not predict perceived stress above and beyond the other organizational variables. However, Dignity at Work predicted each dimension of engagement above and beyond the other organizational variables. Interestingly, only surface acting and workload predicted perceived stress and of the Step 1 variables, only skill use predicted engagement.

Table 10

Study 2: Overall Dignity at Work predicting outcomes beyond pre-established organizational variables

Standardized Betas and Raw Relative Weights				
Predictor	Perceived stress	UWES-VI	UWES-DE	UWES-AB
Transformational leadership	.02 (.008)	.02 (.046)	.04 (.070)	-.00 (.044)
Abusive supervision	.04 (.010)	.09 (.028)	.01 (.043)	.10 (.029)
EL- Surface acting	.21** (.057)	-.06 (.014)	-.07 (.024)	-.07 (.011)
EL- Deep acting	-.03 (.002)	.07 (.002)	.02 (.001)	.07 (.001)
Workload	.20*** (.067)	-.05 (.011)	.00 (.003)	.05 (.002)
Skill use	-.14 (.014)	.40*** (.168)	.52*** (.272)	.39*** (.156)

Recognition		-.00	.07	.07	.08
		(.016)	(.032)	(.045)	(.019)
	R^2	.19***	.43***	.61***	.35***
Overall Dignity		-.09	.30***	.26***	.26***
		(.020)	(.161)	(.169)	(.120)
	ΔR^2	.01	.05***	.03***	.03***
	Total R^2	.20	.47	.64	.38***

Note. N = 286; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001, numbers in brackets = raw relative weights
Commit. = Commitment; UWES = engagement; VI = vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption

Discussion

The purpose of Study 2 was to further validate the Dignity at Work scale. Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that the data fit the hypothesized four-factor model (supporting my hypothesis) but that the items also loaded onto a general factor. Additionally, the four dimensions comprising the scale demonstrated acceptable Cronbach's alphas supporting the reliability of the dimensions. As in Study 1, the four dignity dimensions were all positively correlated with one another. These dimensions were also significantly correlated (and in some cases, differentially so) with theoretical antecedents and outcomes of workplace dignity. Based on a series of regressions, the theoretical antecedents were able to predict the dignity dimensions and the dignity dimensions were able to predict the theoretical outcomes. These findings both support and add to the literature on dignity at work.

While further research is needed, there is some evidence that the Dignity at Work measure may be able to use a total dignity score on top of the four dimensions. Based on CFA, the model that best fit the data was a bi-factor model with each of the proposed dimensions plus a fifth overall dimension. Each of the four Dignity at Work factors are correlated with one

another (r = .38 to .82), making a total dignity score convenient. However, as these factors showed differing relationships with other variables, a total dignity score should be used with caution until the suitability of a total dignity score is examined further.

In support of H2a, all four dimensions were positively predicted by transformational leadership indicating that having a good leader promotes employee dignity. While a good leader enhances workplace dignity across the board, a bad leader may only impact certain aspects of dignity. Abusive supervision predicted reduced respect from others, lending partial support for H2b. As this dimension is most strongly tied to interpersonal interactions, this relationship makes sense. Leaders who are abusive would not show respect to their employees. An abusive leader does not seem to impact employees' control or work and value. Being the victim of workplace abuse may not impact dignity in terms of the way employees perceive their job or their work. That said, contrary to what I expected, abusive supervision positively predicted self-respect. Perhaps leader abuse spurs employees to stand up for themselves and not simply 'take it.'

Emotional labour – surface acting negatively predicted control and respect from others but deep acting did not predict any of the dignity dimensions, lending partial support to H3. Altering one's emotions to match what they should feel does not appear to impact workplace dignity. If an employee can successfully feel the positive emotions they are expressing, their dignity is unaffected. However, dignity can be threatened when an employee masks their true feelings at work. Being unable to express emotions (or at least certain emotions) at work can be seen as an incursion on autonomy (Lucas et al., 2013). As emotions are a natural part of being human, being forced to hide said emotions should make a person feel less respected.

Supporting H5, skill use positively predicted control, work and value, and self-respect. Having the opportunity to use skills and gain new ones had already been theoretically tied to

dignity (Hodson, 1996). The literature explains this relationship by saying that skill use should promote a feeling of meaning in one's work (Cruz & Abrantes, 2014; Hodson, 1996; Winchenbach et al., 2019). Skill use and meaningful work tie in perfectly with the work and value dimension of the Dignity at Work scale. Having the ability to use one's skills at work also presents an employee with a feeling of control over their work as well as self-respect. Employees feel they are useful and can take pride in their work when they are able to use their skills.

As in Study 1, workload was negatively correlated with dignity but it was not a predictor of dignity when other variables were added to the regression equation (H4). While workload is linked to dignity, it may not be as salient as, say, a leader's behaviour when predicting employee dignity.

Dignity was positively related to recognition (H6). However, recognition had no impact on employees' sense of control, self-respect, or respect from others. Contrary to expectations, recognition negatively predicted work and value. This would indicate that the worth an employee places on their work can only come from themselves, and not the praise of others. While further research is needed, this negative relationship may be similar to the push and pull of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. When intrinsically motivated, an employee works on a task because they genuinely enjoy it (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When extrinsically motivated, an employee works on a task to receive an award they associate with doing the task (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When someone is rewarded for something they were already intrinsically motivated to do, there is a chance that the extrinsic motivator will decrease the person's intrinsic motivation (Gagné & Deci, 2005). Perhaps recognition (something extrinsic) is taking away the intrinsic worth and value that one places on their work.

In support of H8, work and value positively predicted all three components of engagement, control predicted dedication, and self-respect predicted vigor. Respect from others was unrelated to engagement. Feeling that one's work has value has the strongest impact on engagement and this is consistent with how the literature describes the relationship between dignity and engagement (Winchenbach et al., 2019). That said, there is more at play in this relationship. Feelings of control predicted a personal involvement or pride in the work. Self-respect predicted being energized at work. The dignity-engagement relationship is about more than just finding meaning in one's work.

Only work and value negatively predicted perceived stress in this sample (H7). This is somewhat contradictory of the results of Study 1, where all four Dignity at Work dimensions predicted mental well-being. The different patterns of relationships observed may be due to the different measures used. Future research will need to examine this further using multiple measures of well-being and stress. However, the lack of a stress-dignity relationship may be due to the nature of the student sample. Hierarchical linear regression found that only surface-acting and workload predicted perceived stress. There is ample evidence that transformational leadership positively predicts employee well-being (Arnold & Walsh, 2015) and negatively predicts perceived stress (Liu et al., 2010). Yet transformational leadership did not predict perceived stress in this sample. Participants in this sample worked anywhere from 3 to 50 hours per week. Those working fewer hours are likely less impacted by their leader's behaviour than those who work full-time. Students' stress may be more impacted by factors related to their studies than to their work, especially those working fewer hours. School-work balance may also impact working student stress.

As this study used a sample of working students, participants were potentially more likely to have "dirty jobs" or sometimes perceived as lower-status jobs (e.g., customer service, minimum wage). While information on occupation was not collected, it is possible that this sample was more similar to the samples that are typical in the workplace dignity literature compared to the broader sample collected in Study 1.

Limitations and Future Research

While the survey in this study contained three attention checks to try to maintain data quality (including one immediately following the dignity items), the Dignity at Work scale was one of the last scales in a fairly large survey. By the time participants answered the dignity items, it is possible that they were experiencing survey fatigue. As was the case in Study 1, Study 2 relied on cross-sectional self-report data, limiting causal inferences and findings may have been contaminated by CMV. As in Study 1, this concern is at least somewhat mitigated (Harman, 1976; Lindell & Whitney, 2001).

While this study included data from people currently employed, the sample consisted of university students that were working either full- or part-time. The notion of workplace dignity may be less salient in part-time workers than in full-time workers. As most of the participants were full-time students, they may identify more as students than as workers. Their job may simply be a means to an end rather than a long-term job or career (e.g., a way to pay for school, a job outside of their chosen field). While this may not impact how respondents answered the dignity items, it may have impacted the relationship between dignity and other workplace variables as workplace dignity may not be as important to a working student population as to a typical full-time worker population. Unfortunately, due to the small sample size of part-time students (N = 24) differences in dignity between full- and part-time students could not be

conducted. Somewhat similarly, the number of students who were working full-time (i.e., ≥ 35 hours/week) during the academic year was also too small (N = 32) to meaningfully compare to part-time workers (N = 348). This variable was also not continuous as many participants provided a range for their average hours per week.

As stated in Study 1, studying this new dignity measure with a longitudinal design is advisable. This would allow for the exploration on whether workplace dignity is stable over time (at least without some form of intervention). Theory on workplace dignity says that dignity can be impacted by organizational variables and mistreatment from others (e.g., Hodson, 2011; Sayer, 2007), implying that dignity is a state. While the previous two studies showed that dignity was related to many variables cross-sectionally, they could not determine cause and effect.

Study 2 confirmed the Dignity at Work's 4-factor structure. There is also some preliminary evidence that the scale may be used as an overall measure of dignity. However, dignity did not predict students' perceived stress, contrasting the predictive ability of the Dignity at Work scale predicting mental well-being in a sample of working adults. That said, even in a working student sample, dignity was able to predict the three dimensions of work engagement above and beyond other organizational variables.

Study 3

As the previous two studies examined relationships cross-sectionally, Study 3 examined dignity's relationship to leadership, mental well-being, and psychological safety longitudinally (specifically over two time points).

Both the conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and the job-demands resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001) discuss the importance of resources. Resources such as personal characteristics, justice, and interpersonal relationships act as buffers against stressors or

job demands (Kelloway et al., 2011). According to social exchange theory, leadership (or rather, exchanges between an employee and their leader; and leader support) is one such resource (Arnold, 2017; Colquitt et al., 2013; Kelloway, 2017). Leadership is linked to employee well-being (Arnold et al., 2007; Kelloway & Barling, 2010) and, as shown in Studies 1 and 2, to employee dignity as well.

The RIGHT model of leadership draws from transformational leadership theory and the American Psychological Association's (APA) Psychologically Healthy Workplaces Model (Kelloway et al., 2017). The Psychologically Healthy Workplaces Model states that leaders should engage in the following five behaviours: recognition, involvement, support employee growth and development, emphasize health and safety, and foster teamwork. RIGHT is an acronym for these behaviours (Recognition, Involvement, Growth, Health, and Teamwork; Biricik Gulseren et al., 2021). RIGHT leadership is positively associated with employee mental health (Biricik Gulseren et al., 2021).

Workplace dignity is said to be linked to being recognized and trusted (Islam, 2013; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019; Winchenbach et al., 2019). Dignity is said to increase with praise (Stievano et al., 2019) and being acknowledged for one's worth (Tiwari & Sharma, 2019). This includes remarks from one's supervisor (Tiwari & Sharma, 2019). A leader who recognizes their employees for their efforts should increase employee dignity (Kelloway, 2017).

Hodson's (2001) work on dignity discussed contradictions of employee involvement. Lucas et al. (2013) built on this and provide the example of being forced to attend a company-sponsored event. Employee involvement is important but there are right and wrong ways to go about this. Being involved in decision making, allowing employees to have a voice, and having self-managed work teams are great ways to promote involvement. However, feeling forced into

being involved or pretending to be involved would have the opposite effect than what is intended. A leader who encourages employees to be involved and express their opinions should increase employee dignity.

Unfortunately, dignity research does not exactly discuss its relationship to growth and development. However, a leader who cares enough about their employees to want to help them grow in their careers should increase employee dignity as a lack of humane treatment is linked to a lack of dignity (Khademi et al., 2012).

Winchenbach et al. (2019) posit that violations to physical and mental health harm employee dignity while safe and healthy working conditions would promote dignity. A leader who cares about and promotes employee health and safety should increase employee dignity.

Finally, collaboration has been tied to workplace dignity (Winchenbach et al., 2019). Specifically, collegiality, solidarity and team participation in workplace matters should foster a sense of dignity. A leader who encourages teamwork should increase employee dignity.

As previously discussed, workplace dignity has been theoretically tied to leadership and leader behaviour (e.g., Thomas & Lucas, 2019). In Study 2, I found that all four Dignity at Work dimensions were positively related to and predicted by transformational leadership. Furthermore, abusive supervision negatively predicted respect from others but positively predicted self-respect.

H1: Based on the relationships between dignity and transformational leadership in Study 2, all four Dignity dimensions will be positively related to and be predicted by RIGHT leadership. As this is a longitudinal sample, Time 1 leadership should predict Time 2 dignity above and beyond Time 1 dignity.

Dignity has also been tied to psychological safety (e.g., Winchenbach et al., 2019) and both theoretically and empirically tied to well-being outcomes such as burnout (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). In Study 1, I found that well-being was positively predicted by all dimensions of dignity. Study 1 also found that psychological safety was positively linked to all four dimensions of dignity and positively predicted control, work and value, and respect from others.

H2: All four dimensions of dignity at work will be positively related to and predict mental well-being as found in Study 1. Time 1 dignity should predict Time 2 well-being above and beyond Time 1 well-being.

H3: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by psychological safety. These relationships should be similar to those found in Study 1. Time 1 psychological safety should predict Time 2 dignity above and beyond Time 1 dignity.

Method

Participants

Participants were employees whose leaders were participating in a pilot study to examine the impact of a RIGHT leadership intervention. Two hundred and sixty-six participants (66.50% female; 24.80% male; 0.80% trans; 4.90% prefer not to answer) completed the Time 1 survey and 162 participants (52.50% female; 14.20% male) completed the Time 2 survey. Age ranged between 20 years and 66 years with a mean age of 40.55 years (*SD* = 10.53). Organizational tenure ranged between 1 month and 35.75 years with a mean tenure of 7.29 years (*SD* = 8.42).

Procedure

Data for Study 3 were collected as part of a pilot leadership intervention separate from the current study. However, as there was no control group, this is not a true intervention design. Inferences about the effectiveness of the intervention (i.e., the impact of improved leadership

through this training on subordinate dignity) cannot be made. As such, the data were examined as simply longitudinal despite the pre-post intervention nature of the data.

Participants were recruited by their organization via email and were invited to complete a short online survey at two time points in order to assess the effectiveness of the training intervention their leaders were taking part in. The researchers had access to the data and ID codes while the organization had contact information and ID codes. Participating leaders took part in a half day classroom-style RIGHT leadership training session followed by a one-on-one half-hour coaching session in November 2019. The coaching session included feedback on leader strengths and weaknesses as well as goal setting. Time 1 data were collected approximately three weeks before the training. Time 2 data were collected approximately three months after the training was completed.

Once recruited, participants were directed to a consent form and were prompted to respond with “Yes, I agree and wish to participate” if they wanted to proceed with the survey. If they did not want to proceed with the survey, participants could either close the survey or respond with “No, I do not wish to participate”. If consent was obtained, participants began the study. All survey data were collected using LimeSurvey, an online survey platform.

The survey began with a section to enter their own personal employee ID code as well as a leader ID code in order to link surveys over time. Next, participants answered questions about their organizational perceptions including leadership and the new Dignity at Work scale. The survey concluded with a short demographics section. Once participants had completed the study, they submitted it online. After completion, a feedback form that elaborated on the full purpose of the study was provided.

Measures

The newly developed 12-item measure of Dignity at Work was included. Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*. All measures' Cronbach's alphas for Time 1 and Time 2 are presented in Table 11.

Participants rated their leaders using the RIGHT leadership scale (Kelloway et al., 2017). Participants were asked how often their leader engaged in each of the 20 behaviours. RIGHT leadership is composed of 5 dimensions, specifically recognition (e.g., "Compliments me on my job performance"), involvement (e.g., "Asks for my input when making decisions"), growth and development (e.g., "Supports my growth and development"), health and safety (e.g., "Openly discusses the importance of health and safety"), and teamwork (e.g., "Is concerned about my team members' well-being"). Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 7 for *always (e.g., every day)*.

Psychological safety was assessed using six items (e.g., "When someone in our organization makes a mistake, it is often held against them"; Edmondson, 1999). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 7 for *strongly agree*.

The well-being measure used in the current study was the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ; Banks et al., 1980). Participants were asked how often in the last three months they experienced each of the 7 situations (e.g., "felt that you couldn't overcome your difficulties"). Values ranged from 1 for *not at all* through to 7 for *all of the time*.

Table 11

Study 3 Cronbach alphas

Measure	Time 1	Time 2
Overall Dignity at Work	.84	.86
D- Control	.85	.86
D- Work and value	.84	.87
D- Self-respect	.78	.84

D- Respect from others	.85	.80
RIGHT (total)	.97	.98
RIGHT-R	.96	.97
RIGHT-I	.97	.97
RIGHT-G	.96	.94
RIGHT-H	.97	.97
RIGHT-T	.92	.92
Psychological safety	.73	.69
Mental well-being (GHQ)	.92	.91

Note. R = recognition, I = involvement, G = growth and development, H = health and safety, T = teamwork, D = dignity

Results

CFA

All model tests were based on the covariance matrix and used ML estimation as implemented in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998 - 2017). A 1-factor model (i.e. all 12 Dignity at Work items on one factor), a 4-factor model (i.e. control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as separate factors), a higher order model (i.e. control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as subfactors that all load on a higher order factor), and a bi-factor model (i.e., control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect, plus a fifth factor onto which all items load) were tested using CFA.

At Time 1, the fit indices for dignity suggest that the model with the best fit is the bi-factor model (see Table 12). The 1-factor model provided poor fit compared to both the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(6) = 696.09$, $p < .001$) and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(4) = 690.66$, $p < .001$). There was not a significant difference in model fit between the 4-factor model and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(2) = 5.33$, $p < .10$). Therefore, the 4-factor model is retained. Finally, the bi-factor model fit better than the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(12) = 50.23$, $p < .001$). The bi-factor model's fit indices show that the model fit the data well.

Table 12

Dignity at Work: S3 Time 1 CFA Model Comparisons

Model	χ^2	*Df*	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
1 factor	800.57	54	.51	.22	.23	.14
4 factors	104.58	48	.96	.95	.07	.06
Higher order	109.91	50	.96	.95	.07	.06
Bi-factor	54.35	36	.99	.98	.04	.04

Note. N = 260; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

At Time 2, the fit indices for dignity suggest that the model with the best fit is the bi-factor model (see Table 13). The 1-factor model provided poor fit compared to both the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(6) = 431.97$, $p < .001$) and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(4) = 429.95$, $p < .001$). There was not a significant difference in model fit between the 4-factor model and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(2) = 2.02$, $p > .10$). Therefore, the 4-factor model is retained. Finally, the bi-factor model fit better than the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(12) = 30.72$, $p < .005$). The bi-factor model's fit indices show that the model fit the data well.

Table 13

Dignity at Work: S3 Time 2 CFA Model Comparisons

Model	χ^2	*Df*	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
1 factor	512.34	54	.55	.46	.23	.13
4 factors	80.37	48	.97	.96	.07	.05
Higher order	82.39	50	.97	.96	.06	.05
Bi-factor	49.65	36	.99	.98	.05	.03

Note. N = 159; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Construct Validity

Correlations between the new Dignity measure and pre-established construct scales are presented in Tables 14 and 15. All of the dignity dimensions are positively correlated with one another. All correlations with the dignity dimensions and the other study variables were significant and positive with the exception of self-respect's relationships with the RIGHT dimensions (where the relationships were non-significant in at least one time point).

Table 14

Study 3: Time 1 Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Dignity at Work				
			Overall Dignity	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Overall Dignity	4.23	0.50					
Control	3.63	0.96	.79***				
Work and value	4.28	0.70	.73***	.34***			
Respect from others	4.56	0.62	.70***	.39***	.43***		
Self-respect	4.47	0.55	.54***	.25***	.31***	.20**	
RIGHT (total)	4.92	1.29	.40***	.38***	.31***	.55***	.07
RIGHT-R	4.99	1.45	.50***	.31***	.27***	.47***	.05
RIGHT-I	4.63	1.53	.40***	.48***	.27***	.44***	.14*
RIGHT-G	5.10	1.50	.32***	.29***	.29***	.52***	-.00
RIGHT-H	4.46	1.72	.45***	.24***	.20***	.38***	.05
RIGHT-T	5.41	1.32	.51***	.28***	.34***	.58***	.06
Mental well-being	5.14	1.08	.53***	.38***	.45***	.43***	.37***
Psychological safety	4.91	1.07	.38***	.38***	.44***	.55***	.14*

Note. $N = 260$; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Table 15

Study 3: Time 2 Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Overall Dignity	Dignity at Work			
				Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Overall Dignity	4.27	.52					
Control	3.72	0.99	.74***				
Work and value	4.30	0.67	.70***	.25**			
Respect from others	4.56	0.62	.78***	.39***	.47***		
Self-respect	4.51	0.56	.71***	.27**	.45***	.56***	
RIGHT (total)	5.06	1.30	.42***	.35***	.29***	.60***	.18*
RIGHT-R	5.22	1.38	.44***	.30***	.24**	.54***	.17*
RIGHT-I	4.77	1.61	.40***	.46***	.22**	.42***	.12
RIGHT-G	5.17	1.50	.36***	.25**	.30***	.54***	.13
RIGHT-H	4.71	1.65	.47***	.27**	.20*	.44***	.15
RIGHT-T	5.39	1.37	.56***	.28***	.27**	.65***	.21**
Mental well-being	5.28	1.02	.58***	.37***	.46***	.52***	.46***
Psychological safety	4.99	1.07	.39***	.36***	.34***	.50***	.28***

Note. $N = 159$; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Predictive Validity

As the original purpose of the study was a pilot leadership intervention where employees rated their leader's behaviour, participants were nested within leaders. As such, multilevel modeling (MLM) was implemented. Using a nested model allows the examination of the research question without violating the assumption of independence in linear multiple regression (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

The interclass correlation (ICC) for Time 2 mental well-being was 0.01 for the null model, indicating that 1.0% of the variance in T2 well-being is between-group variance. T1 mental well-being accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 mental well-being (AIC = 560.38; BIC = 574.19) above and beyond the intercept-only model (AIC = 462.66; BIC = 471.87; $\chi^2(2) = 125.16$, $p < .001$; $R^2_{\text{between}} = .07$, $p = .92$; $R^2_{\text{within}} = .57$, $p < .001$). T1 workplace dignity and T1 mental well-being together accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 mental well-being (AIC = 1302.97; BIC = 1338.77) above and beyond the intercept-only model ($\chi^2(10) = 158.58$, $p < .001$). However, none of the between-level effects for any of the T1 variables were significant ($R^2 = .74$, $p = 64$). Additionally, only the within-level T1 mental well-being significantly predicted T2 mental well-being ($R^2 = .57$, $p < .001$). None of the within-level T1 dignity dimensions predicted T2 well-being above and beyond T1 well-being. See Table 16 for the full fixed effect results. Similar results were found when using T1 overall dignity instead of each dignity dimension (dignity on well-being: within-level parameter estimate = -.01, *SE* = 0.06, $p = .92$; between-level parameter estimate = .72, *SE* = 1.32, $p = .58$)

Table 16

Fixed Effect Results of Final Model of T2 Mental Well-being as a Function of T1 Workplace Dignity

Effect	Parameter Estimate	SE
Within-level		
T1 Well-being	.75***	.06
T1 Control	-.06	.06
T1 Work and Value	.03	.08
T1 Self-respect	.04	.08
T1 Respect from Others	-.01	.08
Between-level		
T1 Well-being	.24	.84
T1 Control	.53	1.18
T1 Work and Value	.06	.78
T1 Self-respect	.56	1.16
T1 Respect from Others	-.24	.82

Note. N = 116 employees, 48 leaders; SE = standard error; * < .05, ** < .01, *** <.001

Dignity Antecedents

The interclass correlations (ICC) for Time 2 dignity dimensions were: .253 for control, .003 for work and value, .022 for self-respect, and .043 for respect from others for the null models, indicating that 0.3% to 25.3% of the variance in T2 dignity is between-group variance.

T1 control accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 control (AIC = 540.72; BIC = 554.54) above and beyond the intercept-only model (AIC = 439.37; BIC = 448.56; $\chi^2(2) = 135.21$, $p < .001$). T1 control, T1 RIGHT leadership, and T1 psychological safety together accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 control (AIC = 1177.71; BIC = 1202.49) above and beyond the intercept-only model ($\chi^2(6) = 243.98$, $p < .001$). The within-level T1 control and T1 psychological safety significantly predicted T2 control but T1 RIGHT leadership did not. Additionally, the between-level effects for T1 control predicted T2 control but RIGHT and psychological safety did not. See Table 17 for the full fixed effect results.

T1 work and value accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 work and value (AIC = 361.21; BIC = 375.02) above and beyond the intercept-only model (AIC = 314.81; BIC = 324.00; $\chi^2(2) = 77.60$, $p < .001$). T1 work and value, T1 RIGHT leadership, and T1 psychological safety together accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 work and value (AIC = 994.78; BIC = 1019.56) above and beyond the intercept-only model ($\chi^2(6) = 111.67$, $p < .001$). The within-level T1 work and value and T1 psychological safety significantly predicted T2 work and value but T1 RIGHT leadership did not. However, none of the between-level effects for any of the T1 variables were significant. This was true for work and value, self-respect, and respect from others.

T1 self-respect accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 self-respect (AIC = 359.33; BIC = 373.09) above and beyond the intercept-only model (AIC = 270.93; BIC = 280.12; $\chi^2(2) = 14.51$, $p < .001$). T1 self-respect, T1 RIGHT leadership, and T1 psychological safety together accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 self-respect (AIC = 1302.97; BIC = 1338.77) above and beyond the intercept-only model ($\chi^2(6) = 158.58$, $p < .001$). The

within-level T1 self-respect and T1 psychological safety significantly predicted T2 self-respect but T1 RIGHT leadership did not.

T1 respect from others accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 respect from others (AIC = 304.50; BIC = 318.27) above and beyond the intercept-only model (AIC = 301.01; BIC = 310.20; $\chi^2(2) = 58.01$, $p < .001$). T1 respect from others, T1 RIGHT leadership, and T1 psychological safety together accounted for a significant amount of variance in T2 respect from others (AIC = 916.96; BIC = 941.67) above and beyond the intercept-only model ($\chi^2(6) = 100.92$, $p < .001$). Only the within-level T1 respect from others significantly predicted T2 respect from others. Neither T1 RIGHT leadership nor T1 psychological safety predicted T2 dignity above and beyond T1 respect from others.

Table 17

Fixed Effect Results of Final Model of T2 Dignity Dimensions as a Function of T1 Dignity, RIGHT Leadership, and Psychological Safety

	Control		Work & Value		Self-Respect		Respect from Others	
Effect	Parameter Estimate	SE	Parameter Estimate	SE	Parameter Estimate	SE	Parameter Estimate	SE
Within-level R^2	.50***	.08	.54***	.08	.34**	.10	.52***	.08
T1 dignity	.59***	.08	.60***	.10	.47***	.12	.62***	.08
T1 RIGHT leadership	.02	.05	.07	.08	-.01	.07	.07	.06
T1 psychological safety	.22***	.06	.17*	.08	.27**	.09	.11	.08
Between-level R^2	.99***	.24	.92	4.88	.81	1.41	.13	.39
T1 dignity	.94***	.12	.45	1.29	.30	.61	-.10	2.62
T1 RIGHT leadership	-.17	.19	.31	1.27	-.71	.65	1.81	4.27
T1 psychological safety	.17	.25	-.84	0.99	-.09	.95	-1.48	4.32

Note. N = 115-116 employees, 47 leaders; SE = standard error; * < .05, ** < .01, *** <.001

Change over Time

To confirm whether the pilot intervention changed employees' workplace dignity and employee-rated leader behaviour, I conducted a series of *t*-tests comparing T1 and T2. There was no significant change over time in overall dignity ($t(116) = .60$, $p = .28$), control ($t(116) = .32$, $p = .37$), work and value ($t(116) = .79$, $p = .22$), self-respect ($t(115) = 1.0$, $p = .16$), or respect from others ($t(115) = .98$, $p = .17$). Similarly, overall RIGHT leadership ratings did not significantly change over time, $t(117) = 1.13$, $p = .13$. Finally, neither psychological safety ($t(116) = .84$, $p = .40$) nor mental well-being ($t(116) = .18$, $p = .85$) changed over time either. Please note that as SPSS 28 includes *p*-values for both one-sided and two-sided significance and I expected each variable in question to increase over time, two-sided was reported. That said, neither one- nor two-sided *p*s were significant in any case.

Discussion

Like Study 2, in Study 3, I found support for the Dignity at Work scale's bi-factor model with its four dimensions loading both separately and on an overall factor. The factor structure has now been replicated over diverse samples. In further support of the scale's reliability, Cronbach's alphas for the scale's dimensions ranged between .78 and .85 at Time 1 and .80 and .87 at Time 2.

Time 1 psychological safety positively predicted Time 2 control, work and value, and self-respect but was unrelated to respect from others. This is partially in-line with Study 1's cross-sectional findings. In both S1 and S3, psychological safety predicted control and work and value. However, S1 found that psychological safety predicted self-respect but not respect from others.

While RIGHT leadership was positively correlated with workplace dignity at both time points, T1 RIGHT leadership did not predict T2 dignity above and beyond T1 dignity. In other words, initial leadership ratings were unrelated to changes in dignity. A few factors could explain this lack of relationship over time. First, as psychological safety was also entered into the cross-lagged MLM equation, too much of the explained variance may have been partialled out. In fact, Biricik Gulseren et al. (2021) found that psychological safety mediated the relationship between RIGHT leadership and well-being. This mediational relationship could also explain the lack of a link between dignity and leadership in the current study. As the data for Study 3 were part of a training intervention, it would seem likely that leadership improved over time and that change in leadership may have influenced post-intervention employee dignity. However, this was not the case as neither dignity nor RIGHT leadership changed over time, making longitudinal predictive ability minimal. Cross-lagged regressions (in MLM or otherwise) essentially measure the change in the outcome as the T1 outcome is entered in the first step of the regression, controlling for the initial measurement.

Contrary to H2, none of the T1 dignity dimensions predicted T2 mental well-being above and beyond T1 mental well-being. Similar to the lack of a longitudinal relationship between leadership and dignity, the lack of change in variables from T1 to T2 would explain this null finding. The absence of change over time may be because the pilot intervention did not have its intended effect or perhaps because the T2 data were collected in February to March, 2020, overlapping with the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The stress and uncertainty of the pandemic could have nullified any benefit of the intervention.

Limitations and Future Research

Like the previous two studies, Study 3 relied on self-report data. However, these data were not cross-sectional. The current study examined workplace dignity longitudinally, but only over two time points. While this does allow testing the prediction of variables over time, it does not allow testing possible mediated relationships longitudinally. Further research should use at least three time points.

This sample consisted of employees that all worked for the same organization. While the geographic location, position, and job tasks likely varied, the work environment and organizational culture may have been somewhat similar across participants, limiting variability. Further, in terms of nesting within leaders, the number of employees 'grouped' under each leader was relatively small (ranging between 1 and 12). This could be why only 1.0% of the variance in T2 well-being was explained by between-group variance.

As previously stated, the data in the current study were part of a pilot intervention that had yet to be tested. This study was also not a true experiment as there was no control group that did not receive the intervention. As such, any changes (or lack thereof) may simply be due to time or some other variable(s) instead of the intervention itself. Analyses were conducted as if the data were simply longitudinal without the notion of an intervention. The pre-post intervention nature of the data may also have influenced the results of the current study as the intervention piece was ignored.

Time 2 data were collected between late-February and end of April, 2020. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared a worldwide COVID-19 pandemic on March 11, 2020 and Canadian provinces began shutting down and calling a state of emergency within two weeks of that date. This means that part of the second wave of data were collected at the beginning of the

COVID-19 pandemic. The organization that participated in this intervention began working from home full-time towards the end of March. The work from home environment could have also influenced both leader behaviour and employee responses to the Time 2 survey.

The current study supported the Dignity at Work scale's 4-factor model (specifically bi-factor model). While the current study did not provide much evidence on the longitudinal relationships between dignity and other variables, it did show that dignity is relatively stable over time (earlier dignity predicted later dignity), despite a pilot leadership training program.

Study 4

A fourth sample was collected to further examine the theoretical and empirical factor structure of the new Dignity at Work scale as well as its relationship with other organizational constructs. Some of the variables examined in the current study are the same as the previous studies while others are additional measures. As I found that Dignity at Work was stable over time over two points of measurement in Study 3, I examined these relationships longitudinally using three time points in Study 4. The third time point allowed for further assessment into dignity's stability over time without intervention.

H1: I expected that the Dignity at Work scale would maintain its four-factor structure longitudinally.

To start off, the relationship between dignity at work and leadership were examined in more depth. Specifically:

H2a: As in Study 2, all four Dignity at Work dimensions will be positively related to and be predicted by transformational leadership.

H2b: Dignity will be negatively related to and be predicted by passive leadership.

Little research has discussed the relationship between dignity and workplace safety. However, Winchenbach et al. (2019) do state that hazardous working conditions are considered a dignity-violating factor. Safety-specific transformational leadership involves behaviours that promote shared group values around safety and individualized support to achieve safety goals (Conchie et al., 2012). Little dignity research has focused on safety, especially not safety-specific leadership. That said, safety-specific transformational leadership has been linked to several employee outcomes such as employee trust (Conchie et al., 2012) and lower levels of safety events and injuries (Kelloway et al., 2006a). Having a leader that cares about employee safety should foster a sense of employee dignity.

H2c: Dignity will be positively related to safety-specific transformational leadership.

While there is little dignity literature on the construct of civility (i.e., courteous and respectful behaviour; Leiter et al., 2011), there is plenty of dignity literature that discusses how dignity can be damaged by disrespectful treatment and increased by respectful treatment (e.g., Tiwari & Sharma, 2019). In fact, Thomas and Lucas (2019) suggest that civility training may increase workplace dignity. The findings in Study 1 lend support to this as incivility was negatively linked to the Dignity at Work dimensions (specifically work and value and respect from others).

H3a: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by climate for civility.

H3b: Furthermore, dignity (specifically work and value and respect from others) will be negatively related to and be predicted by customer incivility.

Past research and theory suggest that workload negatively impacts workplace dignity (Hodson, 2001; Lucas et al., 2013; Tiwari & Sharma, 2019; Winchenbach et al., 2019). Both Study 1 and Study 2 found that workplace dignity dimensions were negatively correlated with

workload (except for work and value in Study 2). However, neither Study 1 nor Study 2 found that workload significantly predicted any of the dignity dimensions cross-sectionally. It is unclear whether dignity would be predicted by workload longitudinally.

H4: Dignity will be negatively correlated with workload.

Task significance refers to the "judgments that one's job has a positive impact on other people" (Grant, 2008, p.108). Dignity researchers often talk about workers of 'dirty jobs' finding meaning in their work (Stievano et al., 2019; Winchenbach et al., 2019) because they know they are providing a valuable service (Cruz & Abrantes, 2014; Stacey, 2005) and improving the lives of others (Stacey, 2005). When looking at specifically nurses' dignity, this can include proving good patient care and putting the patient first (Utriainen & Kyngäs, 2011).

H5: Dignity will be positively related to and be predicted by task significance.

Emotional labour was examined in Study 2 and has been discussed in the dignity literature. In Study 2, I found that dignity was significantly correlated with surface acting but not deep acting. Additionally, control and respect from others were negatively predicted by the surface acting component of emotional labour.

H6: Dignity (specifically control and respect from others) will be positively related to and be predicted by the surface acting component of emotional labour.

Stress and mental well-being were examined in both Study 1 (a measure of mental well-being) and Study 2 (a measure of perceived stress) and has been discussed in the dignity literature. In Study 1, I found that mental well-being was significantly related to and predicted by all four dignity dimensions. In Study 2, I found that stress was related to dignity but was only significantly predicted by work and value.

H7: Dignity (especially work and value) will be negatively related to and predict perceived stress.

There is a vast amount of research linking leadership (especially transformational leadership) to employee well-being outcomes (e.g., Arnold et al., 2007; Kuappala et al., 2008). Researchers have examined possible mediators to determine why this relationship exists (e.g., trust in the leader and meaningful work; Arnold et al., 2007; Kelloway et al., 2012). As shown in the previous studies in this dissertation, there is also evidence that leadership is linked to employee workplace dignity. Workplace dignity should act as a mediator between leadership (and potentially other interpersonal treatment) and employee well-being (Kelloway, 2017).

H8: Dignity will mediate the relationship between leadership and employee perceived stress.

Method

Participants

At Time 1, 505 Canadians (49.7%) and Americans (50.3%) working in retail were recruited through Qualtrics, an online survey system using the Qualtrics panel service, during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants were recruited by, and compensated by, Qualtrics. It was required that each participant be 18 years of age or older, fluent in English, currently employed in a retail setting, and working at least 20 hours per week.

The sample had an approximately 50:50 gender and sex ratio with 46.3% reporting being male and 53.7% reported being female, and 46.1% identified as a man, 53.5% identified as a woman, and 0.2% identified as non-binary. The age of the participants ranged between 18 and 77, with a mean of 51.73 years (*SD* = 12.33 years). The mean organizational tenure was 11.03 years (*SD* = 9.91 years). The majority of participants (67.1%) were working more than 35 hours

per week while 31.7% reported working between 20 to 35 hours per week at the time of the survey.

Three hundred and twenty-six participants from the original Time 1 sample completed the survey at Time 2. The majority of participants still reported that they were working more than 35 hours per week (70.2%) while 25.5% reported working between 20 and 35 hours per week. Additionally, 4.3% of participants reported that they were working less than 20 hours per week at the time of the second survey, indicating that they were working less hours than they were in the previous month.

Two hundred and eighteen participants from the original Time 1 sample completed the survey at Time 3. The majority of participants still reported that they were working more than 35 hours per week (69.1%) while 26.3% reported working between 20 and 35 hours per week. Additionally, 4.6% of participants reported that they were working less than 20 hours per week at the time of the second survey. The overlap between Time 2 and Time 3 was 180, indicating that 180 participants completed the survey at all three time points. Of the 180 participants, 48.3% were female (51.7% male). Participants' age ranged between 19 and 77 years old (M = 50.59, SD = 12.13). Additional demographic information for the participants that completed the survey at all 3 time points is presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Study 4: Demographics for longitudinal sample

		% of sample
Ethnicity		
	White/Caucasian	84.4%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	7.8%
	First Nations/Native Canadian	2.2%
	Hispanic/Latino	2.2%
	Black/African Canadian	1.7%
	Other	1.7%
Occupation		
	Management occupations	25.1%
	Business, finance and administration occupations	9.1%
	Natural and applied sciences and related occupations	3.4%
	Health occupations	1.1%
	Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport	1.1%
	Sales and service occupations	54.9%
	Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations	0.6%
	Multiple Occupation Categories	2.9%
	Invalid/Unclear Answer	1.7%
Position		
	Front-line employee	57.3%
	Supervisor or manager	32%
	Other	10.7%
Pay		
	Salary	27.9%
	Hourly	69.3%
	Other	2.8%
Education		
	High school	31.3%
	College Diploma	20.1%
	Bachelor's degree	38.5%
	Master's degree	7.8%
	Doctoral degree	0.6%
	Other	1.7%
Average hours/week (@ T1)		
	>35 hrs/wk	68.5%
	20-35 hrs/wk	31.5%

Note. $N = 180$

Procedure

Once recruited, participants were directed to a consent form and were prompted to respond with "Yes, I agree and wish to participate" if they wanted to proceed with the survey. If they did not want to proceed with the survey, participants could either close the survey or respond with "No, I do not wish to participate". If consent was obtained, participants began the study. The survey began with the inclusion criteria, followed by study measures, and ending with a demographics section. Once participants had completed the study, they submitted it online. After completion, a feedback form that elaborated on the full purpose of the study was provided.

All participants at Time 1 were re-contacted by Qualtrics approximately two weeks later for the Time 2 survey and another two weeks later for the Time 3 survey. The survey was almost identical at each time point. That said, some measures were modified or added between Time 1 and Time 2 (as noted in the measures section). The demographics section was only included at Time 1. Consent and feedback forms were presented in each survey.

Measures

Note that the data for this study were collected as part of a larger research project examining the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the workplace. Only measures relevant to the current study are discussed further. The surveys included various measures including the 12-item measure of Dignity at Work. Cronbach's alphas for each measure at each time point are included in Table 19.

Participants rated their leaders using three scales: Global Transformational Leadership (GTL; Carless et al., 2000), passive leadership (Kelloway et al., 2006b), and SAFER leadership (Wong et al., 2015). Transformational leadership was assessed using 7 items (e.g.,

"Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future"). Passive leadership was assessed using 3 items (e.g., "Avoids making decisions"). Safety-specific transformational leadership (or SAFER leadership) was assessed using 6 items at Time 1 (specifically measuring the Speak and Act components of SAFER) and the full 15-item scale at Time 2 and Time 3 (measuring Speak, Act, Focus, Engage, and Recognition). Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *always*.

Customer incivility was measured using 10-items (Wilson & Holmvall, 2013). Participants were asked how often in the last three weeks they experienced customers acting in each manner (e.g., "Continued to complain despite your efforts to assist them"). Values ranged from 0 for *never* through to 4 for *all the time*.

Climate for civility was measured using 4 items (Walsh et al., 2012). Participants were asked how strongly they agree with each statement (e.g., "Rude behaviour is not accepted by your coworkers"). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*.

Workload was measured using 5-items (Kelloway & Barling, 1994). Participants were asked how strongly they agree with each statement (e.g., "I usually have enough time to complete my work"). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*.

Stress was measured using the 10-item Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988). Participants were asked how often they experience each statement (e.g., "In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?") in the last month. Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *very often.*

A 4-item measure of task significance was included based on Hackman and Oldham (1975) and Grant (2008). Values ranged from 1 for *strongly disagree* through to 5 for *strongly agree*.

Emotional labour was measured through a 6-item scale that asked participants how often in their average workday they engage in each behaviour (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). Specifically, 3 items assessed surface acting (e.g., “Resist expressing my true feelings”) and 3 items assessed deep acting (e.g., “Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others”). Values ranged from 1 for *never* through to 5 for *always*.

Table 19

Study 4 Cronbach alphas

Measure	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3
Overall Dignity	.90	.92	.92
D- Control	.87	.93	.91
D- Work and value	.84	.88	.89
D- Self-respect	.82	.83	.85
D- Respect from others	.87	.87	.88
GTL	.96*	.97	.97
Passive leadership	.87	.88	.89
SAFER-Speak	.93	.96	.96
SAFER-Act	.96	.97	.98
SAFER-Focus	N/A	.96	.96
SAFER-Engage	N/A	.95	.94
SAFER-Recognize	N/A	.98	.98
Customer incivility	.95	.95	.96
Climate for civility	.86	.88	.93
Workload	.89	.89	.89
Stress	.89	.89	.90
Task significant	.95	.94	.96
EL- Surface acting	.87	.87	.92
EL- Deep acting	.91	.91	.93

Note. D = dignity, EL = emotional labour

* = missing item #2 from scale

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

All model tests were based on the covariance matrix and used ML estimation as implemented in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998 - 2017). A 1-factor model (i.e. all 12 Dignity at Work items on one factor), a 4-factor model (i.e. control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as separate factors), a higher order model (i.e. control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect as subfactors that all load on a higher order factor) , and a bi-factor model (i.e., control, work and value, respect from others, and self-respect, plus a fifth factor onto which all items load) were tested using CFA.

At Time 1, the fit indices for dignity suggest that the model with the best fit is the bi-factor model (see Table 20). The 1-factor model provided poor fit compared to both the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(6) = 1082.64$, $p < .001$) and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(4) = 1081.98$, $p < .001$). There was not a significant difference in model fit between the 4-factor model and the higher order model ($\chi^2_{difference}(2) = 0.66$, $p > .05$). This would indicate that adding the additional theoretic and empirical complexity of an additional factor (in the higher order model) did not improve fit; therefore, the simpler 4-factor model is the more parsimonious solution. Finally, the bi-factor model fit better than the 4-factor model ($\chi^2_{difference}(12) = 81.23$, $p < .001$). This would indicate that in addition to the four factors, a total dignity score may be acceptable. The bi-factor model provided good fit to the data.

Table 20

Dignity at Work: S4 Time 1 CFA Model Comparisons

Model	χ^2	*df*	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
1 factor	1289.41	54	.66	.59	.21	.10
4 factors	206.77	48	.96	.94	.08	.05
Higher order	207.43	50	.96	.94	.08	.05
Bi-factor	125.54	36	.98	.96	.07	.04

Note. N = 505; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Measurement Invariance over Time

In order to use as much of the study's data as possible, all data from all time points were kept in the analyses where possible. As the sample size is different at different time points, the sample size used in each analysis varied depending on what parameters were used in the specific analysis. The χ^2 difference test is based on sample size, as such, it is best to examine other fit indices (e.g., ΔCFI) when conducting tests for measurement invariance (Alavi et al., 2020; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016).

As shown in Table 21, the configural invariance model provided a poor fit to the data. Recognizing the longitudinal nature of the data by allowing correlated uniqueness terms resulted in a better fit ($\chi^2_{difference}(36) = 862.12$, $p < .001$) and an acceptable absolute fit to the data. Therefore, the data demonstrated configural invariance (Geiser, 2021). Forcing the corresponding factor loadings to equality across time did not degrade the fit of the model (ΔCFI

< .01). Therefore, the data demonstrated metric invariance (i.e., factor loadings held across time). Finally, constraining both the factor loadings and intercepts to equality across the time did not appreciably change the CFI. Therefore, the data demonstrated scalar invariance (i.e., the scale's intercepts held across time).

Table 21

Dignity at Work: S4 Measurement Invariance over Time

Model	Compared Model	χ^2	*df*	CFI	ΔCFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Configural invariance	--	1912.75	528	.875	--	.851	.072	.066
Configural invariance with correlated uniqueness	Config1	1050.63	492	.95	.075	.936	.047	.06
Metric invariance	Config2	1081.19	508	.948	.002	.936	.047	.064
Scalar invariance	Metric	1135.39	532	.946	.002	.936	.047	.065

Note. N = 505; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Latent Growth Curve Modelling

Latent growth curve (LGC) modelling was conducted to examine if the Dignity at Work dimensions changed over the time period of the study. LGC was done separately for each of the four dimensions across the three time points. As can be seen in Table 22, the fit indices for each dimension were excellent.

Table 22

Study 4: Latent Growth Curve Modeling Fit Indices

Model	χ^2 (*df*)	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Overall Dignity	1.92 (1)	1.00	.99	.07	.02
Control	3.67 (1)	0.99	0.98	.12	.02
Work and Value	.31 (1)	1.00	1.01	.00	.01
Respect from Others	.76 (1)	1.00	1.00	.00	.01
Self-Respect	.09 (1)	1.00	1.01	.00	.004

Note. N = 180; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Overall Workplace Dignity. There is not a significant correlation between the slope and intercept (.03, p = .21) indicating that there is no relationship between participants' initial level of overall dignity and how much their dignity changed over time. There was not a significant mean slope (-.02, p = .37) indicating that dignity did not change over time. The significant intercept variance (.27, p < .001) indicates that not every participant started at the same level of dignity. A non-significant variance for the slope (.01, p = .74) indicates that participants' dignity did not change at different rates.

Control. There is not a significant correlation between the slope and intercept (r = .02, p = .69) indicating that there is no relationship between participants' initial level of control and how much their control changed over time. There was not a significant mean slope (b = .01, p = .82) indicating that control did not change over time. The significant intercept variance (σ^2 = .70, p < .001) indicates that not every participant started at the same level of control. A non-significant variance for the slope (σ^2 = .09, p = .07) indicates that participants' control did not change at different rates.

Work and Value. There is not a significant correlation between the slope and intercept (r = .00, p = .99) indicating that there is no relationship between participants' initial level of work and value and how much their work and value changed over time. There was not a significant mean slope (b = -.02, p = .37) indicating that work and value did not change over time. The significant intercept variance (σ^2 = .39, p < .001) indicates that not every participant started at the same level of work and value. A significant variance for the slope (σ^2 = .09, p < .05) indicates that participants' work and value changed at a different rate.

Respect from Others. There is not a significant correlation between the slope and intercept (r = .02, p = .54) indicating that there is no relationship between participants' initial level of respect from others and how much their respect from others changed over time. There was not a significant mean slope (b = -.00, p = .95) indicating that respect from others did not change over time. The significant intercept variance (σ^2 = .51, p < .001) indicates that not every participant started at the same level of respect from others. A non-significant variance for the slope (σ^2 = -.01, p = .71) indicates that participants' respect from others did not change at different rates.

Self-Respect. There is not a significant correlation between the slope and intercept (r = -.00, p = .92) indicating that there is no relationship between participants' initial level of self-respect and how much their self-respect changed over time. There was not a significant mean slope (b = -.03, p = .18) indicating that self-respect did not change over time. The significant intercept variance (σ^2 = .24, p < .001) indicates that not every participant started at the same level of self-respect. A non-significant variance for the slope (σ^2 = .02, p = .37) indicates that participants' self-respect did not change at different rates.

Dignity's Relationship to Other Variables

Correlations between the Dignity at Work measure and pre-established construct scales are presented in Tables 23-25. As in Studies 1 and 2, each of the four dignity dimensions are positively correlated with one another. At each time point, all four dignity dimensions are positively correlated with positive forms of leadership (transformational and SAFER). At each time point, all four dimensions were again negatively linked to stress. While most relationships were significant regardless of time point, all dignity dimensions except for self-respect were negatively correlated with passive leadership, customer incivility, and emotional labour surface acting. It does not appear that dignity is related to the deep acting dimension of emotional labour.

Table 23

Study 4: Time 1 Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Overall Dignity	Dignity at Work			
				Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Overall Dignity	4.05	0.62					
Control	3.67	.91	.83***				
Work and value	4.01	.78	.83***	.57***			
Respect from others	4.03	.82	.84***	.58***	.60***		
Self-respect	4.51	.57	.69***	.40***	.48***	.50***	
GTL	3.02	1.18	.57***	.46***	.44***	.63***	.24***
Passive	2.06	1.01	-.33***	-.19***	-.29***	-.43***	-.11*
SAFER-Speak	2.66	.81	.24***	.20***	.27***	.20***	.10*
SAFER-Act	3.40	1.17	.51***	.38***	.45***	.53***	.23***
Customer incivility	1.33	.95	-.21***	-.17***	-.22***	-.20***	-.04
Climate for civility	3.96	.83	.54***	.41***	.36***	.62***	.30***
Workload	2.73	.93	-.26***	-.20***	-.20***	-.28***	-.14**
Stress	1.61	.74	-.41***	-.28***	-.37***	-.40***	-.24***
Task significant	3.36	1.10	.22***	.10*	.31***	.16***	.17***
EL- Surface acting	2.85	1.11	-.22***	-.20***	-.20***	-.21***	-.07
EL- Deep acting	2.72	1.09	-.03	-.06	-.03	-.03	.06

Note. N = 505; EL = emotional labour; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Table 24

Study 4: Time 2 Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Overall Dignity	Control	Dignity at Work: Work and Value	Dignity at Work: Respect from others	Dignity at Work: Self-respect
Overall Dignity	4.02	0.69					
Control	3.59	1.06	.82***				
Work and value	4.02	.87	.84***	.56***			
Respect from others	3.99	.84	.85***	.61***	.62***		
Self-respect	4.46	.63	.69***	.34***	.54***	.51***	
GTL	3.04	1.26	.57***	.49***	.41***	.66***	.23***
Passive	2.07	1.04	-.32***	-.27***	-.23***	-.46***	-.02
SAFER-Speak	2.91	1.27	.44***	.35***	.35***	.50***	.19**
SAFER-Act	3.41	1.25	.46***	.32***	.36***	.55***	.26***
SAFER-Focus	3.25	1.27	.50***	.40***	.36***	.57***	.24***
SAFER-Engage	2.84	1.34	.50***	.46***	.36***	.54***	.19**
SAFER-Recognize	2.78	1.39	.51***	.45***	.37***	.56***	.22***
Customer incivility	1.23	.95	-.21***	-.24***	-.19**	-.23***	.06
Climate for civility	3.94	.89	.53***	.37***	.44***	.60***	.25***
Workload	2.69	.93	-.30***	-.27***	-.23***	-.30***	-.12*
Stress	1.52	.75	-.46***	-.30***	-.43***	-.44***	-.32***
Task significant	3.52	1.08	.30***	.10	.41***	.23***	.29***
EL- Surface acting	2.70	1.13	-.22***	-.26***	-.17**	-.23***	.01
EL- Deep acting	2.51	1.13	.06	-.01	.05	.02	.21***

Note. $N = 326$; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Table 25

Study 4: Time 3 Descriptives and Correlations Between the Dignity at Work Scale and Other Study Variables

	Mean	SD	Dignity at Work				
			Overall Dignity	Control	Work and Value	Respect from others	Self-respect
Overall Dignity	4.00	0.68					
Control	3.61	1.00	.82***				
Work and value	3.99	.88	.82***	.51***			
Respect from others	3.98	.84	.85***	.62***	.55***		
Self-respect	4.42	.65	.74***	.39***	.57***	.56***	
GTL	2.98	1.22	.57***	.49***	.38***	.69***	.25***
Passive	2.07	1.06	-.19**	-.15*	-.14*	-.29***	-.01
SAFER-Speak	2.97	1.31	.44***	.37***	.33***	.51***	.18**
SAFER-Act	3.43	1.31	.45***	.31***	.33***	.55***	.26***
SAFER-Focus	3.22	1.29	.46***	.32***	.34***	.56***	.23**
SAFER-Engage	2.84	1.33	.47***	.43***	.30***	.55***	.18**
SAFER-Recognize	2.75	1.38	.47***	.40***	.34***	.54***	.17*
Customer incivility	1.25	.96	-.19**	-.15*	-.20**	-.21**	-.01
Climate for civility	3.90	.98	.56***	.42***	.38***	.65***	.33***
Workload	2.72	.94	-.30***	-.21**	-.24***	-.31***	-.22**
Stress	1.47	.74	-.46***	-.32***	-.41***	-.44***	-.29***
Task significant	3.55	1.08	.34***	.12	.46***	.25***	.27***
EL- Surface acting	2.72	1.17	-.24***	-.26***	-.19**	-.24***	-.04
EL- Deep acting	2.63	1.11	.16*	.08	.09	.12	.25***

Note. $N = 218$; * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

Cross-lagged hierarchical regressions were conducted to assess the longitudinal prediction of workplace dignity and its dimensions. On Step 1, each Dignity at Work dimensions

at (a) Time 2 was regressed on the corresponding dimension at Time 1, (b) Time 3 was regressed on the corresponding dimension at Time 2, and (c) Time 3 was regressed on the corresponding dimension at Time 1. On Step 2 of the regression, the possible antecedents were entered as predictors. In effect, this procedure used an earlier measure of the antecedents to predict the change (e.g., Time 2 residualized for Time 1) in dignity (measured later).

Leadership. For each lag, at Step 1, an earlier measure of dignity predicted its corresponding dignity dimension later on (e.g., T1 control predicted T3 control). Transformational leadership predicted the change in overall dignity over time but only for the shorter time lags (T1-T2, $sr^2 = .01$, $p < .001$; T2-T3, $sr^2 = .01$, $p < .01$). Transformational leadership positively predicted respect from others at each lag (T1-T2, $sr^2 = .02$, $p < .001$; T1-T3, $sr^2 = .01$, $p < .01$; T2-T3, $sr^2 = .02$, $p < .01$) above and beyond the earlier measure of dignity. Transformational leadership positively predicted control above and beyond the earlier measure of control for the T1-T2 lag ($sr^2 = .01$, $p < .01$) and T2-T3 lag ($sr^2 = .01$, $p < .01$). Transformational leadership positively predicted work and value but only for the T2-T3 lag ($sr^2 = .02$, $p < .01$). Passive leadership significantly predicted respect from others at the T1-T2 lag ($sr^2 = .01$, $p < .01$) but did not predict any other dimension of dignity at any other time point (see Table 26a-26b).

Table 26a

Study 4: Leadership predicting Dignity - Results of the cross-lagged regression analyses

Standardized Betas										
	T1-T2					T1-T3				
Predictor	Overall Dignity	Control	Work & Value	Other Respect	Self-respect	Overall Dignity	Control	Work & Value	Other Respect	Self-respect
Time 1 Dignity	.68***	.65***	.66***	.59***	.54***	.74***	.70***	.63***	.70***	.62***
	(.423)	(.418)	(.393)	(.354)	(.295)	(.457)	(.455)	(.361)	(.424)	(.373)
ΔR^2	.58***	.52***	.48***	.58***	.31***	.59***	.54***	.42***	.66***	.39***
Transformational leadership	.11*	.12**	.05	.19***	.10*	.11	.11	.10	.16**	.10
	(.129)	(.101)	(.068)	(.170)	(.023)	(.110)	(.081)	(.049)	(.089)	(.018)
Passive leadership	-.05	-.07	.01	-.12**	.03	.08	.06	.08	-.02	.10
	(.045)	(.033)	(.023)	(.099)	(.002)	(.028)	(.013)	(.010)	(.175)	(.001)
ΔR^2	.01**	.02**	.00	.04***	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02**	.01
Total R^2	.59	.54	.48	.62	.32	.60	.55	.42	.67	.40

Note. N = 325 (T1-T2), 217 (T1-T3); * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

Table 26b

Study 4: Leadership predicting Dignity - Results of the cross-lagged regression analyses

Standardized Betas					
			T2-T3		
Predictor	Overall Dignity	Control	Work & Value	Other Respect	Self-respect
Time 1 Dignity	.73***	.78***	.72***	.65***	.65***
	(.486)	(.562)	(.504)	(.393)	(.427)
ΔR^2	.64***	.67***	.58***	.63***	.45***
Transformational leadership	.16**	.11*	.16**	.17**	.15*
	(.130)	(.089)	(.065)	(.185)	(.026)
Passive leadership	.06	.06	.07	-.04	.09
	(.029)	(.016)	(.015)	(.076)	(.002)
ΔR^2	.02*	.01	.02*	.02*	.02
Total R^2	.65	.67	.60	.65	.47

Note. N = 179 (T2-T3); * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

Other Work Environment Variables. For each lag, at Step 1, an earlier measure of dignity predicted its corresponding dignity dimension later on (e.g., T1 control predicted T3 control). The work environment variables only predicted dignity at a later time point when examining the relationships between Time 1 and Time 2. T1 task significance positively predicted T2 overall dignity (β = .10, p < .01, sr^2 = .01) above and beyond T1 overall dignity (see

Table 27). T1 Climate for civility positively predicted T2 control (β = .09, p < .05, sr^2 = .01) above and beyond T1 control. T1 task significance positively predicted both T2 work and value (β = .15, p < .001, sr^2 = .02) and respect from others (β = .08, p < .05, sr^2 = .02) above and beyond T1 dignity. Finally, T1 workload negatively predicted T2 respect from others (β = -.08, p < .05, sr^2 = .01) above and beyond T1 respect from others. None of the other variables at other time points significantly predicted dignity above and beyond the earlier measure of dignity (see Table 28).

Table 27

Study 4: Work Environment predicting Overall Dignity - Results of the cross-lagged regression analyses

	Standardized Betas		
Predictor	T1-T2	T2-T3	T1-T3
Time 1 Dignity	.69***	.74***	.71***
	(.414)	(.478)	(.419)
ΔR^2	.58***	.64***	.59***
Climate for civility	.05	.07	.08
	(.096)	(.106)	(.129)
Customer incivility	-.07	-.00	-.05
	(.016)	(.006)	(.005)
Workload	-.03	-.10	-.01
	(.018)	(.032)	(.025)
Task significance	.10**	.03	.03
	(.037)	(.019)	(.022)
EL - Surface acting	-.03	.02	.02
	(.016)	(.013)	(.011)
ΔR^2	.02*	.01	.01
Total R^2	.60	.65	.60

Note. N = 326 (T1-T2), 180 (T2-T3), 218 (T1-T3); * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights; EL = emotional labour

Table 28

Study 4: Work Environment predicting Dignity - Results of the cross-lagged regression analyses

	Standardized Betas											
	T1-T2				T2-T3				T1-T3			
Predictor	C	W&V	OR	S-R	C	W&V	OR	S-R	C	W&V	OR	S-R
Time 1 Dignity	66.***	.60***	.66***	.53***	.78***	.74***	.69***	.64	.67***	.56***	.70***	.61***
	(.420)	(.356)	(.379)	(.278)	(.564)	(.439)	(.420)	(.388)	(.432)	(.308)	(.426)	(.355)
ΔR^2	.52***	.48***	.58***	.31***	.67***	.58***	.63***	.45***	.54***	.42***	.66***	.39***
Climate for civility	.09*	.05	.09	.02	.06	.01	.10	.12	.14	.06	.12	.02
	(.074)	(.049)	(.134)	(.014)	(.049)	(.050)	(.158)	(.035)	(.108)	(.048)	(.193)	(.024)
Customer incivility	-.07	-.09	-.03	-.01	.04	-.03	.04	-.03	-.06	-.08	.03	.01
	(.018)	(.016)	(.014)	(.000)	(.010)	(.005)	(.010)	(.013)	(.005)	(.008)	(.006)	(.002)
Workload	-.00	-.00	-.08*	-.04	-.05	-.13	-.09	-.06	-.00	-.01	-.07	-.00
	(.009)	(.006)	(.041)	(.005)	(.023)	(.029)	(.026)	(.004)	(.013)	(.016)	(.041)	(.004)
Task significance	.04	.15***	.08*	.12	.05	.01	.04	.03	-.02	.14	.03	.02
	(.005)	(.066)	(.024)	(.032)	(.008)	(.067)	(.020)	(.029)	(.002)	(.065)	(.015)	(.011)
EL - Surface acting	-.05	-.02	-.03	-.00	-.03	.06	-.06	.10	.02	.00	-.02	.02
	(.019)	(.013)	(.011)	(.001)	(.034)	(.005)	(.038)	(.002)	(.013)	(.005)	(.018)	(.001)
ΔR^2	.02*	.03**	.02**	.02	.01	.02	.02	.02	.02	.03	.01	.00
Total R^2	.54	.51	.60	.33	.68	.60	.65	.47	.56	.44	.67	.39

Note. N = 326 (T1-T2), 180 (T2-T3), 218 (T1-T3); * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights; C = control, W&V = work and value, OR = respect from others, S-R = self-respect, EL = emotional labour

Predictive validity

Cross-lagged hierarchical regressions were conducted to assess the longitudinal prediction of perceived stress (see Table 29). On Step 1, stress at (a) Time 2 was regressed on stress at Time 1, (b) Time 3 was regressed on stress at Time 2, and (c) Time 3 was regressed on stress at Time 1. On Step 2 of the regression, the Dignity at Work subscales were entered as predictors. In effect, this procedure used an earlier measure of Dignity at Work to predict the change (e.g., Time 2 residualized for Time 1) in stress (measured later).

Time 1 – Time 2. At Step One, T1 perceived stress ($\beta = .79$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .63$) predicted T2 perceived stress ($R^2 = .63$, $F(1,324) = 539.85$, $p < .001$). At Step Two, the T1 Dignity at Work dimensions did not contribute a significant amount of explained variance in T2 perceived stress ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(4,320) = 1.87$, $p = .12$) above and beyond the Time 1 outcome measure.

Time 2 – Time 3. At Step One, T2 perceived stress ($\beta = .76$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .58$) predicted T3 perceived stress ($R^2 = .58$, $F(1,178) = 248.05$, $p < .001$). At Step Two, the T2 Dignity at Work dimensions did not contribute a significant amount of explained variance in T3 perceived stress ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F(4,174) = 1.60$, $p = .18$) above and beyond the Time 2 outcome measure.

Time 1 – Time 3. At Step One, T1 perceived stress ($\beta = .74$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .55$) predicted T3 perceived stress ($R^2 = .55$, $F(1,216) = 260.18$, $p < .001$). At Step Two, T1 self-respect ($\beta = -.12$, $p < .05$, $sr^2 = .01$) predicted T3 perceived stress ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F(4,212) = 2.85$, $p < .05$) above and beyond the Time 1 outcome measure.

Table 29

Study 4: Dignity Predicting Stress - Cross-lagged regression analyses

		Standardized Betas		
Predictor		T1-T2	T2-T3	T1-T3
Time 1 stress		.75***	.72***	.69***
		(.515)	(.472)	(.44)
	ΔR^2	.63***	.58***	.55***
Control		.04	-.08	-.01
		(.014)	(.031)	(.019)
Work and Value		-.04	-.01	-.04
		(.040)	(.036)	(.028)
Respect from Others		-.05	-.07	-.03
		(.053)	(.038)	(.045)
Self-respect		-.05	.02	-.12*
		(.012)	(.013)	(.034)
	ΔR^2	.01	.02	.02*
	Total R^2	.63	.60	.57

Note. N = 325 (T1-T2), 179 (T2-T3), 217 (T1-T3); * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001; numbers in brackets = raw relative weights

Discussion

In support of Studies 2 and 3, I found that the Dignity at Work scale dimensions are each their own distinct factor and also load onto an overall factor (i.e., a bi-factor model). Measurement invariance testing found that the data demonstrated configural invariance, metric invariance, and metric equivalence over time. This means that the Dignity at Work scale's model held over time (i.e., across the three time points). LGC modelling showed that workplace dignity did not change over a six to eight week period. This supports the notion that workplace dignity is relatively stable over at least a short period of time without any formal intervention.

Cross-lagged regressions supported the LGC modelling findings. Earlier dignity was a strong predictor of later dignity, indicating that dignity did not change much during the study. Due to this, very few longitudinal relationships of the dignity measure with other study variables were found. Transformational leadership consistently predicted respect from others over time. However, leadership (transformational or passive) did not consistently predict any other dignity dimension over time. Looking at non-leadership environmental variables, significant relationships were only found for T1 antecedents predicting T2 dignity. The significant T1-T2 findings are likely due to the larger sample size compared to the other time point comparisons.

Contrary to what was expected, dignity did not predict perceived stress over time (with the exception of T1 self-respect predicting T3 stress). This is somewhat in line with Study 2, where I found that only work and value predicted stress cross-sectionally. Contrary to past theory, this finding is not especially surprising given all the Study 4 data were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic. The unknowns and uncertainties of the early stages of the pandemic could have overshadowed the impact of workplace dignity and other variables on employee stress.

While still self-report, the data in the current study were longitudinal (three time points) instead of simply cross-sectional. This allowed for the examination of longitudinal predictions controlling for earlier time points. A longitudinal design also allowed me to examine the scale's stability over time, an important aspect of evaluating new measures. Furthermore, unlike a general working sample, retail workers may be employed in "dirty(er) jobs". This sample may be more representative to the "dirty jobs/work" that is the focus of most of the past workplace dignity research (e.g., Hamilton et al., 2019).

Limitations

All data for Study 4 were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic. Results were potentially influenced by this ongoing event. For example, studies in multiple countries (including Canada) have found that levels of depression, anxiety, and/or symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) have been higher during the pandemic than pre-pandemic (Tucker & Czapla, 2020). As data were collected longitudinally, the pandemic and its associated factors and consequences may have influenced participants' responses differently at different time points. Further, we have no way of knowing whether or how the pandemic influenced responses as we did not collect data from these participants pre-pandemic.

Like the previous studies, this study also relied on self-report data, which raises the possibility of these findings being contaminated by CMV or influenced by participants' social desirability bias. While longitudinal, the current study used very short time-lags between data collection (i.e., 2-3 weeks).

Dignity continues to be correlated with most organizational variables cross-sectionally. While the longitudinal relationships between dignity and organizational variables were not encouraging, I found that dignity was stable over time, even during the pandemic.

Post-Study Analyses

Finally, I compared the Dignity at Work scale's dimensions and factor structure across groups. Samples from each study (i.e., Study 1 general working sample, Study 2 working student sample, Study 3 Time 1 government workers, and Study 4 Time 1 retail workers) were compared. Given that the 4-factor (or bi-factor) structure held for each sample, it was expected that the scale's factor structure would hold across these groups (i.e., configural invariance) and that the scale will have the same factor loadings and same intercepts (i.e., metric and scalar invariance) across these different groups.

To examine whether the structure of the Dignity at Work scale held across groups (working students, government workers, and retail workers), group invariance testing was conducted using Mplus 7.4. Study 1's general sample was left out of this analysis as the sample was broader than the other more specific samples and to avoid using the original sample that refined the scale. This analysis used data from Study 2, Study 3 Time 1, and Study 4 Time 1. The invariance models were conducted in the following order: configural invariance, metric invariance, and scalar invariance. Invariance was determined by comparing changes in the comparative fit index (CFI) between successive models. A change of less than or equal to 0.01 is considered evidence of invariance (Zimprich et al., 2012). Note that if the ΔCFI was greater than 0.01 and the model did not show invariance, the subsequent model was not conducted. As a confirmation, changes in RMSEA and SRMR were also examined using the thresholds as used in the ΔCFA (i.e., ΔRMSEA < .015, and ΔSRMR < .03 as evidence for invariance; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016).

As shown in Table 30, the configural invariance by study sample model provided an adequate fit to the data indicating that the factor structure fit well for each of the 3 study samples

(which coincides with previous CFA results). The metric model fit worse than the configural model (ΔRMSEA = .018; ΔSRMR = .071), indicating that the scale's factor loadings are invariant across study sample.

Table 30

Dignity at Work Measurement Invariance by Study Sample

Model	Compared Model	χ^2	*df*	CFI	ΔCFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Configural invariance	--	508.91	144	.948	--	.93	.085	.059
Metric invariance	Config.	755.68	160	.916	.032	.90	.103	.130

Note. N = 1053; CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were group differences (by sample) on overall dignity. While a general sample, Study 1 data were included along with Studies 2-4. There was a main effect of study on overall dignity ($F(3, 1472) = 16.00$ $p < .001$). Post hoc (Bonferroni) analyses revealed that almost all samples differed from one another ($p < .001$; see Table 31). The only non-significant differences were between the general worker sample (S1) and government workers (S3) and between employed students (S2) and retail workers (S4).

Table 31

Study Sample Differences in Overall Workplace Dignity

	N	*Mean*	*SD*
S1: General workers	420	4.21	0.58
S2: Working students	287	3.95	0.63
S3: Government workers	261	4.23	0.50
S4: Retail workers	505	4.05	0.62
Overall	1473	4.11	0.60

Note. $N = 1473$

General Discussion

The Dignity at Work scale is a short, reliable, and valid measure of workplace dignity. Dignity at work is a multi-dimensional construct but the measure can also be used to assess dignity as an overarching construct. Dignity is stable over time, at least without some form of intervention. Cross-sectionally, dignity predicted mental well-being and was associated with many important organizational variables. Some of these relationships were also found longitudinally.

Beyond the scale development and validation, in this multi-study dissertation I defined the dimensionality of dignity at work, demonstrated that workplace dignity is a unique construct, and examined both the factors that influence dignity and the relationships between dignity and other important outcomes. Previous qualitative research did an excellent job determining the space that workplace dignity should occupy in the literature and what it might be or is related to.

With the addition of quantitative data, I was able to differentiate workplace dignity from pre-established and more well-known constructs.

The Dignity at Work scale demonstrated configural invariance across samples, supporting each study's CFA results. However, the scale did not demonstrate metric invariance across samples, indicating that its factor loadings were different between these groups. A one-way ANOVA revealed significant mean overall workplace dignity difference in some of the study samples. The workplace dignity of government workers and a general sample of workers did not differ. Working students and retail workers did not differ in overall dignity and both reported significantly lower workplace dignity than a general worker sample and government workers. That said, the lowest mean overall dignity was 3.95 on a 5-point scale, indicating that even this group (working students) do still experience at least some dignity in their work on average. This indicates that while the construct of dignity exists in different populations of workers, the amount of dignity a worker has can be influenced by their role and/or industry.

Future Research

While this dissertation used longitudinal data, future research should continue to examine the scale longitudinally. Longitudinal data should be collected once the pandemic has passed or at least in places where cases are low and restrictions have been removed. While intervention studies are encouraged, dignity's relationship with organizational variables over time should be tested more outside of an intervention. If dignity is a state, how stable is it over time and how quickly can it change? The longitudinal study in this dissertation used short time lags. It is possible that dignity takes more time to change without intervention. If dignity can be enhanced (Hodson, 1996; 2001) or hindered (Sayer, 2007), how much would it take to increase or decrease (e.g., a single event or multiple events/behaviours)?

Collecting non-self-report data is advisable. For instance, researchers could collect other-report (e.g., colleagues or supervisor) data on subjects' behaviours while still using self-report workplace dignity. Other-reports could also be used to measure subjects' exposure to incivility and the organization's culture (e.g., culture of civility).

How and Where Does Dignity Fit?

In these four studies, I examined antecedents and outcomes of workplace dignity. However, there are often variables that are mediating the relationship between workplace variables (e.g., trust in one's leader mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being; Kelloway et al., 2012). Future research should examine what variables might mediate the relationship between dignity and its outcomes. On a similar note, many mediators have been proposed between transformational leadership and employee well-being (Arnold, 2017). Researchers should examine where workplace dignity may act as one such mediator.

Examining potential moderators for dignity's relationships between other workplace variables would also advance the literature. For example, perhaps personality (e.g., narcissism) or demographic variables (e.g., race, age) moderate the relationship between dignity and its antecedents. It would be important to understand whether certain people are more vulnerable to threats to their dignity than others. Looking at the other end of things, perhaps there are variables that moderate the relationship between dignity and its outcomes. For instance, maybe there is something about the work environment that makes dignity's impact on employee engagement more or less pronounced.

Comparing Measures

While no measure of workplace dignity existed when this study was conceptualized, two measures of workplace dignity have since emerged. Thomas and Lucas (2019) developed an 18-item measure (Workplace Dignity Scale; WDS) containing six factors (two to four items per factor): respectful interaction, recognition of competence and contribution, equality, inherent value, general feelings of workplace dignity, and indignity (the only negatively framed factor). These factors all loaded onto a second-order measurement model with the positively worded dimensions falling under a higher order dignity factor (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Tiwari and Sharma (2019) developed a 17-item measure containing five factors (two to four items per factor): trust and respect, equality, self-esteem, fair treatment, and autonomy. While both scale developments had their limitations and methodological issues, it would be important to compare the current study's Dignity and Work measure with these two workplace dignity measures.

Differences in Workplace Dignity

Given that much of the dignity at work literature discussed dignity "dirty work" (i.e., jobs viewed by society as disgusting or 'beneath them' in some way such as sanitation work) and how that impacts dignity, future research should examine exactly to what extent "dirty work" impacts dignity. For instance, would those working dirty jobs experience less workplace dignity than those engaged in non-dirty work? Thomas and Lucas (2019) found that the combined positive subscales of their workplace dignity measure was negatively predicted by dirty work (based on a 7-item measure they created) and their indignity subscale was positively predicted by dirty work. Similarly, it was found that organizational rank predicted (positively worded) workplace dignity and income insufficiency (i.e., the perception that it is difficult to get by on participants' current income) predicted both dignity and indignity in the expected directions. If the new Dignity at

Work scale is measuring the same construct as Thomas and Lucas' (2019) WDS, similar relationships would be expected.

The notion that dignity is influenced by "dirty work" or organizational rank was somewhat examined in this dissertation. I found that the samples of general workers and government workers scored higher on Dignity at Work than did the samples of working students and retail workers, indicating that a person's job and/or industry could influence their dignity. My findings, as well as those of Thomas and Lucas (2019), suggest that the theorized "dignity enhancing behaviours" (Hodson, 2001) such as citizenship behaviour (which did predict some dignity dimensions in S1) cannot fully combat other aspects of the work environment. Interventions, job redesign, and other efforts to improve worker dignity, especially in these lower dignity jobs or industries, are all advisable.

Workplace dignity literature talks about the type of work but never really discussed any physical traits of the workers. Davis (2021) discussed the perceptions and mistreatment of Black and Indigenous people at work and how that impacts their dignity. The examination of workplace dignity in terms of racial differences is a gap in the literature and one that is especially relevant on the tails of Black Lives Matter. Workplace dignity may also have a place in workplace diversity literature. The current study was not able to address this as race/ethnicity was only collected in Study 4 where the vast majority of participants were white/Caucasian (87%).

Interventions

Future research should look into types of interventions and how these impact workplace dignity. If formal interventions can impact workplace dignity, then a lack of dignity may not be hopeless and employees may not need to fight as hard to regain or take back their dignity at

work. There is ample evidence to the effectiveness of leadership training on employee outcomes such as mental well-being (Avolio et al., 2009; Duygulu & Kublay, 2011; Kelloway & Barling, 2010). As leadership predicted dignity, increased leadership ratings should lead to increased employee dignity. Pre-established leadership interventions not designed with dignity in mind may still be able to improve employee dignity.

Other intervention methods may also impact workplace dignity. For example, job re-design could affect employee dignity such as increased control. Policy changes, such as developing guidelines on email civility, could increase dignity, especially respect from others. Methods that develop a positive organizational culture could also impact workplace dignity. While interventions aimed or designed specifically to target dignity could be done, it is likely that interventions aimed at improving the overall workplace or that target other specific organizational factors should still increase workplace dignity. Further research will need to be done to determine if this notion is correct.

Conclusion

Dignity is a fundamental human right (Marmot, 2022; Sabatino et al., 2016). People should experience dignity in all aspects of their lives, especially where they spend most of their adult lives – at work. Workplace dignity is an organizational construct that is distinct from existing variables and is related to important employee outcomes. The Dignity at Work scale is a reliable and valid measure of workplace dignity. In this dissertation, I extended the empirical research on workplace dignity and suggested new avenues for future research. Organizations should assess their employees' workplace dignity and actively work towards enhancing their dignity.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Arnold, K. A. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*, 381-393. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000062

Arnold, K. A., & Walsh, M. M. (2015). Customer incivility and employee well-being: Testing the moderating effects of meaning, perspective taking and transformational leadership. *Work & Stress, 29*, 362-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1075234

Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & McKee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 193-203. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.193

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumba, F. O., & Chan, A., (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(5), 764-784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.006

Banks, M. H., Clegg, C. W., Jackson, P. R., Kemp, N. J., Stafford, E. M., & Wall, T. D. (1980). The use of the General Health Questionnaire as an indicator of mental health in occupational studies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *53*(3), 187-194.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Biricik Gulseren, D., Thibault, T., Kelloway, E. K, Mullen, J., Teed, M., Gilbert, S., & Dimoff, J. (2021). R.I.G.H.T. leadership: Scale development and validation of a psychologically healthy leadership model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1640

Breaugh, J. A. (1989). The work autonomy scale: Additional validity evidence. *Human Relations, 42*, 1033-1056. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678904201105

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(3), 365-379. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317903769647229

Byars-Winston, A. (2012). Broadening sources of dignity and affirmation in work and relationship. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*(2), 255-267. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000011429033

Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A short measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*(3), 389-405.

Christian, M. S., Bradley, J. C., Wallace, J. C., & Burke, M. J. (2009). Workplace safety: A meta-analysis of the roles of person and situation factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1103-1127. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016172

Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S., Spacapan & S., Oskamp, (Eds.) *The Social Psychology of Health*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social

exchange and affect-based perspectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(2), 199–236. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757

Conchie, S. M., Taylor, P. J., & Donald, I. J. (2012). Promoting safety voice with safety-specific transformational leadership: The mediating role of two dimensions of trust. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17(*1), 105-115. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025101

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*, 64-80. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Crowley, M. (2012). Control and dignity in professional, manual and service-sector employment. *Organization Studies, 33*(10), 1383-1406. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612453529

Cruz, S. A., & Abrantes, M. (2014). Service interaction and dignity in cleaning work: How important is the organizational context?. *Employee Relations, 36*(3), 294-311. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2013-0064

Davis, A. (2021, April, 26). Dignity is the bedrock for workplace belonging. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/dignity_is_the_bedrock_for_workplace_belonging#

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Dimoff, J. K. & Kelloway, E. K. (2019) Signs of struggle (SOS): The development and validation of a behavioural mental health checklist for the workplace. *Work & Stress, 33*(3), 295-313. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1503359

Doty, H. D., & Glick, W. H. (1998). Common methods bias: Does common methods variance really bias results? *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(4), 374-406. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819814002

Duygulu, S., & Kublay, G. (2011). Transformational leadership training programme for charge nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing 67*(3), 633-642. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05507.x

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Francis, L., Holmvall, C. M., & O'Brien, L. E. (2015). The influence of workload and civility of treatment on the perpetration of email incivility. *Computers in Human Behavior, 46,* 191-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.044

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331–362. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322

Geiser, C. (2021). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling with Mplus: A latent-trait perspective*. London: The Guilford Press.

Grant, A. M. (2008). The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 108-124. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.108

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J.-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR": Understanding the role of resources in Conservation of Resources theory. *Journal of Management, 40*(5), 1334-1364. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130

Hamilton, P., Redman, T., & McMurray, R. (2019). 'Lower than a snake's belly': Discursive constructions of dignity and heroism in low-status garbage work. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156,* 889-901. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3618-z

Harman, H. H. (1976). *Modern factor analysis* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: Univ. Chicago Press.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 268-279.

Hildenbrand, K., Sacramento, C. A., & Binnewies, C. (2018). Transformational leadership and burnout: The role of thriving and followers' openness to experience. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23,* 31-43. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000051

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hodson, R. (1996). Dignity in the workplace under participative management: Alienation and freedom revisited. *American Sociological Review, 61*(5), 719-738. https://doi.org/10.2307/2096450

Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inness, M., Turner, N., Kelloway, E. K., Barling, J., Lyubykh, Z., Francis, L.,… Bygrave, C. (2022). *'Take this job and love it!' Development and measurement of the 'love of one's job'*. [Unpublished manuscript]

Islam, G. (2013). Recognizing employees: Reification, dignity and promoting care in management. *Cross Cultural Management, 20*(2), 235-250. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601311313490

Jacobs, L. (2017). On dignity, a sense of dignity, and inspirational shame. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 37*(6), 380-394. https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2017.1334447

Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kane, J., & de Vries, K. (2017). Dignity in long-term care: An application of Nordenfelt's work. *Nursing Ethics, 24*(6), 744-751. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733015624487

Kelloway, E. K. (2015). *Using Mplus for structural equation modeling: A researcher's guide* (Second Edition ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483381664

Kelloway, E. K. (2017). *The Dignity of Labor: Dignity as a core resource*. In A. M. Rossi, J. A. Meurs and P. Perrewe (Eds). Stress and the Quality of Working Life, 6th Edition. Information Age Publishing

Kelloway, E. K. (2022). *Using time separated data to control CMV: Another urban myth* [virtual PowerPoint presentation].

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (1994). *Development of the Canadian Forces Occupational Stress Questionnaire* [White paper]. Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (1994). Stress, control, well-being, and marital functioning: A causal correlational analysis. In G. P. Keita & J. J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), *Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues* (pp. 241-251). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10165-015

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2010). Leadership development as an intervention in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress, 24*(3), 260-279. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.518441

Kelloway, E. K., Catano, V. M., & Day, A. L. (2011). *People and Work in Canada*, Nelson Canada: Toronto.

Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(1), 18-25. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.014

Kelloway, E. K., Inness, M., Barling, J., Francis, L. & Turner, N. (2010). Loving one's job: Construct development and implications for individual well-being. In Perrewé, P. L. & Ganster, D. C. (Ed.) *New Developments in Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to Job Stress* (Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being, Vol. 8 pp. 109-136), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2010)0000008006

Kelloway, E. K., Mullen, J., & Francis, L. (2006). Divergent effects of transformational and passive leadership on employee safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(1), 76-86. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.1.76

Kelloway, E. K., Penney, S., & Dimoff, J. (2017). Leading the Psychologically Healthy Workplace: The RIGHT Way to appear in E.K. Kelloway, K.Neilsen & J. Dimoff (Eds). . *Leading to Occupational Health and Safety*: Wiley

Kelloway, E. K., Penney, S., & Dimoff, J. K. (2017). Leading the psychologically healthy workplace: The RIGHT way. In K. E. Kelloway, K. Nielsen & J. K. Dimoff (Eds.),

Leading to Occupational Health and Safety: How Leadership Behaviours Impact Organizational Safety and Well-Being (pp. 113-127). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Kelloway, E. K., Turner, N., Barling, J., & Loughlin, C. (2012). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership. *Work & Stress, 26*, 39-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774

Khademi, M., Mohammadi, E., & Vanaki, Z. (2012). Nurses' experiences of violation of their dignity. *Nursing Ethics, 19*(3), 328-340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733011433926

Kuoppala, J., Lamminpaa, A., Liira, J., & Vainio, H. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 60*(8), 904-915. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e31817e918d

Lawless, J., & Moss, C. (2007). Exploring the value of dignity in the work-life of nurses. *Contemporary Nurse, 24*(2), 225-236. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2007.24.2.225

Leiter, M. P., Spence Laschinger, H. K., Day, A., & Gilin Oore, D. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1258-1274. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024442

Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 114–121. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.114

Liu, J., Siu, O., & Shi, K. (2010). Transformational leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of trust in the leader and self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*, 454-479. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00407.x

Lucas, K. (2011). Blue-collar discourses of workplace dignity: Using outgroup comparisons to construct positive identities. *Management Communication Quarterly, 25*(2), 353-374. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318910386445

Lucas, K. (2015). Workplace dignity: Communicating inherent, earned, and remediated dignity. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(5), 621-646. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12133

Lucas, K., Kang, D., & Li, Z. (2013). Workplace dignity in a total institution: Examining the experiences of Foxconn's migrant workforce. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*(1), 91-106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1328-0

Lucas, K., Manikas, A. S., Mattingly, E. S., & Crider, C. J. (2017). Engaging and misbehaving: How dignity affects employee work behaviors. *Organization Studies, 38*(11), 1505-1527. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616677634

Malhotra, N. K., Schaller, T. K., & Patil, A. (2017). Common method variance in advertising research: When to be concerned and how to control for it. *Journal of Advertising, 46*(1), 193-212. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2016.1252287

Marmot, M. (2022, April, 8). Studying health inequalities has been my life's work. What's about to happen in the UK is unprecedented. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/apr/08/health-inequalities-uk-poverty-life-death

Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (1998-2017). *Mplus User's Guide. Eighth Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Nordenfelt, L., & Edgar, A. (2005). The four notions of dignity. *Quality in Ageing: Policy, Practice and Research 6*(1), 17-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/14717794200500004

Noronha, E., Chakraborty, S. & D'Cruz, P. (2020). 'Doing dignity work': Indian security guards' interface with precariousness. *Journal of Business Ethics, 162*, 553-575. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3996-x

Penney, L. M., Hunter, E. M., & Perry, S. J. (2011). Personality and counterproductive work behaviour: Using conservation of resources theory to narrow the profile of deviant employees. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*, 58-77. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02007.x

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Mishra, P. (2011). Effects of organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 310-326. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020948

Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Developmental Review, 41*, 71-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004

Reise, S. P., Moore, T. M., & Haviland, M. G. (2010). Bifactor models and rotations: Exploring the extent to which multidimensional data yield univocal scale scores. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 92*(6), 544-559. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2010.496477

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

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Sabatino, L., Kangasniemi, M. K., Rocco, G., Alvaro, R., & Stievano, A. (2016). Nurses' perceptions of professional dignity in hospital settings. *Nursing Ethics, 23*(3), 277-293. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733014564103

Sayer, A. (2007). Dignity at work: Broadening the agenda. *Organization, 14*(4), 565-581.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee engagement in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66,* 701-716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471

Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(3), 456-476.

Stacey, C. L. (2005). Finding dignity in dirty work: The constraints and rewards of low-wage home care labour. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 27*(6), 831-854. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2005.00476.x

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review, 93*, 119-135.

Sternberg, R. J. (1987). Liking versus loving: A comparative evaluation of theories. *Psychological Bulletin, 102,* 331-345.

Stievano, A., Sabatino, L., Affonso, D., Olsen, D., Skinner, I., & Rocco, G. (2019). Nursing's professional dignity in palliative care: Exploration of an Italian context. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 28*(9-10), 1633-1642. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14753

Sturm, B. A., & Dellert, J. C. (2016). Exploring nurses' personal dignity, global self-esteem and work satisfaction. *Nursing Ethics, 23*(4), 384-400. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733014567024

Swanson, S., & Kent, A. (2017). Passion and pride in professional sports: Investigating the role of workplace emotion. *Sports Management Review, 20*, 352-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2016.10.004

Sweeney, P. D. (1990). Distributive justice and pay satisfaction: A field test of an equity theory prediction. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 4*(3), 329-341.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178-190. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375

Thomas, B., & Lucas, K. (2019). Development and validation of the workplace dignity scale. *Group & Organization Management, 44*(1), 72-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601118807784

Tiwari, A., & Sharma, R. R. (2019). Dignity at the workplace: Evolution of the construct and development of workplace dignity scale. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02581

Tonidandel, S. & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analyses: A useful supplement to multiple regression analyses. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9204-3

Tucker, P., & Czapla, C. S. (2020). *Post-COVID stress disorder: Another emerging consequence of the global pandemic.* Psychiatric Times. https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/post-COVID-stress-disorder-emerging-consequence-global-pandemic

Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2011). Ageing hospital nurses' well-being at work: Psychometric testing of the dignity and respect in ageing nurses' work scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences, 25*(3), 617-624. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2011.00873.x

Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Davies-Schrils, K. A. Marmet, M. D., Reeves, D. A., & Gallus, J. A. (2012). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the civility norms questionnaire-brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(4), 407-420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9251-4

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-618. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305

Wilson, N. L., & Holmvall, C. M. (2013). The development and validation of the incivility from customers scale. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(3), 310-326. https://10.1037/a0032753

Winchenbach, A., Hanna, P., & Miller, G. (2019). Rethinking decent work: The value of dignity in tourism employment. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(7), 1026-1043. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1566346

Wong, J. H. K., Kelloway, E. K., & Makhan, D. W. (2015). Safety Leadership: In S. Clarke, T. M. Probst, F. Guldenmund, & J. Passmore (Eds), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of psychology of occupational safety and workplace health handbook* (pp. 83-111) Chichester: Wiley.

Yalden, B. J., & McCormack, B. (2010). Constructions of dignity: A pre-requisite for flourishing in the workplace?. *International Journal of Older People Nursing*, *5*(2), 137-147. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-3743.2010.00218.x

Zimprich, D., Allemand, M., & Lachman, M. E. (2012). Factorial structure and age-related psychometrics of the MIDUS personality adjective items across the life span. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(1), 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025265

Appendix A: Study 1 Survey

Dignity at work

This survey will examine your thoughts, feelings, and experiences at work. Please answer how much you agree/disagree with each statement using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

At work

1. I think that I do a good job.
2. I think that I make an important contribution.
3. I am knowledgeable about my job.
4. I feel free to speak my mind.
5. I stand up for myself.
6. I take pride in doing a good job.
7. I am treated like a person.
8. My coworkers respect me.
9. My supervisor(s) respects me.
10. When I have something to say, people listen.
11. Other people know that I do good work.
12. My coworkers know that I am knowledgeable.
13. My work is important.
14. I take pride in the work I do.
15. My job is meaningful.
16. My job gives me status.
17. My work affects other people.
18. My work has value.
19. I have enough influence on my job.
20. I have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making.
21. I have a say in how my work gets done.
22. I can make my own decisions.
23. People in authority listen to my opinions.
24. I can control what happens to me.

Autonomy (Breaugh, 1989)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Work Method Autonomy

1. I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done (the methods to use).
2. I am able to choose the way to go about my job (the procedure to utilize).
3. I am free to choose the method(s) to use in carrying out my work.

Work Scheduling Autonomy

4. I have control over the scheduling of my work.
5. I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what).
6. My job is such that I can decide when to do particular work activities.

Work Criteria Autonomy

7. My job allows me to modify the normal way we are evaluated so that I can emphasize some aspects of my job and play down others.
8. I am able to modify what my job objectives are (what I am supposed to accomplish).
9. I have some control over what I am supposed to accomplish (what my supervisor sees as my job objectives).

Workplace Incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001)

During the past year, how often have you been in a situation where any of your supervisors or coworkers: (2 separate scales; one rating supervisor incivility, one rating coworker incivility)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Sporadically	Now and Then	Regularly	Often	Very Often	Daily

1. Put you down or was condescending to you?
2. Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion?
3. Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you?
4. Addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately?
5. Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie?
6. Doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility?
7. Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?

Workload (Kelloway & Barling, 1994)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I usually have enough time to complete my work. (R)
2. I have too much work to do.
3. I have to work very quickly to finish all of my tasks.
4. There is never enough time to finish all of my work.
5. I'm frequently behind in my work

R.I.G.H.T. Leadership (Kelloway, Penney, & Dimoff, 2017)

The following items refer to your immediate supervisor/manager. Please indicate how often he/she engages in each of the following behaviors using the scale given below.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	About Half the Time	Most of the Time	Almost Always	Always (e.g. every day)

My Manager…

1. Compliments me on my job performance
2. Notices when I do good work
3. Thanks me for the work I do
4. Tells me when I have done a good job
5. Asks for my input when making decisions
6. Gives me a say in decisions
7. Asks me for suggestions
8. Asks for my opinion
9. Identifies opportunities to develop my job-related knowledge, skills and abilities
10. Identifies opportunities to apply my skills
11. Supports my growth and development
12. Promotes my growth and developmental opportunities
13. Speaks with me about the importance of health and safety
14. Openly discusses the importance of health and safety
15. Shares information about health and safety resources
16. Addresses health and safety problems in the workplace
17. Makes sure that we work together as a team
18. Is concerned about my team members' well-being
19. Encourages my team members to collaborate with one another
20. Clearly defines each team member's roles and responsibilities

Love of the Job (Inness et al., 2022)

Now I would like to ask you about your job and the company you work for. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each item using the scale given below.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. My work is more than a job to me, it is a passion
2. I am excited to do my job each day
3. I adore what I do at work
4. I love my job
5. I love the organization for which I work
6. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
8. I love the people I work with
9. I feel very close to the people at work.
10. We can confide in each other at work.

Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999)

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. When someone in our organization makes a mistake, it is often held against them (R)
2. No one in our organization would deliberately act in a way that undermines others' efforts
3. It is difficult to ask others for help in our organization (R)
4. In our organization one is free to take risks (+)
5. The people in our organization value others' unique skills and talents
6. As an employee in our organization one is able to bring up problems and tough issues

Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB; Williams & Anderson, 1991)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

OCB-I

1. I help others who have been absent
2. I help others who have heavy work loads
3. I help orient new people even though it is not required
4. I assist my supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)

5. I take time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries
6. I take a personal interest in other employees
7. I pass along information to co-workers

OCB-O

8. My attendance at work is above the norm
9. I give advance notice when I am unable to come to work
10. I take undeserved work breaks (R)
11. A great deal of my time is spent on personal phone/email/other communications (R)
12. I complain about insignificant things at work (R)
13. I conserve and protect organizational property
14. I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order

Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB; Bennett & Robinson, 2000)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Sporadically	Now and Then	Regularly	Often	Very Often	Daily

CWB-I

1. Made fun of someone at work
2. Said something hurtful to someone at work
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work
4. Cursed at someone at work
5. Played a mean prank on someone at work
6. Acted rudely toward someone at work
7. Publicly embarrassed someone at work

CWB-O

1. Taken property from work without permission
2. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working
3. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses
4. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace
5. Come in late to work without permission
6. Littered your work environment
7. Neglected to follow your boss's instructions
8. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked
9. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person
10. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job
11. Put little effort into your work
12. Dragged out work in order to get overtime

Health (GHQ; Banks et al., 1980)

Instructions: People respond to the pressures they face in their lives in many different ways. This section of the survey focuses on how people might respond to various pressures in their lives. Please provide the answer that you believe best matches the frequency with which you have engaged in these actions or experienced these feelings since the start of the school year using the 7-point frequency scale given below.

Not at All	Rarely	Once in a While	Some of the Time	Fairly Often	Often	All of the Time
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How often in the last 3 months, have you…

1. …been able to concentrate on what you were doing?
2. …felt that you were playing a useful part in things?
3. …felt capable of making decisions about things?
4. … been able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities?
5. …been able to face up to your problems?
6. … been reasonably happy, all things considered?
7. …lost much sleep over worry? (R)
8. …felt constantly under strain? (R)
9. … felt that you couldn't overcome your difficulties? (R)
10. … been feeling unhappy and/or depressed? (R)
11. … been losing confidence in yourself? (R)
12. … been thinking of yourself as a worthless person? (R)

Dark Tetrad (DTW; Thibaut & Kelloway)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Narcissism

1. My position at work is prestigious.
2. I am much more valuable than my coworkers.
3. I demand respect at work.
4. People always pay attention to me at work.
5. Others admire me at work.
6. I like being the centre of attention at work.

Machiavellianism

7. I do not trust others at work.
8. At work, you always have to look out for number one.

9. At work, people backstab each other to get ahead.
10. At work, people are only motivated by personal gain.

Psychopathy

11. I don't care if my work behaviour hurts others.
12. I have been told I act rashly at work.
13. When I'm at work, I don't tend to think about the consequences of my actions.
14. I like to mooch off my coworkers.
15. I'm rather insensitive at work.
16. I don't care if I accidently hurt someone at work.

Sadism

17. I love to watch my boss yelling at my coworkers.
18. I can dominate others at work using fear.
19. It's funny to watch people make mistakes at work.
20. I never get tired of mocking my coworkers.
21. I would laugh if I saw someone get fired.
22. I have daydreams about hurting people I work with.

Demographics

Gender: Male____ Female____ Trans____
Prefer not to answer____ Other_____

Age: ____

Organizational tenure: _____ years _____ months

Appendix B: Study 2 (SONA) Survey

Screening question

1. Were you employed over the summer AND/OR are you currently working during the academic year?
    a. Yes
    b. No
2. Are you 18 years of age or older?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Demographics

1. To which gender identity do you most identify?
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Transgender female
    d. Transgender male
    e. Gender variant/non-conforming
    f. Not listed _____
    g. Prefer not to answer

2. Are you a full- or part-time student?
    a. Full-time
    b. Part-time

3. What year of study are you in? _____

4. What program are you in? _____

5. Are you currently employed?
    a. Yes; How many hours per week do you typically work? _____
    b. No

6. Did you have a summer job (summer 2018)?
    a. Yes; How many hours per week did you typically work? _____
    b. No

7. What is your current GPA? _____

Big Five (OCEAN-20; O'Keefe, Kelloway & Francis, 2012)

This questionnaire asks about a variety of subjects such as your attitudes towards other people, what you like doing, and how you would feel in particular circumstances. Using the following rating scale, decide how well each of the adjectives and statements below describe you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Uncharacteristic	Quite Uncharacteristic	Slightly Uncharacteristic	Neither Characteristic Nor Uncharacteristic	Slightly Characteristic	Quite Characteristic	Extremely Characteristic

1. Silent
2. Neat
3. Sympathetic
4. Organized
5. Withdrawn
6. Kind
7. Quiet
8. I have thought a lot about the origins of the universe
9. I like to keep all my belongings neat and organized
10. I often have headaches when things are not going well
11. I am always generous when it comes to helping others
12. Sometimes I get so upset, I feel sick to my stomach
13. I am highly interested in all fields of science
14. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place
15. I am fascinated with the theory of evolution
16. When I am under great stress I often feel like I am about to break down
17. I always treat other people with kindness
18. My feelings are easily hurt
19. I am very shy person
20. I would enjoy being a theoretical scientist

Love of the Job (Inness et al., 2022)

Now I would like to ask you about your job and the company you work for. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each item using the scale given below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

11. My work is more than a job to me, it is a passion
12. I am excited to do my job each day
13. I adore what I do at work
14. I love my job
15. I love the organization for which I work
16. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own
17. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
18. I love the people I work with
19. I feel very close to the people at work.
20. We can confide in each other at work.

Dark Tetrad at Work (Thibault & Kelloway)

Please rate your agreement or disagreement

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Narcissism

23. My position at work is prestigious.
24. I am much more valuable than my coworkers.
25. I demand respect at work.
26. People always pay attention to me at work.
27. Others admire me at work.
28. I like being the centre of attention at work.

Machiavellianism

29. I do not trust others at work.
30. At work, you always have to look out for number one.
31. At work, people backstab each other to get ahead.
32. At work, people are only motivated by personal gain.

Psychopathy

33. I don't care if my work behaviour hurts others.
34. I have been told I act rashly at work.

35. When I'm at work, I don't tend to think about the consequences of my actions.
36. I like to mooch off my coworkers.
37. I'm rather insensitive at work.
38. I don't care if I accidently hurt someone at work.

Sadism

39. I love to watch my boss yelling at my coworkers.
40. I can dominate others at work using fear.
41. It's funny to watch people make mistakes at work.
42. I never get tired of mocking my coworkers.
43. I would laugh if I saw someone get fired.
44. I have daydreams about hurting people I work with.

Safety-related scales (Barling, Loughlin, & Kelloway, 2002)

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently

Please respond to these questions based on your experiences at your summer job.

Safety Consciousness

1. I always wore the protective equipment or clothing required by my job
2. I was well aware of the safety risks involved in my job
3. I knew where the fire extinguishers were located in my workplace
4. I did not use equipment that I felt was unsafe
5. I informed management of any potential hazards I noticed on the job
6. I knew what procedures to follow if injured on my shift
7. I knew what to do if an emergency occurred on my shift (e.g., fire)

Safety-Related Events

1. Had something fall on me
2. Overextended myself lifting or moving things
3. Had my hand contact a blade while using or cleaning a meat slicer
4. Slipped on a slick surface and touched grill/fryer
5. Had a knife slip while cutting vegetables
6. Had grease or food splatter on me (e.g., from a grill or deep fryer)
7. Was exposed to a smoke filled environment for long periods of time
8. Had my hand contact a grill while cleaning or cooking
9. Was exposed to chemicals or cleaning solutions without proper ventilation
10. Was in contact with broken glass
11. Tripped over something on the floor

12. Fell off of something (e.g., a ladder, shelf, etc.)
13. Had clothes get caught in something (e.g., a piece of machinery)
14. Other injuries not mentioned (specify _____)
15. Please choose "often" [ATTENTION CHECK]

Injuries

1. Strains or sprains
2. Cuts or lacerations
3. Burns
4. Bruises or contusions
5. Fractured bone
6. Dislocated joint
7. Serious muscle or back pain
8. Blisters

Resilience at Work (RAW; Winwood, Colon, McEwen, 2013)

Please rate your agreement or disagreement

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I have important core values that I hold fast to in my work life
2. I am able to change my mood at work when I need to
3. I know my personal strengths and I use them regularly in my work
4. The work that I do helps to fulfill my sense of purpose in life
5. My workplace is somewhere where I feel that I belong
6. The work that I do fits well with my personal values and beliefs
7. Generally I appreciate what I have in my work environment
8. When things go wrong at work, it usually tends to overshadow the other parts of my life
9. Nothing at work ever really "fazes me" for long
10. Negative people at work tend to pull me down
11. I make sure I take breaks to maintain my strength and energy when I am working hard
12. I have developed some reliable ways to relax when I am under pressure at work
13. I have developed some reliable ways to deal with the personal stress of challenging events at work
14. I am careful to ensure that my work does not dominate my personal life

15. I often ask for feedback so that I can improve my work performance
16. I believe in giving help to my work colleagues, as well as asking for it
17. I have a good level of physical fitness
18. I am careful about eating well and healthily
19. I have friends at work whom I can rely on to support me when I need it
20. I have a strong and reliable network of supportive colleagues at work

Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988)

0	1	2	3	4
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Often

1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and "stressed"?
4. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
5. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?
6. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?
7. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?
8. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?
9. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside your control?
10. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

Work Experiences (Kelloway & Barling, 1994)

Instructions: This section of the survey asks about your experiences at work and your feelings about work in general. Please provide the answer that you believe is the best match for you indicating the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements using the 7-point scale given below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Workload

1. I have too much work to do.
2. There is never enough time to finish all of my work.
3. I have to work very quickly to finish all of my tasks.
4. I am often asked to do more than one task at the same time.

Skill Use

5. My job allows me to learn new things.
6. My job allows me to use my skills and abilities.
7. My job requires the use of many skills.

Work-Family Conflict

8. My work conflicts with my personal life.
9. Because of work, I have had to miss family functions.
10. It is difficult to balance my work and life demands.
11. My family feels that I work too much.
12. I feel that I have to choose between my work and having a family.
13. Work gets in the way of time with my family and friends.

Recognition

14. There is not enough recognition for good work in my job.
15. Nobody in authority appreciates my work.
16. I usually hear if I've done a good job.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006)

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the "0" (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.
3. Time flies when I am working.
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
5. I am enthusiastic about my job.
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me.
7. My job inspires me.
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
10. I am proud of the work that I do.
11. I am immersed in my work.
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time.
13. To me, my job is challenging.
14. I get carried away when I am working.
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job.
17. At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.

Emotional Labour (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003)

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

On an average day at work, how frequently do you . . .

Surface acting

1. Resist expressing my true feelings
2. Pretend to have emotions that I don't really have
3. Hide my true feelings about a situation

Deep acting

1. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others
2. Try to actually experience the emotions that I must show
3. Really try to feel the emotions I have to show part of my job
4. Please choose "Never" [ATTENTION CHECK]

Occupational Fatigue Exhaustion Recovery (OFER15) Scale (Winwood, 2006)

These Statements are about your experience of **fatigue** and **strain** at Work ***over the last few months***

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Select the option which best indicates your response.

1) I often feel I'm 'at the end of my rope' with my work.
2) I often dread waking up to another day of my work.
3) I often wonder how long I can keep going at my work.
4) I feel that most of the time I'm just "Living to Work.
5) Too much is expected of me in my work.
6) After a typical work period I have little energy left.
7) I usually feel exhausted when I get home from work.
8) My work drains my energy completely every day.
9) I usually have lots of energy to give to my family or friends.
10) I usually have plenty of energy left for my hobbies and other activities after I finish work.
11) I never have enough time between work shift to recover my energy completely.

12) Even if I'm tired from one shift, I'm usually refreshed by the start of the next shift.
13) I rarely recover my strength fully between work shifts.
14) Recovering from work fatigue between work shifts isn't a problem for me.
15) I'm often still feeling fatigued from one shift by the time I start the next one.

OFER-CF; Chronic Fatigue subscale comprises items 1-5 inclusive.
OFER-AF Acute Fatigue subscale comprises items 6-10 inclusive.
OFER-IR Intershift Recovery subscale comprises items 11-15 inclusive.

Do you have pain (such as migraines, back pain, or arthritis pain) that has persisted for about 3 months or more?

- Yes
- No

McGill Pain Questionnaire (Melzach, 2005)

What Does Your Pain Feel Like?

Statement: Some of the following words below describe your present pain. Circle ONLY those words that best describe it. Leave out any category that is not suitable. **Use only a single word in each appropriate category** - the one that applies best.
Please give a point from 1 to 5.

1	2	3	4	5
No pain				Very severe pain

Group	Descriptor	Points
Temporal	Flickering	
	Quivering	
	Pulsing	
	Throbbing	
	Beating	
	Pounding	
[redacted]		
Spatial	Jumping	
	Flashing	
	Shooting	
[redacted]		
Punctate Pressure	Pricking	
	Boring	
	Drilling	
	Stabbing	

	Lancinating
Incisive Pressure	Sharp
	Cutting
	Lacerating
Constrictive Pressure	Pinching
	Pressing
	Gnawing
	Cramping
	Crushing
Traction Pressure	Tugging
	Pulling
	Wrenching
Thermal	Hot
	Boring
	Scalding
	Searing
Brightness	Tingling
	Itchy
	Smarting
	Stinging
Dullness	Dull
	Sore
	Hurting
	Aching
	Heavy
Sensory Miscellaneous	Tender
	Taut
	Rasping
	Splitting
Tension	Tiring
	Exhausting

Autonomic	Sickening
	Suffocating
Fear	Fearful
	Frightful
	Terrifying
Punishment	Punishing
	Grueling
	Cruel
	Vicious
	Killing
Affective-Evaluative-Sensory: Miscellaneous	Wretched
	Blinding
Evaluative	Annoying
	Troublesome
	Miserable
	Intense
	Unbearable
Sensory: Miscellaneous	Spreading
	Radiating
	Penetrating
	Piercing
Sensory	Cool
	Cold
	Freezing
Affective-Evaluative: Miscellaneous	Nagging
	Nauseating
	Agonizing
	Dreadful
	Torturing

How Does Your Pain Change with Time? (from 0 to 5)

Question	Response	Points
1. Which word or words would you use to describe the pattern of your pain?	a) Continuous b) Steady c) Constant	
2. Which word or words would you use to describe the pattern of your pain?	a) rhythmic b) periodic c) intermittent	
3. Which word or words would you use to describe the pattern of your pain?	a) brief b) momentary c) transient	

Creative Self-Efficacy Measure (Tierney & Farmer, 2002)

Instructions: *Using the following responses, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each statement currently describes you.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree

Items:

1. I feel that I am good at generating novel ideas.
2. I have confidence in my ability to solve problems creatively.
3. I have a knack for further developing the ideas of others.

Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000)

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

My supervisor …

1. Ridicules me
2. Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid
3. Gives me the silent treatment.
4. Puts me down in front of others
5. Invades my privacy.
6. Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures.
7. Doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort.
8. Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment.

9. Breaks promises he/she makes.
10. Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason.
11. Makes negative comments about me to others
12. Is rude to me.
13. Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers.
14. Tells me I'm incompetent.
15. Lies to me.

Masculinity Contest Culture Scale (Glick, Berdahl, & Alonso, 2018)

1	2	3	4	5
Completely Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Completely Agree

In my work environment….

1. Admitting you don't know the answer looks weak
2. Expressing any emotion other than anger or pride is seen as weak
3. Seeking other's advice is seen as weak
4. The most respected people don't show emotions
5. People who show doubt lose respect
6. It's important to be in good physical shape to be respected
7. People who are physically smaller have to work harder to get respect
8. Physically imposing people have more influence
9. Physical stamina is admired
10. Athletic people are especially admired
11. To succeed you can't let family interfere with work
12. Taking days off is frowned upon
13. To get ahead you need to be able to work long hours
14. Leadership expects employees to put work first
15. People with significant demands outside of work don't make it very far
16. You're either "in" or you're "out," and once you're out, you're out
17. If you don't stand up for yourself people will step on you
18. You can't be too trusting
19. You've got to watch your back
20. One person's loss is another person's gain

Dignity at work (Thibault & Kelloway)

This survey will examine your thoughts, feelings, and experiences at work. Please answer how much you agree/disagree with each statement using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

At work

1. I think that I do a good job.
2. I think that I make an important contribution.
3. I am knowledgeable about my job.
4. I feel free to speak my mind.
5. I stand up for myself.
6. I take pride in doing a good job.
7. I am treated like a person.
8. My coworkers respect me.
9. My supervisor(s) respects me.
10. When I have something to say, people listen.
11. Other people know that I do good work.
12. My coworkers know that I am knowledgeable.
13. My work is important.
14. I take pride in the work I do.
15. My job is meaningful.
16. My job gives me status.
17. My work affects other people.
18. My work has value.
19. I have enough influence on my job.
20. I have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making.
21. I have a say in how my work gets done.
22. I can make my own decisions.
23. People in authority listen to my opinions.
24. I can control what happens to me.
25. Please choose “Strongly Agree” [ATTENTION CHECK]

Global Transformational Leadership (GTL; Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000)

1	2	3	4	5
Rarely or never				Very frequently, if not always

1. Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future
2. Treats staff as individuals, supports and encourages their development
3. Gives encouragement and recognition to staff
4. Fosters trust, involvement and cooperation among team members
5. Encourages thinking about problems in new ways and questions assumptions
6. Is clear about his/her values and practices what s/he preaches
7. Instills pride and respect in others and inspires me by being highly competent

Appendix C: Study 3 (RIGHT) Survey

R.I.G.H.T. Leadership (Kelloway, Penney, & Dimoff, 2017)

The following items refer to your immediate supervisor/manager. Please indicate how often he/she engages in each of the following behaviors using the scale given below.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	About Half the Time	Most of the Time	Almost Always	Always (e.g. every day)

My Manager…

1. Compliments me on my job performance
2. Notices when I do good work
3. Thanks me for the work I do
4. Tells me when I have done a good job
5. Asks for my input when making decisions
6. Gives me a say in decisions
7. Asks me for suggestions
8. Asks for my opinion
9. Identifies opportunities to develop my job-related knowledge, skills and abilities
10. Identifies opportunities to apply my skills
11. Supports my growth and development
12. Promotes my growth and developmental opportunities
13. Speaks with me about the importance of health and safety
14. Openly discusses the importance of health and safety
15. Shares information about health and safety resources
16. Addresses health and safety problems in the workplace
17. Makes sure that we work together as a team
18. Is concerned about my team members' well-being
19. Encourages my team members to collaborate with one another
20. Clearly defines each team member's roles and responsibilities

Love of the Job (Inness et al., 2022)

Now I would like to ask you about your job and the company you work for. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each item using the scale given below.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. My work is more than a job to me, it is a passion
2. I am excited to do my job each day
3. I adore what I do at work
4. I love my job
5. I love the organization for which I work
6. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
8. I love the people I work with
9. I feel very close to the people at work.
10. We can confide in each other at work.

Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999)

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. When someone in our organization makes a mistake, it is often held against them (R)
2. No one in our organization would deliberately act in a way that undermines others' efforts
3. It is difficult to ask others for help in our organization (R)
4. In our organization one is free to take risks (+)
5. The people in our organization value others' unique skills and talents
6. As an employee in our organization one is able to bring up problems and tough issues

Health (GHQ; Banks et al., 1980)

Instructions: People respond to the pressures they face in their lives in many different ways. This section of the survey focuses on how people might respond to various pressures in their lives. Please provide the answer that you believe best matches the frequency with which you have engaged in these actions or experienced these feelings since the start of the school year using the 7-point frequency scale given below.

Not at All	Rarely	Once in a While	Some of the Time	Fairly Often	Often	All of the Time

How often in the last 3 months, have you…

1. …been able to concentrate on what you were doing?
2. …felt that you were playing a useful part in things?
3. …felt capable of making decisions about things?
4. … been able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities?
5. …been able to face up to your problems?
6. … been reasonably happy, all things considered?
7. …lost much sleep over worry? (R)
8. …felt constantly under strain? (R)
9. … felt that you couldn't overcome your difficulties? (R)
10. … been feeling unhappy and/or depressed? (R)
11. … been losing confidence in yourself? (R)
12. … been thinking of yourself as a worthless person? (R)

Dignity at work (Thibault & Kelloway)

This survey will examine your thoughts, feelings, and experiences at work. Please answer how much you agree/disagree with each statement using the following scale:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

At work…

1. I have a say in how my work gets done.
2. I can make my own decisions.
3. I have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making.
4. My work has value.
5. My job is meaningful.
6. My work affects other people.
7. I am treated like a person.
8. My supervisor(s) respects me.
9. My coworkers respect me.
10. I am knowledgeable about my job.
11. I think that I do a good job.
12. I take pride in doing a good job.

Demographics

Gender: Male____ Female____ Trans____
Prefer not to answer____ Other_____

Age: ____

Organizational tenure: _____ years _____ months

Appendix D: Study 4 (COVID-19) Survey

Inclusion criteria

Are you currently employed (and work for at least 20 hours per week)?

- Yes
- No

Do you work in a retail or customer-service oriented job?

- Yes
- No

What country do you currently live in?

- Canada
- United States
- Other _____

Are you 18 years or older? (screen out no)

- Yes
- No

Context

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. The company I work for provides an essential service
2. My job is essential during the pandemic
3. My employer requires me to be physically present at my place of work
4. My employer is requiring me to perform new or alternative job duties
5. My employer is requiring me to work more hours than before the pandemic
6. My employer is requiring me to work a different schedule than before the pandemic
7. Task Significance
8. My job provides opportunities to substantially improve the welfare of others during the COVID-19 pandemic
9. A lot of people can be positively affected by how well my job gets done during the pandemic
10. My job enhances the welfare of others during the COVID-19 pandemic
11. My job provides opportunities to have positive impact on others during the COVID-19 pandemic

Fear of Infection

1. I am afraid that there will be a case of COVID-19 in my workplace
2. I am worried about my health during this pandemic

3. I worry about how safe my workplace is from infectious disease
4. I am afraid that the exposure to COVID-19 might become more serious.
5. I know how to take care of myself during the pandemic

Wilson & Holmvall, 2013 – Customer incivility scale

0	1	2	3	4
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All the time

In the last 2 weeks, how often have customers…

1. ...continued to complain despite your efforts to assist them
2. ...made gestures (e.g., eye rolling, sighing) to express their impatience
3. ...grumbled to you about slow service during busy times
4. ...made negative remarks to you about your organization
5. ...blamed you for a problem you did not cause
6. ...used an inappropriate manner of addressing you (e.g., “Hey you”)
7. ...failed to acknowledge your efforts when you have gone out of your way to help them
8. ...grumbled to you that there were too few employees working
9. ...complained to you about the value of goods and services
10. ...made inappropriate gestures to get your attention (e.g., snapping fingers)

Workload (Kelloway & Barling, 1994)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Considering the last 2 weeks, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by using the following scale:

1. I usually have enough time to complete my work. (R)
2. I have too much work to do.
3. I have to work very quickly to finish all of my tasks.
4. There is never enough time to finish all of my work.
5. I’m frequently behind in my work

Emotional Labour (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003)

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

On an average day at work in the last 2 weeks, how frequently do you . . .

Surface acting

1. Resist expressing your true feelings
2. Pretend to have emotions that you don't really have
3. Hide your true feelings about a situation

Deep acting

1. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that you need to display to others
2. Try to actually experience the emotions that you must show
3. Really try to feel the emotions you have to show as? part of your job

Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988)

0	1	2	3	4
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Often

1. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
2. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
3. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”?
4. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
5. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt that things were going your way?
6. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?
7. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?
8. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?
9. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside your control?
10. In the last 2 weeks, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

R.I.G.H.T. Leadership – short form (Kelloway, Penney, & Dimoff, 2017)

The following items refer to your immediate supervisor/manager. Please indicate how often he/she engaged in each of the following behaviors in the last 2 weeks *using the scale given below.*

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	About Half the Time	Most of the Time	Almost Always	Always (e.g. every day)

My leader…

1. Tells me when I have done a good job
2. Gives me a say in decisions
3. Identifies opportunities to apply my skills
4. Openly discusses the importance of health and safety
5. Encourages my team members to collaborate with one another

Dignity at work (Thibault & Kelloway)

This survey will examine your thoughts, feelings, and experiences at work. Please answer how much you agree/disagree with each statement using the following scale:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

In the last 2 weeks *at work…*

1. I have a say in how my work gets done.
2. I can make my own decisions.
3. I have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making.
4. My work has value.
5. My job is meaningful.
6. My work affects other people.
7. I am treated like a person.
8. My supervisor(s) respects me.
9. My coworkers respect me.
10. I am knowledgeable about my job.
11. I think that I do a good job.
12. I take pride in doing a good job.

Job Insecurity scale (De Witte, 2000)

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Partly agree partly disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

Considering the last 2 weeks, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by using the following scale:

1. Chances are, I will soon lose my job.
2. I am sure I can keep my job. (R)
3. I feel insecure about the future of my job.
4. I think I might lose my job in the near future.

SAFER Leadership

Below are a number of statements concerning your perceptions of your supervisor. Use the rating scale to rate the extent to which you feel each statement represents your supervisor's behaviour at work in the last 2 weeks.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Regularly	Usually	Always

My supervisor…

1. Talks about safety related problems at work
2. Talks about how to prevent exposure to COVID-19
3. Communicates a positive vision of workplace safety
4. Complies with the COVID-19 safety protocols he/she describes
5. Pays attention to safety rules and regulations
6. Practices what he/she preaches when it comes to safety
7. Demonstrates a commitment to a safe workplace
8. Monitors the workplace for any unsafe conditions
9. Motivates employees to be safe
10. Encourages employees to suggest new ways to improve safety
11. Asks employees to share their perspectives on safety
12. Encourages employees to report any challenges related to safety
13. Praises employees when they are being safe
14. Recognizes employees who perform their jobs safely
15. Praises employees who prioritize safety

Safety Compliance, Participation and Willingness

1. I use all the necessary safety equipment to do my job.
2. I carry out my work in a safe manner.
3. I follow correct safety rules and procedures while carrying out my job.
4. I put extra effort to improve the safety of the workplace.

5. I voluntarily carryout tasks or activities that help to improve workplace safety.
6. I encourage my co-workers to work safely.
7. I would be willing to invest a great deal of effort to improve safety in my workplace.
8. I would be willing to invest a great deal of time to improve safety in my workplace
9. I would be willing to invest a great deal of energy to improve safety in my workplace.

Self-Protection

Use the rating scale to rate the extent to which you feel each statement represents your behaviour at work in the last 2 weeks.

1. I've been washing my hands with soap and water more frequently.
2. I've been using hand sanitizers regularly.
3. I've been avoiding physical contact with other people.
4. I've maintained as much distance as possible between myself and other people.
5. I've avoided touching items that may be contaminated with COVID-19. (Added)
6. I've been wearing gloves at work. (Added)

Social Distance

Use the rating scale to rate the extent to which you feel each statement represents your behaviour at work in the last 2 weeks.

1. I avoid greetings that involve touching.
2. I maintain physical distance from others (6 feet/2m).
3. I limit my attendance at gatherings of groups of people.
4. I avoid being in enclosed spaces with other people.

Safety Voice

In the last 2 weeks, how frequently at your main job did you engage in these behaviors:

1. Tell my supervisor about the consequences of dangerous working conditions
2. Group together with coworkers and take safety concerns to the supervisor
3. Tell my supervisor about hazardous work

Climate for Civility (Walsh et al., 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Considering the last 2 weeks, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by using the following scale:

1. Rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers.
2. Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your organization.
3. Respectful treatment is the norm in your organization.

4. Your coworkers make sure everyone in your organization is treated with respect.

Safety Culture/Climate (Kelloway & Calnan, 2013)

Below are a number of statements concerning your perceptions of safety at your workplace and your safety behaviour in the last 2 weeks. Use the scale below to rate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. My coworkers value their own safety
2. My coworkers believe safety is a top priority
3. My coworkers believe in working safely
4. My coworkers look out for each other's safety
5. My coworkers always wear their safety equipment
6. My coworkers always work as safely as possible
7. There is an effective health and safety committee at the workplace
8. Incidents are always reported
9. All reported incidents are formally documented
10. Internal health and safety inspections are done on a routine basis
11. Safety issues are dealt with effectively in my workplace
12. I have access to all of the health and safety resources that I need

Organizational Exposure Reducing Measures and infection prevention measures

Considering the last 2 weeks, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by using the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My employer…

1. Promotes frequent and thorough hand washing
2. Encourages frequent use of hand sanitizer when handwashing is not an option
3. Discourages employees from touching their eyes, nose, and mouth
4. Encourages employees to cover coughs and sneezes with elbow
5. Provides personal protective equipment (PPE) recommended by occupational health and safety guidelines (e.g., masks, shields, gloves, etc.)

6. Conducts routine cleaning and disinfecting of surfaces and equipment in the work environment
7. Encourages employees to self-monitor for signs and symptoms of COVID-19
8. Encourages employees to follow recommended guidelines for self-isolating
9. Encourages maintaining a physical distance of 2m (6 feet) between individuals
10. Modifies the physical workspace to minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19 (i.e., physical barriers)
11. Modifies work processes to minimize the risk of exposure (i.e., going cashless)
12. Minimizes interactions between customers and employees, (i.e., limiting the number of customers permitted in the work environment)
13. Adjusts workplace policies and procedures to reduce social contact
14. Cancels or postpones non-essential work-related travel
15. Cancels or postpones non-essential in-person meetings

Communication

Considering the last 2 weeks, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. My organization provided employees with information during the early stages of the pandemic.
2. My organization provided information about plans to address COVID-19 in a timely manner.
3. My organization quickly updated information as the situation progressed.
4. Information provided by my employer contained relevant information.
5. My organization provided me with advice about how to reduce my exposure to COVID-19
6. My organization provided me with information about recommended hygiene practices.
7. My organization acknowledged the stress and anxiety employees may be experiencing.
8. My organization provided information about policies and procedures for employees to report when they are sick or experiencing symptoms of COVID-19.
9. My organization provided me opportunities to communicate my concerns.

PTSD Scale

On a scale from 1-5 please indicate how much you have been bothered by each problem in the last 2 weeks.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Fairly	Extremely

1. Repeated, disturbing memories, thoughts, or images of a stressful experience from the past?
2. Feeling very upset when something reminded you of a stressful experience from the past?
3. Avoided activities or situations because they reminded you of a stressful experience from the past?
4. Feeling distant or cut off from other people?
5. Feeling irritable or having angry outbursts?
6. Difficulty concentrating?
7. Being “super-alert” or watchful or on guard?
8. Feeling jumpy or easily startled?

Demographics

What is your age in years? _____

What is your biological sex?

- Male
- Female
- Intersex
- Prefer not to respond

With what gender do you most identify?

- Man
- Woman
- Non-binary
- Other _____
- Prefer not respond

Ethnicity

- White/Caucasian
- Asian or pacific Islander
- First Nations/Métis/Inuit
- Hispanic/Latino
- Arabian

- Black/African Canadian
- Other (please specify) _____

Are you currently employed full-time or part-time?

- Full-time (>35 hours per week)
- Part-time (20-35 hours per week)
- Part-time (but less than 20 hours per week)

What is your occupation? _____
What industry do you work in?

- Retail (please specify) _____
- Service (please specify) _____
- Other (please specify) _____

What best describes your position in the organization?

- Front-line employee
- Supervisor or manager
- Other (please specify) _____

I am paid…

- Salary
- Hourly
- Other _____

How long have you worked with your current organization? (in years) _____
What province (if Canadian) or state (if American) do you currently live in? _____
Do you consider yourself immunocompromised (i.e., having an impaired immune system)?

- Yes
- No

What is your highest completed level of education?

- High school
- College Diploma
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree
- Other (please describe): _____

What is your marital status?

- single
- never married/common-law
- married/common-law

- widowed
- separated or divorced

Do you have any minors/children under the age of 18 as your dependents currently living with you in your home?

- Yes: how many _____
- No

Ages of children:

- 1: ____ 2: ____ etc.

Do you care for anyone else at your home (e.g., a parent)?

- Yes
- No