



Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología

<http://revistalatinoamericanadepsicologia.konradlorenz.edu.co/>



ORIGINAL

Adaptation and validation into Spanish of the Workplace Dignity Scale

Mario Sainz ^{a,b}, Roberto M. Lobato ^{c,*}, Frida Porrás-Caballero ^a

^a School of Psychology, University of Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico

^b Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

^c Euro-Arab Foundation for Higher Studies, Granada, Spain

Received 8 September 2020; accepted 15 June 2021

KEYWORDS

Dignity, indignity, scale, workplace, spanish speakers

Abstract Introduction and objective: Workers contend with many threats while performing their daily routine that could undermine their dignity, such as denigrating comments from supervisors or co-workers. Denying workers' dignity constitutes a direct threat towards their well-being. The aim of this paper is to adapt and validate the Spanish version of the Workplace Dignity Scale (WDS). **Method:** An instrumental design was executed in order to adapt the scale to Spanish with a Mexican population ($N = 588$). Following back-translation, three studies were conducted in which confirmatory factor analysis, correlations, regressions, and invariance analysis were applied. **Results:** The results showed that the Spanish adaptation conforms to the six-factor structure of the original scale and that organisational dehumanisation and workers' self-objectification predicted dignity at work; with workers' self-objectification being the variable that most strongly predicted workers' dignity. Finally, we also evaluated measurement invariance comparing our data with the results of the original scale. In general, results indicated that even when the Spanish version of the WDS presented an adequate factor structure, its measurement presented different factor loadings and slopes compared with the measurement of the original scale. **Conclusions:** In general, we have an instrument adapted to the Mexican context that allows us to evaluate workers' sense of dignity in the workplace.

© 2021 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Adaptación y validación al español de la Escala Dignidad en el Trabajo

PALABRAS CLAVE

Dignidad, indignidad, escala, lugar de trabajo, hispanohablantes

Resumen Introducción y objetivo: Los trabajadores pueden enfrentar muchas amenazas mientras realizan su rutina diaria que podrían socavar su dignidad, como comentarios denigrantes de supervisores o compañeros de trabajo. Negar la dignidad de los trabajadores constituye una amenaza directa para su bienestar. El objetivo de este artículo fue adaptar y validar la versión en español de la Workplace Dignity Scale (WDS). **Método:** Se realizó un diseño instrumental con el fin de adaptar la escala al español con población mexicana ($N = 588$). Después de realizar una traducción inversa, se realizaron tres estudios donde se aplicaron análisis factoriales confirmatorios, correlaciones, regresiones y un análisis de invarianza. **Resultados:** Los resultados mostraron que la adaptación al español se ajusta a la estructura

* Corresponding author.
E-mail: romulobato@gmail.com

de seis factores de la escala original y que la deshumanización organizacional y la auto-objetivación de los trabajadores predecían la dignidad en el trabajo; siendo la auto-objetivación de los trabajadores la variable que predecía en mayor medida la dignidad de los trabajadores. Finalmente, también se evaluó la invariancia de medición comparando nuestros datos con los resultados de la escala original. En general, los resultados indicaron que aun cuando la versión en español de la WDS presentaba una estructura factorial adecuada, su medición presentaba cargas factoriales y pendientes diferentes en comparación con la medición de la escala original. **Conclusiones:** En general, contamos con un instrumento adaptado al contexto mexicano que nos permite evaluar el sentido de dignidad de los trabajadores en el lugar de trabajo.

© 2021 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Dignity is considered an intrinsic value possessed by all human beings (Sayer, 2007); nevertheless, it is continually challenged and denied to certain individuals and groups (Christoff, 2014). This is especially true in the organisational sphere (Lucas, 2017; Vesga Rodríguez et al., 2020). In this specific context, workers contend with many threats that could undermine their dignity such as denigrating comments from supervisors or co-workers (Tepper, 2000, 2007; Tye-Williams & Krone, 2015), the stigma of performing filthy jobs (Ackroyd, 2007; Yu, 2016) or inadequate material conditions (e.g., low pay or wages; Leana et al., 2012; Spontón et al., 2019), among others. Due to this construct's potential relevance to the organisational sphere and its direct influence on workers' well-being (Yalden & McCormack, 2010), we validated and adapted the Workplace Dignity Scale (WDS; Thomas & Lucas, 2019) into Spanish, to expand the potential scope of research that can be undertaken on this topic.

Workplace Dignity

Workplace dignity is a process in which people engage in self- or other-recognition of the inherent human worth that each individual has (or lacks) accrued from performing a work activity (Lucas, 2017; Thomas & Lucas, 2019). As stated by previous authors, dignity is a subjective and self-constructed process that is also closely related to the assessments that individuals make of their own worth, as well as to the recognition of the worth that others ascribe to individuals (Lucas, 2015). This implies that dignity is inherent and unconditional in each human being. In the workplace, dignity is also complemented or reinforced with the perceptions that workers have concerning their daily work and the quality of the interactions that they have, when performing on the job (Lucas, 2015). In this regard, many manifestations can reinforce workers' dignity such as having respectful interactions with co-workers or being recognised for their work efforts (Hodson, 2001). Other factors such as disrespectful interactions, acting with denigrating behaviour or limiting work opportunities could negatively impact workers by threatening their dignity (Tiwari & Sharma, 2019) and thus create feelings of indignity among individuals in the workplace.

In this sense, previous literature differentiated between the factors that protect dignity at work versus the factors

that promote perceived indignity among workers. Regarding protective roles, individual variables such as feeling competent (Van den Broeck et al., 2010), having prestige within the organization (Djurdjevic et al., 2017) and finding the activities being performed to be meaningful (May et al., 2004) could foster workers' dignity. Among the psychosocial risk factors that can decrease dignity, we can stress the presence of abusive leadership (Tepper, 2000) or the perception of being dehumanised within the company (Caesens et al., 2017), which can even lead to workers' inferiorisation by self-dehumanisation (Baldissarri et al., 2019). All of these negative factors might not only lead to indignity among workers but also have some detrimental consequences, such as feelings of alienation during their work (Nair & Vohra, 2010) or lowered job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al., 1997).

Acknowledging these negative consequences stemming from a lack of work dignity, we aimed to adapt the Workplace Dignity Scale (WDS, Thomas & Lucas, 2019) into Spanish. Accordingly, we carried out a study to translate the items, confirm the scale's original factor structure (CFA), and analyse the scale's correlation with Mexican workers. Subsequently, we conducted a second study to provide evidence of the extent to which the Spanish version of the WDS is predicted by organisational dehumanisation and workers' self-objectification. We ended by carrying out a third study to evaluate the equivalence between the measurements of the original scale and the adaptation presented in this research. All of these findings allowed us to expand the scope of workplace dignity research by providing a tool to study this process among Mexican workers.

Study 1

In this study, we aimed to adapt the scale to the Spanish context. First, we conducted a direct back-translation of the WDS's items (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Second, we carried out a factor analysis to confirm the six factors of the scale's dimensionality: workplace indignity, respectful interaction, recognition of competence and contribution, equality, inherent value, and general feelings of workplace dignity. We ended by testing the scale's convergent and divergent validity with related constructs in the work sphere.

Method

Translation and Evaluation of the Items

First, the original items were independently translated from the source language (English) to the target language (Spanish) by two bilingual work psychology experts (Hambleton, 2005). We compared and resolved possible discrepancies between the translations. Then, the items were inversely translated, from Spanish to English, by two different professionals. We ended the translation process by analysing the integrity of the translation, as compared with the original items (see supplementary materials).

Second, we asked two experts (a woman and a man) in the work domain to evaluate the wording of each item. Slight modifications were made to the translated items based on the judgment evaluation (Table 1).

Participants, Procedure and Analysis Plan

The study comprised of 263 Mexican workers (126 females; $M_{age} = 40.96$, $SD = 10.31$) from different organisations and occupations. To recruit participants, we used a snowball method. Participants were recruited online through social media platforms and asked to diffuse the survey among their co-workers or other working professionals. We provided them with a link to a survey on working conditions that takes around 15 minutes to complete. The survey comprised of the translated WDS and several variables to test its convergent and divergent validity. The analyses performed included descriptive statistics, confirmatory factor analysis, and bivariate correlations. Once volunteers agreed

to participate in the study, they were presented with the following information:

Workplace Dignity Scale. We include the 18 items of the WDS from Thomas and Lucas (2019) translated into Spanish. Answers were provided by using a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). This scale comprised of six factors: workplace indignity (e.g., “I am treated in undignified ways at work”), respectful interaction (e.g., “I feel respected when I interact with people at work”), recognition of competence and contribution (e.g., “People show they appreciate my work efforts”), equality (e.g., “I feel just as valued as others in the organisation”), inherent value (e.g., “People at work genuinely value me as a person”), and general feelings concerning workplace dignity (e.g., “I am treated with dignity at work”).

Convergent and divergent validity. To assess the validity of the translated construct, we include the following variables (based on Thomas & Lucas, 2019): the Need for Competence Scale (e.g., “I feel competent at my job”; Van den Broeck et al., 2010), the Workplace Status Scale (e.g., “I have a great deal of prestige in my organisation”; Djurdjevic et al., 2017), the Work Alienation Scale (e.g., “I do not feel connected to the events in my workplace”; Nair & Vohra, 2010), meaningfulness at work (e.g., “My job activities are personally meaningful to me”; May et al., 2004), abusive leadership (e.g., “My supervisor ridicules me”; Tepper, 2000), organisational dehumanisation (e.g., “My organisation considers me only as a number”; Caesens et al., 2017), self-objectification (computed as a single measure by subtracting instrument-like scores from human scores; Baldissarri et al., 2019), and job satisfaction (e.g., “All in

Table 1 Originals and translated items of the Work Dignity Scale

Workplace Dignity Scale (WDS)	Escala de Dignidad en el Trabajo (SDT)
1. People at work communicate with me respectfully.	La gente en el trabajo se comunica conmigo respetuosamente.
2. I feel respected when I interact with people at work.	Me siento respetado cuando interactúo con gente en el trabajo.
3. I am treated with respect at work.	Me tratan con respeto en el trabajo.
4. At work, I have the chance to build my competence.	En el trabajo, tengo la oportunidad de desarrollar mis habilidades.
5. People at work recognize my competence.	La gente en el trabajo reconoce mis habilidades.
6. People show they appreciate my work efforts.	La gente muestra que valora mis esfuerzos en el trabajo.
7. At work, people talk to me like an equal, even if there are status differences between us.	En el trabajo, la gente me habla como un igual, incluso cuando existen diferencias de estatus entre nosotros.
8. I feel just as valued as others in the organization.	Me siento tan valorado como los demás en la organización.
9. At work, I am valued as a human being.	En el trabajo, soy valorado como un ser humano.
10. People at work treat me like I matter as a person, not just as a worker.	La gente en el trabajo me trata como una persona, no solo como un trabajador.
11. People at work genuinely value me as a person.	La gente en el trabajo realmente me valora como persona.
12. My workplace is a source of dignity for me.	Mi lugar de trabajo es una fuente de dignidad para mí.
13. I am treated with dignity at work.	Me tratan con dignidad en el trabajo.
14. I have dignity at work.	Tengo dignidad en el trabajo.
15. People at work treat me like a second-class citizen.	La gente en el trabajo me trata como un ciudadano de segunda clase.
16. I am treated as less valuable than objects or pieces of equipment.	Me tratan como si fuera menos valioso/a que los objetos o piezas de trabajo.
17. My dignity suffers at work.	No siento que tenga dignidad en este trabajo.
18. I am treated in undignifying ways at work.	Soy tratado de manera poco digna en el trabajo.

all, I am very satisfied with my current job"; Eisenberger et al., 1997).

Finally, the participants provided demographic information (gender, age, nationality, and language) and work details (years at the company and working hours; see supplementary materials).

Results and Discussion

Dimensionality of the Work Dignity Scale with Mexican Workers

To test the scale's structure, we carried out three confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs; Table 3). The assumption of multivariate normality was tested. Because it showed multivariate kurtosis (Mardia's normalised coefficient of 117.54) and skewness (Mardia's normalised coefficient of 10027.60), we decided to test the three models with CFA using maximum likelihood estimators with robust standard errors (Satorra-Bentler scaling corrections; Satorra & Bentler, 2001) using *lavaan* package for R (Rosseel, 2012). According to the analysis, Model 1 with two first-order factors (dignity: items 1-14 and indignity: items 15-18) showed an adequate model fit (Kline, 2016). Likewise, Model 2 with six first-order factors (respectful interaction: items 1-3; competence contribution: items 4-6; equality: items 7 and 8; inherent value: items 9-11; general dignity: items 12-14; and indignity: items 15-18) showed an improvement in the fit indexes. Finally, we tested Model 3 with a six-factor second-order structure, which was proposed in the scale's original factor structure (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). The goodness of this model's fit was also adequate. The results also indicated that Model 2 presented a better fit than Model 3 ($p < .001$), although both presented an excellent fit. Bearing in mind the adequate fit of both models, we decided to maintain the original structure proposed by Thomas and Lucas (2019). Given

that measurement invariance was computed using the same sample as in Studies 1 and 2, these analyses will be presented in Study 3.

Correlations of the Work Dignity Scale

The bivariate correlations among the sub-factors of the WDS were computed (Table 2). In general, the results turned out in the expected orientation. Dignity sub-factors (in opposition to the indignity factor) seemed to be positively related to the need for competence and workplace status along with job satisfaction, but were negatively related to psychological risk factors in the workplace such as abusive leadership, organisational dehumanisation, or self-objectification. These findings underscore that workplace dignity aligns with variables that promote workers' well-being, while perceptions of indignity are related to negative processes such as dehumanisation or the denigration of individuals (see all the correlations between measures in the supplementary materials).

Study 2

In this study, we aimed to expand upon previous findings by exploring the extent to which the WDS is predicted by perceptions of being dehumanised in the organisation (i.e., organisational dehumanisation) and internalisation of this dehumanised perception (i.e., self-objectification). Based on the variables included in the previous study, we decided to focus on these two specific processes: organisational dehumanisation and self-objectification. This was due to our acknowledgement of the detrimental effect that dehumanisation and its diverse manifestations have on interpersonal relationships (see Haslam & Loughnan, 2014). Further, in the organisational sphere, previous evidence highlights the negative effect that organisational dehumanisation and

Table 2 Descriptive statistics and correlations among the measurements included in Study 1 with the WDS subfactor

	Items	Scale	α	Mean (SD)	1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5
1. Workplace dignity	14	1 to 7	.975	6.08 (1.27)	-					
1.1 Respectful interaction	3	1 to 7	.960	6.30 (1.30)	.913	-				
1.2 Recognition of competence	4	1 to 7	.908	5.87 (1.36)	.902	.733	-			
1.3 Equality	2	1 to 7	$r = .552$	5.82 (1.44)	.893	.756	.812	-		
1.4 Inherent value	3	1 to 7	.962	6.11 (1.46)	.949	.848	.804	.804	-	
1.5 Feelings of dignity	3	1 to 7	.935	6.22 (1.35)	.950	.862	.806	.802	.896	-
2. Workplace indignity	4	1 to 7	.911	1.88 (1.53)	-.685	-.675	-.585	-.575	-.642	-.671
3. Need for competence scale	6	1 to 7	.712	6.14 (0.97)	.373	.327	.385	.323	.324	.355
4. Workplace Status scale	5	1 to 7	.943	5.07 (1.65)	.428	.344	.469	.405	.378	.379
5. Work alienation scale	5	1 to 7	.901	1.89 (1.21)	-.384	-.333	-.408	-.343	-.331	-.359
6. Meaningfulness at work	5	1 to 7	.957	6.19 (1.28)	.430	.325	.447	.419	.369	.434
7. Abusive leadership	15	1 to 5	.940	1.36 (0.97)	-.419	-.415	-.337	-.382	-.426	-.373
8. Organisational dehumanisation	11	1 to 5	.848	2.18 (0.94)	-.356	-.252	-.376	-.339	-.368	-.305
9. Self-objectification	10	1 to 7	Index	-3.87 (1.99)	-.398	-.350	-.368	-.331	-.392	-.376
9.1 Instrument words	5	-	.857	2.09 (1.37)	-.386	-.356	-.365	-.299	-.362	-.370
9.2 Human words	5	-	.669	5.95 (1.11)	.297	.241	.264	.271	.309	.279
10. Job satisfaction	4	1 to 7	.905	5.84 (1.35)	.525	.377	.583	.514	.455	.503

Note. All correlations are significant, $p < .05$.

Table 3 Fit index for the confirmatory factor analyses according to the different models proposed in Studies 1 and 2

	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% IC)	SRMR	AIC
Study 1 (N = 250)							
Model 1. Two dimensions (first-order)	789.141*	134	0.886	0.870	0.140 (0.130 - 0.149)	0.043	11558.89
Model 2. Six dimensions (first-order)	352.006*	120	0.960	0.948	0.088 (0.077 - 0.099)	0.032	11149.75
Model 3. Six dimensions (second-order)	418.567*	129	0.950	0.940	0.095 (0.085 - 0.105)	0.035	11198.31
Study 2 (N = 325)							
Model 1. Two dimensions (first-order)	804.763*	65	0.596	0.515	0.152 (0.142-0.161)	0.139	17020.67
Model 2. Six dimensions (first-order)	266.726*	64	0.889	0.865	0.080 (0.070-0.090)	0.056	16953.09
Model 3. Six dimensions (second-order)	188.911*	62	0.931	0.913	0.064 (0.054-0.075)	0.050	16968.19

Note. χ^2 = Chi-squared; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion; * $p < .001$.

workers self-objectification have on the workers' psychosocial process (Baldissarri et al., 2019; Caesens et al., 2017). Thus, due to their relevance, we explored the extent to which these outcomes are related and predict the different subfactors of the WDS. Consequently, we expected that being dehumanised by others (i.e., organisational dehumanisation) and internalising this dehumanisation (i.e., self-objectification) will negatively affect workers' sense of dignity at the workplace. Specifically, we expected that higher perceptions of organisational dehumanisation (Hypothesis 1) and higher self-objectification (Hypothesis 2) among workers would trigger a lack of dignity in workers. Moreover, we also aim to confirm the factor structure of the Spanish version of the WDS that was previously identified in Study 1.

Method

Participants, Procedure and Analysis Plan

The study comprised of 325 Mexican workers (185 women; $M_{age} = 36.90$, $SD = 12.82$) recruited from different companies. The data-collection procedure was the same as in the previous study. The analyses performed included descriptive statistics, confirmatory factor analysis, bivariate correlations, and linear regressions. Once volunteers agreed to participate in the study, they were presented with the following information:

Workplace Dignity Scale. We included the same items as in Study 1. Answers were provided using a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*).

Worker's Dehumanization and Demographic Information. The participants responded to the organisational dehumanisation and self-objectification scales, as in the previous study. Finally, the participants provided demographic information and work details (see supplementary materials).

Results and Discussion

Dimensionality of the Work Dignity Scale with Mexican Workers

We followed the same procedure as in the previous study to confirm the factor structure of the Spanish version of the WDS. We carried out three CFAs to confirm that the six-factor

scale structure of the WDS had a better fit than the alternative factor structures (Table 3). As in the previous study, the data showed multivariate kurtosis (Mardia's normalised coefficient of 119.95) and skewness (Mardia's normalised coefficient of 9773.41), so maximum likelihood estimators with robust standard errors were applied using *lavaan* package for R (Rosseel, 2012). The results indicated that Model 1 (two first-order factors) had the lowest model fit, as compared with the other tested models, while the results for Model 2 (six-factor first-order structure) and Model 3 (six-subfactor second-order structure) indicated that both models had adequate fit (Kline, 2016). However, Models 2 and 3 had no significant differences ($p = .051$). In the absence of differences between the original and this alternative model, we decided to keep the scale's original structure. Therefore, we confirmed that the Spanish translation of the WDS scale had a six-factor first-order structure.

Predictors of the Workplace Dignity Scale

The zero-order correlations between the variables showed the variables were moderately correlated with the sub-factors of the WDS (Table 4). Moreover, we also tested the extent to which the different measures included predicted the sub-factors of the Spanish version of the WDS. We conducted multiple regression analyses using the ordinary least squares method, with the sub-factors of the WDS as the criterion variables (Table 5). The results showed that predictor variables explained a moderate percentage of variance among the WDS sub-factors, from 19% (for equality) to 43% (for workplace dignity). Self-objectification positively predicted the five sub-factors of dignity and negatively predicted the indignity factor. Conversely, organisational dehumanisation negatively predicted two dignity subfactors (recognition of competence and inherent value) and positively predicted the indignity factor. Furthermore, the results show that self-objectification invariably was a better and more consistent predictor, than organisational dehumanisation, among all of the WDS sub-factors. This implies that workers' perception of dignity is more related to a greater extent to the self-internalisation of being dehumanised at the workplace than to the perceptions of being used as a tool by the organisation. In short, even when an organisation may dehumanise workers, workers' dignity seems to be detrimentally affected especially when they internalise being a tool for company goals.

Table 4 Descriptive statistics and correlations among the measurements included in Study 2

	Items	α	Mean (SD)	1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2	3	4	4.1	4.2
1. Workplace dignity	14	.928	6.21 (0.90)	-	.888	.876	.755	.885	.879	-.497	-.492	-.671	-.569	.580
1.1 Respectful interaction	3	.960	6.39 (0.92)		-	.725	.583	.746	.759	-.509	-.382	-.562	-.474	.490
1.2 Recognition of competence	4	.908	6.08 (1.09)			-	.568	.709	.715	-.356	-.466	-.598	-.500	.529
1.3 Equality	2	$r = .584$	5.85 (1.28)				-	.583	.565	-.274	-.296	-.441	-.341	.428
1.4 Inherent value	3	.962	6.23 (1.06)					-	.726	-.477	-.519	-.637	-.562	.522
1.5 Feelings of dignity	3	.935	6.36 (0.97)						-	-.508	-.420	-.619	-.544	.512
2. Workplace indignity	4	.772	1.94 (1.29)							-	.419	.495	.500	-.321
3. Organisational dehumanisation	11	.877	3.46 (1.38)								-	.618	.652	-.365
4. Self-objectification	10	Index	-3.46 (2.22)									-	.895	-.804
4.1 Instrument words	5	.859	2.41 (1.48)										-	-.455
4.2 Human words	5	.742	5.87 (1.11)											-

Note. All correlations are significant, $p < .05$.

Study 3

In a final study, we set out to test the measurement invariance between the American population, for which the scale was created, and the Mexican population, for which it has been adapted. The goal of this last study is, therefore, to test the equivalence between the measurements of the original scale and the adaptation presented in this research.

Method

Participants, Procedure and Analysis Plan

For this study, the two samples from Studies 1 and 2, previously used, were collapsed. This sample comprised of 588 Mexican workers (312 women; $M_{age} = 38.66$, $SD = 11.95$) who responded to the adapted version of the WDS. In addition, we requested a similar sample from the authors of the original scale (Thomas & Lucas, 2019), which they kindly provided us with. This sample comprised of 532 American workers (282 women; $M_{age} = 35.74$, $SD = 9.84$) who responded to the original version of the WDS. The two samples were integrated into a single database for the sole purpose of testing the invariance measurement.

Results and Discussion

An invariance analysis was performed between the two groups to determine whether the instrument measures the

construct in the same way for the different groups, as well as to corroborate that the differences among the groups are due to substantive changes in the construct and not to a difference in psychometric properties (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). Therefore, we estimated an incremental model in which restrictions were added to the estimated parameters to show the configural, metric, and scalar invariance. A change in CFI $> .01$ indicates that constraining that component of the model as equal between groups significantly affected model fit and thus that component of the measurement model is not equivalent between groups (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Kline, 2016).

Model 2 (six-factor first-order structure) and the maximum likelihood method with robust standard errors were applied as indicated in the previous studies using *lavaan* package for R (Rosseel, 2012). The configural invariance ($\chi^2(240) = 1504.143$, $p < .001$, $TLI = .903$, $RMSEA$ (90% CI) = .099 (.094-.103), $SRMR = .049$, $CFI = .924$) obtained appropriate fit statistics. This means that the relationships among latent factors are equivalent between groups. To test the metric invariance, we imposed the equivalence among groups of the items' factor loads in the model. The metric invariance ($\chi^2(252) = 3195.242$, $p < .001$, $TLI = .786$, $RMSEA$ (90% CI) = .147 (.142-.151), $SRMR = .259$, $CFI = .823$, $\Delta CFI = .101$) reduced its fit levels ($\Delta CFI > .01$), which means that there was no metric nor scalar invariance (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Kline, 2016). In other words, it cannot be assumed that the factor loadings of the items associated with each factor are equivalent between groups, neither are the intercepts of the items between the two samples.

Table 5 Multiple regression analysis of the criterion variables on the sub-factors of the Work Dignity Scale in Study 2.

	Respectful interaction	Recognition of competence	Equality	Inherent value	Feelings of workplace dignity	Workplace indignity
	$F_{(2, 324)} = 74.89^{**}$, $R^2 = .313$	$F_{(2, 324)} = 95.73^{**}$, $R^2 = .369$	$F_{(2, 324)} = 39.18^{**}$, $R^2 = .191$	$F_{(2, 324)} = 121.88^{**}$, $R^2 = .431$	$F_{(2, 324)} = 101.15^{**}$, $R^2 = .382$	$F_{(2, 324)} = 58.15^{**}$, $R^2 = .262$
	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Organizational dehumanization	-.057 (.039)	-.156 (.044)*	-.037 (.059)	-.204 (.041)**	-.060 (.039)	.183 (.057)*
Self-objectification	-.526 (.024)**	-.502 (.028)**	-.419 (.037)**	-.511 (.026)**	-.582 (.024)**	.382 (.035)**

Note. Coefficients are standardized; ** $p < .001$; * $p < .05$.

Further analysis indicated that partial metric invariance improved if factor loadings of items 3, 8, 10, and 17 were released ($CFI = .923$, $\Delta CFI = .001$) while partial scalar invariance improved if the intercepts of items 3, 7, 10, 12, 15, and 18 were released in addition to the previous factor loadings released ($CFI = .914$, $\Delta CFI = .009$).

In summary, the results showed equivalence in the association of the items with each of the factors. Therefore, we conclude that the Spanish adaptation of the scale presents configural invariance with respect to the original scale. Further research should explore the measurement invariance in other Spanish-speaking contexts as well as the intervention of possible cultural factors that affect the equivalence of the measurements (Lobato et al., 2020).

General Discussion

In this project, we aimed to adapt the WDS (Thomas & Lucas, 2019) into Spanish and validate the result. We carried out three studies, which involved direct back-translation of the original items, a qualitative expert judgment evaluation of the final items, two confirmatory factor analyses to test the scale's structure, correlations to explore its validity with related constructs in the work sphere, and testing the equivalence between the measurements of the original scale and the adaptation presented in this research.

The results in Studies 1 and 2 confirmed that the Spanish version of the WDS has a six-factor first-order structure: five factors evaluating dignity (respectful interaction, competence contribution, equality, inherent value, and general dignity) and one evaluating indignity. This factor structure showed a good fit in Study 1 and a better fit than the alternative factor structures showed in Study 2. Thus, we confirm that the Spanish version of the WDS maintained the factor structure proposed during the scale's original development by Thomas and Lucas (2019).

As for the measurement invariance that we test in Study 3, the results showed that the only equivalence was in the association of the items with each of the factors. Therefore, there was no complete equivalence in the determinations between the two measures. These results prevent us from comparing data obtained in different contexts. Nevertheless, regarding the use of the adaptation to the Mexican context there is sufficient evidence of its good fit despite the fact that the measures are not comparable with those of the American context.

Additionally, the results showed that the scale is related to the constructs considered in Studies 1 and 2. This allowed us to confirm this scale's external validity with several variables (e.g., recognition of competence as well as workplace status) included in the original article from which the scale was developed (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Furthermore, our results expanded on previous evidence by including additional variables in Studies 1 and 2, such as organisational dehumanisation and self-objectification.

The inclusion of these variables provided useful information. First, the scale was moderately correlated with the other variables included in the studies. This indicated that the measures are distinct from each other. In addition, the expected correlational patterns that we found provide evidence favouring the appropriate functioning of the Spanish version of the WDS. Second, we identified that dignity

seemed to be predicted, reaching high levels of the variance proportion, by the dehumanisation measurements that we included in Study 2. Particularly, the tendency towards self-objectification among workers (more than the perceptions of being dehumanised by the company) seems to be a key factor that reduces dignity at the workplace, while increasing feelings of indignity. This is in line with previous evidence that underscores how self-dehumanisation causes detrimental effects in individuals (Bastian & Haslam, 2010; 2011), but also with previous research that highlights the negative consequences of self-objectification (e.g., Baldissarri et al., 2019).

These findings have interesting implications for studying and understanding the factors that trigger or reduce dignity in the workplace. Based on our findings, it seems that the internalisation of self-perceptions as an instrument within the company has a detrimental effect on worker's dignity. This effect appears over and above other blatant factors such as being dehumanised in the company. This implies that even when psychological risk factors have a negative effect on workers, the internalisation or the self-definition of a worker as being less than human and more instrument-like is the key factor that erodes perceived dignity. This finding highlights the need to provide more empirical evidence regarding the role of self-dehumanisation/self-objectification in the workplace, as stated by Baldissarri et al. (2019), but also underscores the need to perform interventions at the workplace that favour workers' dignity, by promoting among them the perceptions that they are valued as human beings at the workplace. Specifically, organisations should reduce the tendency to self-objectivise among workers as a possible practical intervention to favour workers' dignity at their workplace.

Additionally, limitations apply to Studies 1 and 2 due to the correlational nature of these studies. Performing an additional experimental study modifying workers' conditions (e.g., type of supervisor, type of relationship with co-workers) will allow us to see changes in the workers' level of dignity and, thus, confirm that the adapted scale is sensitive enough to capture changes in this variable. Also, the discrepancies in the invariance that we identify in Study 3 seem to be a limitation of the project. Even when the factorial structure of the scale seems to be reliable with the present results, we cannot ensure the reason why we identify these discrepancies in some of the metrics between the American and the Spanish speaker's samples. Moreover, the Spanish adaptation of the WDS was only tested in a single country (i.e., México). However, there are plenty of Spanish speaking countries in which the scale can be tested in order to confirm its factorial structure and measurement equivalence (Lobato et al., 2020). Likewise, the strong skewness, which reveals a possible ceiling effect in the dignity factors and a floor effect in the indignity factor, seems to limit the measurement scale. Among the possible explanations we can accentuate social desirability given the participants' eagerness to maintain their positive identity at work.

Finally, future studies can be implemented based on the present findings. On the one hand, studies can be carried out to explore, in depth, the measurement equivalence discrepancies between the original scale and the adapted version. By resolving this issue, transcultural studies could be performed to understand, for instance, how workplace

dignity fluctuates based on social variables, such as the level of individualism or economic inequality within countries. On the other hand, studies could be carried out using the Spanish adaptation of the WDS in order to better understand and identify the main psychological risk factors that could promote indignity perceptions among workers. By doing this, we will be able to address the main sources of workers indignity and, hence, be able to promote actions (e.g., interventions, recommendations to organisations) to reduce the occurrence of this process and its negative consequences in the organisational sphere.

In short, the Spanish adaptation of the WDS has an adequate factor structure and is related to the psychological risk factors that appear in the workplace. This instrument is expected to contribute to the study of dignity in the workplace and its encompassing processes.

Supplementary materials

The materials for the studies reported in this article are openly available at <https://osf.io/tuq8e/>.

Conflict of interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Thomas and Lucas, the original authors of the Work Dignity Scale, for sharing their data to use it in Study 3. We acknowledge the support from the Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies - COES (ANID/FONDAP/15130009).

Financing

This research was funded by the Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo - ANID through the program FONDECYT Postdoctorado 2020 [Proyect number 3200031].

References

- Ackroyd, S. (2007). Dirt, work and dignity. In S. C. Bolton (Ed.), *Dimensions of dignity at work* (pp. 30-49). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-7506-8333-3.50008-1>
- Baldissarri, C., Andrighetto, L., & Volpato, C. (2019). Feeling like an object: A field study on working self-objectification and belief in personal free will. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *26*, 185-197. <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM26.2.1>
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: The dehumanizing effects of social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 107-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022>
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2011). Experiencing dehumanization: Cognitive and emotional effects of everyday dehumanization. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(4), 295-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2011.614132>
- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin S., & De Wilde, M. (2017). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: The mediating role of organizational dehumanization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *26*, 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1319817>
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*, 233-255. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5
- Christoff, K. (2014). Dehumanization in organizational settings: Some scientific and ethical considerations. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 748. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00748>
- Djordjevic, E., Stoverink, A. C., Klotz, A. C., Koopman, J., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Yam, K. C., & Chiang, J. T. J. (2017). Workplace status: The development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 1124-1147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000202>
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 812-820. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.812>
- Hambleton, R. K. (2005). Issues, designs and technical guidelines for adapting tests into multiple languages and cultures. In R. Hambleton, P. Merenda, & S. Spielberger (Eds.), *Adapting Educational and Psychological Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment* (pp. 3-38). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*, 399-423. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115045>
- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kline, R. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press.
- Leana, C. R., Mittal, V., & Stiehl, E. (2012). Perspective - Organizational behavior and the working poor. *Organization Science*, *23*, 888-906. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0672>
- Lobato, R. M., Sainz, M., & García-Sánchez, E. (2020). Adaptation and validation of the Self-Censorship Orientation (SCO) Scale into Spanish/Adaptación y validación de la escala de Orientación a la Autocensura (OAC) al español. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(2), 310-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2020.1723367>
- Lucas, K. (2015). Workplace dignity: Communicating inherent, earned, and remediated dignity. *Journal of Management Studies*, *52*, 621-646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12133>
- Lucas, K. (2017). Workplace dignity. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication* (Vol. 4, pp. 2549-2562). Wiley Blackwell.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*, 11-37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
- Nair, N., & Vohra, N. (2010). Developing a new measure of work alienation. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, *14*, 293-309. <https://doi.org/10.2190/wr.14.3.c>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. Version 0.5-12 (BETA). *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(2), 1-36.
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika*, *66*, 507-514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02296192>
- Sayer, A. (2007). Dignity at work: Broadening the agenda. *Organization*, *14*, 565-581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508407078053>

- Spontón, C. L., Trógolo, M. A., Castellano, E., Morera, L. P., & Medrano, L. (2019). Desarrollo y validación de una escala para medir satisfacción con los recursos laborales. *Suma Psicológica*, 26(1), 64-74. <https://doi.org/10.14349/sumapsi.2019.v26.n1.8>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1556375>
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812>
- Thomas, B., & Lucas, K. (2019). Development and validation of the workplace dignity scale. *Group and Organization Management*, 44, 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, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02581>
- Tye-Williams, S., & Krone, K. J. (2015). Chaos, reports, and quests: Narrative agency and co-workers in stories of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 29, 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914552029>
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2010). Capturing autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work: Construction and initial validation of the Work-related basic need satisfaction scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 981-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X481382>
- Vesga Rodríguez, J. J., Rubiano, M. G., Forero Aponte, C., Aguilar Bustamante, M. C., Jaramillo, J. Á., Quiroz González, E., Castaño González, E. J., Andrade Jaramillo, V., & Gómez Vélez, M. A. (2020). Aspectos de la cultura organizacional y su relación con la disposición al cambio organizacional. *Suma Psicológica*, 27(1), 52-61. <https://doi.org/10.14349/sumapsi.2020.v27.n1.7>
- Yalden, B. J., & McCormack, B. (2010). Constructions of dignity: A pre-requisite for flourishing in the workplace? *International Journal of Older People Nursing*, 5, 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-3743.2010.00218.x>
- Yu, K. H. (2016). Immigrant workers' responses to stigmatized work: Constructing dignity through moral reasoning. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58, 571-588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185615609204>