Dehumanization in the workplace

by

Karen Fiorini

M.A. (Leadership and Training), Royal Roads University, 2007

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the
Curriculum Theory and Implementation Program
Faculty of Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Spring 2019

Approval

Name:	**Karen Fiorini**
Degree:	**Doctor of Philosophy**
Title:	**Dehumanization in the workplace**
Examining Committee:	**Chair:** **Laurie Anderson** Executive Director, SFU Vancouver
	Heesoon Bai Senior Supervisor Professor
	Allan MacKinnon Supervisor Associate Professor
	Avraham Cohen Supervisor Sessional Adler University
	Charles Scott Internal Examiner Adjunct Professor
	John Portelli External Examiner Professor Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto
Date Defended/Approved:	March 8, 2019

Abstract

Workplace stress is often referred to as the epidemic of the century. It is so normalized within our society that it often goes unrecognized and unquestioned. This study describes and explores the phenomenon of workplace stress. This study looks at some of the key factors, such as overwork, being undervalued in the workplace, and emotional labour, that contributes to workplace stress. This study makes a case that workplace stress is a cloaked phenomenon for dehumanization. The research starts with theoretical overview of dehumanization through different theoretical constructs, such as instrumentalism and moral disengagement, and also through Haslam's and Montague's models of dehumanization. The theoretical explorations here consider how we have allowed ourselves to become dehumanized and how we have allowed others to be dehumanized. The study then looks at how dehumanization shows up in the workplace. From there, it takes a historical perspective, and considers how successive industrial revolutions resulted in the current forces and pressures that insidiously dehumanize workers in the workplace. The study then moves to ways we can recover, in a more systemic and conscious way, the human dimension in workplaces, and build and develop caring communities through leadership-facilitated positive changes. It offers different perspectives on how one can cultivate awareness of self and expand one's sense of one’s own humanness. Finally, this study focuses on the outer direction and examines the collective work experience and attempts to answer the question: How does an organization shift to be an organization that is humanizing.

Keywords: workplace stress, dehumanization, instrumentalism

Acknowledgements

I express my great affection for my parents, Franco and Susan Fiorini, who have always believed that I could do anything I set my mind to. I have gained my strength, determination, and perseverance from both of you. Thank you.

I learned that to complete a PhD degree takes a community of people. First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Heesoon Bai, my senior supervisor. Dr. Bai accompanied me every step of the way. She flawlessly guided me through the dissertation process from concept to defense. I am grateful for her knowledge, thoughtful insights, endless amounts of patience, and a delightful sense of humor. With Dr. Bai, supervision was not limited to the classroom, but occurred while cooking together or while have an early morning tea. She provided guidance, both academically and personally. I appreciate that Dr. Bai recognized that I had a full-time job and other family obligations, she accommodated me in a manner that allowed me to complete my dissertation and still meet my work and family obligations. Finally, I wanted to take my academic learnings and make it practical and useable for others, to be a *pracademic.* Dr. Bai created that opportunity for me.

I would like to thank Dr. Allan McKinnon. Thank you for stepping in and serving as my Committee Member. I appreciate your generosity and kindness as you took on a guiding role.

I would like to thank Dr. Avraham Cohen, my third Committee member. More importantly, he has been my friend and mentor for over 25 years. Dr. Cohen encouraged me to pursue graduate school at the Master's level and then once again at the PhD level. He inspired me to expand my vision for myself and to emphasize the *being* and *presence* dimensions in my life. I thank Dr. Cohen for being my life teacher.

I would like to thank Serenne Romanycia for her research assistance. I appreciate her thoughtfulness, her curiosity, and her support through the process.

I would like to thank for Maria Ishikawa for the gift of her time and dedicated editing while it also being a busy time for her.

To my friends and colleagues not named here but who supported me through this process, a very gracious "Thank you."

Table of Contents

PREAMBLE

There is a well-known statement that rings true for many people personally and professionally. It does so for me: “We teach who we are” (Palmer, 1998, p.1). Acknowledging its truth, I would like to introduce a variation on this theme: we research who we are. As I entered graduate school, I observed researchers researching their “burning question,” be it existential or theoretical. My peers and I in the doctoral program have been advised by our supervision and coursework professors to choose and work on a topic that we are so passionate about that it will haunt us day and night. One that will carry us and propel us through many years (up to eight years in my doctoral studies) until it has been addressed, resolved, and answered. Here is my burning question: *how do we recover, in a more systemic and conscious way, the human dimension (Cohen, 2015) in workplaces, and build and develop caring communities through leadership-facilitated positive changes*? Briefly, when I refer to bringing the human dimension into the workplace, I am speaking to the creation of an organizational climate and culture in which employees can develop and maintain their whole human potential. When I refer to "human potential," I am drawing on Abraham Maslow's (2010/1962) idea that self-actualization, the fulfillment of self through reaching one's potential, as the highest expression of human life. I will be working out the details of these concepts in later chapters.

I have been *living my burning question* for many decades, unknowingly and knowingly: it has been troubling me, haunting me, and actively engaging me in my everyday workplace life. Coming to my burning question took most of my adult life; even when I joined the workforce at the tender age of 17, soon after my high school graduation. Joining the workforce was a survival necessity due to my familial circumstances. While many of my high school peers were studying at university, I was working in sundry workplaces. It was not until I established myself as a professional in my 40’s that I entered the university gate as a Master of Arts Student, in a program that accepted professionals without university studies experience. I make a side note here, that even after ten years of engagement in my graduate studies and working full time, I do not feel that I am an academic. I do not speak like, write like, or probably think like an academic. All the same, my mission in my doctoral studies is clear: addressing my burning question. Much of my long-drawn doctoral journey has been devoted to articulating this question in the present form.

My burning question arose out of my decades of work-life experience. My life has been dominated by workplace experience since the age of 17. It is thus my workplace environment that I am writing about and researching. However, my writing is not focused on me and my experience. My reader's attention is called not to me but to the ideas that my life illustrates. In fact, in deliberately avoiding providing an autobiographical account, I fictionalize names of people, organizations, and events, and I anonymize factual details. My account is still quasi-biographical in that when I talk about my life and myself, I am faithfully conveying ideas, thoughts, feelings, and perceptions that are intertwined into the fabric of my experience.

Speaking of autobiography, I shall address here the methodology for my dissertation. During the coursework phase of my doctoral studies at Simon Fraser University, from various instructors, peer-colleagues, educational theorists, and from everywhere in the academy, I received a firm impression that questions of methodology rule supreme. However, simultaneously, I was advised by my Philosophy of Education circles not to 'obsess' about research methodology; and, for philosophers, thinking, reading, and writing are methods enough. My decision, after many discussions with my senior thesis supervisor, is not to have a separate chapter on methodology. Rather, I shall take up a bit of space in this Preamble to talk about the research methodology for my present work.

To recall, my burning question is: *how do we recover, in a more systemic and conscious way, the human dimension in workplaces, and build and develop caring communities through leadership-facilitated positive changes?* My life experiences fuelled my burning question and is what I came to see and name as the phenomenon of dehumanization. I am examining and reflecting on my personal experiences of dehumanization in the workplace and relating it specifically to the workplace culture and society in general. I reviewed and evaluated many types of research methodologies commonly deployed in educational research. I found one particularly compelling for my research: autoethnography. Autoethnography is a cultural study of self and others (Ellis, 2004). This methodology allows a person to explore and understand his or her experience with a particular issue. It provides a way of bringing personal lived experiences into a dialogue with theoretical perspectives, making this type of approach valuable for studying organizational workers experiencing dehumanization. Dehumanization in the workplace is not really talked about: it is a taboo subject. Autoethnography lends itself well to taboo subjects, according to Carolyn Ellis (2004) and Heewon Chang (2008). Autoethnographic research has been employed to examine many organizational taboo subjects such as sexual harassment, workplace bullying, and social ostracism. My topic of dehumanization in the workplace fits with these types of topics.

While dehumanization in the workplace is the presenting problem in my research, I will look at different strategies to re-humanizing the workplace. Therefore, when I read Ellis (2009), a champion of autoethnography, stating the following, I thought that autoethnography made sense for me.

> Effective autoethnographies are not victim tales; on the contrary, writing autoethnography well produces survivor tales for the writer and for those who read them. Accomplished autoethnographers … strive to open up a moral and ethical conversation with readers about the possibilities of living life well. (Ellis, 2009, p. 17)

It appealed to me that autoethnography can be written in ways that invite readers to participate in ethical changes (Chang, 2008). This was my goal in applying to the doctoral program: to become a researcher who can seamlessly combine academic knowledge and professional experience to respond effectively to organizational and community issues and needs. I wanted to write a thesis that appeals to a broad scope of readers. The key to writing such a thesis is that it can be read easily and understood. Creating a reader-friendly study may increase the number of readers, and as a result, increase the influence of my work.

Autoethnography can enhance cultural understanding of self and others (Chang, 2008). The purpose of autoethnography is not to write the story for one's self, but to share a message with others going through similar experiences, as well as to gain a greater understanding of the phenomena being explored. I want my thesis to fulfill at least one purpose of autoethnography, which is for "all people who can benefit from thinking about their lives in terms of other people's experiences" (Ellis & Bochner, 1996, p. 18).

Moreover, I will draw on the tradition of fictionalized autoethnographic writing that is championed by scholars such as Carolyn Ellis (2004), Maree Boyle & Ken Parry (2007) and Heewon Chang (2008). Meaning, the narratives that appear in this dissertation are fictionalized. The characters and situations that follow are not real; rather, they are fictional recreations resulting from the amalgamation of people and situations I have seen, met, or heard of during the process of data collection. Embedded within these narratives are the weaving of personal stories, news reports, and informal conversations and observations. The reason for choosing such a method to present my findings is an ethical one; in which I want to maintain confidentiality of people and organizations.

Another methodological modality that is important for my research is working with lived experience. Van Manen (1990) states: "The fundamental model of this approach is textual reflection on the lived experiences and practical actions of everyday life with the intent to increase one's thoughtfulness, and practical resourcefulness or tact" (p. 4). I question the way I experience the world in order to shed new light on the nature of my ontology, thereby gaining a fresh perspective that will change how I comprehend the world.

Overview of thesis

In Chapter 1, I move inward to focus on my own stories of workplace experience in order to situate my research and generate key research questions that will be picked up in subsequent chapters for investigation and analysis. Some of my key research questions are: how do workers experience dehumanization in workplaces? Why should we call certain workplace experiences as ‘dehumanizing’ instead of just stressful?

I move outwards in Chapter 2 to describe and explore the phenomenon of workplace stress. Through literature reviews and first-hand observations, I will thematize the physical and mental health issues that surround workplace stress. I will then look at some of the key factors, such as overwork, being undervalued in the workplace, and emotional labour, that contribute to workplace stress. My aim in this chapter is to mount the argument and make a case that workplace stress is a cloaked phenomenon for dehumanization.

Chapter 3 begins with a theoretical overview of dehumanization. The first part of this chapter will examine dehumanization through different disciplinary lenses. The first lens analyzes the philosophical viewpoint of instrumentalism. The second lens is the viewpoint of moral disengagement. The third lens is seeing through a social psychologist perspective, using Haslam's (2015, 2006) and Montague's (1966/1950) models of dehumanization. In the second part of this chapter, I will illustrate how dehumanization shows up in the workplace. Observing dehumanization from an instrumentalist point of view, we unveil how time and unrealistic expectations of workers are precipitating dehumanization. Looking at dehumanization from the viewpoint of moral disengagement, we begin to understand how negative work behaviours such as work incivility, harassment, workplace, abuse, ostracism and workplace violence occur. I will also connect Montague's (1966/1950) work on dehumanization to workplace disassociation.

Chapter 4 is a historical foray into industrial revolutions to understand the forces and pressures that gave birth to Homo Economicus, who in turn shaped the modern workplace environment and made itself vulnerable to dehumanization. This chapter will review the four industrial revolutions, ending with the 4th revolution that is currently unfolding. However, the focus of this chapter is not the historical survey itself but how the successive industrial revolutions resulted in the current forces and pressures that insidiously dehumanize workers in the workplace.

Chapter 5 takes this re-humanization project into the inner world of individual workers. The inner direction goes towards *inner work* in which individuals cultivate awareness of self and other, or, more accurately, self-other. I will offer different perspectives on how one can cultivate awareness of self and expand one's sense of own's humanness.

Finally, Chapter 6 works to respond to my burning question: (to reiterate) *how do we recover, in a more systemic and conscious way, the human dimension in workplaces, and build and develop caring communities through leadership-facilitated positive changes*? I title my response to this question as 'workplace re-humanization project.' My conceptualization of this re-humanization project extends in two opposite but complementary directions: the inner and the outer. This chapter focuses on the outer direction as it examines the collective work experience and attempts to answer the question: How does an organization shift to be an organization that is humanizing?

In the closing Post-amble, I look back at my whole dissertation journey and attempt to calibrate my re-humanization project. Have I succeeded in answering my own burning question? To what extent? What more could I do if I were to keep pursuing this project further? Where are my further horizons of personal development and community contribution?

Chapter 1. Philosophy as an eye-opening practice: A narrative account

In this chapter, I present an account of lived history from my work life. I weave reflections into this account and pull up threads of themes that are relevant to business and associated organizational dynamics, structure, and practice. These themes will be taken up, elaborated, and analyzed in subsequent chapters. Numbered subtitles below capture these themes.

1.1. Stress as psychologizing dehumanization

In my 35-plus years of working in business organizations, I observed varying degrees of what I now call “dehumanization” in the workplace. I have adopted a philosophical understanding of ‘dehumanization’ as perception and treatment of human beings in ways that diminish their intrinsic worth and dignity as human persons. I will say more about dehumanization later in Chapter 3, as this is the focal concept and issue that this dissertation addresses. Also, for clarification purposes, when I refer to business organizations, I am not referring to the little mom-and-pop shop on the corner, or to the small business working to create ethical and sustainable business environment, but rather to larger organizations. It is in the latter where I have witnessed the fundamental respect for human beings forgotten or ignored to the point where exploitation was either allowed in various forms or occurred without awareness or realization because everyone considered these behaviors ‘normal.’ To note, I myself did not always see the workplace as dehumanizing. In fact, it took me a few decades to come to view the organizational world in this manner. My graduate work, both at the master's level and, currently, at the doctoral level, has gradually opened my eyes to see the phenomenon of dehumanization. It has been a rare gift of insight, albeit at times it has been a painful gift: I did not like what I saw, and at times, I resisted it.

When I started my doctoral program, I did not understand the concept of "dehumanization in the workplace." It was a pivotal conversation that I had with my senior thesis supervisor, Dr. Heesoon Bai, that helped me gain clarity. I shared with her that I needed a semester off from the Ph.D. program as I was exhausted both physically and mentally. Work was incredibly busy, and I was coming home from work exhausted.

Other than the most minimally required tasks, I could not focus on school or anything else; I was simply too tired and worn out. I shared with her that due to the merger our organization was going through, work intensification increased and everyone in the organization was putting in extra hours. I was continually on high alert. I was aware that the work intensification and the long hours were due to having merger related tasks in addition to my regular job. I was emotionally exhausted supporting my team and experiencing a disconnect between how I was feeling and how I was presenting myself. Additionally, there was new management and I was trying to make a good impression. I was in a situation where I was struggling to do 'more with less.' I was overworked and overwhelmed. However, as the organization was going through some major changes, I considered this a nonnegotiable reality of organizational change.

During the conversation, when I mentioned something about workers being 'assets', Dr. Bai made the comment that seeing and treating workers as “assets” is inherently dehumanizing. At that time, I could not fully understand what she was saying. Employees being the 'organization's greatest assets' is typical organizational language. My initial thought as well, when she made the comment, was that “dehumanization” was too strong of a word and didn’t and couldn’t apply to me. After all, I was not the only one putting in long hours, and there were others who were working far more than me. Also, I was making good money, had a title and a rank, and nobody brutally treated me as if I was in a labour camp! I thought that my experience of working longer hours and trying to do 'more with less' was the typical organizational workers' experience. Therefore, I struggled with the term, “dehumanization”. The potential that this word applied to me seemed too harsh, if not absurd. I associated the term "dehumanization" with extreme situations such as child labour or war atrocities. After all, I thought, how can I be dehumanized at work when I work with good people in a good organization? Wasn’t I just stressed?

Despite my initial incredulity and resistance toward ‘dehumanization’ when applied to my work-life situation, there must have been something in that term that touched my core; for it went deep into me and set off a reverberation of waves within me. In the end, as you will read in the following chapters, I did come to recognize that I, along with my work colleagues in my organization and beyond, had indeed been dehumanized. The process of recognition was not a swift and linear one, it took me a long time to internalize and involved many stages of denial, fits of outrage, pondering, curiosity, and research.

As I mentioned above, I initially reacted to the term, "dehumanization" because it seemed harsh and inappropriate for the workplace. When individuals or groups of people are clearly depicted as less than human, we would then commonly consider that an appropriate use of the term. For example, Haslam (2015) states that

> First, dehumanization generally is understood to be an extreme phenomenon, observed in conditions of atrocity, moral outrage, hatred, and intense conflict. Second, it is directly associated with aggression as a precondition and as a post hoc justification of acts of violence. (p. 296-297)

One of the most well-known examples of dehumanization, as it is generally understood, is Hitler's genocide of European Jews. I kept coming back to this very example as a reminder that, surely, my co-workers and I, were not being dehumanized. However, as I came to discover, the power of philosophy goes beyond the appearance of concepts and interprets the core understanding, principles, and spirit of things. It was the introduction to a philosophical understanding of dehumanization that I began to reconsider my initial reaction and came to adopt a certain philosophical understanding of this term as applied to my work-life world.

The term *dehumanization* stuck with me as I tried to wrap my mind around the term and the implications of being 'dehumanized in the workplace.' I have always been interested in organizational leadership, the workplace community, and work from a humanistic perspective. Shortly after getting my professional designation, which was more than 25 years ago, I decided to take a two-year transformational individual and group counselling program. I wanted to develop a better understanding of people. I knew that developing an understanding of people would assist me in my work. The outcomes of this program included a greater psychological understanding of myself and others and an increase in my interpersonal and group facilitation skills. As I progressed through the counselling program, one of the dawning insights I had was the recognition and understanding of what humans were like and the importance of relationships within our humanity. This insight deeply affected my professional life, as I realized that our understanding of humanity is also reflected in how we conduct business.

Ten years ago, I decided to pursue my Master's Degree in Leadership and Adult Training. My Master's thesis was on work-life balance and wellbeing for public practice accountants. It was no surprise that the topic of work-life balance was not clean-cut. Some people were passionate about their work and did not require nor desire work-life balance. For some, work was refuge, where they go to escape. For others, working excessive hours was a means to an end; putting in the long hours as a strategy of obtaining life balance at a later point. However, during my research process, I heard directly about fatigue, burnout, and emotional depletion. Surprisingly, most people considered work stress as a non-negotiable fact of life. In truth, It should not have been surprising because I too thought likewise! Stress and exhaustion were not questioned; it was simply 'part of the job' with peaks and valleys of busier times.

In the last few years, I was beginning to notice that I was chronically busy and taking work home with me. This was becoming a way of life that I did not want. I became one of those people constantly on their smart phone. I was checking and responding to work emails after hours with the rationale that I could start my morning with a clean slate if my emails were up to date. However, this was not about emails: it was about the pace of work, the volume of work, and the expectations of clients. I knew I was not the only one in the office in this position. It was pervasive. It was not simply my organization; it was as though the world had changed overnight.

It can often be misleading as the organizations themselves may appear externally to be great places to work, as nobody recognizes if employees are suffering, if the causes for suffering are considered 'normal' or if work conditions that in reality are poor working conditions appearing to be normal. Chronic overwork was not only occurring in typical business organizations but also in government, education, and medical professions. People were not critically questioning their own and others' attitude or conduct. Workers were not assessing whether their workload or the organization's expectations were reasonable or not; they simply did it, often at a great cost to their own health and wellbeing and those of their family members, especially their children. Leaders were not questioning the workloads that they were assigning to their employees: the work had to be done, and if the work was not completed during regular hours *plus* some overtime, only then would they consider hiring temporary help or even hire another full-time employee. After all, the work needed to be completed. The needs of the organization come first.

1.2. Normalizing the process of dehumanization

As I began to reflect on what dehumanization meant, I was simultaneously reflecting on my own experiences and workplace history. I have worked both as a full-time employee in different organizations and as an independent business advisor. Currently, in my managerial position, I have many positive work experiences, but I am focusing on the experiences in my career that have caused me more work-stress than others.

I went into the workforce shortly after graduating high school. My family situation prevented me from undertaking post-secondary education. If I did want to attend university, I would have to do it either at night or by correspondence. I graduated high school just after I turned 16. I was fortunate to land a records file clerk job in a large organization known for good pay and benefits. The work was relatively easy but boring and repetitive. Almost a year into this position I had developed tendonitis from the work. So, while I was happy with the pay and the benefits, I realized that I could not stay in a job that was tedious and physically demanding on my body. I decided to pursue the Certified General Accountants' designation as it was a professional program that I could pursue while simultaneously working full time.

During my program studies, I worked for an accounting firm to gain the practical work experience needed to obtain the professional designation. Like many professions, accountants need the relevant progressive work experience. It is not always easy to find a firm that can provide this type of training, therefore, if one obtains one of these jobs, one was considered fortunate. Competition is often stiff for these positions, but I joined the firm with the promise of great opportunities. I was gaining the work experience and training that I needed to obtain my designation. However, I came to realize the heavy price to pay for this experience and training. Long hours, low pay, and heavy workloads were a few of the sacrifices I had to make. In talking to other students working in different firms, I realized how fortunate I was. While I did have to work overtime, it was not excessive in comparison to my peers. I was also working with a firm that treated students like human beings. Fellow students often shared how they were treated like second-class workers. I heard horror stories ranging from excessive hours to being spoken to as if they were animals. Students that I knew in other professions, worked in places with the 'unspoken rule' that students never left earlier than the bosses did, regardless of how many hours they had already worked or whether there were assignment deadlines. From listening to others, this type of student treatment was commonplace. Organizations believed that to gain work experience, you had to pay your dues (e.g. work long hours, low pay, being at the beck and call of the bosses), and then years later, have students working for you repeat the same. Many professions such as banking, law, medicine, and accounting require students to acquire the practical work experience as part of becoming a professional.

I have been a professional accountant for over 25 years, and I still have colleagues who believe the following: "I had to suffer and pay my dues to become a professional, so what is the issue? Students need to know that this is part of their growth as a professional". I have heard this attitude from lawyers, doctors, educators and many others. As I reflect on the concept of "gaining one's practical experience", I recognized that it was the socialization-normalization process into the professional workforce. I also recognize the truth in this statement, that students do need to know understand their respective professions and the challenges associated. Therefore, I was torn in my feelings about this. As I stated earlier, I thought I was fortunate compared to other students in similar positions, despite the low pay and a heavy workload.

Critically reflecting on my past experiences, I name two key incidents in my work history as clear instances of dehumanizing practice. My first incident occurred after three months of working for a firm. I was sexually harassed by a senior male colleague. I went to the personnel department to file a complaint. I was not the first to complain about this person, but I was told to just ignore it: after all, they said, he was "old school" and he did not mean anything by it. He was in a position of power, and I was still in my probationary period. It became clear to me that I could either choose to remain silent and keep the job, or, not pass the probationary period. I was in my early twenties, young and unsure of what to do. I thought that complaining to the personnel department (now referred to as *human resources)* would stop the behaviours. I never expected to be advised to ignore it. It was the early 1980s and I was unaware of alternative resources, so I believed that my options were limited to ignoring the behaviour or quitting. I chose to quit the job.

About 18 months later, after a year of working for another organization, I was in a serious car accident. I sustained several injuries which included a head injury. Within three days of the accident, I received a phone call that I was being immediately terminated from my job. As I could not provide an exact return date to work, I was told that I was being replaced and it was ‘nothing personal, it was simply business’. After all, they "could not have the work piled up on my desk". At the time, I believed the organization was right in terminating me: I was unable to provide a return date to work.

The doctors advised that my recovery was going to take time— weeks or even months, and it did not occur to me to challenge the termination notice. Later, I discovered from a reliable source that the reasoning for my termination was the firm’s decision to not place me on short-term disability, as that would increase the organization’s premiums for insurance. Nor did they want to pay for a temporary relief worker, as it would be costlier to hire a temporary relief worker from an agency compared to simply replacing me. Although the organization had had many options, they had chosen the least expensive one, namely termination. They had chosen economic profitability over my wellbeing as a person. Although I was unaware of it then, my newfound vocabulary and understanding leads me to conclude that they participated in a dehumanizing practice, resulting from an act of moral breach. The company treated me as an asset, not as *a person*. I was nothing but a resource to them, for once I was no longer useful to the company, I was immediately disposed of for someone else to fill my job.

I recovered, although not completely, from the car accident and was ready to return to work a year later. When I did return, I was unsure whether I could work normal working hours. While recovering, I had been off work for almost a year and had some anxiety about working again. I was hired by a local accounting firm and told the owner about my car accident and the anxiety surrounding my physical capabilities to work. He offered me the job with the understanding that we would see how it worked out. Within four months, I was able to work full time; other than the odd doctor’s appointment, I was not losing work time due to the car accident. I was receiving positive performance evaluations. I was so grateful to be able to be working again that I ignored the low pay and absent benefits.

A few years later, my partner died of sudden organ failure. I was shocked and simply beside myself. My boss was sorry to hear that my partner had died. However, the timing could not have been worse, as it was busy, and deadlines were looming. I was permitted three unpaid days off work as per the BC Labour Regulations. After those three days, I came back to work and immensely struggled. I was devastated and unable to focus, so I worked extra hours to make up for the inefficient work. It became a vicious cycle for me.

In the meantime, I received mixed messages from my boss. On the one hand, my boss understood that it was a challenging time for me; but, on the other hand, would tell me to lighten up and be more upbeat. To keep my job, I learned to dissociate my emotions from my work life, thus maintaining a professional persona regardless of how I was feeling. I learned to compartmentalize my personal life and my work life. As I will discuss in subsequent chapters, this compartmentalization or fragmentation of the self and the practice of emotional dissociation is part and parcel of the dehumanization phenomenology.

Following the loss of my partner, I undertook my own personal therapy to deal with the grief and other unresolved issues. After some time, I began to question many things about my work life. My work was consuming my life at a huge cost to my mental and physical health. I also noticed how my values often conflicted with the workplace ethos. The value I placed in the relationships with my clients became a constant conflict with the owners of the business; because it was ‘against the norm of the organization’. The owner primarily viewed the client as a source of revenue and not as a person. The owner *did* care but relied on the logic that if you could not bill for the time, you did not spend the time doing it. The stress and personal conflict I endured while working within this environment and my person-centered and relational approach to work was at odds with what I later (during my doctoral studies) came to understand as the instrumentalist values within the organization. This, too, is at the heart of dehumanization phenomenology, as I will discuss in depth in Chapter 3.

I finally decided to transition from a for-profit organization to a not-for profit organization. As this organization’s purpose was to support community members, I felt that it was going to be a better fit for my values. However, as with many not-for-profit organizations, the organization was understaffed and had a large workload. I was often working late and on the weekends. I also traveled a lot for this job. I did not complain about working the long hours or on the weekends, as it was common throughout the organization and my boss worked longer hours and traveled more than I did. I was once again reminded about my luck in this organization because colleagues in other organizations were working longer hours than I was. I respected the leadership and enjoyed the relationships with my colleagues and the clients who utilized our services. Although I enjoyed the benefits of the job, I was feeling the tension between these benefits and working the extensive hours. The decision came to head in 2007, when my father had a major stroke. He developed aphasia and could not communicate. He was unable to be left alone. My mother was diabetic and not well herself. My parents needed assistance with things such as grocery shopping, errands, and tasks. I was now travelling from Vancouver to my parents' home on Vancouver Island every weekend. I had to make a choice, and I chose to look for another job that did not involve travelling. This was my introduction to the life of being a child with older parents who now needed my assistance. Once again, I was reminded by others that I should be fortunate: many people I knew were of the sandwich generation, looking after their children and assisting their older parents.

1.3. Survival imperative: “I simply put my head down and continue to work . . .”

In 2007 I finished my Master's Degree and began my current position in another not-for-profit organization. Again, I was fortunate: I was working with people whom I liked and respected. I enjoyed the work and did not have to travel; making it possible for me to manage work while supporting my parents. However, as in the prior not-for-profit, it was long hours and heavy workloads.

Shortly after changing jobs I came into the doctoral program. I developed a research interest in culture and consciousness change that would promote human wellbeing and work-life balance in institutions and organizations. I observed these institutions and organizations as well-intentioned communities with often unrealized potential. I started the program with the intention of studying the philosophical, cultural, and historical theories that would develop an understanding of organizational and institutional leadership, and how to create better workplace. I wanted to conduct research with a new paradigm that emphasized practices that altered the view of leadership and work experience in support of human wellbeing and institutional and organizational productivity. Prior to the Ph.D. program, I did not acquire the language for the type of leadership and mentorship that I desired to practice in the company of those whom I directly or indirectly supervised. I did eventually acquire that language, and indeed, much more.

During my Ph.D. program, the organization I worked for went through a merger. When organizations merge, the stress level goes up. You prepare for the merger, and as the saying goes, "You are doing two jobs for the promise of none." The staff, the leadership, and the board worked extremely hard to accomplish a successful merge. A key expectation in an organizational merge is the development of efficiencies. One of the largest organizational expenses is payroll and we were talking about a reduction in staff. For example, an organization does not need two financial controllers. When there is a merger of organizations, each with their own financial controller, there is a strong chance that there will eventually be only one financial controller. During this time, I saw colleagues leaving the organization. I became a layoff survivor. While I could understand the organization's perspective, I saw the devastation of people losing their jobs. I felt for those who lost their jobs, but I put my head down and continued to work; I did not want to be the next person terminated. Once again, I was one of the fortunate ones.

Throughout the merge, the organization did its best to find jobs and provide counselling and re-training for those who were terminated, they also provided generous severance packages. The leadership worked tirelessly to meet the challenging situation. However, the leadership’s actions were overshadowed by the palatable tension as people wondered who may be leaving next.

Dr. Bai and I had the pivotal conversation about dehumanization during the middle of this organizational transition. I have always considered myself someone who leads from a humanistic perspective. It was not only challenging to consider myself dehumanized, but I had to ask myself a critical question: Was I dehumanizing others without realizing it? I took stock of my own behaviour and heavily considered my interactions with staff. I did not want to merely survive the negative experiences at work: I wanted to transform the culture. To create a different experience for my team, I attended to my mindset (intentions and inner experience) which transformed my behaviour and actions. As a result, the team culture (in terms of relationships and belonging) was positively affected. Simultaneously, the workplace culture was at an all-time low and the organization’s leadership team was attempting to improve it. I was inspired by the work of the renowned educator Parker Palmer. His readings made me experienced the "Aha" moment in discovering education's role in educating and also changing society. Parker Palmer (2007) defines a new professional as "a person who not only is competent in his or her discipline but also has the skill and the will to resist and help transform the institutional pathologies that threaten the profession's highest standards" (p. 9). Palmer stated that professionals have a bad habit of treating themselves as victims and blaming the system to excuse their unprofessional behaviour. Through this statement I was able to reflect on myself and my actions as a team leader. Moreover, Palmer explains our culture's hidden curriculum in which society has become conditioned to believe in the harmful power of organizations or institutions if we cross them. Palmer asserts that higher education does little to prepare students to confront, challenge, and change the organizational conditions they will be working under. Underlying his criticism is a commonsensical view that if we are responsible for creating organizational dynamics, then we should and can change them. He also encourages higher education to elicit emotional sources of energy that will be used in challenging and changing institutions.

Palmer (2007) presents 'five immodest proposals' to educate new professionals.

1. We must help our students uncover, examine, and debunk the myth that institutions are external to and constrain us, as if they possessed powers that render us helpless – an assumption that is largely unconscious and wholly untrue.

2. We must take our students' emotions as seriously as we take their intellects.

3. We must start taking seriously the "intelligence" in emotional intelligence. We must do more than affirm and harness the power of emotions to animate learning and leadership: We must help our students develop the skill of "mining" their emotions for knowledge.

4. We must offer our students the knowledge, skills, and sensibilities required to cultivate communities of discernment and support.

5. We must help our students understand what it means to live and work with the question of an undivided life always before them. (p. 9 – 11)

Reading his five immodest proposals resonated with me. If we co-create the organizations and the organizational dynamics, we have the power to change them. We need to be accountable for our organizations. Neglecting student emotions and solely encompassing their intellectual abilities trains students to suppress their emotions as they focus on their technical skills. In overlooking 'intelligence' in emotional intelligence we never develop the capacities to use the knowledge within our emotions (Goleman, 1998). Students should acquire emotional literacy, the ability to understand their emotional state, to communicate their feelings, and to manage their emotions. We want students to understand the interconnectedness of emotion and intellect, especially in the workplace. Students should be able to gain support and hear different perspectives and not feel isolated in a supportive professional community (Segal & Jaffe, 2008; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Goleman, 1998). We want students to have heart, to speak their truth, to deeply listen, and live authentically. I believe that if we adopt Parker Palmer's (2007) five immodest proposals, we would avoid creating students who are exclusively “good” technicians: we would be educating them.

Now, three years post-merger, my doctoral journey has taken longer than I anticipated due to countless hours spent in supporting the implementation of the merger processes. The time I lost for my dissertation writing, however, has been rewarded by valuable and contributing experiences for my thesis research. I observed how organizational change itself changes the organizational culture. I witnessed an organizational culture changing from a high stress, overworking, and overwhelming environment into one that is more humane. I contributed to a more positive working environment. I also believe that the intentions of the leadership in my current environment are not to harm the workers in any way, but to inspire a humanistic working environment.

1.4. Isn’t workplace stress cloaked dehumanization?

Nevertheless, I have continually experienced and observed the human element in the workplace in danger of being forgotten. Some of my days were so busy that I did not have the time to say 'good-morning' to my colleague in the office next to me, until I was leaving to go home. If these situations were unusual occurrences, perhaps it would not be so bad. We would just say, “Oh, one of those days . . ..” However, these situations are easily normalized. These situations should not be normalized: I want them to be very unusual if they happen at all.

My Ph.D. program studies made me wonder: could it be possible that workplace stress is unrecognized dehumanization that is connected to seeing ourselves and others predominantly instrumentally? As business tools, instruments, resources, and assets? While I can agree that some workplace stress pertains to individuals and specific organizations, I do not agree with the acceptance of workplace stress as 'normal work life reality'. Moreover, what I question is: Could it be that workplace stress is cloaked dehumanization? The importance of language is key here. Many people would not flinch to hear someone say, “I am stressed”. They may respond differently, if they hear someone say, “I am dehumanized.”

The problem of dehumanization is not specific to any one field. It exists in most organizations and often goes unrecognized and unquestioned, as workers rationalize the stress and suffering, they experience as part of the job. While my Master’s thesis addressed work-life balance and well-being, my doctoral research stretches one step further. My focus is on the issue of dehumanization in the work place. I believe that uncovering and acknowledging dehumanization in the workplace can create successful organizations where we all want to work. My intent is to inform all readers, especially those in leadership and managerial positions, of the importance in giving conscious attention and taking conscious action towards re-humanizing workplace environments. This thesis will address transformation of organizational culture through shifting relationship interactions within the workplace. I intend to spark the reader's interest to take action, no matter how small, towards people's awakening to workplace cultures that is healthy, life giving, and life sustaining.

Chapter 2. Is workplace stress a misnomer for dehumanization?

At its core, business is and has always been a human endeavour. But we forget this, deny this, and at times, revile it. I assert that beneath its polished and professional exterior, business is about human interaction and the sharing of meaning; however distorted, eroded, and attenuated it has become. The workplace is not exclusively for the production of goods and services. Workplaces are communities where humans live out a significant portion of their daily lives. In this chapter, I contend to the distinct loss or lack of the human dimension (Cohen, 2015) in the workplace. In the business world, the human element seems to have been subtly and not so subtly forgotten or neglected, resulting in their diminishment and compromise. By *human element and dimension,* I speak of people foremost and fundamentally as *persons* who have individual hopes and dreams, aspirations, worries, fears, personal values and worldviews. People desire to be loved and treated with respect, dignity, and care. *Persons ought to be* respected for their inherent dignity and sanctity. When this fundamental respect is not accorded to people at work, school, or at home, the phenomenon of dehumanization results. In this chapter, I trace the elements that lead into the process of dehumanization at the workplace. Central to this process is how we understand, handle, relate to, and work with our emotions as they appear in our work environment. This discussion will begin with stress.

2.1. Survival Stress

Treating people with respect, dignity, and care appears to be a "pie in the sky" issue. The main priorities in life for most people in North America is securing a job and obtaining financial security. The possibility of being unable to provide for oneself and for their families is real. In "*Long Overdue: Why BC needs a poverty reduction plan*", the Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives states that British Columbia has the second highest poverty rate in Canada and is the only province without a poverty reduction plan (Klein, Ivanova & Leyland, January 2017). As of September 15, 2017, BC's minimum wage was increased from $10.85 to $11.35 per hour. On an annual basis, a full-time employee receiving minimum wage receives $3,500 less than the poverty line for a single person. (Klein, Ivanova & Leyland, January 2017). BC has the highest rate of wealth inequality in Canada. Thousands of British Columbians are struggling with the devastating effects of poverty. Poverty hit multiple groups of people: the homeless, seniors relying on the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security, and the low-income workforce. With the rising costs of housing, child care, food, and elder care, the ramifications associated with poverty will continue to rise (Klein, Ivanova & Leyland, January 2017). A survey conducted by the Canadian Payroll Association (2017) revealed that 47% of Canadians polled were living paycheque to paycheque and would find it difficult to meet their financial obligations if their pay was delayed by a week. 70% of Canadians polled save only 10% or less on an annual basis. Additionally, 64% of the polled working Canadians put aside less than 25% of the money they expect to need in retirement (Canadian Payroll Association, 2017, August).

Linda Duxbury, one of Canada's leading workplace health researchers, described the Canadian workforce as broken and separated into three groups: "knowledge workers (professionals and managers working long hours); lower-end service sector workers, who work several part-time jobs; and jobless people displaced by automation or outsourcing, unable to find any work for which they're qualified" (as cited by Luke, 2014, January 12). Canada's workforce also differentiates between "white collar" and "blue collar" occupations. White collar jobs include management and professional occupations, technologists, and technical occupations. Blue-collar jobs are trades and occupations related to processing, manufacturing, and utilities. Historically, white collar workers wore white button-down shirts and worked in an office setting; and blue-collar workers usually wore blue uniforms and worked in the trades. While work classifications commonly used the terms, "white collar" and "blue collar", there is a more recent classification, "pink collar" jobs. Pink collar jobs are clerical, sales and service occupations. These positions are often occupied by female employees, hence the pink-collar designation (Compton, Susan, 2011). Job losses are a regular occurrence in the capitalist system. Traditionally, white collar workers have been somewhat protected. Unfortunately, there is a growing phenomenon of job layoffs in the white-collar community (Bardwick, 2008; Noer, 2009). Media sources report that profitable banks, such as CIBC and RBC, are increasing layoffs as the outsourcing of jobs to countries where labour is cheaper is becoming more common (Posadzki, 2017, June 21). Organizations are downsizing and flattening their structures, and in some cases, middle management employees are being laid off. This is often referred to as "organizational anorexia" at the management level (Duxbury & Higgins, 2003). Perhaps these layoffs are insignificant unless you are the individual experiencing it. However, Statistics Canada (2001) reported that Canadians who were laid off take an average of 20.6 weeks to find work again. For people 55 and over, only 7.9% find jobs within a year of being laid off (Galarneau & Stratychuk, 2001). More recently, in 2014, Statistics Canada reported that Canadians take about 20 weeks to find a job. People 55 and over were more pessimistic about their chances of finding a job. This group was more inclined to accept a pay cut of up to 20% for work. Often, people 55 and older are supporting themselves with their retirements savings (Bonikowska & Schellenberg, 2014)

Given this harsh reality, employees working long hours are considered lucky to have a job. I understand why some people feel that "workplace stress" is a privileged problem, especially when so many are struggling to survive. Still, there are two issues present here: workplace stress that erodes and damages workers' health and a culture that has normalized and accepted workplace stress.

Workplace stress is a subset of stress and is understood by the World Health Organization as the 21st century epidemic (as cited in Fink, 2017). Many US and Canadian studies confirm that the leading source of stress for adults is workplace stress (American Psychological Association, 2017; Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C., 2017, 2012). A correlation has been discovered between stress and mental health as mental health issues increase during stressful times. In 2007, mental health became a political priority in Canada when Prime Minister Harper created the Mental Health Commission of Canada. The former Prime Minister Harper quoted:

> With almost one million Canadians suffering from a mental health disorder, it's now the fastest-growing category of disability insurance claims in Canada. The cause is unclear. … Some blame the hectic pace of modern life, the trend to smaller and fragmented families, often separated by great distance, or the mass migration from small stable communities to huge, impersonal cities. (as cited in Parrouty, 2013, p. 8)

Mental health and stress-related disorders are intertwined. Stress can trigger mental health issues as well as physical ailments such as cardiovascular problems, of which heart attack, stroke, and hypertension are most common. Stress is costing the Canadian economy an estimated $33 billion in lost productivity, as well as billions more in medical costs (MacQueen, K. Patriquin, M. & Intini, October 15, 2007, Duxbury, L. &

Higgins, C., 2012). In this chapter, I will focus on some of the numerous types of workplace stressors: overwork, being undervalued, and the inappropriate handling of emotions within the workplace. I will conclude with the lack of psychological understanding underlying these stressors. The next section begins with a discussion of the physical and emotional consequences of overwork. I will also discuss what overwork is and is not.

2.2. Overwork

A main workplace stressor is overwork. "*Karoshi*", the Japanese term for "death by overwork", originates from the 1970s. The International Labour Organization (2013) states that

> Karoshi is not a pure medical term but a sociomedical term that refers to fatalities or associated work disability due to cardiovascular attacks (such as brain strokes, myocardial infarction or acute cardiac failure) aggravated by a heavy workload and long working hours (p. 1).

Hiroshi Kawahito, the secretary general of the National Defense Counsel for Victims of Karoshi, interview with Tapei Times and warned that the number of deaths could be ten times higher due to the invisibility of the problem (Tapei Times, April 14, 2016). The Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare defines a death by Karoshi as " the sudden death of any employee who works an average of 65 hours per week or more for more than 4 weeks or on average of 60 hours or more per week for more than 8 weeks may be karoshi" (as cited in Hiyama, Yoshihara, 2008, p. 428). Several Japanese studies demonstrated how extremely long hours (consistently working more than 60 hours a week) have severe effects on health (Amagasa et al., 2013; Hiyama & Yoshihara, 2008). Although the west may not have an equivalent term for "karoshi", we do suffer the same problem. Jeffrey Pfeffer (2018), specialist in organizational behaviour at Stanford Business, claims in his new book, *Dying for a Paycheck*, "American Institute of Stress maintains that job stress costs US employers more than 300 billion annually" (p. 3) and "workplace environments in the United States may be responsible for 120 thousand excess deaths per year- which would make workplaces the fifth leading cause of death" (p.48). China also has a mandarin term similar to *karoshi*: "*guolaosi"* (Pfeffer, 2018, p. 119). There is a disconnect between the studies coming out of China on "death by overwork." For example, one study came out that China was the nation with the highest instance of death by overwork (Monet, 2014) reporting that 600,000 people die from work-related stress and its effect every year in China; another study came out that while working longer hours does significantly increase the probabilities of high blood pressure and poorer reported health, they were disputing the it led to death by overwork (Nie, Otterback & Souza-Poza, 2015). Although there are contradictory studies on the influences of *guolaosi*, I am not focusing on this aspect in my thesis. I am emphasizing the existence of the word in the Mandarin language.

Karojisatsu, another Japanese term, is defined as "suicide by overworking or from stressful working conditions" (Amagasa et al., 2005). Amagasa, Nakayama, & Takahashi (2005) completed the first case study on *Karojisatsu*. This case study included in-depth analyses and “psychological autopsies” on 22 cases of work-related suicide. These 22 individuals who committed suicide worked long hours, experienced heavy workloads, felt pressing psychological demands and received little social support at work. They suffered depression which worsened, and they committed suicide. The preliminary conclusion to their study was that a failure to meet employer's expectations, an increase in job responsibilities, and work-related psychological stress led to depressive states and subsequent suicide.

Suicide associated with overwork or stressful working conditions is not isolated within Japan. Thirty-five France Telecom employees committed suicide during a two-year period (2008-2009). This occurred after the former CEO, Didier Lombard, announced the organizational plans to eliminate 22,000 employees. The organization intentionally demoralized staff to push them to quit their jobs. The organization persuaded mothers with children to commute to offices that were two hours away, directed tasks to employees they were not trained to do, and offered jobs to senior employees that were clearly below their current positions. After a 7-year inquiry, Paris prosecutors ordered Lombard and six executives to go on trial for psychological harassment and 'dangerous degradation of working conditions' (National Post, July 7, 2016; Marlowe, T. July 7, 2016). As of 2018, a court date has not been set.

According to the Public Health Agency of Canada (2018), 10 people die by suicide each day in Canada. In adults, 30 to 44, suicide is the 3rd leading cause of death and in adults 45 to 64, it is the 7th leading cause of death. Within the last ten years, studies that are showing that job stressors can be related to suicides. It has also been identified that there are times where the job-related factors are hidden as secondary factors, such as depression or substance use disorders mask the original source of suffering (Milner et al, 2018; Vertanen, 2018).

A third Japanese word, *furoshiki,* is defined as 'cloaked overtime' (Cropley, 2015) *Furoshiki* is a type of wrapping cloth traditionally used to transport clothes, gifts, and other goods. Within organizations, cloaked overtime is turning a blind eye to work that is taken home. Consequently, an abundance of working hours are unpaid and not recorded. Additionally, cloaked overtime is easily hidden by our new technologies. Remote access to our office desktop and the accessibly to work emails through our smartphones allows us to be connected 24/7 to our work tasks. Unfortunately, work from home is not considered as work by many employers. The hours worked at home are invisible and unacknowledged by the employer.

Unsurprisingly, the number of hours worked in Japan is higher compared to other countries. The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (2016) presents the average annual hours spent at work per worker in multiple countries. In 2016, Japan recorded 1,713 hours while Canada recorded 1,703. Interestingly, the top three countries were: 1) Mexico, 2,255; 2) Costa Rica, 2,212; 3) and Korea, 2,069.

Karoshi, karojisatsu, and *furoshiki* are Japanese in origin, but the meaning behind them are relevant in the Western culture. The term *Karoshi* is only applied when an employee works an average of 60 hours per week for approximately eight weeks or more. According to numerous studies conducted in Europe, USA, and Australia, 60 hours per week is classified as a heavy workload and could potentially precipitate cardiovascular problems (Kivimäki, et al., 2015). Logging 60 hours per week is not extremely difficult; a person working 40 hours a week adds an additional three hours per evening for five days a week and works five hours on the weekend equals 60 hours total. The Center for American Progress's study entitled "The Poor, the Professionals, and the Missing Middle" (2010) reported that top-level professionals— including lawyers, management consultants, and doctors, considered a 40-hour work week as part-time (Williams & Boushey, 2010). On a personal note, as an accountant who has experienced the intensity of tax season, 60 hours per week during the four-month period is not a stretch. Other professionals that I have spoken to, such as lawyers, physicians, and academics, agree. Unfortunately, 60-hour weeks are not uncommon; and amidst the busier seasons, professionals are working more than 60 hours per week. In certain professions, people are expected to work the demanding hours. Duxbury's 2012 National Study on Balancing Work and Caregiving in Canada encompassed 25,000 employed Canadians. The report states:

> [T]he typical employee in this sample "spends 50.2 hours in work related activities per week. Sixty percent work more than 45 hours per week while 36% work between 35 and 44 hours ... Just over half (54%) of the employees in this sample take work home to complete outside of their regular hours on evenings and weekends (a phenomenon which is referred to as supplemental work at home or SWAH). These individuals spend another 7 hours in work per week" (p. 4)

Studies from Europe, the USA, Australia, and Canada have established a link between long working hours and risk of coronary heart disease and stroke (Kivimaki et al, 2015; Mariappanadar & Aust, 2017). Individuals working 55 hours or more per week had a 13% greater risk of experiencing a heart attack and were 33% more likely to have a stroke compared to those working regular hours. Sudden death from overwork is often caused by stroke and is believed to be triggered by the repetition of the stress response (Kivimaki et al, 2015; Sapolsky, 2004/1994). These studies offered differing conclusions as to whether working long hours was more common in highly qualified positions with higher socioeconomic status. Dr. Kivimaki and his associates' study found a correlation between positions of higher socioeconomic status, whereas the University College London study found no difference. Research conducted by three Stanford professors reported each year, more than 120,000 deaths were associated with workplace stressors. Long hours, job insecurity, high work-family conflict, low job control, and high job demands accounts for the $190 billion in health care costs (Goh, Pfeffer, & Zenious 2016).

Reflecting on my own managerial experiences and discussing with others about their own, take home work is not considered “overtime”; "overtime" does not exist within management. Management is a salary position and not determined by the hours you work. The unspoken expectation is, "you are a professional and therefore, you know what needs to get done." There are a multitude of studies exploring overwork within the healthcare or educational professions. Healthcare studies document the consequences of overwork and employees are frequently unable to meet patients' needs. In the 2012 National Steering Committee study, "*Fatigue, Risk, & Excellence: Towards a Pan-*

Canadian Consensus on Resident Duty Hours" 80% of survey respondents stated that fatigue was compromising the care they were able to provide patients. Canadian educators have also conducted national studies on overwork within their profession. Canadian Teachers' Federation completed a study that has demonstrated that educators often work an average of 50 to 55 hours per week (Froese-Germain, 2014). Duxbury and Higgins compared national findings from over 25,000 Canadians with a sample of 2,500 Alberta teachers. They found that on average, teachers in the sample were spending 60.8 hours on work-related activities; 10 hours more than the typical employee at 50.2 hours (2012, p. 49). One of the things that I have noticed is that people often do not include responding to their work email after hours as work. It has become so normalized for them, that this becomes one of the things that they simply do.

Furoshiki, or cloaked overtime, is not a common term in Western society. However, *Furoshiki* is occurring in many professional organizations. The downsizing or restructuring of an organization often leads to a reduction in staff. Work tasks intensify, and the additional work becomes absorbed by the remaining workers who may or may not be compensated for their time. In situations of downsizing, employees are expected to be a team player and take the extra work. Workers also perform these actions to reduce their chances of being laid off. Senior leadership in organizations contribute to cloaked overtime as the senior leadership may not want to believe that their organizational culture is one of overwork or stress. Here are some fictionalized examples of overtime that is expected, but not explicitly assigned.

> In a weekly meeting, my boss states, "I don't want anyone taking their work home with them as there is really no need for that." I thought that was a mixed message if I ever heard one. You don't want anyone taking work home or doing overtime, but the volume is such that if I don't take it home and do it after hours, how will it get done? Have you not listened to staff state what they are dealing with? (Executive Assistant)

> I am dealing with phone calls and emails all day long. The interruptions are non-stop. I am working on projects off the side of my desk, so I need to take them home to complete. (Administrator)

> I dare not complain or state that I can't get the work done. I am scared that they will think that I am slow. I am already coming in early and working through my lunch, just so I can try to keep on top of my job. (Assistant)

> At a staff meeting, we are told that overtime will not be approved. We are to work within our team and if we need additional help to ask one of our co-

> workers. Who has capacity to help me? No one on our team has capacity, we are all over-loaded. (Team Member)

As the above examples show, cloaked overtime is often obscure, but there is a type of overtime that is competitive and visible. Nicolas Henry, Director of Business Intelligence at Xoomworks (2016), defines *competitive overtime* as work hours added to the forty hours per week without compensation (as cited in Frith, 2016)). Competitive overtime may be used to impress employers, especially in experiences of job insecurity. It precipitates a stress cycle as other workers feel pressured to work through lunches or stay late; possibly coming in when they are sick. I have witnessed competitive overtime occur through organizational changes because employees feel threatened and must compete to remain employed. Demonstrating work ethic and work-value to the employers are tactics used in competitive overtime.

Overwork is a complex issue. It is not simply about the requirement to work x number of hours to complete job tasks; there are multiple varying reasons at play. In addition to the reasons of overwork described prior, learned behaviours also transpires the use of overtime. Technological advances allow employees to work anywhere and anytime. A person checking work emails while standing in a line at the grocery store may not consider their behavior as working overtime. Many of my colleagues argue that they were not working but making good use of wasted time and being efficient. Checking emails during off-work hours has become a norm for our society.

Overwork also arises in professions directly dealing with people. Meeting or not meeting the demands of your job affects another employee's life. An employee who is committed to their job may likely overextend themselves in response to someone else not accomplishing their tasks. Numerous professionals have also experienced work intensification as paperwork often handled by administrators are now delegated to regular employees. Research on overwork conducted by educators is easily transferable to work-life in organizations. David Dibbon (2004), in his study "*It's about time!!; A report on the impact of workload on teachers and students*", discusses Hargreaves (of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) research on work intensification. Hargreaves asserts that work intensification "represents one of the most tangible ways in which work privileges of educated workers gets eroded" (as cited 2004, p. 11). Hargreaves also made the following claim:

> Intensification leads to reduced time for relaxation during the working day… Intensification leads to a lack of time to retool one's skills and abilities and keep up with one's field; … Intensification creates chronic and persistent overload (as compared with the temporary overload that is sometimes experienced in meeting deadlines)…; Intensification leads to reduction in the quality of service, as corners are cut to save time; Intensification is voluntarily supported by many teachers and misrecognized as professionalism (as cited in Dibbon, 2004 pp, 11-12).

The above statements regarding work intensification deeply resonate with me. The statement: "intensification leads to reduced time for relaxation during the work day" cannot be more strongly emphasized. Speaking from experience, catching my breath results in reduced time as my Outlook calendar continually controls where I am going to be and when. My busiest days at work are filled with meetings and/or scheduled phone calls and I cannot attend to my actual work until almost the end of the day. Work intensification as misrecognized professionalism is prevalent in the corporate workplace. I have personally experienced the unconscious reframing of work-intensification and compression into professionalism when I am suffering from overwork.

The consequences of chronic overwork have negative impacts on one's health, one's relationships, and one's quality of life. Many studies have concluded that overwork and the resulting stress leads to health problems, such as impaired sleeping and sleep debt, which raises the risk of cardiovascular problems like heart disease, stroke, obesity, and diabetes.

Diane Fassel (1990, 2000), a management consultant stated:

> Everywhere I go it seems people are killing themselves with work, busyness, rushing, caring, and rescuing. Work addiction is a modern epidemic and it is sweeping our land …. I call it the cleanest of all the addictions. It is socially promoted because it is seemingly socially productive (p. 2)

It is important to highlight the distinctions between a person who is addicted to work (workaholic), a work enthusiast, and someone who is overworked. Workaholism is understood as the "addiction of the century" (Griffiths, 2011; Burke, 2000) or the "respected addiction" (Robinson, 2014). Workaholic behaviour is socially acceptable and may be encouraged by organizations. For some, the acknowledgement of being a "workaholic" is a badge of honour. "Workaholics" interpret their work-addictive behavior as being a dedicated, responsible and conscientious worker. However, identifying as a workaholic does not equate to being a dedicated, responsible, or conscientious worker. Wayne Oates (1971), an American psychologist, coined and defines the term "workaholic." A workaholic is "a person whose need for work has become so excessive that it creates noticeable disturbance or interference with his bodily health, personal happiness, and interpersonal relations, and with his smooth social functioning" (p. 4). Oates' work depicts the true addictive nature of workaholism as both a compulsion to work and as having a high degree of conflict in a person's life. While the latest edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5) recognizes addictive behaviours in general, it has not yet formally defined or included workaholism.

Distinguishing between a passionate worker and one who suffers workaholism is a difficult situation for employers. As workaholism is completely uncorrelated to work performance, employers find themselves in a grey area; they want to combat the effects of workaholism but also desire hardworking employees who will occasionally go the extra mile. Another type of worker who differs from workaholics and overworked employees are work enthusiasts. Work enthusiast truly enjoy what they do and are passionate about their work. They also may not require or desire balance. For example, people who choose to work on the weekend rather than attend a family event and who do not experience conflict within themselves are considered work enthusiasts.

It is important to make the distinctions between a workaholic, a work enthusiast, and someone who is overworked. To clarify: I do not believe that all people working long hours are suffering from overwork. There are people who truly enjoy their work and would be highly offended if I were to suggest they were suffering from overwork.

2.3. Feeling undervalued in the workplace

Feelings of being undervalued or not valued at all in the workplace are also workplace stressors. Valuing in the workplace occurs on a continuum where the individual is on one end and professional value is on the other. Undervaluing an employee on an individual level ranges from undervaluing their contributions to their presence being unacknowledged. A simple but common example is an employee entering the office of a supervisor, who barely glances away from their emails or paperwork when the employee is in their office. Gostick & Elton (2006) defined the invisible employee as someone who is "feeling overlooked, ignored, and unappreciated" (p.7). Employees feel undervalued in the workplace due to a lack of recognition. Additionally, input from employees relating to their thoughts, feelings, or ideas about their job may not be respected or sought out by employers. The APA 2017 Worker and Well-Being survey of 1,512 working adults in the United States showed that only 53% of employees regularly participate in activities designed to include employees in decision-making, problem solving, and goal setting (p. 12). Further, only 50% of workers claim to receive non-monetary forms of recognition at work, such as praise from supervisors, thank-you cards, or awards for their achievements and contributions (p. 15).

A lack of trust in bosses may lead to the undervalued experiences of some employees. A scarcity of constructive feedback and support for employees leads to the development of stagnation and growth in some positions. Alternatively, micromanaging employee work could translate as not having confidence in their abilities to do their job.

A negative working relationship between an employee and their direct supervisor may also cause devaluation in the workplace. The following examples illustrate the differences between a positive or negative working relationship. Managers who do not take the time to interact with or get to know an employee will be unaware of the unique skills that appear outside of the current job. Promotions may be overlooked without appropriate care and attention given to employees. Poor communication between a worker and their boss results in feelings of disconnect and undervalue; whereas effective communication promotes positive interactions with employees who then feel valued. Organizations need to regularly communicate with employees, obtaining feedback from employees, and make changes based on employee feedback (APA Psychologically Health Workplace Program, 2016).

Employee's feeling undervalued and not appreciated in the workplace will also occur when work is unstimulating, disengaging, or not appropriately fitted to their job description. For example, some organizational jobs contain meaningless tasks or repetitive patterns of work. Jobs that are below the capabilities of the employee or painfully simple and do not challenge employees will additionally create an environmental that is devaluing and uninspiring.

Feeling undervalued is not excluded to the individual level but ensues at the macro level, when employees feel that their jobs are devalued in society. For example, eight out of ten educators feel that their profession is not valued by society (Canadian Teachers' Federation National Research, 2011). While studies show that educators find great meaning in their jobs at different grade levels, they express frustration with their heavy workloads, increasing demands by others, and an increasing disrespect for the teaching profession (p. 6). The 2017 Canada-wide Insights West poll identified business executive, bankers, realtors, and lawyers as the least respected professions in the Canadian society.

Rank abuse is another factor contributing to the feelings of being undervalued by employers (Fuller, 2003). Rank develops based on the hierarchy of positions in the organization. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will hold a higher rank than an administrative assistant. While there are legitimate uses of rank, many workers routinely suffer abuse from their supervisors who misuse their power and rank within an organization. Rank abuse often arises within interpersonal relationships; through the tone or raising of one’s voice, threats of poor performance reviews, or non-inclusive meetings. Harassment, bullying, and workplace incivility all fall under rank abuse (Fuller, 2003). Relating to my research in *karojisatsu* (suicide by overwork or under stressful working conditions) I found a correlation between workers who contemplate suicide and victims of workplace bullying (Worksafe BC, 2013). The Canada Safety Council stated that one in six employees in Canada have been bullied (as cited in Mueller, 2005). Verbal aggression, personal attacks, and various behaviours that are considered to be intimidating or humiliating are manifestation of bullying and harassment in the workplace. The problem of bullying in the workplace became so apparent that the government added new anti-bullying rules into the *Workers Compensation Act of BC* (Bill 14), that went into effect on July 1, 2012. In Chapter 4 I will further examine the incivility and dehumanizing behaviors of rank abuse, harassment, and bullying throughout organizations.

An absence of recognition, demonstrations of distrust, and/or rank abuse can all contribute to workers feeling undervalued or not valued at all in the workplace. These research-based identified stressors all add to workplace stress. In the next section, I will analyze these stressors in more fundamental terms of how we engage or disengage from, and how we perceive, express, or not express, emotions in the workplace. This discussion will clearly reveal that workplace stress is a symptom of our unethical human relations, signalled by our emotional experiences.

Despite positive intentions from organizations, bad workplace behaviours occur on a continuum of minute to severe. Workplace incivility, harassment, bullying, and violence are closer to the severity end of this continuum. **Incivility** is defined as "seemingly inconsequential, inconsiderate words or deeds that violate conventional norms of workplace conduct, which may or may not be intended to harm". Ninety – six percent of people have experienced uncivil (disrespectful behavior) in the workplace (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Examples of workplace incivility are rudeness, social exclusion, belittling, moodiness, and eye rolling. **Harassment** is a "broad range of unwelcoming behaviours that degrade, insult, humiliate, or offend. The actions may intentional or not " (Bar-David, 2015. p. 4). Examples of harassment include: insulting or offensive language, sexual advances, and discriminatory practices. A Canadian survey conducted by the Angus Reid Institute (2004) found that 28% of Canadians have experienced sexual harassment in their place of work or at a work-related function.

Workplace bullying is a particularly potent form of workplace harassment. Bullying is defined as "the repeated mistreatment of one or more employees, sometimes by an employee in a position of influence or authority, who intentionally or unwittingly, subjects others to behaviour that humiliates, demoralizes or otherwise undermines the victim's credibility, effectiveness, and well-being" (Bar-David, 2012, p. 5) The Workplace Bullying Institute reported the following: 37% of workers have been bullied with 57% of the targets identified as women. Most of the bullies (72%) are people in positions of authority. Long-term well-established employees are more likely to be targeted than new employers (Namie, 2017)

Workplace violence is a broad term including "any act where a person is abused, threatened, intimidated or assaulted in his or her place of employment by an individual or individuals inside or outside the organization" (Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, 2017, p. 3). Statistics Canada (2014), in a report titled *Criminal Victimization in Canada,* reported 27% of violent incidents occur at the victim's place of work (Perreault, 2015). Despite the data, employers assume that the workplace is problem-free, especially when they are unaware of complaints. However, complaint-free workplaces are not guaranteed to be problem-free workplaces. Fears of embarrassment, not being believed, or the possibility of retaliation or job loss encourages employees to not complain about workplace incivility. Occasionally, the only situation where incivility is brought to light is when a complaint is filed with Human Rights

Services or through exit interviews. In British Columbia, *Bill M212 -2012 Workplace Bullying Prevention Act, 2012* requires employers with 10 or more employees to implement a workplace harassment policy. In addition, as part of the Canada Labour Code S 247.4 (1), all employers are advised to issue a policy statement concerning sexual harassment. The mandated requirements to issue statements pertaining to bullying and harassment policies is a cue to a larger societal problem. Likewise, issues of incivility are associated with workplace power relationships and treated with a lack of dignity. Power relationships exist between people employed at different levels within an organization, and conflicts arise with the abuse of one's power position. While there is extensive literature on the concept of power, I am going to limit the discussion of power as it relates to dehumanization.

2.4. Emotions in the workplace

Within this section, I will explore the connection between emotions in the workplace and workplace stress. The workplace is filled with emotion. Fineman (2007) suggests that organizations, like societies, have cultures that consist of “language, rituals and meaning systems, including rules about the feelings workers should and should not have, feel and display” (p. 46). Different businesses will have different emotional expectations: The hospitality industry will show a more caring and helpful approach, while workers in the financial collection industry will show a more firm and stern approach. Professional accountants, lawyers, and physicians may suppress positive or negative emotions and elicit a more neutral approach to appear objective and rational.

Emotional management is “the effort people put into making sure that their private feelings are expressed in a way that is consistent with socially accepted norms, such as looking happy at a party and sober at a funeral” (Fineman, 2007 p. 29). Emotional management transpiring as a commodity becomes emotional labour. Hochschild (2012/1983) defined emotional labor as "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has exchange value" (p. 7).

Emotional labour is an essential part of business. Emotional labour, when practiced effectively, increase sales and improves client and customer relations.

However, it has the potential to decrease sales and hurt client and customer relations when incorrectly approached. For example, emotional labor is an integral part of the service industry, such as the hospitality and travel industry. Waiters and stewardesses' cheerful disposition is part of the customers' experience. A sulky waiter would decrease one's enjoyment of the meal and experience. Within an organization, sufficient use of emotional labor increase employee openness to organizational change (Fineman 2007; Tracy, 2005).

Emotional work presents differently depending on *the emotional display rules*. Emotional display rules are the cultural, group, or organizational rules for how, when, and where one can express or not express certain emotions (Hochschild 2012/1983; Fineman, 2007). Here are some examples of emotional display rules: The store greeter is taught and expected to greet everyone with a smile whether they feel like smiling or not. Bill collectors are trained to express feelings of slight irritation and urgency when following up on collections (Hochschild, 2012/1983). Display rules can also suppress emotional responses. Administrative staff members are advised to conceal frustration with clients or customers who may repeatedly ask the same question.

Emotional display rules attest emotional regulation an important part of one’s job performance. For example, medical and other professions keep a professional demeanor that is described as a “mask” that cannot slip off, as it is very important that the image of the professionalism is upheld (Fineman, 2007; Hochschild, 2012/1983). This is referred to "emotional masking", defined as suppressing positive and negative emotions, to create impressions of objectivity and professionalism (Diefendorrff & Richard, 2007).

Emotion labour magnifies emotion while simultaneously suppressing emotions that are defined as organizationally inappropriate (Fineman 2007; Hochschild, 2012/1983). Hochschild (2012/1983) asserts three criteria for jobs that call for emotional labour.

> First, they require face-to-face or voice-to-voice contact with the public. Second, they require the worker to produce an emotional state in another person – gratitude or fear, for example. Third, they allow the employer, through training and supervision to exercise a degree of control over the emotional activities of employees (p. 147).

Although I agree with Hochschild’s three criteria, I also believe emotional labour occurs not only in the public, but with co-workers and bosses. Emotional behaviours create the expectations of being willing to take on more even at capacity. Emotional labour also exists in management control, organizational cultural control, and peer-based control (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Management control show up in the form of rewards to employees who successfully engage in emotion labour and punishments or a denial of a reward to employees who fail to display proper emotions. Management control is demonstrated by defining specific requirements to job tasks; perhaps to follow a closely worded script within call-centers or to greet customers in a certain way. Management control is then reinforced through the supervisory process and performance evaluations. Organization cultural control is socializing employees to express certain emotions. For example, when a new employee starts (onboarding) with the organization, they are typically informed of the organization’s values and beliefs. The new employees will also be advised of what is expected of them in order to provide the good customer service.. Peer-based control shows up in the relations between co-workers. For example, if one worker is negative due to an unmanageable workload, another coworker may try to encourage the person to be positive, by reinforcing the organizational culture, which may have the belief that "No matter what, we will get this work done." Coworkers reinforce the organizational culture by regulating their co-worker’s behaviours if they display inappropriate emotions.

Workers are expected to regulate emotional expressions. Gross (1998) identifies three different types of 'emotional regulation'. Firstly, the term 'emotional regulation' refers to the way emotions regulate or influence our thoughts and behaviours. Secondly, 'emotional regulation' refers to how we try to regulate the emotional experiences of others. Lastly, 'emotional regulation' can be "the process by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions" (Gross, 1998, p. 275). I will focus on the third usage of “emotional regulation”.

Hochschild discusses two instances of emotional acting in emotional regulation: surface acting and deep acting. Hochschild states:

> Feelings do not erupt spontaneously or automatically in either deep acting or surface acting. In both cases the actor has learned to intervene – either

> in creating the inner shape of a feeling or in shaping the outward appearance of one (Hochschild, 2012/1983, p. 36).

Both surface and deep acting are false and effortful emotional regulations (Hochschild 1983; Grove & Fisk, 1989), each representing different intentions. Deep acting is the modifying of emotions to match the required display. Employees enacting deep acting are authentic. For example; an employee working with an upset customer will attempt to understand the customer's point of view by being empathetic and appearing concerned. This is also referred to as "faking in good faith" (Refaeli & Sutton, 1987, p. 32). Surface acting is 'faking' affective displays. For example, an employee working with an upset customer may put on a concerned face but is rather frustrated with the customer. Surface acting is sometimes described as "faking in bad faith" (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987, p. 32). Both surface and deep acting involves putting on an act to conform to positive display rules.

Concealing or restraining emotion is linked to multiple affective, cognitive, and social consequences (Gross, 2012). Emotional labour reduces job satisfaction and effects the psychological well-being of employees. Emotional labour is challenging for the individual as the lack of authenticity may conflict with a person’s preferred identity. Organizations that hold a 'customer is always right' attitude may force employees to adopt a calm presence and present themselves in a way contrary to their current, authentic emotions. Consequentially, emotional exhaustion and increased stress levels follow these false emotional states. Research demonstrates the negative influence of emotional labour on an individual’s psychological health, often causing a person to feel insincere, stressed, and burnt out (Fineman, 2007; Sloan, 2012). Emotional inhibition also causes an increased risk for the psychological problems of anxiety or depression (Krause et al., 2003). Suppressed emotions can be harmful to a person's immune system. The impact of emotional suppression on one's body can be harmful and increase the risk of heart disease (Mate, 2004; Sapolsky, 2004).

2.5. Emotional Dissonance and the Fragmented Self

For leaders and management, it is important to address concerns of employees' unexpressed feelings, their meaning, and impact on the workplace. Withholding emotions may incorrectly motivate employees to partake in activities that are unsupported by their emotions that further suppress their feelings. Some leaders interpret silence as agreement. However, there are countless reasons why someone does not voice their opinion. Often, workers stay silent due to 1) not feeling safe to share their feelings; 2) a lack of listening skills amongst coworkers; and 3) disingenuous motives in asking for their opinions, such as a strategy for inclusion.

I will now trace the connection between emotions in the workplace and the fragmented self. In the workplace, *emotional dissonance* is the disconnection between the emotions experienced by the worker and those required by the organization and can lead to emotional exhaustion (Fineman, 2007; Hochschild, 2012/1983). Emotional dissonance occurs when this disconnection is understood as a threat to the worker's identity. When employees engage in acts of emotional suppression– acts that are depleting and exhausting– it encourages the avoidance of social interactions (Gross & John, 2003). An employee may spend the morning engaging in effortful emotional regulation with a spouse then tries to appear emotionally regulated at work. At the end of the day, getting home from work, they are unable to contain their emotions and displaces them onto their spouse. Or, they may avoid interacting with their spouse, to evade the emotional outburst of anger and resentment. However, avoidance may lead to further rupture within the relationship.

Another common scenario of emotional displacement is as follows: An employee is treated with disrespect and aggressiveness by co-workers or their boss but contains their negative emotions and appears calm. However, when returning home, the suppressed painful emotions are unfairly redirected to their spouse and children through aggressively criticizing them. Overall, the unresolved emotional dissonance depleted internal psychological resources and energy, further decreasing pro-social behavior. Self-alienation is another adverse consequence of workplace emotional dissonance, as workers may feel that they are 'selling' emotions for a wage. I have observed this time and time again in myself and in others.

The experience of fragmentation develops through excessive emotional dissonance. In some instances, people who constantly manage their emotions start to have difficulty identifying authentic emotions versus the fictitious emotions they display in congruence with emotional expectations. To illustrate: Jane Doe, a highly successful professional in a high-stress occupation, feels that her supervisor is continually unfairly critical and disrespectful. This continual criticism directly conflicts with Jane's sense of her identity. Jane is angry, but she is aware, implicitly or explicitly, that it is either inappropriate to express her anger in being unfairly criticized, or, it would be a danger to her livelihood to contest her supervisor's viewpoint. She suppresses her anger and unfortunately becomes depressed. Depression *is* an acceptable emotion within the workplace as long as the work is being done (Fineman, 1993). Jane's repressed feelings and experiences become detached from her conscious self and her false self begins to develop. The original integrity of her being at birth, even if undeveloped, is broken. This is one example of how psychological fragmentation develops.

My above narrative illustrates how the long-term management of emotions potentially causes individual alienation from one's self. Alienation is one aspect of the process of *dehumanization*. I will return to a close analysis of this claim in the next chapter. To recap, emotional labour is a type of workplace stress that causes emotional exhaustion and, more seriously, psychological fragmentation and self-alienation. The engagement in "acting", whether for clients or for organizational acceptance, creates emotional exhaustion for two main reasons: 1) tension from emotional dissonance and 2) draining resources in the effort of acting (Hoschschild,2012/1983).

2.6. Functional element of dehumanization – power in the workplace

Today, evaluating humans based on functionality is common in our society. It is a massive part of the business culture. It has become entirely normal to value first and foremost the functional, or *instrumental* value of a person. We hire, and fire employees based on their production rate, functionality, efficiency, and so forth. This form of evaluating, however, assigns a value or "price tag" to individuals. Some people are identified as valuable, and others worthless, based on aspects that are culturally cherished and appreciated. I am arguing that the fragmentation of being, the separating and evaluating of different aspects of the human being, has breached the basic morality of humanity. Instead of recognizing, valuing, and respecting persons for their fundamental wholeness as human beings, we are culturally trained to recognize and assess persons based on attendant functions that are considered socially important.

Evaluating people based on functionality elicits harmful moral effects that we are largely unaware of. We do not understand the ideology of *instrumentalism* or acknowledge its dehumanizing practices that normalized in our society. Haslam (2015*)* sheds light on this issue of misrecognition, writing that dehumanization occurs in both blatant and subtle forms. “At one end of the spectrum,” Haslam (2015) argues, “are cases in which people blatantly are denied their humanity, either by an explicit exclusion from the human category or by the explicit use of a non-human label to describe them” (p. 300). The atrocities I previously mentioned would be placed within this end of the spectrum. Blatant dehumanization does not generally transpire in the organizational workplace; not in my personal experiences. Organizations do not espouse blatant dehumanization in the forms of discrimination, bullying, etc. In fact, most organizations are prideful in their respectful workplace policies. Organizations perceive themselves as being ethical, just, and serving everyone’s best interest.

Lammers and Stapel (2011) argue two reasons how positions of power increase dehumanization: positions of power lead to dehumanization because dehumanization supports people in power in making tough decisions; and that the experience of power decreases perspective-taking, provides psychological distancing, and increases deindividuation (Lammers & Stapel, 2011).

How does dehumanization support powerful people in making tough decisions? Power is described as the ability of capacity to exercise your will to control other people. In Susan Opotow's (1990) moral exclusion theory, the person in power (i.e., the leader, the boss, the supervisor) views a person as situated outside of their moral community. Suddenly, the leader is able to downplay the potential suffering of other people and justifies their acts of dehumanization (Lammers & Stapel, 2011). Therefore, challenging decisions, such as termination, become uncomplicated and effortless; and dehumanization becomes functional. If the person in power places a person within their moral community, it may evoke feelings of empathy and compassion when making decisions that cause hurt and suffering. Thus, the decision to terminate employees is difficult. I will note that there are many types of difficult decisions that arise and people in power will engage in dehumanization of others in order to make the best decisions. For example, it would be impossible for doctors or surgeons to make medical decisions for others without mildly distancing themselves from a person.

The psychological processes associated with the experience of power increases the dehumanization of others (Lammers & Stapel, 2011). Firstly, power increases the potential to ignore the viewpoint of others (classic sign of dehumanization). Secondly, powerful people are psychologically distant to those who they exercise their power over. Lastly, power increases deindividuation of others and dehumanization ensues (Lammers & Stapel, 2011).

Abusive supervision is "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours, excluding physical contact" (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Workplace violence and aggression are serious issues but are often noticed and appropriately handled. Abusive supervision can be sustained for years and is more difficult to recognize. Witnesses who observe abusive supervision second hand experience "vicarious abusive supervision" (Tepper, 2000). Harrison and Westwood (2009) demonstrates that "virtually observing or simply hearing about abuse from the written or spoken accounts of others can cause "pervasive and enduring alterations in the cognitive schema that impact the [employee's] feelings, relationship and life (p. 204). These reactions emerge from the empathy felt for the victims of abusive behaviour and the possible fear that they could be future victims of the abuse. Employees suffering from vicarious abuse recognize that passivity of the organization in allowing the abusive behaviour to continue.

At this level of dehumanization, we observe the interpersonal influence recognized as "emotional contagion". Schoenewolf (1990) defines this as "the process in which a person or group influences the emotions or behaviour of another person or group through the conscious or unconscious induction of emotions states and behavioural attitudes"(p. 41). Considerable research has been conducted at the group level to investigate the spreading of team emotion through emotional contagion; leader and member interactions can also affect the dynamic of the group.

Burnt out, disengaged and disempowered – the lack of energy to experience diverse personalities and attend to the organizational pressures and demands. An overreliance on the rational (you are here to work) and on inauthentic emotions that do not feed the human spirit (anxiety, mistrust, resentment, frustration) are all factors contributing to the sense of exhaustion and disillusionment that many employees feel.

2.7. Burnout

The psychiatrist Henry Freudenberger (1975) is accredited with inventing the term *burnout*. Freudenberger used the term *burnout* to describe a set of consequences from the stress experienced by those working in the helping profession. Freudenberger (1975) described burnout as "failing, wearing out, or becoming exhausted through excessive demands on energy, strength, and resources" (p. 19). Christina Maslach (1975), a social psychology researcher, conducted considerable research on the topic of burnout. I find the following definition of burnout by Maslach (1982) to be useful:

> Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind … a pattern of emotional overload and subsequent emotional exhaustion is at the heart of the burnout syndrome. A person gets overly involved emotionally, overextends him or herself, and feels overwhelmed by the emotional demands imposed by other people (p.3).

Although burnout was first identified within the helping professions, it has now transgressed to other professions. Burnout, as specified to the work domain, has inspired research on various types of occupations, such as teacher burnout or corporate and managerial burnout. According to a Statistics Canada study 27% of working adults reported that their lives were 'quite' or 'extremely stressful. Over 6 out of 10 of the highly stressed workers reported that work was the main source of their stress. (Compton, 2011). A Harvard Medical School Study reported that 96% of senior leaders feel burnt out to some degree; 33% describe their burnout as extreme (Goh, Pfeffer, Zenios, 2016).

Burnout syndrome is a set of symptoms related emotional exhaustion, lack of personal fulfillment in work, and depersonalization. (Maslach et al, 2001). Emotional exhaustion is feeling emotionally worn-out and emotionally overextended because of one's work. Personal unfulfillment is characterized by employees judging themselves in a negative way, feeling unable or incompetent, or unmotivated. Depersonalization involves negative, cynical, and impersonal attitudes and feelings towards other people (Maslach et al, 2001). Depersonalization also causes feelings of alienation from co-workers and disengagement from work. This combination of symptoms can mask as depression. However, the difference is that burnout is only related to work.

Maslach et al. (2001) identified the following six factors of the workplace that contributed to burnout. These factors are: having a heavy workload (overwork), feeling like you have little or no control over your work, working for insufficient reward (this could be money, recognition, positive feedback), working with little social support, working in an unfair environment, and working where you experience a conflict of values. These factors were predictors for high levels of burnout in an organization or in specific department of an organization.

Research has shown that burnout evokes consequences at the both the individual and organizational levels. At the individual level, burnout is experienced in a variety of negative physical, emotional, and behavioural symptoms. Physical symptoms range from exhaustion, illness, headaches and joint pain, to changes in sleep habits. The emotional symptoms include a sense of failure and self-doubt, feeling helpless, detached, and increasingly cynical and negative. Behavioural symptoms are using food, alcohol or drugs to cope, displacing frustration onto others, isolating oneself, and being unfocused at work. At the organizational level, increased absenteeism, employees arriving late or leaving early, and less productive workers are consequences of burnout.

Burnout has often been described as "emptiness" or "feeling drained". Circling back to my question of workplace dehumanization: is burnout a symptom of someone who has been dehumanized? Someone who is emotionally empty reflects a person that has been dehumanized because emotion is a key part of who we are as human beings. The next section will examine burnout within the dehumanization process.

As described by Maslach, a coping strategy people use to protect themselves from burnout is termed 'detached concern'. Or, in extreme cases, verges on 'depersonalization.' Maslach (1982) stated:

> The development of this detached, callous, and even dehumanized response signals a second aspect of the burnout syndrome – depersonalization. It is as though the individual is viewing other people through rust colored glasses – developing a poor opinion of them, expecting the worst from them and even actively disliking them (p. 4)

The depersonalizing coping strategy and expecting the worst from people, even to the point of actively disliking them, easily plants the seeds for dehumanization. The strategy of "dehumanization in self-defense" is prevalent in the medical profession. To prevent themselves from the burnout of dealing with patient demands, health practitioners dehumanized their patients and compartmentalized the patient by their illnesses or their organs. A news outlet announced that the BC provincial government is promising to reduce surgical wait times for hip and knee replacements. Those hips and knees belong to people! It is *people* who wait in pain for six months to get the surgery they need (Vancouver Sun, March 21, 2018, p.1). This language reflects the absence of the human and the emphasis on their parts in modern society.

Within the medical profession, it is more painless to talk about death, or to make decisions about death, if you do not consider the patients as human beings. Similarly, in the corporate world, decision makers treat people as 'pairs of hands', not human beings. Henry Ford, known for his creation of the assembly line, once stated, "Why is it every time I ask for a pair of hands, they come with a brain attached?" In these instances, dehumanization does not appear as we typically imagine dehumanization to be. Harsh and physically cruel treatment is not always a part of the process. Dehumanization is treating the human being before you or within you as an object, number, or body part.

To clarify – I do not identify every type of workplace stress as dehumanizing; nor am I concluding that people who suffer from burnout are all dehumanized. We must be cautionary when using absolutes when talking about issues such as dehumanization. However, when I perceive workplace stress, employee disengagement, and burnout, I associate them with symptoms of dehumanization. Most organizations continue to treat burnout and workplace stress as individual problems rather than structural problems within the organization. Identifying burnout as an individual problem and not a societal one prevents us from investigating the root causes of workplace stress and not considering how workplace stress can be collectively prevented.

I wish to end this chapter with a few words about emotional intelligence. The term emotional intelligence has been around for 20 years and is a part of the workplace culture and management. When I google "emotions and the impact on leadership", I receive 38,400,000 results. On a theoretical level, people recognize the importance of emotions within organizations but are confused and uncomfortable when confronted with emotions in the workplace. Iain L. Mangham's assessment of the lack of attention to emotions in organizational contexts is a helpful reminder:

> The general neglect of emotions by contemporary writers on behaviour in organizations seem largely due to an acceptance of the common managerial perspective that "feelings" (a term often used pejoratively) have no place in institutions that are committed to considering judgement and rational action. They get in the way and cloud the issues (Mangham as cited in Grant et al, 1998, p. 51)

Mangham's words were written nearly twenty years ago, but for revolutionary ideas and theories (like emotional intelligence) to be integrated into a culture and practiced is a lengthy process. My doctoral research is part of the ongoing effort to put humanization into workplace practice. We form our relationships through emotions. How people handle their own emotions and with others is very important in our work relationships.

I have determined the workplace stressors that are key to an organizational workplace. I am aware of other factors that may be considered workplace stressors; but overwork, feeling undervalued or disrespected in the workplace, and emotional labour are the three stressors I place my focus on. I contend that these three stressors lead to burnout and may be signs individual dehumanization. Some readers may consider overwork, not feeling valued in the workplace, or having to monitor one's emotion in the workplace as normal experiences in the workplace., or, that these feelings are integral to life. I believe that these do not have to be our normal. Comments such as "you just need to suck it up" or "deal with it" should not be normal. In the next chapter, I will analyze how this ontology became our "normal".

Chapter 3. Dehumanization

This chapter will explore more directly the phenomenon of dehumanization as it relates to the workplace environment. As I reflect upon ‘dehumanization’ throughout this thesis, I think of it as a question with growing conviction. The complexity of its philosophical meaning, psychological nuances, and sociological phenomenology of dehumanization will be discussed in further detail.

3.1. Varieties of Perspectives on Dehumanization

The concept of dehumanization has been reviewed through philosophical and moral, sociological, and psychological perspectives. Through my research of these various perspectives of dehumanization, I imagine these perspectives to be like branches of a tree: intrinsically connected but visibly distinct from one another. These perspectives are complimentary and provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of dehumanization. To create a map-like view of the subject of dehumanization, I will present a brief summary of the different perspectives on dehumanization. These perspectives aided in my inquiry into dehumanization in organizational work environments.

Montague and Matson (1983) address dehumanization from a social psychological perspective, calling it a disease of the spirit: a process in which humans remain physically and mentally competent, but become increasingly psychologically disabled and one-dimensional. For Montague and Matson, *dehumanization is a dissolution of the self as subject or agent, and a reconstitution of the self as role performance*. Montague and Matson’s foci are on the ways we self-dehumanize and how this dehumanization of personality spreads into society, politics, and culture.

Montague’s work on self-dehumanization was particularly important to me, as I never intentionally reflected on my own socialization process. In my own socialization experiences, I reflect on the important points in my life that shaped my own identity. I am the first-born child of immigrant parents each from a different culture. We had no other family in Canada. The first socialization messages I received were: "*You need to work hard because money is hard to come by. School and family are important. We have no other family; therefore, we can only count on each other. It is important for you to be* *independent".* I do not consider these as negative messages. However, in hindsight, these messages acted as “inner tapes” that impacted the decisions I made. In school, I opted out of any activity that cost money; whether it was a field trip or prom. The “inner tape” recording constantly reminded me of how hard my parents worked and the difficulty of earning a livable wage. At 17, I moved out of my parent's home to achieve independence. Consequently, I became anxious about authority; I do not want to cause problems. Fear of authority was pervasive in my consciousness. I did not stand up for my rights even in situations where I needed to. I became more comfortable speaking up for myself during my late twenties, after years of completing my own therapy. I recognized that my anxiety about authority or speaking up for myself reduced my own sense of belonging and diminished my self-esteem. Looking back, I can see that I had contributed to my own dehumanization as a person. I was able to understand Montague's concept of self-dehumanization.

My understanding of dehumanization in the workplace was highly influenced by the work of Susan Opotow and Albert Bandura. Opotow addresses moral exclusion and moral inclusion, phenomenon I have witnessed at great lengths in the workplace environment. Bandura probes deeper into the notion of moral exclusion and integrates the concept of moral disengagement. Bandura’s work illuminated reasons why people, who are otherwise compassionate and humane, inflict pain on others in particular situations. A famous example often cited in research are prison guards who torture inmates. These prison guards are kind, family men, yet torture people during their day jobs. In the workplace, people are not torturing others physically, but employees are susceptible to bullying, a form of "psychological torture". Bullying tactics consist of threats, the silent treatment, rumours, and gossip. Workplace bullying is a recognized problem in BC. WorkSafeBC changed the Workers Compensation Act (Bill 14) to outline the responsibilities of both supervisors and employees to prevent and address bullying and harassment in the workplace. I can now identify unpleasant situations in my work experiences as bullying. As I had never really considered tactics such rumors, gossip, or silent treatment as bullying, I labelled them as unpleasant but I accepted them as an unfortunate part of the workplace. Becoming aware of the issues of workplace bullying in BC was an eye-opening experience for me. It demonstrates our ability to selectively disengage with our morality and it prompted me to reflect on my own moral stance and moral practice. Now, I address those types of behaviours if they occur around me.

A close friend of mine was successfully working in an organization for many years. Suddenly, a new supervisor arrived and began bullying a couple of the older employees, which included my friend. My friend recognized that her supervisor's behaviour was not appropriate. However, she did not have the awareness or language to identify the bullying. My friend confided in the HR department for assistance. The HR Department acknowledged the inappropriate behaviours but suggested to toughen-up and deal with it. She was referred to as "too sensitive" and no action was taken. My friend had approximately nine years to retire with full pension, so leaving the organization was not an option. She tried endlessly to better the relationship; overresponding to requests, working late, and performing the undesirable tasks. Her efforts went unrewarded and she continue to be belittled or ostracized. These behaviours were horrible, but even worse, my friend believed that she deserved the bullying from the supervisor. I witnessed my friend develop depression and health issues, resulting in her needing a long-term disability leave. I thought these scenarios were rare but soon realized that they were more common than I thought. This is exemplary of a secondary problem to bullying in the workplace. Patricia Ferris (2004) identified that unsupportive responses to people who request further guidance on workplace issues ensues more emotional damage to the employee.

Nick Haslam (2014, 2009, 2007) was also highly influential in my understanding of dehumanization. Haslam addresses dehumanization from a psycho-social perspective similar to Montague and Matson but focuses on different aspects. Haslam's explores two different forms of humanness (animalistic and mechanistic) and how these two forms of humanness are denied to out-groups of people from in-groups of people. Haslam's work provided clarity to the subtler forms of dehumanization. Haslam describes the "animalistic" in animalistic dehumanization to the process of associating intrinsically human characteristics to those of animals, or the "out group." The mechanistic form of dehumanization occurs when people are denied of their human nature and are represented as objects. I will return to Haslam's two forms of dehumanization at a later point.

The philosophical perspective of dehumanization dovetailed Montague's psychological perspective and Haslam's social perspective. The philosophical perspective directed me towards the fundamental ground of values and morality, which are centralized within intrinsic and extrinsic valuation and the notion that a person is a being who has intrinsic value and worth. Kant's philosophy and ethics, Bai's (2001) thoughts on moral education, and Taylor's (1985) views profoundly influenced my thinking on the moral implications of dehumanization. They were more than influential to me; they were a wakeup call! I finally understood the essence of dehumanization and its serious implications on my own humanity and those of my fellow co-workers. This loss or reduction of humanization is the essential meaning of dehumanization.

In my literature review, given the multiple approaches to the subject of dehumanization, I struggled to cohesively link these overlapping perspectives together and questioned how to ground them into the context of what I have been experiencing in the workplace. I decided to begin with a philosophical approach to unearth the heart of dehumanization. Both self-dehumanization and the dehumanization of others are possible because we are generally, through the socialization processes, trained in the mindset of instrumentalism. The philosophical underpinnings of Instrumentalism award an in-depth exploration to demonstrate its impact on dehumanization. I will then expand to include a social psychological perspective.

3.1.1. The Philosophical Perspective

From a philosophical perspective, dehumanization is mainly examined in the moral dimension of being human. What are the core values of being human, and where do they lie? Central to morality is the notion that humans (and other) beings have intrinsic value. Beings have intrinsic value or worth simply because they exist, it is an existential value. They are valued for who or whatever they are. Value is not assigned on the basis of its benefit to us. Intrinsic value is not a use value. The opposite of intrinsic value is extrinsic or instrumental value, where a being or an object exists for the sake of others—their design, interests, and use. This assumption that humans are moral beings who should be treated with fundamental respect is strongly supported in the ethics of philosopher Kant, who formulated the second maxim of the Categorical Imperative. The second imperative directs humans to "[a]ct in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end" (Kant, 1948/1964, p. 32). A being who is an end to itself has its own lived world. A human being may hold values (that I may disagree with); entertain hopes and dreams (that do not align with my own); cherish life (differently to how I cherish my own life); fear death and suffering (I may wish she or he could be more courageous); and have a sense of self (that I believe should be more confident); and have a rich inner life of feelings (with more refined feelings). Regardless of my own interpretation of another human being, according to the Kantian Imperative, I should treat all human beings with fundamental respect, and value them for their own sake. Even if a person has committed a moral breach in behaviour, and deserves critique, moral outrage, criticism or correction, they should not be treated in dehumanizing ways.

The Kantian formulation of humanity's intrinsic worth is a true moral revelation to me. Intuitively, I deeply resonate with Kant's truth of humanity. Therefore, I have chosen to use Kant's reasoning as a criterion to assess a given business environment on its treatment of employees as moral beings. When workers are treated as a means to profitability, I can conclude that the fundamental moral value of human dignity is violated in that work environment. Or, more specifically, I can conclude that the human elements are forgotten in this environment and is open to dehumanizing. To emphasize, philosophically speaking, dehumanization means not recognizing, reducing, or diminishing the human core within ourselves and others.

Contemporary thinkers and educators like Taylor (1985) and Bai (2001) have also drawn on Kant's philosophy of ethics; in which the person obtains fundamental human dignity and value and is a moral being. Taylor argued that:

> A person is a being with a certain moral status, or a bearer of rights. But underlying the moral status, as its condition, are certain capacities. A person is a being who has a sense of self, has a notion of the future and the past, can hold values, make choices; in short, can adopt life-plans. (p. 97)

Taylor (1985) argues that a person is a moral being because they possess a sense of self, holds values, makes choices, and has plans for their life. A person discerns between the value of life plans. A person interprets how they feel. When a person is treated as if they do not obtain a sense of self with unique values and the autonomy to make their own choices, we are violating, subtly or not subtly, their personhood.

Bai (2001) refers to *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* valuation in her writing whilst frequently referencing Taylor and Kant. Human beings and inhuman objects obtain *intrinsic* value, they have worth for what they are in and of themselves. Bai argues that intrinsic valuing secures an ethical implication: “to view something morally is to view it intrinsically; that is, to value it for its own sake, as an end onto itself, as a subject” (p. 4).

For Bai, an example of intrinsic valuing is aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. Observing the world with purely aesthetic appreciation is not viewing it for profit or gaining advantage, it is enjoying beauty for what it is. As an accountant, I was trained to understand life with purely instrumental value. I find the concept of intrinsic valuing revelatory. I never thought of enjoyment in its own sake as an instance of morality or ethics. I did not think of ethics and aesthetics as one (Bai, 2003). By contrast, *extrinsic* valuing is valuing something for its instrumentality, or its resourcefulness. Their worth resides in its ability to be used as a tool. Reflecting on my own workplace experiences, I ask myself: Do I value my co-workers intrinsically? An even more challenging question might be: Is it possible to intrinsically value one another in the workplace, an environment set up for instrumental valuing? I will dive into these questions during later chapters when exploring the humanization of the workplace. In the meantime, I would like to take a closer look at instrumentalism.

Instrumental valuation is not morally problematic per se. Humans constantly use tools and instruments. However, as instrumental value dominates intrinsic worth, things and people are at risk for being solely or predominantly used as a means to an end. This reflects the *ideology of instrumentalism.* Consumerism is an example of instrumentalism, wherein objects exist only to be consumed by subjects (Bai, 2001). From this viewpoint, plants, animals, minerals, the whole earth itself, is nothing more than a collection of raw materials to be manufactured for human use. Today, we are experiencing the consequences of instrumentalizing the natural world around us; our ecosystems are damaged, our earth is stripped of nutrients, our water sources are polluted, species are extinct, and much more (Thomas, 1992; Lovelock, 1979;). The instrumentalism of people ensues similar damage. When people are treated as a means to an end, as instruments or tools, they lose their intrinsic worth, and only have worth in what they can do for others. This is the instrumentalism of human beings.

Instrumentalism of human beings as the prioritization of *instrumental* value over their *intrinsic* value is the fundamental principle of dehumanization. In our current culture, dehumanization is often unrecognizable because we are accustomed to the instrumental valuation of everything. We are socialized from an early age to see objects and other beings primarily for their extrinsic or instrumental value. We value a forest for the lumber it provides us, not as the community of living beings that it is. We perceive a cow as the meat we eat, not as an animal with intrinsic value that exists for itself. Similarly, our society conditions us to interact and value human beings in regard to their extrinsic attributes and qualities. We value people in terms of their titles, status, skills, attributes, and possessions. We do not fundamentally value people as *persons* who deserve respect for their basic humanity and sanctity.

To reiterate: the basic tenet of instrumentalism is the valuing of human beings not for who they *are,* but for what they *provide* to us. Dehumanization occurs when people are valued solely or predominantly extrinsically; not intrinsically. Dehumanization leads to the recognition of human beings as instruments, tools, or assets—as a means to an end, not an end in themselves. Finally, dehumanization as an ideology prohibits us from clearly observing its presence in our lives and its action becomes standard practice. The subtle forms of dehumanization are difficult to identify because of their subliminal nature. Societal treatment of homeless people is an example of dehumanization on a regular, day-to-day basis. Most of us avoid eye contact and do not notice homeless people on the streets because their humanness has been forgotten. We perceive them as fixtures in the neighborhood with little or no value to us. As this thesis contends, worker ethos in business organizations is also an example of regular, day-to-day dehumanization that has gone unrecognized. I am claiming that the instrumentalist ideology is the dominant lens of organizational culture.

With a clearer idea of the connection between instrumentalism and dehumanization we can attend to the question of how society and the dominant workplace culture in particular, became this way. This question is best answered from a psychological perspective to which now I turn.

3.1.2. The Psychological Perspective

Dehumanization exists indefinitely in our society but is largely unnoticed due to our normalization of the phenomenon. The normalization of dehumanization has resulted from preconditions that allowed for its development. I use Laing's (1967/1969) and other existential psychologists' and psychotherapists' work to examine the concept of the *fragmentation of what is whole*. Through a psychological lens, the preconditions to dehumanization stem from the fragmentation of the whole human being and the privileging of certain fragments over others. Like many humanity theorists (e.g., Cohen, 2015; Laing, 1969/1967; Schneider, 2004;), I too observe the 'original' or essential humanity as whole. We have been inducted into and conditioned to perceive ourselves as being distinctly composed of categorically separate parts; the mind, body, heart, and spirit. We do not identify ourselves as interconnected, whole beings, but as parts. The parts are distinguished as the mind or cognitive processes; heart or emotional states; body or physicality; and spirit.

In the process of *extrinsic valuing*, the integrity of the whole human is broken and fragmented into separate parts, where some parts are more valued than others. The Cartesian dualism of body and mind is a relevant example. Descartes (1988/1989) claims that the immaterial mind and the material body are two distinct types of substances. Once separated, the human cannot function as a coordinated whole until these substances interact. Descartes' believed that the mind substance and the body substance combined in the "human pineal gland" (p. 230). Descartes' body and mind separation and dualistic thinking claims have influenced our western culture, particularly within the medical field. The approach to medical treatment primarily focuses on the physical body, often ignoring the emotional, mental, and spiritual dimensions of the human being. Traditionally (although slowly changing with the increased popularity of alternative and naturalistic healing), western thought has not considered the emotional/mental/spiritual dimensions of healing. Comparing the western approach to holistic medicine (e.g. Ayurvedic medicine or traditional Chinese medicine) the person is not compartmentalized into three distinctive parts—mind, body, spirit—but rather, considers and treats the person in their wholeness.

Our ability to value or de-value people stems from a fragmentation of being, or a splitting of the whole human into separate parts. The normalized process of fracturing the essential integrity of the whole human being and separating the different parts of the human has normalized our valuing of certain parts over others. We value rationality over emotionality, and mind over body. Discerning the value between different humans is an unconscious process due to the normalization of extrinsic valuation. Equality is a difficult concept to conceive because of our naturalized tendency to evaluate and ascribe values to people. I will continue by exploring the stages of dehumanization; as a practice, dehumanization is a psychological process and exhibits typical preparatory stages.

Dehumanization develops through psychological processes: a series of learned behaviours in which people implicitly or explicitly learn to perceive themselves and others as less than fully human, and to relate to others as such. The first stage is *perception*. I can either perceive someone as fully human, or, perceive them as less than human. In other words, the person is perceived for their extrinsic rather than intrinsic value. To reiterate Haslam's two modes of dehumanization (see page 64 in this thesis), I could also associate a person to an animal, or a machine, rather than a human. To perceive someone in this way is determined by the socialization processes and the values of the various cultures and subcultures in which one is embedded within. Further, the context of the situation and the behaviour of the person during the interaction influences the dehumanized perception. For example, passively walking by someone who is homeless is an action of dehumanization, however subtle. This dominating mode of perception demonstrates the value of instrumentalism; where a person is not worthy of interaction. One may not identify a homeless person as an animal or a machine, but they are perceived as a person without intrinsic value. This form of dehumanization is part and parcel of the instrumentalist ideology that acculturates society into assigning value tags to people based on their status, income level, class, ability/disability, etc. We often regard people with high-income as "superior" to people with low-income. This deeply ingrained mindset results in our inability to notice a homeless person as we pass them. This person may not even cross our perceptual field as worthy of respect.

The next stage is *discernment*. As I notice you, how do I perceive you? Do I perceive you as fully human? How do we relate to each other? Interactions with other beings is not considered a connection to the person. We often experience people as the tasks or the functions they serve us, not as human beings. For example, my interactions with my bank teller are limited to a place (the bank) and to a specific purpose. I would recognize her on the street, but the services she provides me overshadows who she is. Even as I write this, I suddenly became aware of the language I used as I phrased this sentence: "my interactions with my bank teller." Unconsciously, I singled out the person's *function* before her personhood. We say, "my hairdresser," "my assistant," "my boss," to signify our relationship with a certain person. We cannot avoid this, nor would we want to; identification roles are a way to signify the social network of people we interact with and the basis of our interactions. Yet, we need to be aware of the consequences of identifying people based on their *roles* rather than the person themselves. Automatically perceiving others for the tasks or functions they perform is instrumentalism at work. In larger organizations, instrumentalism appears when the person behind the role becomes nonexistent. Employees may refer to people as their job functions: “Please bring this to finance” instead of, “please bring this to Mary.” Losing sight of a person and replacing them with a function is a step in the process of dehumanization. This step results with extrinsic valuation and the perception of people as their roles, opposed to the person they are. To reiterate, roles should not be discarded; roles serve important functions and purposes. However, in our instrumentalist culture, we have confused the person with the roles they assume. Their intrinsic worth is devalued and reduces a person to an instrumental role.

The final step in the process of dehumanization is the *reactionary behaviours* or actions we take or don't take when faced with the previous steps. The perception of a person determines my action or reaction to them. My behavior will reflect my mode of perception. For example, when I do not recognize homeless people as human beings who are worthy of respect and dignity, I will walk by them without attending to their presence and do not feel compassion towards them. I am also not motivated to question the social injustice of their situation. However, by perceiving homeless people as human beings worthy of the respect equal to myself, my behavior will change. I would feel compassion for them and converse with them as I would with any other person. I may also feel motivated to engage with the issue of homelessness and want to help.

3.1.3. The Sociological Perspectives

Shifting to the sociological perspective, I will draw on Susan Opotow’s work on moral exclusion theory, Daniel Bar-Tal's work on delegitimization, Albert Bandura's work on moral disengagement theory, Jacques Leyens work on infrahumanization, and conclude with Nick Haslam's theory on two distinct ideas of humanness. These theories and their relevant concepts act as a precision lenses when examining the workplace environment. Applying them to workplace dehumanization provides an analysis that reveals the phenomena of dehumanization in close-up and fine-grained outlines.

Opotow’s writings on moral exclusion will begin this exploration. Opotow credits Ervin Staub for creating the term moral exclusion in her 1990 article, “*Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction.*” Opotow (1990) asserts, “Moral exclusion occurs when individuals or groups are perceived as outside the boundary in which moral values, rules, and consideration of fairness apply” (p. 1). People within the boundaries of moral values, rules, and considerations of fairness are considered *morally included* and deserving of consideration and fair treatment. People on the outside of this boundary are *morally excluded* and considered unimportant or undeserving of respect and safety. They are subjected to potential marginalization, exploitation, and dehumanization.

Most people have their own ingrained beliefs about the type of person who should or should not be treated fairly. These beliefs are rooted in cultural norms, values, and communicates messages of who should be included in a “moral community” (alternatively, referred to as “scope of justice” (Opotow, 1990). Opotow refers to people within a “moral community” as those where moral values, rules and considerations apply. For conceptual convenience, “moral community” or "the scope of justice" is often described in black and white terms; a group of people are either included or excluded from the community or the scope of justice. However, the scope of justice is more fluid and contextual in nature and expands or contracts depending on the situation. The scope of justice is largely determined by the current social order and defines the nature of our relationships and beliefs about others’ entitlements (Opotow).

Moral exclusion can manifest subtly or blatantly and exists on a range from subtle to extreme. Extreme moral exclusions include "violations of human rights, political repression, religious inquisitions, slavery, and genocide" (Opotow, 1990, p. 2). Subtle moral exclusions transpire when people "fail to recognize and deal with undeserved suffering and deprivation" (p. 2). Although there are differences between subtle and extreme moral exclusions, all forms of moral exclusion have certain underlying characteristics. People who exclude others from the moral community "perceive others as psychologically distant, lack constructive moral obligations toward others, view others as expendable and undeserving, and deny others' rights, dignity and autonomy" (p. 2). Symptoms of moral exclusion are categorized under the following: denial of outcome severity, denial of stakeholder inclusion, and denial of self-involvement (Opotow, 1990).

In the workplace environment, moral exclusion also manifests on a range of severity. Extreme moral exclusion in the workplace includes sexual harassment, bullying, and abusive supervisor relationships. Subtle moral exclusions manifest as not acknowledging different opinions, eye rolling when people are talking, ostracism from other workers, rudeness, etc.

Daniel Bar-Tal explores moral exclusion from the perspective of "delegitimizing beliefs." Bar-Tal defined "delegitimation" as:

> categorization of a group or groups into extremely negative social categories that excludes it, or them, from the sphere of human groups that act within the limits of acceptable norms and/or values, since these groups are viewed as violating basic human norms or values. (Bar-Tal & Oren, 2007, p. 112)

Delegitimization as a type of moral exclusion places groups outside of the moral community or scope of justice. Bar-Tal (2007) identifies dehumanization, out-casting, negative trait characterization, political labeling, and group comparison as the different forms of delegitimization. Delegitimization creates a formidable and rigid category that is difficult to break. The delegitimized group becomes casted as morally excluded and is socially normalized as such.

Once delegitimized, people within the moral community are hesitant or reluctant to interact with the excluded group." The group is now outside of the moral community and it becomes easier and easier to morally exclude them. When people are morally excluded the practices of discrimination, exploitation, and other horrific acts ensue.

Earlier in my career, I experienced my male colleagues telling chauvinistic jokes and being derogatory towards myself and other women in the organization. We became upset by this behaviour and brought it to the attention of our supervisors. Unfortunately, we were told, "It is just a joke. You shouldn't be so sensitive. No harm was meant." Although the behaviours ceased, it was replaced by comments of how women in the office had no sense of humor. They complained about our "sensitivity" and complained about their inability to "tell jokes' when women were around. We were blamed for the "boringness" of the office. This type of behavior from my male colleagues was not a case of poor taste or judgement but was a form of delegitimization. I recently found a journal article titled: "Derogating humor as a delegitimization strategy in intergroup contexts" (Hodson & MacInnis, 2016). At the time, I did not have the language to articulate this experience, but the humor was used to establish superiority.

A more broadly applicable concept was created by Bandura (1991), who proposed that people are able to disengage from their moral responsibilities. Even though people violate their own personal moral standards they may not see their behaviours as unethical. As individuals prefer to consider themselves ethical and fair, they will justify their unethical actions through falsifying stories and/or experiences. Bandura's model identified eight mechanisms that cause moral disengagement: "moral justification, euphemistic language, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility, diffusion of responsibility, distorting the consequences, dehumanization, and attribution of blame" (Bandura, 1991).

The first three mechanisms, moral justification, euphemistic language, and advantageous comparison assists the transformation of the unethical or sometimes inhumane action or behaviour to appear less harmful or even beneficial in some ways. M*oral justification* legitimizes destructive behavior by using moral or worthy ends. Moral justification is identifying the "good" in the immoral actions one carries out, making the decisions to engage in unethical behavior uncomplicated. Similarly, *euphemistic labelling* reframes harmful actions to appear harmless. Voltaire's (1765) statement "Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities" (as cited in Pirie, p. 91) summarizes this concept. Sanitizing our language removes emotional responses and masks any injury we may cause. Lastly, *advantageous comparison* lessens the severity of the original unethical act by comparing one's unethical actions to a more appalling act. These three, powerful mechanisms not only disengage one's morality from destructive behaviours but also encourages a person to partake in unethical behaviours (Bandura, 2016, 2002, 1999, 1991).

Through my own personal observations and experiences, I can demonstrate the rampant effects of the disengagement from morality and ethics. A boss taking credit for a subordinate's work proposal is an example of moral justification. The boss may justify this behavior by believing that his name would be the reason for the proposal to be considered. Euphemistic labelling allows one to use language that removes any sense of guilt when acting immorally. A common example in the workplace is the language shift from words such as "terminated" or "fired" to phrases like "pursuing other opportunities" or "being provided career alternatives." Another example is the terminology or conceptualization of workloads, where they are not "unreasonable" but "provide a growth opportunity" for the employees or asks the employee to "become innovative." This reframing reformulates reality and manipulates people into thinking their unethical behaviours are helpful to others. Advantageous comparison lessens the initial harmful act or makes it insignificant by comparing it to a “worse” act. For example, a boss who requests an employee to do a last-minute job that will require the employee to work all weekend may be justified by comparing it another boss who does the same thing, but does not acknowledge the employee's hard work or commitment.

Displacement of responsibility and diffusion of responsibility are the fourth and fifth mechanisms of Bandura's model. Displacement of responsibility occurs when people are told that someone else will be held responsible for their actions. Therefore, displacement of responsibility and diffusion of responsibility minimizes the role of the individual causing harm. Following atrocious orders from authoritative figures has resulted in some of our most heinous acts throughout history. A noted case of displaced responsibility is the 1963 Milgram shock experiments. Stanley Milgram focused on the conflict between following orders from authoritative figures and the personal conscience. He directed volunteers' “teachers” to read out words to the 'learner,' who was hooked up to an electric shock machine in another room. The “learner” was an actor, but the teacher was unaware of this fact. Every time the learner incorrectly repeated the word back to the teacher, the teacher was instructed to deliver an electric shock. The intensity of the shocks began at 15 volts (labeled: slight shock) and increased to 450 volts (labeled: danger, severe shocks). The experimenter encouraged the teacher to increase their shock intensity with every incorrectly repeated word. Some “teachers” did stop shocking the “leaner” despite the experimenter’s encouragement. However, 65% of people continued to 450 volts, ignoring the learners pled for mercy, warnings about heart conditions, or even when they became silent (Milgram, 1963).

The Stanford Prison Experiments conducted in 1971 by Philip Zimbardo is another well-known example of displaced responsibility. This study examined the effects of psychologically "normal" people who had to roleplay as prisoners and guards in a prison environment for two weeks. The 24 participants in the experiment were issued psychological tests to ensure their healthy mental states. Zimbardo stated that they were "an average group of healthy, intelligent, middle class males." Prison cells were built in the basement of the psychology building on campus. Half of the group posed as guards and the other half as prisoners. To create the most realistic setting, the guards wore sunglasses and uniforms and the prisoners were arrested in their homes by real police with fake warrants and transported to the Palo Alto Police Department. They were fingerprinted, blindfolded, and dressed in prison jumpsuits. Within 24 hours, there had been a transformation: the “experiment” was forgotten and the "pretend" prisoners were now real prisoners and the "pretend" guards were now real guards. They created an "atmosphere of terror" within 48 hours. The guards continued to demonstrate their power by increasing their aggressive, humiliating, and dehumanizing tactics against the prisoners. These tactics included verbal insults, sleep deprivation, and simulated homosexual abuse.

After six days, Christina Malach, a former graduate student of Professor Zimbardo, observed the experiment and was appalled by the activities she saw at mock prison. She was brought in to conduct interviews. She saw prisoners lined up with bags over their heads, legs chained, and guards shouting abusive comments as they were moved into the washrooms. She also recognized an escalation in violence when outsiders were removed from the prison. She had to convince Zimbardo and his assistants to end the experiment as they were becoming blind to the activities taking place. When Christina brought her concerns to Zimbardo, he berated her for being overly sensitive and overlooking the importance of the work being done. She yelled at him: "It is terrible what you are doing to these BOYS." In one statement, Christina made it clear to Zimbardo that he was causing suffering in human beings; not prisoners, and not experimental subjects. After reflecting on Christina's statement, Zimbardo (1971) stated:

> I had become a Prison Superintendent, the second role I played in addition to that of Principal Investigator. I began to talk, walk and act like a rigid institutional authority figure more concerned about the security of "my prison" than the needs of the young men entrusted to my care as a psychological researcher. In a sense, I consider that the most profound measure of the power of this situation was the extent to which it transformed me. (p. 13)

According to Zimbardo, Christina was the only person who questioned the morality of the experiment, despite the 50 outsiders who had observed the experiment. Parents of the "mock prisoners" who observed the immoral study did not speak up because they did not want to cause problems (Zimbardo, 2007, Matousek, 2011, Sherrer, 2008). According to Zimbardo:

> The Stanford prison experiment is but one of a host of studies in psychology that reveal the extent to which our behaviour can be transformed from its usual set point to deviate in unimaginable ways, even to readily accepting a dehumanized conception of others, as "animals," and to accepting spurious rationales for why pain will be good for them. (Zimbardo, 2007, pp. B6-B7)

After the Abu Ghraib prison scandal arose in the media in 2004, Zimbardo asserted that the people who commit torture tactics in Iraq were not "bad apples" and were no different from the rest of us. He mentioned the disorderly conduct within the Stanford Experiments as the main reason for deciding to end the research. Zimbardo had chosen the subjects of the experiments specifically for the qualities of normalcy and good mental health. Nevertheless, he said,

> The terrible things my guards [at Stanford] did to their prisoners were comparable to the horrors inflicted on the Iraqi detainees. My guards repeatedly stripped their prisoners naked, hooded them, chained them, denied them food or bedding privileges, put them into solitary confinement, and made them clean toilet bowls with their bare hands. … Over time, these amusements took a sexual turn, such as having the prisoners simulate sodomy on each other. … Human behavior is much more under the control of situational forces than most of us recognize or want to acknowledge. (Zimbardo, May 12, 2004, Boston Globe)

Zimbardo was used as an expert witness to testify against the American prison guards accused of acts of cruelty to Iraqi prisoners. As part of the defense, Zimbardo testified that the environment was responsible for their “cruel” behaviour, not the individuals. His famous statement was, "You can't be a sweet cucumber in a vinegar barrel." The court disagreed with the defense and found the individuals guilty. They felt that the individuals had to be held accountable for their actions and the few 'bad apples' went to jail.

As I agree with the guilty verdict and holding the individuals accountable for their actions, I also believe that this experiment illustrates the systemic conditions that perpetuate unequal power relations. Although the prison system is an overt example of the unequal power dynamics, these dynamics were also present in the research conditions themselves; where the authoritative figures perpetuated and enabled this type of environment to persist. Zimbardo admitted his own guilt in this experience. Another observation from this experiment is the blindness of the immoral actions of Zimbardo and his associates. In situations where intrinsic power differences arise (as they did in

Milgram's and Zimbardo's experiments), adults are willing to aimlessly follow directions from authoritative figures even when they are destructive in nature.

Diffusion of *responsibility* disperses blame across members of a group rather than attributing blame to an individual. There are three different methods in which diffusion manifests. Firstly, responsibility is diffused through group decision-making in order to place responsibility on the group. Secondly, breaking up activities into smaller parts diffuses responsibility because when you look at the smaller parts, it appears harmless. When the activity is observed as a whole, it appears quite destructive. Lastly, group action diffuses responsibility by claiming the involvement of others. The mechanisms of displacement of responsibility and diffusion of responsibility allow the person to obscure personal responsibility (Bandura, 1991).

Organizational environments are highly unlikely to yield similar observations of displacement of responsibility to the Milgram and Zimbardo's experiments. However, displacement of responsibility does occur in the workplace when employees relieve themselves of personal responsibility in actions or non-actions that may have caused harm by using the phrase of "I am following instructions." Displacement of responsibility also arises when people claim ignorance of certain situations in the workplace. A leader who notices poor treatment of employees but pretends to be unaware of the actions is an example of claiming ignorance to displace responsibility. Displacement of responsibility also manifests when using consultants. Unpleasant decisions are often blamed as "consultants' recommendations" even when the consultant lacks the authority to make the decision. Diffusion of responsibility is a psychological phenomenon in which people are less likely to take-action in the presence of a large group of people through the belief that someone else will take responsibility. A consequence of this psychological phenomenon is the absence of people taking responsibility, also understood as the by-stander effect (Latane & Darley, 1968). Although diffusion of responsibility is often seen in the workplace, in witnessing bullying behavior or other related scenarios, the problem goes unidentified.

Distortion of consequences, dehumanization, and attribution of blame are the last three of Bandura's eight mechanisms for moral disengagement. These three mechanisms reframe the effects of one's actions, either by minimizing the outcomes of those actions or by minimizing the perception of distress those actions cause others.

Although Bandura includes dehumanization as one of his eight mechanisms, I consider moral disengagement in its entirety to contribute to dehumanization. Unlike the first three mechanisms discussed prior (moral justification, euphemistic language, and advantageous comparison), these last three mechanisms are not reframing immoral activities in a positive light. Rather, they intend to minimize the true consequences of one's actions on others. For example, even when a situation is die, *distortion of consequences* downplays the effects of a behavior as a “victimless activity”. Bandura claims that dehumanization, while often considered extreme, occurs even in mundane circumstances, especially in conditions of bureaucratization, automation, and impersonal conduct (Bandura, 2002, p. 109). *Attribution of blame* is the attributing of blame onto the victim (Bandura, 1991). Together, these eight mechanisms assist the individual in the reframing of unethical actions as more positive, displaces accountability from the individual, and minimizes the consequences of these actions.

Dehumanization in even mundane circumstances, especially in conditions of bureaucratization, automation and impersonal conduct, is very relevant to me in terms of dehumanization in the workplace. An organization is a cohesive whole consisting of many various departments. Departmental competition for additional resources or staff creates in-groups and out-groups of individuals, despite working for the same organization.

Moving from Bandura's eight mechanisms of moral disengagement, we will now turn to Belgian psychologist Jacques-Phillipe Leyens's term *infrahumanization*. Infrahumanization is the process of in-group members perceiving out-group members as less than human, even in the absence of any significant antagonism or conflict (Leyens et all, 2000). The potential absence of intergroup conflict allows infrahumanization to be subtle or widespread. To work on obtaining a working understanding of humanness, Leyens (2003) and colleagues identified three main attributes that distinguish humans from animals: intelligence, language, and refined emotions. Leyens and colleagues referred to refined emotions as uniquely human secondary emotions, opposed to the primary emotions we share with other mammals. Researchers theorize that in-group members assigning more primary emotions, opposed to secondary emotions, to the out-group members are subtly denying the out-group member's humanity (Leyens et al., 2003). It is widely believed that we share certain emotions with animals, such as anger, fear, and pleasure. However, secondary emotions (higher order emotions) such as love, guilt or hope are considered uniquely human. By refusing to apply secondary emotions to the out-group they are seen as “less than” human, although not nonhuman (Leyens et al, 2003). We see examples of infrahumanization throughout Canadian’s history. In 1868, Canada adopted its first form of Canadian identity titled the *Canadian Nationals Act*. Simultaneously, however, women were chattel of their husbands, children were chattel of their fathers if born in wedlock, and chattel of their mothers if born out of wedlock. Not until October 18, 1929 were women declared persons under Canadian Law (Lower, 1991). A more current example of infrahumanization is our treatment of homeless people. As of 2017, homelessness in Metro Vancouver increased 30% since 2014 (BC Non-Profit Housing Association & M. Thomson Consulting, 2017). Dismally, we no longer find it shocking to walk by someone sleeping on the street.

Infrahumanization research created novel ways to study and theorize dehumanization. Haslam (2006) developed a model to integrate and synthesize existing work with new research. Haslam (2006) proposed two forms of dehumanization transpire when two distinct senses of humanness are denied by others. When people are denied uniquely human attributes and likened to animals, Haslam’s first form of dehumanization develops. When 'Human Uniqueness' attributes are denied, human beings are either implicitly or explicitly associated with animals and seen as "child-like, immature, coarse, irrational or backward” (Bastian & Haslam, 2010, p. 107). Humans who are compared to animals are believed to lack intelligence, rationality, self-control, and other attributes that distinguish humans from animals (Haslam, 2006). Examples of animalistic dehumanization range from subtle to extreme. Some historically extreme examples are Nazi propaganda portraying Jews as vermin, or American slavery advocates labelling African Americans as apes. These are very painful historical examples.

When “Human Nature,” the second sense of humanness, is denied, it leads to dehumanization. Human nature is denied when people are rejected of essential human attributes and are related to machines. When compared to machines, people are seen as "cold, rigid, inert, and lacking emotion and agency" (Bastian & Haslam, 2010, p. 107); their total human experience is denied. Those who dehumanize and relate to people as machines have emotionally distanced themselves from the other and has excluded them. Haslam’s two forms of dehumanization likely elicit a sense unimportance in the dehumanized individual and a denial of one’s identity.

When first considering these two forms of dehumanization, I questioned whether Haslam's first form of dehumanization appeared in the workplace. Unfortunately, I noticed that some leaders, supervisors, and bosses treat their employees like children who lack intelligence and self-control. Micromanaging employees is one sign of child-like treatment.

The second form of dehumanization is more common in the corporate world. Our language is reflective of assigning machine-like characteristics to individuals. The expression: 'being treated as a cog in the wheel' implies the quick replacement of workers in organizations. The language established in organizations are reflective of Taylor's mechanical view of the world that he established in the Principles of Scientific Management (1911). 'Organizations run like well-oiled machines' is another phrase that demonstrates the "inputs" and "outputs" of actual machines. We often describe organizations as being 'driven': student-driven, member-driven, customer-driven, or data-driven. Organizations use people as parts who work together like machines, such as a chain of command. We reengineer our processes and track key performance indicators. Even the terms, *human resource management* or *human capital management* has a mechanical tone, rather than a human tone in its expression.

Organizing tasks and employees produces a company structure. The term "mechanistic" describes the most strict and formal of these structures. Companies with mechanistic structures have effective divisions of labor, resulting in highly specialized jobs. They rely on management for control (creating a bureaucracy) and have a strict chain of command. The company is likened to a machine, its many parts synchronized to produce a standard, predictable output.

3.2. Dehumanization in the workplace

In Chapter 2 I presented some of the key workplace stressors. In the current period of society, many people agree on the negative consequences of workplace stress. In this chapter, I have presented the different lenses of dehumanization. Controversy about the different lenses is sparse. However, my next statement will be controversial for some. I believe workplace stress is a symptom of 'dehumanization.' As I mentioned previously, I struggled with the idea of dehumanization. I have a title, a rank, a good position, and work for a notable company. I know the difficulty of accepting my own dehumanization or that I could be dehumanizing others. I have had multiple, challenging conversations with people who disagree that workplace stress is hidden dehumanization. Through the substantial conversations I have had on this topic, I am aware of the belief that dehumanization occurs only in extreme situations. I have been reminded of my privilege as a working professional. How have I experienced dehumanization? I have also heard, "Of course there is workplace stress. If you weren't stressed, then there would be no need for you to have a job." Other comments I have experienced are, "Does it really matter if we call it workplace stress or dehumanization? Why does it matter?" "Who really cares if you call it workplace stress or dehumanization?" I will first answer the importance of understanding the difference between workplace stress and dehumanization and follow with answering the question of why workplace is dehumanization.

The importance of differentiating between workplace stress and dehumanization is the crisis in humanity developing on a global stage. I have already mentioned the consequences of overworked and exhausted employees on the costs to the economy. These conditions are not limited to only Canada or North America; it is a worldwide reality. The same problems appear in North America, Asia, Australia, and Europe. Workplace stress is acknowledged as the epidemic of the 21st century. Workers are consistently struggling with the highest levels of chronic exhaustion and other issues. Many would feel content remaining to frame the problem as "workplace stress." However, by continuing to frame the problem as workplace stress, society is ignoring dehumanization as the true essence of the problem. The patterns and trends of dehumanization continue to rise, and more people are dying as a result of workplace stress. The framing of a problem influences the nature of solutions created to solve the problem. By framing dehumanization as workplace stress, we are only addressing the issue of workplace stress with little results. Not understanding extreme workplace stress as dehumanization holds us accountable for the immorality of the consequences. We need to acknowledge and address the dehumanization within our organizations and institutions. By naming it, we can begin to address it.

In the workplace, when rationality is prioritized, the focus is on instrumental reasoning with a means to an end—in the business world, rationality equals profit. Workers are not expected to exercise their emotional selves to value intrinsically; the work environment actively discourages intrinsic valuing, as evidenced when organizations decide to trade in their older skilled workers for younger, less skilled workers. In the current organizational culture, instrumental rationality reigns supreme and the disposal of or treatment of human beings as interchangeable assets has been normalized. Intrinsically valuing and respecting both ourselves and others as *persons,* as *whole human beings*, is easily forgotten and dehumanization occurs subconsciously.

Haslam's two forms of dehumanization can be connected with the concept of instrumentalism. It is important to note that perceiving a group as being animalistically dehumanized is not the same being mechanistically dehumanized. The consequences for interpersonal and work relationships may be different with each form. These two forms of dehumanization are occasionally used as legitimizing ideologies for taking advantage of or using members of groups and not always used for rejection and discrimination. Dehumanization does not naturally imply rejection; it functions as a legitimizing ideology that justifies the use of people as tools or objects.

As I look to see the connections between workplace stress and dehumanization, I see that there are some key stressors that may really be symptoms of dehumanization. Overwork is a key stressors of workplace stress. With increased workloads and increased pace of productivity, instrumentalism is common throughout all levels of organizations and throughout different industries. People are being treated as commodities. The sentiment, "everyone is replaceable" is repeatedly spoken or unspoken. Although all employees are replaceable, it becomes dangerous when it is seeped into the organization's culture. The replacement mentality creates an environment where one is exclusively valued for their services. When viewing overwork through a psychological lens of dehumanization, the fragmentation of self appears. When a leader values the work and not the whole person it becomes much easier to increase workloads and expectations because the person’s life outside of work is nonexistent. Overwork is another situation of dehumanization where people are considered "less-than" and the work is obligatory. Being busy is a way of justifying our jobs.

Feeling undervalued in the workplace is the second workplace stressor that relates to dehumanization. The continuum of unacceptable work behaviors ranges from rudeness to harassment. The concept of moral exclusion fits into this stressor when observed through a sociological perspective. Bullying, harassment, and being ostracized reflects the practice of moral inclusion and exclusion in the workplace. Additionally, Bandura's work on moral disengagement also applies to devaluation. In corporate cultures with higher levels of bureaucracy, Haslam's mechanistic dehumanization also appears.

Emotional labour, the third workplace stressor, could lead to self-fragmentation. Monitoring one's emotions with clients and with colleagues and bosses is exhausting. In addition to feeling devalued in the workplace, masking emotions and remaining pleasant creates a magnitude of stress. The inability for people to be themselves in the workplace often requires the fragmentation of the self. Once fragmented the rational self becomes more valued than the emotional, more human self. Addressing workplace stress as dehumanization would allow organizations to make viable changes. Abusive supervision should not be considered a performance issue, but an unethical behavior that is not tolerated. It is important that organizations recognize that the improvement of a workplace culture is a moral and ethical imperative.

Prior to providing suggestions as to how the workplace culture should be improved, I will review important historical underpinnings of the multiple Industrial Revolutions. A historical perspective is necessary to this analysis because it presents the roots of dehumanization. We will learn from the past to observe and understand our current historical conditions.

Chapter 4. Becoming Homo Economicus, Then and Now

All individuals are born into, raised, and educated within a particular set of dominant and subset cultures. Cultures pervasively influence individual's beliefs, values, conventions, habits, and even tastes. Strict determinism does not govern cultural shaping, but a great deal of determinism and its subtler forms adds to our 'soft-wired' nature for cultural shaping. Given this, challenging and changing our thoughts and behaviours in workplace environments must be informed by reflections on the cultural history that has indelibly shaped how we conduct business. In this chapter, I propose to review, in minimalist Zen-stroke sketches, the four Industrial Revolutions that have shaped the modern internalized beliefs and values concerning human valuing and the "good" life. This review is compared and contrasted with my own self-reflections and my experiences as a worker in relation to the influence of the industrial revolutions. My goal is to expose the different roots of dehumanization. Exposing the roots of dehumanization will prepare us for tackling dehumanization in all its subtle and overt variations.

4.1. The Four Industrial Revolutions

When profit is the driving objective in work environments it is difficult to recognize human beings as anything but employees. Interacting with employees as persons opposed to workers is uncommon within business culture. The sociologist Campolo (1992) asserted that "too often, in our attempt to get people to buy what we're selling, we approach them as though they were less than human. Too frequently, we relate to them as if they were objects instead of subjects" (p. 16). I whole-heartedly agree with his argument that people should not be used to increase economic self-interest, and that people are not Pavlovian dogs to be manipulated. This form of dehumanization is largely unrecognized in the business environment. The nature of our relationships as workers and not as humans are shaped by the longstanding paramount goal of economic growth. Our status as persons is lost and we are dreadfully reduced to objects. At what point in human history did our ontology shift from person to object or function? To seriously investigate these questions, one should trace the history of the conceptualization of the "self" and humanity; but such an investigation is out of the depth of this thesis. However, tracing the changing picture of how humans understand themselves through an investigation of the modern history of leadership philosophy and management literature unveils the current view of persons as business vehicles, instruments, and machinery.

The instrumentalist ontology and machine-like behaviours did not naturally evolve. The industrial revolution was the major turning point that changed the human perception of the self. The world has experienced three different Industrial Revolutions, and we are currently in the fourth industrial revolution (Schwab, 2016). Each one of these revolutions changed the way we live, work and relate to each other. Below, I give some key points for these different industrial revolutions, with least attention given to the first, and more to the second and third one, as we are still living out the legacy of these revolutions while being pushed into the fourth revolution. Briefly, the first industrial revolution (1780s-1860s) took place when water and steam were used to mechanize production. The second industrial revolution (1860s – 1950s) was when we used electric power to create a way of mass production, including assembly lines and division of labour. The third industrial revolution (1960s -2000) started with the use of electronics and information technology in automation. We are, according to the periodization experts, now entering the fourth industrial revolution where it is a fusion of technologies, bringing together digital, physical, and biological systems (Schwab, 2016).

4.1.1. The First Industrial Revolution

The first Industrial Revolution (1780s – 1860s) created a shift from agriculture to manufacturing as the development of steam power replaced wind power. In addition, new transportation technologies such as the railroad allowed people to move from the country to the city. People began buying their food and clothing instead of growing it and making it themselves. The consumer mindset replaced the manual labour of farming and sewing. In the 1850s, small factories and small shopping centers slowly developed in Montreal and Toronto. Simultaneously, advances in certain sectors of the economy such as brewing, milling, textiles, and shipbuilding reshaped the economy and built the foundation for the second Industrial Revolution. These entrepreneurs created the emerging capitalist class, one that mostly used small to medium family companies.

As people moved from farms to cities, population dislocation was pervasive. People lost connections to their work and lost control of their traditional forms of labour. Working for oneself to becoming employed in a factory, the workers experienced a loss of control, including loss of autonomy in their hours and the tools they used. More importantly, the connection to their meaningful livelihood was now lost

4.1.2. The Second Industrial Revolution

The second Industrial Revolution (Technological Revolution) (1860s – 1950s) brought mass automation, the assembly line, large-scale factories, and the time management of workers. The First World War accelerated the second Industrial Revolution through the manufacturing of military weapons, transportation vehicles, and other support equipment. Women found their place in the workforce producing weapons in the factories while men went to war. The shift from agriculture to manufacturing accompanied the shift to a wage dependent economy. The Great Depression (1929 – 1939), with mass layoffs in many of the industrialized centers in Canada was a consequence of the wage dependent economy.

During the second Industrial Revolution, the ‘effort in, profit out’ economic model influenced businesses to adopt the machine-like modality. Factory work became the prototype model of the workplace and people became “assistants to the machine” (Fox, 2004, p. 4); an idea arising from the Newtonian worldview that our universe is a machine (Fox, 2004; Tarnas,1991). The Descartes’ body-mind dualism in which our bodies were compared to machines (Fox, 2004; Tarnas,1991) also perpetuated this mentality.

As workers are assistants to machines, it is expected that they behave like machines. Frederick Winslow Taylor noticed this behaviour and created the Scientific Management movement. Management science determines the most efficient way to perform specific tasks through monitoring worker performance (Kanigel, 1997).

Frederick Winslow Taylor, the first ‘efficiency’ expert, had a major impact on the economic models during the early 1900's and influenced the way businesses operated for years to come. He emphasized efficiency as primary importance to the business system (Kanigel,2005/1997). Inherently, human beings are not machines, and nearly all human acts contain inefficiency. In order to create a system where human beings operate like machines with the least amount of inefficiency, Taylor outlined principles of scientific management based on strict control over employees. To emphasize efficiency, Taylor studied worker's tasks and tools, the timing of each task, eliminated all inefficient steps, and created the most efficient way to perform the task. Taylor's philosophy focused on the organization's ability to plan, supervise, and control work with machine-like precision. His philosophy diminished the human element in the workplace by labeling workers as a “cog in the machinery” (Rosen, 1993, p. 140) and treating workers as such.

Taylor focused on the wellbeing of the system and not the wellbeing of employees; and this relationship is factually inversely correlated. In 1912, when Taylor’s philosophy was widely implemented in the workplace, it left a distinctive mark on American life and the world. However, worker’s unions warned of the depersonalizing and inhumane effects of this approach (Kanigel, 2005/1997; Rosen, 1993). Kanigel and Rosen identified the ‘machine consciousness’ where human emotion and the affinity with nature were being displaced in favour of mechanistic models of management and a suppression of human feelings in the workplace. Critics argued that Taylor’s system overworked and enslaved workers, denied their voice, and reduced skilled mechanics to common labourers (Kanigel, 2005/1997).

When reading about Taylor’s philosophy I became emotional. In truth, I saw Taylor’s philosophy enacted in my various workplace environments for the last three decades. My identity is profoundly shaped by this philosophy. Taylor’s system advocates for the dehumanization of workers by valuing them as instruments. His philosophy illustrates the instrumental or extrinsic valuation of human beings in the workplace that results in dehumanization.

Frederick Winslow Taylor’s philosophy is a product of the milieu of his time, influenced by past histories. I turn to German sociologist Max Weber’s (1958) theories on bureaucracy, rationality, and depersonalization to expand on the conditions that led to dehumanization. As the business sector became increasingly dominated by Taylor’s ideas of efficiency and control, it also became increasingly ‘rational’ (Kanigel, 2005/1997). Weber (1958) cautioned against Taylor’s vision of the rationalization in economic life and the bureaucratic nature of business, with its strict guidelines, positions, lines of command, and hierarchies that dictated how people worked. Weber contended that modern Western society was becoming “dominated by efficiency, predictability, calculability, and nonhuman technologies that control people” (Weber, as cited in Ritzer, 2011, p. 24). Although Weber predicted that bureaucracy was inevitable, he claimed that its full realization would succeed in depersonalizing workers. Weber foresaw the effects of depersonalization would achieve the “exclusion of love, hatred, and every purely personal, especially irrational and incalculable, feeling from the execution of official tasks” (Weber as cited in Bendix, 1960/1977, p. 427). Weber’s proposal was a revolutionary idea as it radically shifted the nature and meaning of leadership in the workplace: “[I]n place of the old-type ruler who is moved by sympathy, favor, grace, and gratitude, modern culture requires for its sustaining external apparatus the emotionally detached, and hence rigorously ‘professional’ expert” (Weber as cited in Bendix, 1960/1977, p. 427).

Weber predicted that organizational sustainability and economic wellbeing would normalize the treatment of persons as replaceable parts. As workers become depersonalized, the workplace environment encourages the separation of the working self from their personal self. The personal self that becomes lost consists of body, feelings, dreams, intuitions, and the like. After this separation, rationality is prioritized over emotionality. Such a philosophy of human behaviour was exactly what Taylor advocated and manualized.

I have witnessed the theories explained above. I have lived the separation of the self and the dominance of rationality over emotionality since I entered the workforce at 17. Originally, I agreed with the separation of self that occurred within the workplace. I reflected on this with regard to my own work life and asked myself, why? As an emotional person, why would I agree with splitting myself into parts?

Over time, I realized why I accepted the division between the working self and the personal self. Firstly, my being socialized as a woman encouraged the lessening of emotion in the workplace. Showing emotion is regarded as unprofessional. Secondly, as a worker separated from emotion, my tolerance for conflict was much higher. My rational mind overpowered my emotionality and toughened my responses to workplace incivility. Thirdly, my passion for a project or an idea would be concealed until it was safe to share my emotions. Once I considered why I rationalized the split between the working self and personal self, I focused on the personal costs of this self-splitting.

When I was holistically present, my most innovative ideas would appear. Additionally, my best decisions were made from the "gut" – not the rational pros and cons. However, the most impactful personal cost of dividing the self was in my relationships. When spending considerable amounts of time with work colleagues, the rational consciousness becomes normal, and shifting to a personal state after work hours is difficult. Although, when I do transition into a personal state at work, my colleagues have commented on my " sensitivity" and advise me to “lighten up." The separation between my rational and emotional self was a form of protection. As I have learned about dehumanization, I have decided to allow myself to be "too sensitive." I would rather create healthy boundaries and participate in meaningful conversations than be divided into two isolated selves. However, presenting a holistic self at work is not without risk. Being vulnerable becomes an issue for some. Brené Brown (2012) captured it when she wrote the following:

> Vulnerability is not weakness, and the uncertainty, risk, and emotional exposure we face every day are not optional. Our only choice is a question of engagement. Our willingness to own and engage with our vulnerability determines the depth of our courage and the clarity of our purpose; the level to which we protect ourselves from being vulnerable is a measure of our fear and disconnection. (p. 2)

In the bureaucratic business environments, I have experienced throughout my career, Weber’s (1958/1946) concern for the prioritization of values of rationality over emotionality in business culture has become a reality. The workplace has developed in favour of Taylor’s (Taylor, 1911/2010) vision of a machine-like efficiency. As dehumanization works at an ideological level, living emotionally detached and physically disconnected within the workplace environment has become normalized (I must add the qualifier, “to varying degrees,” to the previous statement). We have manifested the prediction made by Whyte (1956): people who advocate strict adherence to the standards, rules, or demands of the organization. As the modern organization requires rationality and efficiency to maintain its economic functions, Whyte observes that “effective business people [are] logical, reasoned and rational decision makers. Emotions [are] regarded as unwanted influences which deflect . . . us from the path of objectivity; forces to be controlled, if not, sublimated” (as cited in Muchinsky, 2000, p. 802). The bureaucratic culture and the business environment have cultivated a duality of selves: the professional and rational self and the non-professional and emotional self. The rational self is cultivated, prioritized, and valued (Fineman, 1993) as it focuses on the economic goals of the organization. It is assumed that emotionality is “potentially disruptive rather than constructive” (Brown, 1997, p. 248) and will interfere with the efficiency of the organization and the attainment of its goals. The emotional self is marginalized in the workplace and is labeled as “inappropriate,” because of its incompatibility with the organizational goals (Hochschild, 1983).

Bureaucratic relationships centralize around people’s positions or roles and not interpersonal qualities; resulting in depersonalization. This value shift causes individuals feeling isolated from each other and meaningful, social interaction is replaced by formal associations. As bureaucratic modalities permeate other aspects of our lives, depersonalization and alienation grows. In order to succeed in business organizations, workers learn— consciously or subconsciously— to divide themselves to better fit the workplace culture. They are expected to separate their personal and professional lives (Dougherty & Drumheller, 2006); abandoning their emotional and physical life and favouring their rational, goal-oriented, and strategic self and becoming the ‘professional self.’ This professional self is ideally trained to devoid human qualities, such as our emotions, feelings, and bodies. No amount of professional training will eliminate our human qualities, as we are inherently emotional and physical beings. The work environment that demands us to live a divided life causes suffering at an unforeseen level. I have been living out these consequences in my own life.

Being *‘a professional’* was a state of mind throughout my career. In my first administrative job I wanted impress my supervisors and colleagues. On a day-to-day basis, I demonstrated my responsible, reliable, and trustworthy qualities and was emotionally invested in contributing to the overall success of the organization (even in the smallest ways). As an administrator, the professional mindset perpetuated my desires to be the 'ideal worker.' An "ideal worker" prioritizes work, displays loyalty and commitment to the organization through long hours and constant availability, and minimizes obligations outside of work (Reid, 2015; Dumas & Sanchez-Burks, 2015). I evolved into an accommodating, overly helpful person who picked up last-minute jobs. Becoming this type of person required an incredible administrative team who could support my endeavors; administrative teams are made of solid workers who are exceptionally accommodating and responsive. Unfortunately, as I reflect on my professional self, I was disingenuous. When someone asked me to do their work, I wanted to reply "no, I can't drop everything to do this for you now, because you left it to the last minute." Instead, I smiled and replied, "don't worry about it; I will get it done." I am mindful of these professional experiences and I acknowledge the hard work of my staff. I also prevent myself from asking someone to complete something at the last minute, because I remember what it felt like.

A few years ago, in the early days of the doctoral program, I was contemplating the idea of the rational self and the emotional self. During that time, I was suffering from gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). My doctor wanted me to take proton pump inhibitors to reduce the amount of acid in my stomach. I reviewed the safety warnings and the potential negative long-term effects and decided against them. Shortly after the diagnosis, I was having dinner with Dr. Avraham Cohen. As we discussed the pros and cons of the medication, he asked me what I was going to do. There were obvious dietary changes I could implement but stress reduction was a key component to overcoming this disease. Dr. Cohen suggestion that I pay attention to the flare-ups and attend to any signals that could be triggering them. Over the next few weeks, I noticed a connection between the flare-ups and when I silenced myself. I attempted to focus on the inward message of my body and began speaking up during periods of conflict. Working on the thesis for the last two years, I have not had any symptoms of GERD. I share this personal account as this was my personal experiment with paying attention to owning both parts of myself, my rational self and emotional self. I learned for myself the personal cost of not paying attention and respecting both parts of myself.

The increase in manufacturing during the late 19th century created work-related problems. The identified work-related problems are still apparent in the 21st century, providing evidence to the legacy of the successive industrial revolutions. According to the *1889 Report of the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labour and Capital in Canada,* paid labour was the main form of work for Canadians in the 1800's.This report identified differing issues in the labour force, listed as child labour, fear of employers, the need for shorter hours, and the safety of workers as there were many industrial accidents during this time. The section titled, "fear of employers," states: "It is to be regretted that a number of witnesses refused to permit the publication of their names, fearing dismissal or other mark of disapprobation on the part of their employers" (Armstrong & Freed, 1889, p. 7)." This statement is applicable to modern workplace environments. In the section on "Shorter hours," it states:

> Your Commissioners believe that the ordinary working day may be still further reduced with advantage to workmen and without injury or injustice to employers. They recommend that the employment in stores and

> factories of women and children for more than ten hours in one day or more that fifty-four hours in one week be forbidden by law. (Armstrong & Freed, 1889, p. 9)

Factory owners optimized profit with exceedingly long hours (Ritzer, 2011). Advocating for shorter work days has been active for over one hundred years and continues into the 21st century.

After World War II, the period between 1945 -1960 was known as the Postwar economy, or the Golden Age of Capitalism (Marglin & Schor, 2007). This period marks the transition from the 2nd to the 3rd Industrial Revolution. The concept of work evolved from the single identifier of labour into Drucker’s (2001) term, ‘knowledge workers.’ This concept reflects the shift from the production of manufactured materials to knowledge created in the mind. Drucker (2001) stated:

> Knowledge workers are not subordinates; they are "associates." For, once beyond the apprentice stage, knowledge workers know more about their job than the boss does – or else they are no good at all. In fact, that they know more about their job than anybody else in the organization is part of the definition of knowledge workers. (p. 78).

The term "knowledge workers" (alternatively called, white collar workers) has created divisions between people within organizations. The roles and positions of leadership teams and regular employees maintains an established hierarchy. However, in some organizations, higher value is attached to knowledge workers compared to the administrative or trade staff.

The higher valued employees may potentially receive more resources than the lesser valued employees creating tension amongst staff. Organizations allocate resources without attention to the hierarchy of employee positions. Knowledge workers are not more protected from dehumanization than other employees. I am an example of a knowledge worker who has experienced, unknowingly, dehumanization and has become aware of it through my graduate studies.

In my own career history, I notice that I was striving to become a professional, consciously and unconsciously, and moving away from an administrator. I became organizationally socialized as I maneuvered through the organizational hierarchy. "Organizational socialization is the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role" (Van Maanen &

Schein, 1979, p. 211). To find success in a new role, one must adopt the values, standards, and the required behaviours. I try to remember what it is like to be on the lower level of the organizational hierarchy and the inability to voice input in one's job.

4.1.3. The Third Industrial Revolution

The third Industrial Revolution was the Digital Revolution (1969-2000), marked by electronics and information technology to automate production. Information technology increasingly automates production lines. As we experienced worldwide competition with European and Japanese products in the North American markets, the term “globalization” became apparent. However, North American businesses were not prepared for worldwide competition. We witnessed organizational leaders reacting to the effects of globalization by cutting costs of production to keep share prices high for shareholders.

After the 1981-1982 recession, the economy slowly improved. The invention and implementation of the internet in the early 1980's impacted the positive economic shift. In 1991, the first website went live and internet-based companies, called dot-coms, were developed. As the commercial value of the internet grew, the dot-com companies saw substantial rises in their stock prices. Investors believed that the online companies were going to be worth millions and were not considering the investment risks. The high share prices became the new normal. These companies were creating paper millionaires. However, in 2001, the dot-com bubble burst and millionaires lost their shares (Bardwick, 2008; Noer, 2009). The Enron scandal was to blame for the downfall.

The Enron Corp. was a merger organization between two energy companies, Houston National Gas Co. and Omaha InterNorth Inc. Between 1996 and 2001, Fortune Magazine named Enron "America's Most Innovative Company." At Enron's highest point the shares were valued at $90.75. When the organization declared bankruptcy on December 2, 2001, the shares were trading at $0.26. Enron admitted to inflating its income by $586 million dollars since 1997 through fraudulent accounting. Complicating matters further, the prominent accounting firm Arthur Anderson was found guilty of obstructing justice for shredding Enron financial documents to conceal them from the SEC. The firm appealed it, but the scandal ruined the once prominent accounting firm.

The CEO, Jeffrey Skillings, was convicted of conspiracy, fraud, and insider trading. Enron violated the trust of its investors and its employees (Eichenwald, 2005).

The Enron scandal shifted the layout of accounting professions and of investment and shocked the general public. Faith in big corporations and prestigious audit firms was lost. Enron was not the only corporate scandal during the early 2000's. North American markets and investor confidence deflated. Eight years later, the financial meltdown affected the American and European financial systems after a series of related economic disasters occurred. This last recession forced organizations to revisit products and processes in order to survive. As part of the revisiting, organizations were laying off staff (alternatively called, restructuring, rightsizing and downsizing) (Bardwick, 2008: Noer, 2009). People who were once considered long-term assets were losing their jobs. Recall the definition of an asset provide by my thesis supervisor, Dr. Bai: assets could be sold, discarded, and replaced; and if employees were assets, the same terms of operation applied. Employees considered long-term assets who were supported, nurtured, and developed were perceived as short–term costs who needed to be managed, and if possible, reduced or eliminated. Dehumanization actively participated in these recessions.

Even knowledge workers, white-collar workers, are treated as assets in modern business culture. Workers promoted to managerial level positions and who gained sufficient salaries were now the targets of layoffs. As a knowledge worker who has survived a major merger in an organization, I have lived through anxious experiences. Experienced and mature workers are not necessarily protected in the workplace. Younger, less experienced people are now considered more desirable, as they are paid less and rarely draw on health benefits. Rousseau (1989) would argue that the 'psychological employment contract' has been now broken. The psychological employment contract is defined as:

> An individual's belief regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that focal person and another party. A psychological contact emerges when one party believes that a promise of future return has been made (for example, pay for performance), a contribution has been given (for example, some form of exchange), and therefore, an obligation has been created to provide future benefits. (1989, p. 122).

Psychological employment contracts are subjectively based on beliefs and perceptions regarding promises and acceptances. The expectation that the employee and employer relationship will change increases as the length of the relationship extends. An employee with less than two years history in an organization does not expect the same amount of loyalty from an employer compared to a twenty-year veteran of an organization.

Prior to the last recession, the psychological contract ensured the following: job security, health benefits for their family, and an increase in wages. Many people experience working for one employer throughout their entire working lives. This was no longer the case; organizations now hired "just-in-time" employees (Noer, 2009). Organizations would hire part-time, or temporary employees, during the transition from long-term employee development to short-term employee fit. Job security or a secure future with a company was rare for employees. Employees were being displaced, devalued and could not depend on others. The disconnection and isolation between workers began with this shift.

During the 2008 financial crisis, Statistics Canada reported a net loss of 400,000 jobs from October 2008 to October 2009 (LaRochelle-Cote, S & Gilmore, J, 2009). Statistics Canada also reported the employment decrease occurred faster among full-time workers and permanent staff. I witnessed people losing their jobs during this time. Aware of the effects of the financial crisis across different industry sectors, I was more familiar with the impact on members in my profession as many accountants, lawyers and consultants were being laid off. In the 10+ Million-dollar revenue group of public accounting firms, 71% laid off staff; the $6-10 Million-dollar revenue group of public accounting firms laid off 39% off staff; and 50% of staff were laid off in the $2 to 5M group of public accounting firms (Rosenberg, January 7, 2009).. Not only were accountants laid off in the public firms, employers were reducing or eliminating senior positions in the industry because they could no longer afford them. However, they were often rehired on a contract basis for less days of work. I had personal relationships with some people who were re-hired as contractors, and they had to perform the same job tasks in less time and with less pay. Smart, talented employees were being laid off and it occurred to me that it could happen to anyone. The shift to prioritize contract workers over permanent workers caused me great stress.

4.1.4. The Fourth Industrial Revolution

The fourth Industrial Revolution represents a switch from simple digitalization (Third Industrial Revolution) to innovation based on combinations of technologies. Companies are prompted to re-evaluate their business tactics in this new revolution. Artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, and automation performing repetitive jobs allows businesses to work even more efficiently. Flexible processes are needed as factories are smaller and more agile. Additionally, customization is completed at a mass-production speed. Across the country and around the globe, organizations are facing market pressures and competition. Globalization and the free flow of capital are inducing company competition for business, labour, and investors. To increase their global presence, organizations need to optimize efficiencies. Businesses must be strategic, nimble, and responsive to acquire the new opportunities. Opportunities can be lost if one must wait for the following year's annual budget before developing or implementing a program. To become technologically efficient, organizations increase performance goals, shorten innovation cycles, and increase the amount and pace of the work tasks. Achieving high quality performance and producing large quantities of product with less people and less time is identified as the "acceleration trap" (Bruch & Menges, 2010).

Economists such as Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee has stated current industrial revolution can precipitate greater inequality through its potential to disrupt labor markets. This means that during this revolution that the richest people may benefit more by the introduction of this new technology than some of the poorer people. For example, in third world countries where cheap labour may be used, the labour may be replaced with robotics or technologies. There is the risk that some jobs will disappear as we see more complex technology (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2012). Within my own profession, we may see accountants preparing personal income tax returns becoming obsolete. There are many motivators for digitization the tax system: simplification and digitalization better respond to the rapid and variable growth and will cut governmental costs. Government officials believe that digitization could eliminate tax fraud by cutting out human interaction or contact during the entire tax process. In countries like Brazil, digitization is already underway (Insights for Business Leaders, Vol. 17), and the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) is improving their digital processes each year. This year, CRA launched the File My Return service, allowing eligible individuals with low income or fixed income to file their tax return by answering a few short questions over the phone. Auditing may be another example that utilizes digitization. Technology analyzes transactions in a fraction of the time it takes auditors to verify. For example, when an accountant audits financial transactions, they develop programs to identify the high risk areas and sample transactions in these areas. However, with new technology, accountants will be able examine 100% of the transactions in a fraction of the time.

Not all organizations have made the transition into the 4th Industrial Revolution as many organizations are still using 3rd Industrial Revolution business models. The 4th Industrial Revolution is defined by a 'VUCA' world. VUCA stands for Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity. This acronym evolved from the US military and is now used in management literature (Kegan & Lahey, 2016). As artificial intelligence and other technological advances enter the workforce, businesses are seeking human skills, such as creativity, innovation, critical thinking, and problem solving (Deloitte, 2018; Colvin, 2015; Friedman, 2014). How are organizations training for these 'human' skills, and how are they implemented and practiced?

4.2. Today's Workplace Environment

Organizations are attempting to shift into the VUCA (Volatile, Uncertainty, Complexity, and Ambiguity) world and attempting to adopt a new concept of business. Organizations are required to introduce a collaborative network of team leaders who knowledge-share with each other and also with their 'subordinates,' to distance themselves from the traditionally hierarchical decision-making process (Noer,2005; Bardwick, 2008; Kegan & Lahey, 2016)..

The pace of change in the VUCA society is unprecedented and organizations need to respond to marketplace shifts quickly. The traditionally hierarchical organizational model prevents companies from responding promptly because business changes are lengthy to implement. Employees in networked organizations are equally positioned resulting in the decentralization of decision making and adding flexibility to the process. The world is far more complex in the fourth industrial revolution. The perception of work in organizations must be observed through various lenses and disciplines. For example, when building a website, companies consult with IT technologists, marketing consultants, and psychologists to ensure optimal access. Interacting with multiple people on one task is shifting the nature of the work relationship from knowledge workers to relationship workers.

The fast-paced market is increasingly overwhelming organizations and employees who are struggling to grasp the fleeting workload. Disparities among technology, individuals, and businesses are only increasing (Deloitte, 2018). However, people are more adept at keeping pace with technology whereas businesses are falling behind. Organizational leaders and their employees continue to structure business models, job-design, and management styles with 1st Industrial Revolution approaches (Deloitte 2018, Colvin, 2015; Friedman, 2014; Kegan & Lahey, 2016).

The job market has also drastically transformed and is now identified as the "Gig economy" (Deloitte 2018, Colvin, 2015; Friedman, 2014; Kegan & Lahey, 2016). The “gig economy” influenced organizations to move away from hiring full-time employees and instead, are hiring contractors and short-term employees. Freelance or short-term employees enjoy the flexibility and freedom this entails but others feel the pressure of being laid off and job searching. I have spoken with people who have been laid off and are experiencing the new job market. Their financial stability has been shaken and they cannot afford to be unemployed for a period of time. They are often overworked due to working as much as they can when they have the opportunity as they never know if they will have work once they finish their current contract.

The VUCA (Volatile, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity) economy increases the pressure of survival amongst organizational leaders. This volatility and uncertainty requires organizations to change constantly, and employees are nervous of losing their careers in the process. While different researchers suggest different recommendations, they share one common message: technology improves faster than humans, and people cannot compete with it. However, high-value human skills will increase the potential of working with the constant flow of new technologies. These ‘skills’ are innovation, creativity, emotional engagement, and critical thinking (Deloitte 2018, Colvin, 2015; Friedman, 2014; Kegan & Lahey, 2016). The clear espousal of the very ‘human’ dimensions of our being is most compelling. Compared to the 3 prior revolutions, the 4th industrial revolution has differed in its efforts of minimizing and dismissing the human. The 4th industrial revolution has recommended that workers should be trained in natural human ‘skills’ that involve emotion, creativity, and other previously disowned human capabilities.

In order for organizations to stop dehumanizing behaviours in the workplace and supporting people to integrate the previously disowned aspects of themselves, there needs to be change within the organization. Organizations operate simultaneously on many levels. There is the systemic level, changes at this level affect the being of the organization. There is the strategic level, where change at this level can change the direction that the organization is going in. There is the structural level, any change at this level can change people's jobs and responsibilities. Then there can be changes at the operational or managerial level, where processes can be affected, changing how people work. Organizations may also experience change within departments or divisions. Changes within the relationships of people who work together can also be affected. An organizational change can affect so many levels of the organization. We are living in a time of never-ending change. This means that for an organization to want to take on the project of rehumanization, we need leaders to champion this project. It would be helpful if the champions were the top-level leaders as they can influence systemic change. More importantly, for a leader to want to be a champion for rehumanizing the workplace, they need to have a high level of self-awareness. They need to be able to see the data about the organization in a way that is free of distortions, projections, politics and illusions. In the next chapter, I will introduce the concept of inner work which I believe will assist with leaders increasing their self-awareness. Self-awareness gained through inner work, combined with teambuilding, may contribute to a fundamental shift in personal and group consciousness.

Chapter 5. Inner Work

The following words are inscribed upon Karl Marx's grave: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, *is to change it* [emphasis added]." I entered the Philosophy of Education discipline to discover how philosophers and theorists were construing the world and the self, and to apply these conceptualizations to my own experience and observations in business culture. My journey has been eye-opening, yet heart-wrenching. However, I do not wish to end my journey in merely understanding. The ultimate reason I studied philosophy of education is to manifest my knowledge into transformative action on the deep issues that I, along with so many others, have been facing in our everyday lives. My master's thesis offered suggestions in creating a healthier work-life balance. My investigations have presented that work-life imbalance and normalization of stress and burnout in organizational culture has influenced our interpretations and expectations of ourselves and the world. I am now compelled to change this interpretation, as Karl Marx suggested we do.

Within this penultimate chapter, I will consider how individuals may counteract the key factors that I have identified as contributing to the problem of workplace dehumanization: fragmentation of the self and the prioritization of the rational self above the emotional and bodily self; as well as the devaluation of intrinsic relations with others. Fragmentation of the self and prioritization of the rational self has disconnected the presented-self and the internal-self. How do we reintegrate the whole human into the business environment and restore the integrity of our selves in the workplace? This reintegration requires moving beyond the current business ethos of instrumentalist rationalism and accepting holistic beings into the work environment. I argue that the process of reintegration is an internally-related (Cohen, 2009) project for individuals to rework within their consciousness.

5.1. The Call for Whole Self to Work

As described prior, organizations believe that the appropriate response to the exponentially increased pressures and efficiency of work tasks is to push employees to work harder and faster. This form of response emulates the perception employees impart on themselves, as "parts of the organizational machinery that are failing to function properly" (Cohen et al., 2014, p. 42). Our perceptions and responses to any given situation are contextual based on the prior patterns of behaving in the world and the responses we receive for those behaviours. Working harder and faster to support a failing organization reflects the de-humanizing process of becoming what Taylor Gatto (1999) calls “human doings.” As the workplace changes to adopt the technological advances of the modern business model, organizations continue to neglect the deepest human need of human presence and connection. In disregarding the essential human qualities of emotion and connection, the process of dehumanization begins. All of our progress and innovation is null if we do not fully embody humanity; we are liable to dehumanize ourselves and each other.

Organizations have made continuous development in designing business processes, performance matrixes, and increasing quality control, but has not prioritized the health and wellbeing of people. Consequently, humans have also ignored the health and wellbeing of the planet. The intense focalization on maximizing productivity and profit is endangering people and our environment. The disownment or disassociation of individuals’ self-aspects fragment the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual aspects of their lives. The workplace actively discourages and prevents the integration of the whole being by necessitating workers to lead fragmented lives; dividing their rational from emotional and physical selves. Workers learn, explicitly or implicitly, that their emotional, physical, and spiritual selves are inappropriate and unwelcome in the business environment, and they learn to suppress or avoid these selves within the workplace.

Rehumanizing the self and prioritizing the health and wellbeing of all co-inhabitants will take time; unlearning is more difficult than learning. The challenge of unlearning is the self-awareness or awakening of consciousness it requires. An awakening of consciousness warrants a move away from the habituated thoughts and behaviours. Consciousness implies the ability to intentionally respond to the world and its demands, opposed to automatically reacting based on socialized norms and values. Realizing my acceptance of normalized stress was a deep unlearning I experienced. I was unaware that the stress I was experiencing was a result of the same characteristic worldviews, values, and social organization that supported the process of ‘dehumanization.’ I did not have the language to understand or clearly interpret the phenomenology of dehumanization in my work life. The absence of language greatly blocked my awareness.

In business education, students are expected to be well-versed in their trade and are required to take courses in leadership and teamwork. Students will graduate with the skills, competencies, and theoretical knowledge to be ‘successful,’ but do not always develop the philosophical mindset and attendant skills to critically analyze the nature of the success and the negative consequences to the self and others. The most adverse repercussion of this success is the loss of the wholesome self, as I demonstrated in previous chapters.

The “whole human being” refers to the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual aspects of one’s being and life, and the interconnectedness of these parts. Integration of the whole person is the “acceptance and ownership of all thoughts, feelings, fears, beliefs, experiences and memories” (Downing, 2011, p. 1). Reintegration is the process through which all disassociated aspects of the self become known, accepted, and integrated into awareness (Cohen, 2015). Through integration, a person learns to engage, accept, and take ownership of all thoughts, feelings, fears, beliefs, experiences, and memories. The result is an integral self, developing from the interaction among body, mind, heart, soul, and spirit (Betz & Kimsey-House, 2015; Cohen, 2015). When such integration takes place within the business environment, people would be primarily valued for their rational, professional self.

Organization and/or leaders seem fearful of holistic employees in the work environment. How would it affect the organizational culture? Would employees attend meetings in casual clothes and running shoes? Would supervisors and managers experience negative moods or unwanted responses from employees? Employees perceive the danger of welcoming their emotional self into the workplace and by potentially inviting criticism of their work competence. On both sides, leaders and employees feel more comfortable with their professional masks on in the workplace. To survive in the workplace, fragmentation becomes a coping mechanism, allowing one to avoid internal conflict by disassociating. In this manner, the integrity of the whole human being becomes violated, as Wilber (as cited in Collins, 2001) asserted: “any repressed or dissociated experiences inevitably form a personal unconscious, which, if left split off from everyday consciousness, perpetuates a false self” (pp. 25-26).

Kenji Yoshino (2006) used a term called ‘covering,’ which he defined as "hiding elements of our authentic selves in an effort to fit in with the dominant culture" (p. x). While his work focuses on civil rights groups, he provides examples that fit the workplace. For example, "women are told to 'play like men' at work and to make their child-care responsibilities invisible… disable are told to hide the paraphernalia they use to manage their disabilities" (Yoshino, 2006, p. 21). Yoshino's advocated for mainstreaming the term "covering" into everyday language. Yoshino argues that we cannot fix a phenomenon until we have the language to describe it. I believe the same with the term ‘dehumanization.’

The fragmented lives of employees, the division of their work life from their personal life is not a novel concept. Within current literature, many researchers and academics advocates for ‘bringing your whole self to work.’ Mike Robbins (2018) book, *Bring your whole self to work,* and Brené Brown's book (2012), *Daring Greatly* speaks to the idea of being whole in all aspect of life. Also, non-academics such as Sheryl Sandberg, Chief Operating Officer of Facebook, promotes the integration of the self and authenticity in the workplace (Sandberg, 2013). Among many others, people are recognizing the importance of integrating the authentic self. The following themes have emerged from the literature: vulnerability, courage, honesty, and authenticity. How do we appropriately encompass these in the workplace? While the above-mentioned people are advocates and speak to the importance of needing this, my own experience is that they do not speak to how this can be achieved. Hence, the question still remains. How do we make these changes? Obstacles abound. If being vulnerable, courageous, honest, and authentic were easy, we would have ‘done’ them already.

5. 2. Cultivation of Self-awareness

Two key signs of authenticity are self-awareness and integrity. I argue that *self-awareness* is essential for integration to occur and restoring integrity in one’s being is internally accomplished. To notice fragmentation within one’s self and to seek and cultivate integration as a return to wholeness is a personal task that the individual must undertake themselves.   However, while help and support are highly valuable in this internal work, without sufficient self-awareness, one is not able to clearly and substantially notice the fragmented consciousness or ‘divided self.’ The first step towards integration is the cultivation of self-awareness. Palmer (1998) states:

> Knowing others well enough to lead them successfully can only be as powerful and as concrete as how well we truly know and understand ourselves. Without knowing ourselves, we will project the battered and lost condition of our own souls onto others and negatively affect our relationship and our way of being connected. If we fail to examine our own hearts, we will be as far removed from them as I am from my own personal truth. (p. 2).

Knowing ourselves, a long and hallowed tradition in the West and the East, is an educational priority; and to know ourselves, we need to cultivate an expanded and heightened self-awareness.

Self-awareness is defined as “the ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as their effect on others” (Goleman, 1995/2005, p. 95). In addition, self-awareness also refers to the “extent to which people are conscious of various aspects of their identities and the extent to which self-perceptions are internally integrated and congruent with the ways others perceive them” (Hall, 2004, p. 154). To be fully conscious of all parts of one’s identity is not easily done; some aspects of one’s identity may be so deeply buried that these aspects may be non-conscious to the person. It is also important to note that cultivating one's self-awareness is a continual process. Avolio & Gardner (2005) state "self-awareness is not a destination point, but rather an emerging process where one continually comes to understand his or her unique talents, strengths, sense of purpose, core values, beliefs and desires (p. 324).

Self-awareness is an essential and substantial element in the development of a person’s identity (Kegan, 1994; Cohen, 2004). Developing self-awareness is an ongoing process as one continues to understand their personal history, experiences, and capabilities (Cohen, 2004; Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Self-awareness is made explicit in Kegan’s (1994) theory of adult development. Kegan makes the distinction between subject and object:

> [Subjects are] those elements of our knowing and organizing, that we are identified with, tied to, fused with, or embedded in . . ..” (p. 32)
>
> [Objects are] those elements of our knowing or organizing that we can reflect on, handle, look at, be responsible for, relate to each other, take control of, internalize, assimilate, or otherwise operate on.” (p. 32)

In Kegan’s view, identity growth involves the ability to see oneself with objectivity and from a distance.; in contrast to a less-developed state when the self is perceived as fused. One is unable to observe and reflect upon their experiences in the fused state. As we move from *subjec*t (that which controls us) to *object* (that which we can reflect and observe), the shift in our perceptive allows us to become more self-aware and our meaning-making more complex (Kegan, 1994). To increase self-awareness, two parts of the mind must be accessed simultaneously; the active mind and observing mind.

Within Kegan's theory, he describes the subject as "I am." These are the self-concepts that we are typically unable to reflect on or consider objectively. These can include our behaviours, emotions, reactions. He also describes the object as "I have.". These are the self-concepts that we are detached from, allowing us to be able to reflect on them, control and connect to them. It is important to note that when I am using the term detachment, I am not meaning indifference. I am meaning to use it as being able to look at things objectively. Kegan's (1994) theory of adult development shows that adults, similar to children, go through five developmental stages. The five stages of adult development are: child (impulsive) mind, imperial mind, socialized mind, self-authoring mind, and self-transforming mind (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). For my purposes, I am going to address stages 2 to 5, as they are most applicable to adult development and leadership development. Before I go into the stages, I will quickly put in a note here that I don't take these stages as rigidly structured and manifested phenomena. I take them heuristically, open to further interpretation and reconceptualization, as we apply.

Stage two is called the *imperial mind* (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). Often this stage applies to people from 6 years old to teenagers. I may venture to observe that most of us, including myself, at times may act from this place. At this stage, the person's emphasis is on their own needs, interests, and agendas. The subject is needs, desires and interests while the object has impulses, feelings, and perceptions. At this stage, they do not recognize that they control their own perspective. When considering relationships at this stage, individuals see people as a way to get their own needs met. The person at this stage thinks of others as being useful to them or not. The relationships are transactional and consequence-based. The person cares about how other people may perceive them, only because they are concerned if there are real consequences. For example, in the workplace, we may see people at this stage acting impulsively, or making choices based on immediate experiences, or voting on ideas based on self-interests.

Stage three is called the *socialized mind* (Kegan & Lahey, 2009) At this stage, there is a transition from stage two where the most important things were our personal needs and interests to us getting our thoughts, beliefs, and ideas of what we believe to be true from external sources. At this stage, the subject is interpersonal relationships and mutuality while the object has needs, interests, and desires. The transition is from the subject is needs, interests and desires to object has needs, interests, and desires. At this stage, relationships are no longer transactional, we care about others' opinions of ourselves not because of consequences but because we actually care. We also take personal responsibility for how others experience us. This can mean at this stage, we may be spending too much energy trying to avoid causing problems or hurting other people's feelings. At this stage, adults can experience difficulty in letting go of harmful relationships. Adults are looking for external validation in order to have a sense of self. This can leave people being vulnerable to attitudes of others. At this stage, one may not have a strong sense of self and be challenged if there is a conflict between any given order or right and wrong. By this I mean that people at this stage can struggle with the question of what they actually want as they may be too focused on meeting others' expectations or what they feel society expects of them. Kegan reports that many people remain at this stage. He states that, according to his survey and analysis, "58% of the adult population are at this stage" (Kegan & Lahey, 2009, p. 28).

Stage four is the *self-authoring mind*. At this stage, adults define who they are and they no longer defined by other people, their relationships or the environment. At this stage, the subject is in self-authorship, identity, and ideology and the object has relationships and mutuality. Self-authorship is "defining and reshaping what you believe your sense of self, and your relationships with others, rather than simply accepting them from others" (Kegan, 1994, p. 239). At stage four, adults are making the distinction between our own opinions and those of others. We can question expectations and values, we can take stands and set out our limits and solve problems with independent frames of mind. We can now take responsibility for our own inner states and emotions. We recognize that we are always changing and that who we are is something that we can still negotiation. Kegan reports that 35% of adults dwell in this stage (Kegan, 2009, p. 28).

Stage five is the *interconnected mind*. At this stage, one's sense of self is not tied to any roles but is continually evolving through the exploration of our identities and roles and refined through interactions with others. We question ourselves as well as others. We can understand things from many different perspectives. At this place, we are at a point for self-transformation. Kegan reports that only 1% of adults dwell in this stage (Kegan & Lahey, 2009, p. 28).

As Kegan's theory moves through the different stages, we can see that, as one is able to truly observe and reflect upon one's experience, there is room towards a more expansive way of knowing. Therefore, as we want to increase our self-awareness, we need to be able to access two parts of our mind simultaneously; the active part that is doing the action or non-action and the observer part that is watching the active part. To note: this process of moving from subject to object is not to be confused with what is known as objectification, turning subjects into mere objects, which in fact is the essence of dehumanization. We need to be careful in our language use. Kegan's theory of adult development is actually a map or more of a guideline. People can straddle the different stages or be in different stages with different relationships. Perhaps one is at a higher level with his or her spouse and at a lower level at work. Kegan's three stages, the socialized mind, self-authoring mind, and the self-transforming mind are all part of adult meaning systems. These three systems allow people to make sense of the world and operate in it in very different ways. If we take a look at the work place from these perspectives, we can see the level of complexity. A stage three individual may be a team player, a reliant employee, someone who seeks directions. A stage four individual may be a person who is someone who has become a team leader, someone who is problem-solving and independent. While a stage five individual at the self- transforming mind stage would be a meta-leader, a leader that is interdependent and one that is problem finding. In order for leaders to be able to identify dehumanization in the workplace and to take action, these leaders need to have a maturity. I would argue that they would need to be at the adult development stage four or five. My reason is that if each of these stages are plateaus, then we need leaders who are able to step back enough from their environment to obtain that internal sense of judgement that allows them to evaluate and make choices about their environment. They need to be able to see the contradictions within the work environment and be able to still not lose focus on the work at hand. Therefore, I believe that people need to move beyond stage three where we are shaped by the definitions and expectations of our environments. We need to be able to take action and make change in the world (Kegan & Lahey, 2009).

5. 3. Inner Work as Mindful Reflective Practices

To be able to move from one stage of adult development to a higher stage of adult development takes work and effort. To be able to transition from one stage to another requires a practice that allows one to increase one's self awareness and to allow us to shift our way of knowing and to be at a higher level of mental complexity. I am suggesting that inner work is one way for increasing one's self-awareness and allowing one to develop the maturity to move between the different stages for adult development, specifically from stages three to five. Brownstein (2010) asserts that engaging in inner work opens the self to changing perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes. By changing internally, our perceptions may change our experiences of the outer world. However, increasing self-awareness requires the knowledge of how to engage in this process; it requires effort. Inner work helps to increase self-awareness. I was introduced to the idea of inner work by Avraham Cohen, an educator, group leader, and psychotherapist in the 1990's when I was in the two-year transformational individual and group counselling program. Avraham has also been my mentor for over twenty-five years. He has consistently modeled the idea of "looking after oneself" through contemplative practices, psychological inner work, relationship work, health, nutrition, fitness, and caring of others. He is a model of consistent comprehensive and holistic inner work to achieve the wholeness of the human being. Cohen refers to inner work as psychological work; not in terms of pathology and diagnosis, but rather as a life-enhancing perspective. His observation is that ongoing acts of inner work develop the capacities to witness and observe experience (p. 31).

> Inner work refers to reflective practices conducted under the gaze of consciousness, which depends on a developed capacity to self-observe, to witness experience....Inner work is a way of working on and with perceptions, sensations, memories, and cognitions, all of which constitute a person's experience...This type of awareness is not something teacher education addresses nor is it a part of the culture most of us inhabit. (Cohen, 2009, p. 31)

The foundation of increasing self-awareness is the ability to examine and discover different aspects of oneself, and the capacity to reflect upon these feelings and experiences without fear. The development of the 'internal observer' is sufficiently detached to deal with conflicting and difficult emotional reactions experienced from different parts of self (Mindell, 1990).

The conflict and dialogue between the conscious and the unconscious (Johnson, 1986) is overly painful for some, and they shy away from exploring it. Others have created childhood defenses to protect themselves from the emotional pain inflicted upon them by important adults in their lives (Cohen, 2004). These defense mechanisms displace fear and painful memories from the conscious mind and block the engagement in inner work. The process of inner work begins when these fears and painful memories are reintegrated back into consciousness and are in dialogue. The exploration of various facets of experience and the process of introspection and reflection arises from the consciousness in dialogue with fear. Aspects of the whole human that have been lost, ignored, or unrecognized are discovered and recovered. The benefits from this process of becoming whole human beings with full capacity to experience all aspects of one's self are many and gained through expanding consciousness, unearthing the unconscious, and inviting a dialogue between the conscious and the unconscious (Johnston, 1986).

Inner work reconnects and reintegrates our own experiences with our *whole* selves rather than shutting out or denying fragmented experiences. Inner work only occurs when a person obtains with a sense of control over their self-awareness, otherwise known as ‘self-agency.’ A person can have self-agency over one’s self-talk, self-care, the company one keeps, one’s actions, emotional availability, attitudes, choices, and interpretations of experience. Shifting attention onto the self and away from others enables the correction of one’s own thinking, behaviour, choices, and beliefs. Inner work also presents the aspects one does not have control over. Others'communication styles, how people treat themselves, their behaviour, and other’s life-views are only controlled independently.

Inner work is an overarching term: it encompasses *mind, body,* and *heart*. Through our *mind*, we develop an awareness of our values, beliefs, attachments, desires, and aversions that drive our behaviour. Through our *body*, we experience our embodied aliveness, reconnecting with visceral feelings. Our *heart* expands the capacity for compassion, empathy, and spiritual connections. Addressing all three paths, inner work connects parts of the self that have been fragmented, forgotten, or denied by the socio-historical processes discussed earlier, thereby cultivating a whole, integral self. The result from this process is the emergence of integrity: becoming a person who is finely self-aware and multi-dimensionally integrated (Cohen, 2015).

Inner work also develops awareness *in the moment*, cultivating a fine-tuned understanding of our own patterns of reactivity. The “inner state in which we can observe ourselves in action” is also known as *mindfulness* (Silsbee, 2004/2010, p. 19). Practicing moment-by-moment awareness welcomes choice in the responses to reactive situations. A large factor of mindfulness and inner work is to analyze default responses, or *habits*. Habits are conditioned patterns of behaviour that have become automatic or unconscious to us (Duhigg, 2014). Mindfulness practices opens our observation to these patterns as they arise, and through inner work, we recognize habits, sit with the experience, reflect upon the experience, and explore the experience (Cohen, 2009). We come to understand our default reactions and discover the true reasons and motivations behind them. Mindfully examining our habits allows us to determine their beneficial or harmful consequences and to let them go if necessary.

Mindfulness practices occur through meditation, centering, physical activity, creativity, or spending time outdoors. With attention and effort, mindfulness practices build the ‘muscle’ of self-awareness. We discover the wholeness of ourselves and our experiences through the practice of being “aware of our bodies, aware of our feelings and emotions, aware of our thoughts, and aware of events, as they occur, moment by moment” (Das, 1997, p. 19). Separation between the physical and emotional self fragments the awareness of our original wholeness; especially in the case of workplace environments.

Painting, drawing, performing music; or physical fitness, such as running, going to the gym, martial arts, and yoga are some of the many paths to developing personal wholeness. Meditation practices, breathing exercises, journaling, and dream analysis are also forms of mindfulness and awareness. These practices assist people in reconnecting with and attending to their bodies, emotions, and their minds as a whole—a unity of self—through the development of different aspects of self. As described prior, the fragmentation of different parts of the self has become normalized. Becoming *whole* requires the exploration of the connection between our fragmented selves and our holistic qualities. Inner work with the intention of genuine personal growth is an intrinsic approach to wholeness. This approach—the methodology of becoming whole— is currently missing within leadership literature and leadership education (Cohen, 2009; Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

How do we *practice* inner work? Cohen (2011) suggests that inner work begins with an event that triggers an inner experience, and the subsequent awareness that this inner experience has actually occurred. Often, in our busy lives, the subsequent awareness is absent. Or, the “fraction of second” awareness goes unattended to. Allowing ourselves to become aware of the inner experience, and to attend to it, begins the inner work. We reflect upon the event, our actions, and others involved; instead of “rehashing” the event and reacting to it. We search for the unconscious patterns and habits that may underlie the images, memories, and associations of the event, and bring these patterns into our awareness. Searching for and sitting with these patterns creates a ‘space’ for and around them. This spaciousness grants a different perspective and choices of interpretation and response become available to us.

Maslow’s (as cited in Schein, 2010) conception of the hierarchy of human needs (1954) proposes that self-actualization cannot take place without underlying social needs being met, and social needs in turn cannot be met without survival needs being met. What this means is that it is very difficult for people to focus on integrating their inner worlds and outer worlds if they are worried about losing their jobs. Losing a job increases anxiety around survival. Focusing on integrating inner and outer worlds is impossible when one is worried about their ability to survive. Personal growth takes a back seat: “if the individual is in a survival mode, economic motives will dominate” (Maslow, as cited in Schein, 2010, pp. 144-145). As this mode of “survival” is endemic to the competitive nature of the economic world, it has profound effects on both organizational business cultures and those operating within them. The ability to engage in inner work is challenged by the necessity of meeting basic needs that are threatened by the necessity of economic survival in the workplace. The seed of self-awareness, the precursor to inner work, lies dormant. For many, perhaps doing inner work and having them move into a self-authoring mindset may put them at odds with their job, where they may choose to leave their job and find something else, something that may be more a right fit. For some fortunate ones, they are able to move into the self-authoring mindset and discover that they are working in a job that has room for growth and that they can make changes, so the fit for them is right.

It is often very challenging to suggest to someone that they would be benefit from making time to develop an inner work practice. To make the time available to do inner work may sound like a low-level priority or a waste of time. However, those who have a discipline of some sort, whether it is martial arts or yoga, seem to be more open to the idea of inner work, as they are doing practices that require them to be fully present. Educator Parker Palmer has also strongly argued for increasing the value of inner work. Palmer (2000) states: “if people skimp on their inner work, their outer work will suffer as well" (p. 91). He promotes that inner work should become a commonplace phrase in order that people understand that inner work is as real as outer work and can involve skills that one can develop. His words apply to business leadership as well.

5. 4. Self-awareness and Leadership

Self-awareness is an essential quality of leadership. Self-awareness is what allows people to make meaningful changes in their lives. As one is aware of their beliefs and values, they can have developed a good understanding of their own behaviour and make changes that are meaningful to them. Self-aware leaders who know their strengths and weaknesses can increase trust with others, thereby increasing credibility.

Within leadership literature, there is agreement that a leader’s self-awareness is the cornerstone to leadership development (Goleman, 1995/2005; Bennis, 2009/1989). Cashman (2008) defines “authenticity” as “the continual process of building self-awareness of our whole person—strengths and limitations” (p. 36). Cashman further asserts that leaders who continue to work on themselves are able to transcend their egos and move towards authentic service and contribution: “[T]he awareness of their own strengths and vulnerabilities allows authentic leaders to focus on the team, organization, and marketplaces, not on themselves” (p. 37). Leaders who understand their own inner processes and know the “landscape of their personal consciousness” have a greater understanding of their effect on those whom they lead (Cohen, 2011, p. 3). While many people think of leadership as leading others, I agree with the leading authors of leadership curriculum who state that leadership begins with leading ourselves (Bennis, 2009/1989; Brownstein, 2010; Goleman,1995/2005). Leadership is not a mantle that one picks up and takes off; it is integrated in one’s way of being through the ongoing process of self-development, as Kouzes and Posner (2002) argued: “[T]he instrument of leadership is the self, and the mastery of the art of leadership comes from the mastery of the self” (p. 391).

Research in emotional intelligence and leadership has shown that having the capacity to engage in inner work is essential to achieving integrated leadership (Cashman, K, 2012, 2008; Chaskalson, M., 2011; Goleman, D. 2013, 1998) If we want to be able to provide leadership in such a manner that helps to co-create a humanized work environment, where we value people intrinsically and honour their wholeness, we must embody a working knowledge of what that means *personally*. This requires experimenting with our selves—trying new way of being and being open to change. Our own life is the practice field for what we bring to our work, to our working relationships.

.

Many leadership models focus on the external drivers of leadership (i.e. vision, innovation, results, drive) instead of going to the fundamental essence of leadership itself. Bill George, former Chairman and CEO of Medtronic, has moved away from this instrumentalist approach, arguing that "as leaders, the more we can unleash our whole capabilities—mind, body, spirit—the more value we can create within and outside of our organization" (as cited by Cashman, 2008, p. 25). However, it does take work for an individual to become self-aware:

> If knowing yourself and being yourself were as easy to do as to talk about, there wouldn't be nearly so many people walking around in borrowed postures, spouting secondhand ideas, trying desperately to fit in rather than to stand out. (Bennis, 2009, p. 212)

The inner state of the leader is key to the effects and impact that a leader may have in an organization. For example, one can consider the same leader responding to similar situation with the same words in two different instances but having very different results depending on the leader's inner state. If the leader's inner state is rigid and controlling, the result may be one of triggering defensiveness or resistance in his or her employees; whereas, if the leader's inner state is relaxed, open, and optimistic, the same words are more likely to invite openness and acceptance from others. For people to become more whole and grow into effective leaders, they must be asking themselves the critical questions, while looking for their own personal truths. If we can understand how one's family, social, and culture has shaped his or her life, we can then look at our work situations with a clearer vision.

Although inner work may bring about a transformation in the individual, it does not automatically lead to organizational change, if the culture is unwilling to change. I argue that inner work *within leadership* allows leaders to recognize that there is a problem. Organizational change cannot occur just through the intentions and actions of the workers. It must be facilitated through the organization's leaders. As leaders set the tone for the culture of the organization, leaders need to do inner work themselves, and include it as a part of leadership work. Leaders have to be congruent within their espoused values and beliefs for the organization, and the actions that they take. For example, how many mission statements assert that "customer service is a priority," but in practice customer service is neglected?

Leaders have to believe that businesses can be run with integrity and with concern for the wholeness of their employees. Palmer (1998) argued that "good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p. 10). This premise can and should be applied to leadership. Palmer maintains that "all human activity emerges from our inwardness" (cited by Intrator, 2005, p. xxxix). The work we do in the world is a projection of our inner state, meaning that how we relate to the world and to others comes from how well we know and understand ourselves. Inner work is thus essential to leaders in society. Leaders inspire and empower others by the way they live their values regardless of role or position in a family, organization, or community. Leadership belongs to everyone, not just to those in positions of power. It is from this understanding that I propose inner work as a practice that leaders can begin to undertake in their own lives to humanize the workplace.

5. 5. Sample practice exercise of inner work

I shall end this chapter on inner work with a short sample practice of inner work. There are many ways that one can approach inner work. When I was doing the training course with Avraham Cohen (1993), there was one particular exercise out of many that we did in class, and this one stayed with me: I found it to be eminently shareable. I have shared on numerous occasions with colleagues who have been interested in inner work through a meditative/reflective practice and have had positive responses. As well, one of the reasons that I particularly liked this model is that it is not considered to be too far 'on the wild side.' The business environment is in general conservative. As well, business people are used to doing "post-mortems" on events and projects: that is, they are used to reviewing an organizational event and looking for what worked, what did not work, what changes need to be made for next time. Hence, this sample practice exercise that I am presenting here is not a stretch for people in organizations. Here are the four steps: *description, curiosity, reflection, and transformation*.

> Step 1 is describing the experience, event, or interaction that was important to you. Pay attention to your body's sensations, your feelings, your observations.
>
> Step 2 is being curious about the experience. Suspend any judgement. Ask questions of our behaviours, assumptions, beliefs related to the event. Did we respond, or did we react to the experience? If we reacted, was it an automatic pilot reaction or was it emotionally charged? What was our part in this event? This step is about asking the questions and exploring what happened.
>
> Step 3 is reflection and answering some of the questions in step 2. We will reflect on the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that we had at that time. We will look to see if there are any patterns to this. We will look to see if any of the actions or behaviours may roots in our personal history. There are many ways to do this step. Some may choose to take this into mediation or journal about it.
>
> Step 4 is taking the reflection and making decision to learn from this experience. This step is to gain learning from steps 2 and 3, and to have the ability to change the behaviour or response to a future similar event. (Cohen, 1993)

The above inner work exercise allows us to be able to look inwards and really consider the experience. By focusing on the experience and working with whatever arises from the experience, one is able to take ownership of one's experience, being able to be accountable and take responsibility. This then allows us to obtain some critical insights, which will allow for better decision making in the future. This process allows us to take an experience and work with it to develop self-knowledge.

When one has an understanding of the formations of one’s personal beliefs, perceptions and behaviour patterns, one is able to respond to events rather than react to events. When one has a strong knowing of oneself, it can assist in understanding of other individuals and group processes. It can allow them to become sensitive to developmental milestones and transitions. The above may assist leaders in becoming champions for humanistic behaviours and workplaces.

In Chapter 6, I provide suggestions of how to re-humanize the workplace and how to protect it dehumanization. Within the fourth industrial revolution, machines are adopting advanced technological processes and are performing tasks we thought were impossible. Jobs that require knowledge workers may not exist in the next ten years. However, the creativity that is desired within this Industrial Revolution comes through innovation and collaboration; people need social skills to work with others. Many organizations are currently implementing interdepartmental or interdisciplinary teams to promote the idea of the ‘relationship worker,’ who is able to build authentic relationships with his or her colleagues and clients. These qualities are now essential. I argue that the opportunity to create more humanized environments is present. Rehumanization is a considerable project to tackle.

Chapter 6. Rehumanization project

Creating truly humane organizations within a societal structure that supports alienation, oppression and exploitation of human and natural resources may be difficult. One thing is certain: to implement organizational change, we must organize ourselves in a more humane way. However, this is easier said than done: changes to our fundamental view and understandings of the world and ourselves is a lengthy process. The difficulty in this process can be explained by the metaphor of the fish being unaware of the water it lives in. Unless and until water is removed from the fish, it will remain invisible. The phenomenon of dehumanization reflects this metaphor.

6. 1. Making Dehumanization Visible in Culture

To re-humanize organizational cultures, the phenomenon of dehumanization must be recognized. After uncovering the issue of dehumanization, the organizational culture must change in order to resist dehumanizing thoughts and behaviours. Organizational culture is defined as:

> the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (Schein, 2010, 1992 p. 18).

The prominent scholar Edgar H. Schein was the first person to address organizational culture. He demonstrated the structure of organizational culture to employees by dividing the organization into three levels: *artefacts and symbols*, the observable aspects of the company such as websites, logos, the architecture of the building, the language used, mission statements, organizational charts, and job descriptions; *espoused values*, the standards, values, and behaviours of the employees in the organization; and *basic underlying assumptions*, deeply embedded and unconscious thoughts and actions that the organizational culture promotes. Underlying assumptions are manifested through behaviours of the employees.

In corporate organizations, dehumanization is hidden within espoused values and basic underlying assumptions. For example, an espoused value is the organizations' expectation that all employees are professional. The expected behaviour is task completion even with an unreasonable workload. Overwork is misinterpreted as employee professionalism and is supported by the unconscious underlying assumption that professionalism is directly correlated with overwork. The assumption becomes a reality when this practices is repeated over a long period of time. Along the way, the espoused value is generated. Under my scrutiny, the prevalent phenomenon is workplace stress. I raise the question: when people experience high workplace stress within an organization, is it *a dehumanized work environment*?

Researchers have found that staff turnover is correlated with high workplace stress and poor organizational culture (Kegan & Lahey, 2016; Amabile & Kramer, 2011; Hamel, 2007). Employee turnover is the replacement of employees who exited the organization with new employees. Rehiring and training for the same position is costly and time consuming and negatively effects employee morale. Employee turnover occurs when supervisors have poor communication skills; workload is overwhelming; employees are unrecognized; low to zero salary increases, and the working environment is poor. Employee turnover due to overwork, feeling devalued, and working for someone with poor interpersonal skills should be considered a red flag for dehumanization.

Although, low employee turnover does not mirror a humane organizational culture. People experiencing financial insecurity, survival mode, and feeling burnt-out are not going to leave their paying job. There are times that a lack of high turnover can simply be more a statement of people not wanting to leave their job at this time, as they at least know what they have rather than take on a job that they are uncertain. Job searching for someone feeling burnt-out requires too much energy and time. Similarly, professionals close to retirement may feel obligated to remain in their current job, despite the dehumanizing environments. If employee turnover is low, *how can leaders recognize dehumanization in their organizations*? On an individual level, workplace stress may be an indicator of a dehumanized organizational culture. *What are the observable indicators of dehumanization that a leader must attend to?* In addition to employee turnover rates, employee disengagement can be a serious indicator of a dehumanized environment.

According to William Kahn (1990) and Arlie Hoshchild (2012/1983), disengaged employees uncouple themselves from work roles and withdraw physically, cognitively, or emotionally. Physically, cognitively, or emotionally withdrawing are contributors to the fragmentation of the self. Disengaged employees are showing signs of the dehumanization criteria that leaders must address. The Canada Conference Board (2016) drew data from a survey of 400 Canadian employers and from a 10-year longitudinal data base of engagement surveys (Armstrong & Wright, 2016). In addition, Psychometrics Canada Ltd (2010) also gathered data on 368 HR professionals working in business, government, consulting, universities, and not-for-profit organizations (Baker, 2010). Both studies reported a range of 25-30% of engaged employees while 70- 75% are disengaged. Disengaged employees are costing Canadian employers approximately $350 billion per year.

To improve organizational culture, organizations are hiring consultants to address the employee disengagement issue. Employee engagement is required during the 4th industrial revolution for innovation, and creativity. Fragmented selves, lack of trust, and feeling devalued and displaced are not supportive of innovation and creativity. I believe that employee disengagement is another symptom of dehumanized environments. Leaders need to consider the possibility that their working culture may be dehumanized. However, how do they recognize it? I argue that high turnover and/or disengaged employees are symptoms of dehumanization in the workplace.

Researchers claim that employee disengagement is an increasing trend and is not improving (Armstrong & Wright, 2016; Pech, 2013). Even with an increase in literature, coaches, and corporate trainers trained to improve employee engagement, the level of employee disengagement remains elevated. In order to improve employee engagement, leaders must reflect on their underlying basic assumptions to gauge whether or not dehumanization exists in their organizational culture. This third level of Schein's organizational cultural model is difficult to uncover because of its deep entrenchment within the corporate system.

6. 2. Psychological Conditions at Work

I imagine readers questioning my connection between dehumanization and disengaged employees. I have questioned this myself. I will refer to Kahn (1990) to evaluate my argument Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles” and stated that “in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p.694). His definition arises from the idea that people need both self-expression and self-employment in their professional lives (Kahn, 1990; Maslow, 2010/1962). Kahn speaks of three psychological conditions that, when present, have influenced people to engaged and when absent, have influenced people to disengage. The three psychological conditions are: "meaningfulness, safety, and availability" (1990, p. 703).

Psychological meaningfulness refers to the “feeling that one is receiving a return on investments of one’s self in a currency of physical, cognitive, or emotional energy” (Kahn, 1990, p.704). People experience meaningfulness when they are feeling valued, useful, and are recognized as making notable contributions to their work place. In the 3rd and 4th Industrial Revolutions, I identified the characteristics that devalued and displaced people resulting in dehumanization. The absence of work-related psychological meaningfulness ties into the absence of feeling intrinsically valued. Psychological meaningfulness is influenced by the job tasks, roles, and the interpersonal interactions (Kahn, 1990). People have the need to feel that the work that they do is meaningful (Maslow, 2010/1962). Job tasks that are repetitive, boring, or tedious have negative influences on psychological meaningfulness. However, if one perceives their work as making a larger contribution to society, this may increase psychological meaningfulness.

Role position and status influences psychological meaningfulness as it defines a person’s contribution to an organization. The role of an employee will impact the meaningfulness of a job. Job titles are important to job satisfaction because it may or may not fit a person's self-image. However, a poor fit between an employee’s role and their self-image does not encourage dehumanization. Dehumanization proceeds when someone’s role entices poor treatment or removal from the moral community. Psychological meaningfulness is increased through positive interpersonal interactions with mutual experiences of feeling heard; whereas negative interpersonal interactions may be subtle moral exclusions.

The idea that individuals obtain an inherent need to engage in work that they consider meaningful was first introduced by classic humanistic psychologists (Maslow, 2010/1962; Rogers, 1961). Maslow (2010/1962) stated that individuals who do not believe their work is meaningful of purposeful will not work up to their professional potential. His hierarchy of needs demonstrates that individuals are initially motivated to take action when inherent needs are fulfilled (e.g., breathing, eating, drinking, sleeping). As these basic survival needs are satisfied, individuals move to higher order needs, which are more intrinsic and reflective in nature; they reflect the life values of working toward a higher cause and leading a purposeful life. In accordance with Maslow's hierarchy of needs, the meaningfulness of a job extends from fulfilling survival needs to adding purpose to their lives. A job is meaningful to an individual to the extent that it fulfills the person's expectations

The second psychological condition that influences whether someone engages or disengages is *psychological safety*. Psychological safety is the sense of being able to be yourself without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career. It is the personal belief that you can speak up with questions, concerns, ideas, or mistakes and that you will not be punished (Kahn, 1990). It also instills a sense of safety in one's environment; there is trust, security, and clarity in terms of what is allowed and what is not allowed (Kahn, 1990). The feeling of trust is important in psychological safety. When the psychological employment contract was broken in the 3rd and 4th Industrial, businesses lost the trust of the general society and it has not been recovered. Consequently, the disconnect between leadership's actions and words has furthered the absence of trust in leaders, administrators, and coworkers.

Leadership and management style contribute to the psychological safety of employees. When leaders are incompetent, inconsistent with what they say, and do not appear to be trustworthy, employees will have a decreased sense of psychological safety. One's sense of psychological safety will affect their interpersonal relationships and the group dynamics. The group dynamics of an organizational culture can create the moral exclusion of an employee from within their own work group. A common example: when a morally excluded person begins to speak in a meeting, people psychologically distance themselves from that person by checking their smart phones or have a side conversation with someone else. This person is subtly, or even overtly, being morally excluded. Group dynamics contribute to the experience of delegitimization where the "in group" attribute negative traits to one or multiple employees in the "out group". The morally delegitimized employees may be pushed out of their job. When people lose their sense of psychological safety in the work place, they are fearful of rejection and choose to remain silent. For example, an employee who is self-conscious of themselves may not ask questions. Fears of appearing incompetent may remove the ownership of a mistake to avoid further exclusion.

Psychological safety is experienced as feeling that one is able to show one's self without fear of negative consequences to their position, credibility, or self-image. Kahn (1990) states that safety is determined by nonthreatening, predictable, and consistent elements in social situations in which workers can engage. A workplace climate that promotes and demonstrates open communication, supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships, and a sense of acceptance and belonging will foster feelings of psychological safety. To clarify, psychological safety allows for robust conversations with people with various perspectives.

The third psychological condition, *psychological availability,* is the sense of possessing the physical, intellectual, emotional, and psychological resources necessary to complete a job. There are four types of distractions that influence psychological availability: depletion of physical energy, depletion of emotional energy, insecurity, and our lives outside work (Kahn, 1990). The business world is notable for the depletion of physical energy because of stationary work environments; often hunched over a keyboard for more than seven hours a day. The exhaustion leads to a lack of exercise and a cycle is created. The depletion of emotional energy is caused by emotional labour and the struggle of engaging in interpersonal relationships or group dynamics. An employee with low self-confidence in their abilities or status may feel insecure in themselves. Insecurity is heightened due to the breach in the psychological contract and the potential of losing one's job. Our lives outside work, depending on the individual situation, also affects psychological availability. The depletion of physical energy and emotional energy are linked to preconditions of burnout and the fragmentation of the self. The machine-like persona resulting from exhaustion and emotional depletion only add to the dehumanizing environment.

It is important to consider the importance of employee work engagement. Employees who are truly engaged in their work are bringing their authentic selves into the workplace, and are having positive intrinsic experiences (Kahn, 1990; Posen, 2013). There are notable positive effects of engaging the whole self on physical well-being. Engaged employees will identify their work as relevant, important, and personally meaningful rather than reducing their life energy.

According to Kahn (1990), workers unconsciously ask themselves three questions in each work situation to determine personal engagement or disengagement. These questions are “(1) How meaningful is it for me to bring myself into this performance? (2) How safe is it to do so? and (3) How available am I to do so?” (Kahn, 1990, p.703). Kahn's model allows us to look at engagement from three different levels; the intrapersonal level, the interpersonal level, and the ultrapersonal level, or, within our profession.

Kahn’s three levels also impact the educational system, as workplaces and the classroom share similar qualities. As students obtain their education, they are also being prepared for the workforce., Some educators have recognized that the educational system is dehumanizing for both teachers and students (Shea, 2017; Kahn, 2017). The media reports stories of teachers doing "more with less." Classroom sizes and demographics are also problematic. The Gallup reports that 46% of K -12 teachers report high daily stress. Demands and expectations from students, parents, the administration, and colleagues increase the levels of daily stress teachers experience. Teachers assume the role of being role models to students, of care-givers, *and* educators. Teachers are showing the same level of occupational stress as physicians, nurses, and business managers (Koenig, 2014). In Canada, 70% of college and university faculty are not full-time positions. They are either contract, part-time, or sessional. Many faculty staff are concerned about their financial security (Chiose, 2018). Educators also report high percentages of burnout and depression, sometimes causing them to leave the discipline. Educators and teachers are not immune from dehumanization in their work environment.

Students can become dehumanized in the educational system because of the "one size fits all" model of education. The diversity of students from different backgrounds and life experience have varying abilities and needs, and these students need multiple approaches to learning (Bartolo et al, 2007). The “one size fits all” model of education expects that students learn at the same pace and in the same way. This is not true. When we force people (whether adults or children) to be educated in the same manner, we are not taking into consideration that we may be dealing with people who are from a culture with a different worldview from the dominant worldview. Therefore, this one- size fits all education can create inequality. While we refer to bureaucracies in the workplace, we need to recognize that schools are also a form of bureaucracy. When we look at the description of bureaucracy, we see that one of the features is objectivity. In a bureaucracy, people are looked at from an objective perspective, reduced to a number. When we look at the history of education, we see that the preparation for workers starts at a younger age. The actual socialization for workers happened when the workers first went to school. Training future workers with the required workplace skills became the primary goal for education. To produce the best workers, the educational system had to create a standardized method of assessment to objectively grade students on their progress. The evaluation method of the exam depersonalizes a person to a number or grade. This is depersonalization that can lead to dehumanization.

The first step in identifying dehumanization in an organization is for a leader to recognize the signs of dehumanization. I have identified employee turnover and employee disengagement as signals to a problem. A leader must question the nature of employee turnover to determine whether or not it relates to dehumanization. Additionally, the disengagement of employees may also signal dehumanization. Employees suffering from workplace stress or appearing disengaged are red flags to employers to look for further dehumanizing behaviours.

6. 3. Leadership for Re-humanization

A top-down approach to leadership continues to be prioritized in organizational culture. The leaderships influence over employees is tremendous and crucial. Leadership awareness of the dehumanizing organizational culture will enhance the possibility for change. The critical operative word is '*awareness*.' To facilitate change in organizational culture, leaders must become aware of and *feel* the problems first-hand. Opening awareness is the biggest obstacle in the initiation of change. Increasing leadership awareness is difficult because leaders are often disconnected from the employees in the organization. Leaders may only communicate with senior employees and only interact with other employees during all-staff meetings or staff functions. Consequently, senior employees may also be unaware of organizational problems because they may experience more psychological safety, psychological meaning, and work engagement. More foundationally, the organizational culture submerges the problem of dehumanization because the dehumanized culture is normalized, and oppressive behaviours are habituated.

Similar to organizational culture, leadership culture also arises within various philosophical paradigms. There are multiple leadership theories that would support the organic or integrative worldview. Servant leadership is a leadership philosophy where the leader prioritizes the needs of the employees over the organizational goals (Greenleaf, 1998). The authentic leadership philosophy (George, 2003) supports a truly genuine leader who obtains a high sense of self-awareness. Lastly, transformational leadership calls on the leader to create a vision for the company, identifies changes, and initiates the vision with commitment from the group (Laloux, 2014). Amongst these progressive leadership theories, I believe the relational model of leadership fully addresses an integrative world view

Susan Komives, Nance Lucas and Timothy McMahon (1998) describe a relational model of leadership as "a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change" (p. 95). This model of leadership values an ethical and inclusive ontology. It acknowledges that relationships are key to leadership effectiveness and acknowledges the varied group talents of the organization. Leaders in this model trust their employees to make the socially responsible changes to improve working conditions. Researchers describe the relational model of leadership as *aspirational* and does not reflect current leadership practices. The five main components of the relational model are: inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process-oriented. These five components provide a responsive approach to leadership.

An inclusive leader accepts diverse people and respects their points of view; empowers their employees and are purposeful in their goals and actions and are able to collaborate with others to establish a common purpose. The ethical component of the relational model grounds leadership standards in morality. Lastly, the process-oriented principle reflects upon the group dynamics and their efforts in obtaining a goal.

Through a humanizing perspective, these five components rehumanize organizational culture. Inclusivity requires the knowledge and understanding of one self and others. An inclusive organization must also be mindful of its own cultural structure. Inclusivity shapes a person’s values, where differences are valuable; fairness and equality are important for all (Keghan & Lahey, 2016, Laloux, 2014; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Empowerment instills a sense of value in everyone’s skillset. Feedback should be solicited and valued (Cohen, 2015). Power is willingly shared amongst the group. Empowered people encourage others, share information, create trustworthy environments, and promote self-leadership. A clear understanding of one's own vision and role defines purposeful thought and action. Believing in one’s own capabilities and in the organizations’ power to instil meaningful change influences the experience of purposefulness. Creating an accepting and inclusive organizational vision constitutes a purposeful leader. Ethical decision making includes an overall attitude that encourages trust and authenticity; values integrity and high expectations, does not tolerate poor behaviour, and actions that benefit others and not for self-gain.

Recognizing that the process of creating and maintaining an organization is as important as the outcome defines the process-oriented nature of the relational model to leadership. Collaboration in meaning making and providing and receiving feedback in a respectable manner will foster a process-oriented organizational culture. The skill sets involved in each of these components are acquired through beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge or understanding. Inner work is the foundational piece in developing moral attitudes.

While organizations are attempting to rehumanize the workplace, these changes are laboured and gradual. Recognizing the dehumanizing behaviours in the workplace sparks questions such as "What can we do to combat these immoral thoughts and behaviours?" Humanizing the workplace begins with people. I believe a paradigm shift in the workplace culture is necessary to develop a humanistic work culture. This shift encourages analyzing underlying attitudes, beliefs and values that support employees as human beings, rather than perpetuating the underlying beliefs that support 'human machines.’. The signs of a humanized work environment are the intrinsic valuing of employees who are treated fairly and with dignity and employees who perceive the meaningful essence of their contributions.

Top leaders within the organization need to demonstrate their support in valuing all employees for change to initiate and maintain. It is the 'tone at the top' that shapes and determines the workplace environment and culture. The 'tone at the top' is critical in setting the guiding values and ethical culture within the organization. Dynamics between top employees are evaluated by workers who analyze the consistency between leadership speech versus their actions. Consistency of leadership words and actions creates trust within an organization. Modeling behaviours establishes legitimacy in their actions opposed to “walking the talk.” Promoting employee well-being through discouraging employees to work when they are sick yet observing leadership work when they are sick illustrates the disconnect between policy and action causing employees to distrust their leadership team.

To demonstrate the intrinsic valuation of employees, leaders must implement policies and expectations that support a moral culture. However, unspoken expectations and values should be analyzed to determine their authenticity. Are the policies and expectations matching the espoused values? What are policies surrounding work hours and workloads? Are policies and behavior consistent within the organization? A common example of the disconnect between espoused and expected values is as follows:

An employee working at full capacity and often over capacity is instructed to take on additional tasks. The employee clearly states they are currently overcapacity and cannot complete the additional work. The employee suggests a compromise of delegating other tasks to accommodate the additional tasks. However, the supervisor replies, "I have faith in you. I know you can get this done."

I have experienced the above scenario in my own work experiences and have also observed the demoralization that occurs when an employee repeatedly experiences this. Employees assume that supervisors and leaders are aware of the work input of each employee, but it is not often the case. Bosses monitor output but are unaware of the effort, challenges, or sacrifices in completing tasks.

In re-humanizing the workplace, it is important to have emotional connections with staff through conversations in order to understand their contributions to the organization. Leaders also need to remain attentive to the organizational climate. Schein (2010) defined climate as "the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers, or with other outsiders" (p. 15). The perceptions and attitudes of the people in the organization determine the culture. Some offices reflect an upbeat and positive energy; while other offices demonstrate tensions. To determine an organizational climate and work culture, the administrative team can hire a third-party to complete a survey.

Workers who distrust employers are often disillusioned about their organization. When organizations state their value in workplace participation and input but do not follow through, trust is broken between employees and administrative teams. Often, democratic participation in the workplace is a cover for the same authoritarian leadership structures (Ciulla, 2008). Team or staff meetings are used to appease employees and limit potential resistance to employment practices by giving the appearance that the workers are empowered. Ciulla (2008) defines this “bogus empowerment” as:

> The use of therapeutic fictions to make people feel better about themselves, eliminate conflict, and satisfy their desire to belong, so that they will freely choose to work towards the goals of the organization (control of individualism) and be productive (instrumentalism). Leaders who offer bogus empowerment are unauthentic, insincere, and disrespectful of others. They believe that they can change others without changing themselves (Cuilla, 2008, pp. 64-65).

Organizational values of empowerment must be genuine and authentic. Leaders who initiate bogus empowerment cause long-term damage to the organization, and workers feel increasingly alienated as victims of bogus empowerment. True democratic engagement enforces the skills and consciousness necessary to build a strong organization. The “tone at the top” needs continuous reinforcement to maintain the desired culture. This is an ongoing process.

To promote underlying assumptions of a trustworthy organizational culture, the leader(s) must consistently demonstrate this value. Developing trustworthiness contributes to the psychological safety for employees. In addition, it may help decrease the sense of employee insecurity.

Intrinsically valuing employees and ensuring employees are aware of this is one of the most difficult transitions within a dehumanized organizational culture. Some leaders may believe they are treating their employees humanely, but others will not admit to a dehumanized workplace. Organizations are "brands," where any comments may hurt their reputation. To inspire humanistic policy changes, the top-level executives must become aware of the impact at the bottom line. To improve conditions of low-level employees, leaders should implement increased motivation and productivity, employee retention, decreased healthcare costs and absenteeism.

Fairness and equality are paramount to intrinsically valuing employees. All staff must be included in the moral community of the work place. *What does that look like?* An approachable place to begin is fair pay. Taking advantage of and exploiting employees for their hard work does not foster feelings of being valued. Fair working conditions can also aid in the intrinsic valuation of employees. Fair working conditions range from the physical environment to working hours. We need to recognize that physical environments contribute to people feeling either humanized or dehumanized. For example, offices with temperature problems and not prioritizing fixing this issue showcases a lack of human valuation.

Fair treatment in relationship with others, fairness within teams, and fairness across the organization can impact valuation. For example, some people may perceive an organization as accommodating if they address needs specific to their own, such as coming into work later because of parental responsibilities. However, across the organization, individuals may feel angered by this policy and feel penalized with earlier start-times. It is demoralizing when leaders, supervisors or managers do not recognize the discretionary effort on the part of the employee. Discretionary effort is the additional effort that an employee can choose to contribute or not contribute to the organization during the normal course of the job. Discretionary effort can be staying late to complete something or working a little longer to help others on the team. In addition, the recognition that is genuine and specific to the individual.

Employees will feel devalued with poor treatment. It is essential that leadership teams establish clear expectations of sensitivity and tolerance within the workplace. Asking employee to complete work can be respectful and patient. Genuine, frequent, clear, and consistent communication will gain trust of employees and improve psychological safety.

6. 4. The Work Ahead

This chapter suggested, especially at the leadership level, ways to improve the dehumanized workplace. Rehumanizing the workplace should begin now, within the fourth industrial revolution. Machines and technological advances are increasingly developing to complete human jobs. The jobs for knowledge workers may not exist in the next ten years. However, this industrial revolution needs creativity through innovation and collaboration; people need the skills to work together. Many organizations are implementing interdisciplinary teams to promote the role of the ‘relationship worker,’ who builds authentic relationships with colleagues and clients. There is a current opportunity to create more humanized environments.

Realistically, the re-humanization task is not simple to tackle. In our global humanity crisis, we must adopt a worldview that perceives the world as interconnected and, moreover, living and breathing, dying and regenerating. Without this epistemic shift, we will continue to make unethical, unhelpful, and harmful decisions, ultimately causing irreparable harm. We hear arguments for and against climate change. The facts explain the rise in sea levels, in earth's average temperature, in the ocean's temperature through shrinking glaciers. However, some believe that the climate models used to determine climate change are unreliable. On November 6, 2012, President Trump tweeted, "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive." The planet is sending distress signals in which the powerful political leaders are choosing to ignore and deny. This experience with climate change is similar to workplace environments. The increased stress of employees is a sign that the crisis is active here, too. Dehumanized people, whether they are conscious of it or not, potentially feel so overwhelmed that their vision of themselves and their connection to the planet becomes limited.

Applying the term "dehumanization" to the workplace is, understandably, distress-causing to workers and leaders. People do not want to address themselves as dehumanized and their workplace as dehumanizing. Workplace stress is prevalent and *normalized* in current ontologies and continues to socialize people into accepting it as normal. Nonetheless, people must come to terms of reality, attend to the severity of the crisis, and rise to action. Hence, I wanted to extend the continuum for describing the workplace culture from the current exclusive emphasis on people being stressed to beyond where we can talk our experience as dehumanization. It is my hope that the concept of dehumanization enter the language of business culture to transform policy.

POSTAMBLE

This study came to me at one of the most challenging times in my work career. I was pleased to be a contributor to the organizational change as I knew that this would be personally satisfying, and I knew that I was making contribution to my profession. However, I had concerns whether I would have a job after the organizational change, and internally, I was emotionally depleted and exhausted. I was running on empty and my life was narrowing, until the only focus was getting through my work. It was that pivotal conversation that triggered the idea and the questions surrounding dehumanization. As I struggled with the term, dehumanization and everything that it represented, I knew that something had to change within me, and I had to take a good hard look at my life, firstly as an individual, and then secondly as a professional.

I am not the leader of the organization; I am the leader of my team and at the same time, an employee. While I could not set the tone at the top, I knew that I was an influencer in the organization. I was known to be "relational" in my workplace and was referred to by some as the "camp counsellor" as different people would come to me with personal or work interpersonal challenges. As with any label being attached to a person, my being considered "relational" was positive, for others, it was considered an annoyance. The reason being was that some people thought that being "relational" meant that they had to ask me how I was or pretend to have some interest, when the reality was that they simply wanted to deliver a message and move on. I know that one of my strengths is in building good working relationships. I believe that in building good working relationships and effective working teams, it is important to develop your own people skills. How well I communicate, collaborate and deal with conflict will contribute to strength of the relationship(s) and the team. I do believe in scheduling time to build relationships with my co-workers. For some, it may simply be a check-in to see how they are doing, perhaps it is grabbing a coffee. When I am referring to scheduling time to build relationships, I am not referring to additional meetings or creating additional work for myself. I am talking about building in the time that fits for the nature of the work relationship. Taking the time to not only connect to someone but to actively listen to what the other person is saying. Sometimes it is simply to express appreciation for the work that they do. I also believe that part of creating good working relationships includes managing my boundaries. This means that although one of my values is maintaining good working relationships, I do not allow my work time to be eroded. I have developed a good way of integrating having good working relationships that enhance my work and not detract from it. I mention this as often I hear from colleagues, I have no time to talk and the emphasis on working relationships is simply too much. I do not believe this to be true.

As an influencer, my ability to contribute to re-humanization of the workplace is limited. However, I took on the role of the subtle activist. David Nicol (2015) described subtle activism as "representing a bridge between the consciousness movement and the movements for peace, environmental sustainability and social justice" (p. 1). I became what Margaret Wheatley (1999) called a member of the "disturbed group." The disturbed group is the group who are not happy with the current situation in the workplace and who are creating opportunities for change. Wheatley describes these people as ones who are motivated by intrinsic values and who are pursuing a higher purpose and creating more meaning in their lives. I believe that the inner work allows for individuals to become more fully developed as a person, allowing them to gain a more transformative consciousness, who are then willing to make effort to create change within or even at the fringes of the organizations that they work at.

I will share some of the things that I did that I believe contributed to the well-being of my team. The first thing that I did was work on my relationship with myself. I started to treat myself with more compassion and empathy. I had been very hard on myself when I was judging myself for coming up short in terms of self-care. I really focused on how I aspired to be and kept that vision alive. I also knew that I was in a time of intense work pressures and deadlines and was maxed out. I was not going to simply stop working or missing deadlines. I needed to focus on exactly where I was. I could acknowledge that I was not exercising on a regular basis, that my sleep was poor, and that I was emotionally exhausted and depleted. What one change could I do? The first thing that I did was to re-sensitize myself to the stress and pain around me. I had gotten so used to it, I did not have the body awareness to recognize that I was stressed. Then I started with the basics, on the physical level. I also started really examining my priorities, what really needed to be done and what could wait. What work could be delegated, if any? What work at home could be delegated, if any? I really examined what I was doing. I started with exactly where I was and did one change at a time. These changes were not noticeable to anyone but me. However, over time, I could notice internally that my stress level was decreasing. As I was doing this on a personal level, I was having these similar conversations with my team. Where were they in the present with their job? What was working and what was not working? What really needed to be done and what could wait? What work could be delegated, if any? My job was really to listen to what they had to say. I learned things that I was unaware of. Together we triaged the work in order to meet deadlines. In my team, we used the word "triage" a lot as the workload was high, so we worked in the order of deadlines, balancing continually, checking in with each other to see what had come in, what needed to be done. We also checked in on each other. How are you? What are you doing to take care of yourself? We had those conversations on a regular basis. We did not simply focus on our outer work experiences but also our inner work experiences. Triaging workloads is not the ideal work environment. It was fast-paced and can be tiring and exhausting. We focused on being intentional in our triaging of work and not reacting to the newest thing that was dropped on our desks. During the time of high "triaging" with the team, I noticed certain things, my team was an actual team. We worked together. We still worked longer hours at times to get the job done. However, it was not a chronic situation and it did not go unappreciated.

One of the more unusual things that I did with my team is that I learned their jobs. I wanted to know what the administrative staff jobs really required and entailed. I wanted to understand what it took to get the work done. I wanted to understand exactly what they did. This meant I knew what was possible and more importantly, what was not possible. The staff members did not have to come to tell me that they could not do the work in the work time, as I knew how long things took to process. As I have the detailed knowing, I also know if I am asking too much or when not to ask someone to take on an extra project. I have also been known to pitch in and help or provide coverage if needed. Having my team know that I know what their jobs are and how much work they do allows them to know that they can have a conversation with me about workloads, and I have empathy with them. Having an understanding of their jobs allowed me to see where efficiencies could be brought in. For example, I have a very good understanding of IT (information technology), so by knowing what they do exactly, where I could see technology assisting their jobs, I was an advocate to get the request made of our IT department.

At the same time that I recognized that I needed to be more focused on my own inner work, I also realized that multi-tasking was not allowing me to be fully present. For me, when I was multi-tasking, it was as if I was living in a state of urgency and reactivity. When I was multi-tasking, I would often feel as if I were on autopilot. I was not being intentional in my work, but rather reactive. I was feeling like I was on cognitive overload (Goleman, 2013). Therefore, I stopped multi-tasking. I found that by reducing distractions, I was increasing my efficiency and focus. As I recognized the benefits of not multi-tasking, I started recommending this to my team members. We started doing things such as turning off phones in meetings and being more intentional in our communications. Over time, we recognized that it was not simply that we were stopping multi-tasking in meetings, but rather we were showing respect for others and ourselves by being present.

However, I did notice that when I was being full present in meetings, the meetings often felt a lot longer now that I was paying attention. Being more present allowed me to recognize when I was feeling bored or irritated in meetings. I became more in touch with my feelings. While not all the feelings that I was getting in touch with where good feelings, as sometimes some of those feelings involved discomfort and pain. I unwillingly learned to recognize that things that are unpleasant or unfamiliar can teach us things that we need to know.

I was not always someone who was able to speak up at meetings. I erred on the side of caution and spoke up rarely. On more than a few occasions when I did speak up, it was because I was reacting to something that was either being said or proposed. If I was reacting to something that was being said, I was no longer listening to what was being said. However, by working with the practice of being in the present, I am able to attend to my own experiences (sensations, feelings, thoughts) and have choice in whether I choose to share or respond. With the focus of being more in the present, I have improved on my ability to separate data from interpretation and to be able to emphasize non-judgmental or neutral observations. Having a practice of being in the moment allows me to focus on the energy in the room. I become aware of energy or lack of energy in the room. Often the silence in a meeting can be holding onto so much energy, that it is palatable, even if no one is speaking.   In addition, through my studies, I had gained a larger perspective of issues at hand, meaning that I was looking at issues not from a transactional perspective but rather from a broader perspective. From my studies, I also had expanded my own personal worldview that I recognized staying quiet or being neutral could actually contribute to the problem. This has caused me to speak up more.

Earlier in the thesis, I spoke about the relational model of leadership. I see this relational model of leadership emerging from one's inner work. In the same way, one can think about inner work from a framework of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, or as Parker Palmer (1998) states, "head, heart, and practice," it is the same for relational leadership. If inner work can assist in helping one become a more integrated person, then I believe that this relational model of leadership can assist in humanizing the workplace.

While it might be said that nothing had radically changed in the reality around me, my way of looking at things did change dramatically. I could see things from different perspectives, and I had choice in how I responded. By continually working on myself and really discovering my inner self and how my inner life connected to my work life, I am on my way to becoming a more integrated person. I don't mean solely in connection with myself, but also with the world around me. Continuing to work on myself allowed me to expand my worldview, allowing me to have more choice in how I was seeing and doing things. By being able to fine-tune and raise my inner self, it allowed me to be able to create more meaning and a higher value to my work and my life, which, in turn exerted needed influences around me.

References

Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Review Press.

Amagasa, T. & Nakayama, T. (2013). Relationship between long working hours and depression: a 3-year longitudinal study of clerical workers. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine.* 2013 Aug. 55(8), pp. 863-872 doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e31829b27fa.

Amagasa, T., Nakayama, T. & Takahashi, Y. (2005). Karojisatsu in Japan: characteristics of 22 cases of work-related suicides. *Journal of occupational health.* 2005 Mar. 47(2), pp. 157-164.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.*

American Psychological Association (2017). *2017 Work and well-being survey.* Retrieved from http://www.apaexcellence.org/assets/general/2017-work-and-wellbeing-survey-results.pdf

American Psychological Association (2016). *The psychologically healthy workplace program.* Retrieved from https://www.apaexcellence.org/resources/creatingahealthyworkplace/

Angus Reid Institute (2014). *Three-in-ten Canadians say they've been sexually harassed at work, but very few have reported this to their employers.* Retrieved from http://angusreid.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/2014.12.05-Sexual-Harassment-at-work.pdf

Armstrong, J. & Freed, A.T. (1889). *Report of the royal commission on the relations of labor and capital in Canada*. Privy Council Office of Canada: Queen's printer and controller of stationery.

Armstrong, T. & Wright, R. (July 13, 2016). Employee engagement: Leveraging the science to inspire great performance. Ottawa, Ontario: Conference Board of Canada

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 315-338.

Bai, H. (2003). Learning from Zen arts: A lesson in intrinsic valuation. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 1*(2), 1–14. Retrieved from http://www.csse.ca/CACS/JCACS/V1N2/essays.html

Bai, H. (2001). Challenge for education: Learning to value the world intrinsically. *Encounter, 14(*1), 4Â–16.

Baker. S. (2010). A study of employee engagement in the Canadian workplace. Alberta: Psychometrics Canada Ltd.

Bandura, A. (2016). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves.* New York: Worth Publishers.

Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of moral education, 31*(2), 101-119. Retrieved from doi: 10.1080/0305724022014322 August 15, 2016

Bandura, A. (1991). Social Cognitive Theory of Moral Thought and Action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gerwirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behaviour and development Volume 1: Theory*. (45-103). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of the inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193-209.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(2), 364-374.

Bandura, A., Caprara, G., & Zsolnai, L. (2000). Corporate transgressions through moral disengagement. *Journal of Human Studies, 6*(1), 57-64.

Bar-David, S. (2015). *Trust your canary: Every leader's guide to taming workplace incivility.* Toronto, Canada: Fairleigh Press.

Bar-David, S. (2012). *Incivility, Harassment and Bullying: The Business Case.* Retrieved from http://www.sharonebardavid.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Business-Case-Respect-Website-Version-Dec-2011-2.pdf

Bar-Tal, D. & Oren, N. (2007). The detrimental dynamics of delegitimization in intractable conflicts: The Israeli-Palestinian case. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 31 (2007), 111-126.

Bardwick, J. (2008). One foot out the door: How to combat the psychological recession that's alienating employees and hurting American business. New York: Amacom

Barsalou et al, (2003). Social embodiment. *Psychology of Learning and Emotion*. (43). pp. 43-92.

Bartolo, P., Lous, A. & Hoffsass, T. (2007). *Responding to Student Diversity: Teacher Education and Classroom Practice.* Conference paper. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269707740_Responding_to_Student_Diversity_Teacher_Education_and_Classroom_Practice

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: The dehumanizing effects of social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 107-113. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022

Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2011, 11 07). Experiencing dehumanization: Cognitive and emotional effects of everyday dehumanization. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 33*(4), 295-303. doi:10.1080/01973533.2011.614132

B.C. Non-Profit Housing Association and M. Thomson Consulting. (2017). *2017 Homeless Count in Metro Vancouver. Prepared for the Metro Vancouver Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Entity.* Burnaby, BC: Metro Vancouver

Bendix, R. (1977). *Max Weber: An intellectual portrait*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. (Original work published 1960)

Bennis, W. (2009). *The essential Bennis: Essays on leadership by Warren Bennis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bennis, W. G. (2009). *On becoming a leader.* New York: Basic Books.

Betz, A., & Kimsey-House, K. (2015). *Integration: The power of being co-active in work and life*. Washington, USA: Change Maker Books.

Bonikowska, A. & Schellenberg, G. (2014). Employment transitions among older workers leaving long-term jobs: Evidence from administrative data. Statistics Canada: Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2014355-eng.htm

Boyle, M. & Parry, K. (2007). *Telling the whole story: The case for organizational autoethnography*. Culture and Organization. 13. 10.1080/14759550701486480.

Brown, B. (2012): *Daring Greatly: How the Courage to Be Vulnerable Transforms the Way We Live, Love, Parent, and Lead*. New York City, NY: Gotham

.Brown, R. B. (1997). Emotion in organizations: The case of English university business academics. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33*(2), 247-262.

Brownstein, B. (2010). The inner-work of leadership: A guide to personal and organizational transformation. New Hampshire, USA: Jane Phillips Publications LLC.

Bruch, H & Menges, J. (2010). The acceleration trap. Harvard Business Review, April 2010

Brynjolfsson, E. & McAfee, A. (2012). *Race against the machine: How the digital revolution is accelerating innovation, driving productivity, and irreversibly transforming employment and the economy.* Lexington, Massachusetts: Digital Frontier Press.

Burke, R.J. (2000). Workaholism in organization concepts, results and future research directions. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2:1-16.

Butler, E. A. & Egloff, B. (2003). The social consequences of expressive suppression. *Emotion,* 3, 48-67.

Campolo, T. (1992). *Everything you've heard is wrong*. Milton Keynes, England: Word Publishing.

Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (2017). *Violence in the workplace prevention guide.* Hamilton, Ontario: Author.

Canadian Payroll Association. (2017). *CPA NPW 2017 Employee Research Survey, National Press Release Results.* Calgary, Alberta: Framework Partners Inc. Retrieved from https://umanitoba.ca/admin/financial_services/media/CPA_2017_NPW_NATIONAL_MEDIA_DECK_FINAL_EN.pdf

Canadian Teachers' Federation National Research, (2011). *The Voice of Canadian Teachers on Teaching and Learning.* Retrieved from https://www.ctf-fce.ca/Research-Library/TeacherVoice2011_EN_WEB-2ed.pdf

Cashman, K. (2012). *The pause principle: Step back to lead forward*. San Francisco: Berrett- Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Cashman, K. (2008). *Leadership from the inside out: Becoming a leader for life*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method.* New York: Taylor & Francis Inc.

Chaskalson, M. (2011). *The mindful workplace: Developing resilient individuals and resonant organizations with MBSR*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: how to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chiose, S. (2016) Statistics Canada to tally number of contract, part-time professors. The Globe and Mail. Published September 15, 2016; updated May 17, 2018. Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/education/statistics-canada-to-tally-number-of-contract-part-time-professors/article31922546/

Ciulla, J. B. (2000). *The working life: the promise and betrayal of modern work*. New York: Times Books.

Ciulla, J.B. (1998). Leadership and the problem of bogus empowerment in Ciulla,J. (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, pp. 63-86

Cohen, A., Fiorini, K. Culham, T., & Bai, H. (2013). The circle of leadership integrity within business organizations in Amann, W. & Stachowicz-Stanusch, A (Eds.) *Integrity in organizations: Building the foundations for humanistic management*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Cohen, A. (2015). *Becoming fully human within educational environments: Inner life, relationship, and learning.* Burnaby, BC: The Write Room Press.

Cohen, A. (2009). Gateway to the dao-field: Essays for the awakening educator. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press

Cohen, A. (2004). Dissociative identity disorder: Perspectives and alternatives. *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry,* 6(3) Fall/Winter 2004, 217-230.

Collins, M. (2001). Who is occupied? Consciousness, self awareness and the process of human adaptation. *Journal of Occupational Science, 8*(1), 25-32.

Colvin, G. (2015). *Humans are underrated: What high achievers know that brilliant machines never will.* New York: Penguin Random House LLC.

Compton, Susan. 2011. "What's stressing the stressed? Main sources of stress among workers." *Canadian Social Trends. No. 92*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11-008-X. p. 44-51.

Cropley, M. (2015). *The off switch: Leave on time, relax your mind but still get more done.* Ebury Publishing Ltd.

Das, L. S. (1997). *Awakening the Buddha within*. New York: Broadway Books.

Deloitte (2018). Deloitte 2018 global human capital trends. Deloitte Insights: Author Retrieved from https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/focus/human-capital-trends/2018/introduction.html

Descartes, R., 1596-1650. (1989). *Descartes: Selected philosophical writings*. (J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, & D. Murdoch, Trans.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1988)

Dibbon, D. (2004). *It's about time: A study of the impact of workload on teachers and students.* Newfoundland and Labrador Teacher's Association. Retrieved from http://files.nlta.nl.ca/wp-content/uploads/public/documents/wrkldstudy_rprt/wrkldrprt04.pdf

Diefendorff, J. M., & Richard, E. M. (2007). Not all emotional display rules are created equal: distinguishing between prescriptive and contextual display rules. In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *Research Companion to Emotion in Organizations* (pp. 316-334). Northampton, CT: Edward Elgar.

Dougherty, D. S., & Drumheller, K. (2006). Sensemaking and emotions in organizations: accounting for emotions in a rational(ized) context. *Communication Studies, 57*(2), 215-238.

Downing, R. (2011, November 20). *Understanding Integration*. Retrieved from www.sidran.org/sub.cfm?contentID=73&sectionid=4

Drucker, P. (2001). *Essential Drucker*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Duhigg, C. (2014). *The power of habit: Why we do what we do in life and business*. Canada: Anchor Canada.

Dumas, T. & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2015). The Professional, the Personal and the Ideal Worker: Pressures and Objectives Shaping the Boundary between Life Domains. *The Academy of Management Annals*. 9. 1-69. 10.1080/19416520.2015.1028810.

Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (2017). *Something's got to give: Balancing work, childcare, and eldercare.* Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (2012). *Revisiting Work-Life Issues in Canada: The 2012 national study on balancing work and caregiving in Canada.* Ottawa, Ontario: Government of Canada.

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2003). *Work-life conflict in Canada in the new millenium: A status report* (Final Report October 2003, pp. 1-154). Toronto, Canada: Health Canada.

Eichenwald, K. (2005). *Conspiracy of fools: A true story*. New York: Broadway books.

Ellis, C. & Bochner, A (1996) *Composing ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing.* Walnut Creek, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic reflections on life and work*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press

Fassel, D. (1990, 2000). *Working ourselves to death: The high cost of workaholism and the rewards of recovery.* Lincoln, NE:iUniverse.com

Fenner, P. (2007). *Radiant mind: Awakening unconditioned awareness*. Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

Ferris, P. (2004). A preliminary typology of organizational response to allegations of workplace bullying: See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling* - BRIT J GUID COUNS. 32. 389-395. 10.1080/03069880410001723576.

Fineman, S. (2007). *The emotional organization: Passions and Power* (S. Fineman, Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Fineman, S. (1993). *Emotion in Organizations* (S. Fineman, Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Fink, George. (2017). Stress: Concepts, Definition and History. 10.1016/B978-0-12-809324-5.02208-2.

Fisher, C.D. and N.M. Ashkanasy, 2000. The emerging role of emotions in working life: An introduction. J. *Organiz. Behav*., 21: 123-129.

Foulk, T., Erez, A., Woolum, A. Catching rudeness is like catching a cold; The contagion effects of low-intensity negative behaviours. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 101(1), January 2016: pp. 50-67.)

Fox, M. (1994). *The reinvention of work: A new vision of livelihood for our time*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues, 30*, 159-165.

Friedman, R. (2014). The best place to work: The art and science of creating an extraordinary workplace. New York: Penguin Random House LLC.

Frith, B. (2016). Over-ambitious workers make others insecure. HR Insider (April 22, 2016). Retrieved from https://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/article-details/over-ambitious-workers-make-colleagues-insecure-about-their-performance

Froese-Germain, B. (July 2014). *Work-life balance and the Canadian teaching profession.* Canadian Teachers' Federation. Retrieved from https://www.ctf-fce.ca/Research-Library/Work-LifeBalanceandtheCanadianTeachingProfession.pdf

Fuller, R. (2003). Somebodies and nobodies: Overcoming the abuse of rank. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Galarneau, D. & Stratychuk, L.M. (2001). After the layoff. Perspectives on Labour and Income. October 2001 2(10). Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/75-001-x/01001/5960-eng.html

Gatto, J.L. (1999). Education and the western spiritual tradition. In S. Glazer (ED.), *The heart of learning: Spirituality in education.* New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goh, J., Pfeffer, J. & Zenios, S. (2016). "The Relationship Between Workplace Stressors and Mortality and Health Costs in the United States." *Management Science* 62, no. 2 (February 2016): 608–628.

Goleman, D. (2013). *Focus: The hidden driver of excellence*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gostick, A. & Elton, C. (2006). *The invisible employee: Realizing the hidden potential in everyone.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Grant, D., Keenoy, T. & Oswick, C. (Eds). (1998). Emotional Discourse in Organizations in *Discourse and Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc. pp. 51-64.

Grawitch, M. J., & Ballard, D. W. (Eds.). (2016*). The psychologically healthy workplace: Building a win-win environment for organizations and employees.* Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Gray, J. (2010). *How leaders speak: Essential rules for engaging and inspiring others.* Toronto, Ontario: Dundurn Press.

Greenleaf, R. (1996). *On becoming a servant-leader* (1st ed). Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Griffiths, M.D. (2011). Workaholism: A 21st century addiction. *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 24, 740-744.

Gross, J.J. (2012). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39(2002), 281-291.

Gross, J.J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*. 2(3), 271-299.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348- 362. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348

Grove, S. J., & Fisk, R. P. (1989). Impression management in services marketing: A dramaturgical perspective. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 427-438). Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. (An earlier version of this article appeared in Berry, L. L. Shostack, G. L. & Upah, G. D. (Eds.). "Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing" (1983) (45–49) Chicago: American Marketing Association)

Hall, D. (2004). Self – awareness, identity, and leader development in D. Day, S.J. Zaccaro & S.M. Halpin (Eds.). *Leadership development for transforming organizations: growing leaders for tomorrow* (pp.153-176). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hamel, G. (2007). *The future of management*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Harrison, L.R., & Westwood, M. (2009). Preventing vicarious traumatization of mental health therapists: Identifying protective practices. *Psychotherapy (Chicago, Ill.).* 46. 203-19. 10.1037/a0016081.

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., Kashima, Y. & Bain, P. (2009). Attributing and denying humanness to others, *European Review of Social Psychology*, 19:1, 55-85, DOI: 10.1080/10463280801981645

Haslam, N. & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and Infrahumanization. *Annu.Rev. Psycho.* 65: 399-423

Haslam, N. (2015) Dehumanization and intergroup relations. *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology Volume 3: Interpersonal Relations*. American Psychological Association.

Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(3), 252-264.

Hatala, R. J., & Hatala, L. M. (2005). *Integrative Leadership*. Calgary, Alberta: Integrative Leadership Institute.

Hettiarachchi, H. (2017). *Workplace Bullying and Harassment.* Canadian Safety Council. Retrieved from https://hrinsider.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Bullying-Harassment-Feb-8-2017-handout.pdf

Hiyama, T., & Yoshihara, M. (2008). New occupational threats to Japanese physicians: Karoshi (death due to overwork) and karojisatsu (suicide due to overwork). *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 65*(6), 428-429. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/stable/25835227

Hochschild, A.R. (2012, 1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hodson, G. & MacInnis, C. (2016). Derogating humor as a delegitimization strategy in intergroup contexts. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science* 2(1):63-74.

Insights West. (June 15, 2017). *Nurses, doctors and scientists are Canada's most respected professionals.* Vancouver, BC: Author. Retrieved from https://insightswest.com/news/nurses-doctors-and-scientists-are-canadas-most-respected-professionals/

International Labour Organization. (2016). *Workplace stress: A collective challenge.* Geneva, Switzerland: ILO publications. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/safework/info/publications/WCMS_466547/lang--en/index.htm

International Labour Organization. (2013). *Case study: Karoshi: Death from overwork*. Geneva, Switzerland: ILO publications. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/safework/info/publications/WCMS_211571/lang--en/index.htm

Intrator, S. M. (in press). *Living the questions: Essays inspired by the work and life of Parker J. Palmer*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, R. A. (1986). *Inner work: Using dreams & active imagination for personal growth.* San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.

Kahn, P. E. (2017) The flourishing and dehumanization of students in higher education, Journal of Critical Realism, 16:4, 368-382, DOI: 10.1080/14767430.2017.1347444

Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *The Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/256287

Kanigel, R. (2005). *The one best way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the enigma of efficiency.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Original work published 1997)

Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the metaphysic of mor*als (H. J. Paton, Trans.). New York: Harper & row, Publishers, Incorporated. (Original work published 1948)

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2016). *How we way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2016). *An everyday culture: Becoming a deliberately development organization*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kivimaki, M., Joekla, M., Nyberg, S, Singh-Manoux, A., Fransson, E., Alfredsson, L., Bjorner, J., Borritz, M., Burr, H., & Casini, A. (2015). Long working hours and risk of coronary heart disease and stroke: A systemic review and meta-analysis of published and unpublished data for 603 838 individuals. *The Lancet*, Volume 386, Issue 1005, pages 1739-1746. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60295-1.

Klein, S., Ivanova, I. & Leyland, A. (2017). *Long overdue: Why BC needs a poverty reduction plan*. Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives: Vancouver, BC. Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca

Koenig, A, (2014). Learning to Prevent Burning and Fatigue: Teacher Burnout and Compassion Fatigue. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 1928. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1928

Komives, S., Lucas, N., McMahon, T. (2013). *Exploring leadership for college students who want to make a difference*. Third Edition. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krause, ED, Mendolson, T, & Lynch, TR. (2003). Childhood emotional invalidation and adult psychological distress: The mediating role of emotional inhibition. *Child Abuse Negl.* Feb; 27(2): 199-213.

Kumar, A., Prasad, M., & Kathuria, P. (2014). Sitting occupations are an independent risk factor for Ischemic stroke in North Indian population. *The International journal of neuroscience, 124 10*, 748-54.

Laing, R. D. (1969). *The politics of experience and the bird of paradise*. Baltimore: Penguin Books Ltd. (Original work published 1967)

Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing organizations: A guide to creating organizations inspired by the next stage of human consciousness*. Brussels, Belgium: Nelson Parker.

Lammers, J., & Stapel, D. A. (2011). Power increases dehumanization. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(1), 113-126. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430210370042

LaRochelle-Cote, S & Gilmore, J. (2009 December). *Canada's Employment Downturn*. Statistics Canada: Catalogue no. 75-001x. Retrieved from https://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2009112/pdf/11048-eng.pdf

Latane, B., & Darley, J. (1969). Bystander "Apathy". *American Scientist*. Vol. 57, p. 244-268.

Leyens, J. Ph., Paladino, P. M., Rodriguez, R. T., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez, A. P., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice: The role of secondary emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 186–197.

Leyens, J. Ph., Cortes, B., Demoulin, S., Dovidio, J. F., Fiske, S. T., Gaunt, R., Paladino, M. P., Rodriguez, A. P., Rodriguez, R. T., & Vaes, J. (2003). Emotional prejudice, essentialism, and nationalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 704-717.

Lovelock, J. (2009). *The vanishing face of gaia: A final warning*. New York: Penguin Group (USA) Inc.

Lower, J.A. (1991). *An outline history of Canada*. Toronto, Ontario: McGraw Hill Ryerson.

Luke, P. (2014, January 12). Longer hours, more stress: The new reality in the Canadian workplace. *National Post.* Retrieved from http://www.nationalpost.com

Macqueen, K., Patriquin, M., & Intini, J. (October 15, 2007) Workplace stress costs the economy billions. *Macleans.*

Mariappanadar, S. & Aust, I. (2017) The Dark Side of Overwork: An Empirical Evidence of Social Harm of Work from a Sustainable HRM Perspective, *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 47:4, 372-387, DOI: 10.1080/00208825.2017.1382272

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Los Altos, CA:ISHK

Maslach, C, Schaufeli, W. & Leiter, M. (2001). Job burnout. *Annu.Rev. Psychol*., 52:397-422

Marglin, S. A., & Schor, J. B. (2007). *The Golden age of capitalism: Reinterpreting the postwar experience*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Marlow, T. (July 7, 2016). France Telecom accused of driving employees to suicide. The *Irish Times.* Retrieved from https://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/europe/france-t%C3%A9l%C3%A9com-accused-of-driving-employees-to-suicide-1.2713958

Maslow, A. H. (2010). *Toward a psychology of being*. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing. (Originally published in 1962).

Mate, G. (2004). *When the body says no: The cost of hidden stress*. Toronto, Ontario: Vintage Canada.

Matousek, M. (2011). *Ethical wisdom: The search for a moral life.* New York: Random House Inc.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioural study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 371-378.

Milner A, Witt K, LaMontagne AD*, et al. (2018).* Psychosocial job stressors and suicidality: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Occup Environ Med* 2018;**75:**245-253.

Mindell, A. (1990). *Working on yourself alone: Inner dreambody work*. New York: Penguin Books.

Mindell, A. (1992). *The leader as martial artist: an introduction to deep democracy*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.

Monet, C. (2014). *Working to death in China: A look at the nation with the highest instance of death from overwork in the world*. http://thediplomat.com/2014/03/working-to-death-in-china/ (Accessed on 04/28/2018)

Montagu, A., & Matson, F. (1983). *The dehumanization of man*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Montagu, A. (1966). On being human. 2nd edition. New York: Hawthorn Books Inc. (Original published in 1950).

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). Emotions of the workplace: Neglect of the Organization. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 21(*7), 801-805.

Mueller, R. (2005). Bullying bosses: A survivor's guide: How to transcend the illusion of the interpersonal. San Francisco, CA: Bullyingbosses.com

Namie, G. (2017). *2017 WBI. U.S. Workplace Bullying National Survey.* Workplace Bullying Institute. Retrieved from https://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/2017/2017-WBI-US-Survey.pdf

National Post (July 7, 2016). *Wave of suicides at France Telecom (now Orange) could send top executives to trial for harassment*. Retrieved from https://nationalpost.com/news/world/wave-of-suicides-at-france-telecom-now-orange-could-send-top-executives-to-trial-for-harassment

National Steering Committee on Resident Duty Hours (June 2013). *Fatigue, risk & excellence: Towards a pan-Canadian consensus on resident duty hours.* Retrieved from http://www.residentdutyhours.ca/documents/fatigue_risk_and_excellence.pdf

Nie, P., Otterbach, S., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2015). Long work hours and health in China. *China Economic Review*. Volume 33. Pp. 212-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2015.02.004.

Noer, D. (2009). *Healing the wounds: Overcoming the trauma of layoffs and revitalizing downsized organizations*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Oates, W.E. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction*. New York: World Publishing Company.

OECD (2016), Hours worked (indicator). doi: 10.1787/47be1c78-en

Opotow, S., Gerson, J., & Woodside, S. (2005). From moral exclusion to moral inclusion: Theory for teaching peace. *Theory into practice, 44*(4), 303-318. doi:10.1207/s1543042tip4404_4

Opotow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues.* 46(1). 1-20.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Palmer, P. J. (2000), *Let your life speak: Listening to the voice of vocation.* San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Palmer, P. J. (2007) A new professional: The aims of education revisited, *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39:6, 6-13, DOI: 10.3200/CHNG.39.6.6-13

Parrouty, J. (2013). *Stress management with intelligence: The cognitive science behind wellness*. Toronto, Ontario: Lulu Publishing Company.

Pearson, C., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, *19*(1), 7-18.

Pech, R. &, Slade, B., (2006) Employee disengagement: is there evidence of a growing problem? *Handbook of Business Strategy*, Vol. 7 Issue: 1, pp.21-25, https://doi.org/10.1108/10775730610618585

Perreault, S. (2015). *Criminal victimization in Canada, 2014.* Statistics Canada. Received from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14241-eng.pdf?st=YgMO0NbR

Pfeffer, J. (2018). *Dying for a paycheck: How modern management harms employee health and company performance – and what we can do about it.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers

Pirie, M. (2009). *101 great philosophers: Makers of modern thought*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Posadzki, A. (2017, June 21). *Royal Bank to cut 450 jobs*. *Globe and Mail*.

Posen, D. (2018). *Authenticity: A guide to living in harmony with your true self*. Canada: House of Anansi Press Inc.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. (1987). Expression of Emotion as Part of the Work Role. *The Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 23-37. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/257991

Reid, E. (2015). Embracing, passing, revealing, and the ideal worker image: How people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organizational Science*. 6(4). https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0975

Ritzer, G. (2011). *The McDonaldization of society 6* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Robbins, Mike (2018). *Bring your whole self to work: How vulnerability unlocks creativity, connection, and performance*. Carlsbad, California: Hay House, Inc.

Robinson, B. E. (2014). *Chained to the desk: A guidebook for workaholics, their partners and children, and the clinicians who treat them*. Third Edition. New York: New York University.

Rogers, C. (1961). On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy. London: Constable.

Rosen, E. D. (1993). *Improving public sector productivity: Concepts and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Rosenberg, M. (2009). Recession flattens accounting firms in '09. *CPA Trendlines: Actionable Intelligence for the Tax, Accounting & Finance Community*. Retrieved from https://cpatrendlines.com/2010/03/09/recession-flattens-accounting-firms-in-09/

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

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work and the will to lead*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Sapolsky, R.M. (2004) *Why zebras don't get ulcers: The acclaimed guide to stress, stress-related diseases, and coping*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. (Original published in 1994).

Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (Original work published 2002)

Schein, Edgar H., Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture, *Sloan Management Review*, 25:2 (1984: Winter) p.3

Schneider, K. (2004). *Rediscovery of awe: Splendor, mystery, and the fluid center of life.* St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.

Schoenewolf, G., (1990). Emotional contagion: Behavioral induction in individuals and groups. *Modern Psychoanalysis*. Vol. 15, pp. 49-61

Schwab, K. (2016). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Segal, J., & Jaffe, J. (2008). *The language of emotional intelligence: The five essential tools for building powerful and effective relationships*. New York: McGrawHill.

Shea, G. (2017). A dangerous game: The dehumanization of children in Massachusetts testing and data discourse. The Graduate Review (2) 71-78. Retrieved from http://vc.bridgew.edu/grad_rev/vol2/iss1/18

Sherrer, H. (2008). *Dehumanization is not an option: An inquiry into the exercise of authority against perceived wrongdoers.* Seattle, WA: Justice Institute.

Silsbee, D. (2010). *The mindful coach: Seven roles for facilitating leader development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (Original work published 2004)

Sloan, M. M. (2012). The consequences of emotional labor for public sector workers and the mitigating role of self-efficacy. *The American Review of Public Administration*. 44(3); 274-290.

Slopen, N., Glynn, R.J., Buring, J.E., Lewis, T.T., Williams D.R., et al. (2012) Job strain, job insecurity, and incident cardiovascular disease in the women's health study: Results from a 10-year prospective Study. *PLoS ONE* 7(7):e40512.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0040512.

Tarnas, R. (1991). *The passion of the western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view.* New York: Random House Publishing Group.

Taylor, C. (1985). The concept of a person. *In Philosophical Papers* (Vol. 1, pp. 97-114). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, F. W. (2010). *The principles of scientific management*. Ohio, USA: Forgotten Books. (Original work published 1911)

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal.* Apr 2000; 43(2), 178-190.

The Arbinger Institute (2008). *The anatomy of peace: Resolving the heart of conflict*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. (Original work published 2006)

Thomas, L. (1992). *The fragile species*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company

Tracy, S. (2005) Locking Up Emotion: Moving Beyond Dissonance for Understanding Emotion Labor Discomfort. *Communication Monographs*, 72:3, 261-283, DOI: 10.1080/03637750500206474

Van Dam, N., & Van der Helm, E. The organizational cost of insufficient sleep. *McCinsey Quarterly.* February 2016 Retrieved from: www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/the-organizational-cost of insufficient-sleep#0.

Van der Helm, E., Gujar, N., Walker, M.P. (2011). Sleep deprivation impairs the accurate recognition of human emotions. *Sleep 33* (no 3). pp. 335-342.

Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E.H. (1979). Towards a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 1:209-264.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* London, Ontario; The University of Western Ontario.

Virtanen M (2018).Psychosocial job stressors and suicidality: can stress at work lead to suicide? *Occup Environ Med* 2018;**75:**243-244.

Whyte, W.H. (2002). *The organization man*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Simon and Schuster Inc.

Williams, J., & Boushey, H, (2010). The three faces of work-family conflict: The poor, the professionals, and the missing middle. American Center of Progress. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2126314

Work Safe BC. (2013). *Employer Duties – Workplace bullying and harassment.* Richmond, BC. Retrieved from https://www.worksafebc.com/en/resources/law-policy/board-of-directors-decisions/bod-2013-03-20-occupational-health-and-safety-workplace-bullying-and-harassment-policies?lang=enYoshino, K. (2007). *Covering: The hidden assault on our civil rights*. New York: Random House Trade Paperback Edition.

Yoshino, K. (2006). *Covering: The hidden assault on our civil rights*. New York: Random House Trade Paperback Edition.

Zimbardo, P. (2006). The psychology of power: To the person? To the Situation? To the System in *Moral Leadership: The theory and practice of power, judgement, and policy.* (Eds. Rhode). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). Revisiting the Stanford prison experiment: A lesson in the power of situation. Vol.53 Issue 30, p B6-B7.

Zimbardo, P. (May 9, 2004) Power turns good soldiers into 'bad apples'. Boston Globe News. Retrieved from http://archive.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2004/05/09/power_turns_good_soldiers_into_bad_apples/