

Factors of Dehumanization of Dirty Workers: Multiple Stigmatization, Social Status, and Workers' sex

Научный руководитель – Агадуллина Елена Рафиковна

Ерохина Д.А.¹, Терскова М.А.², Анкушев В.В.³

1 - Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Факультет социальных наук, Москва, Россия, *E-mail: daerokhina@edu.hse.ru*; 2 - Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Факультет социальных наук, Москва, Россия, *E-mail: m_terskova@mail.ru*; 3 - Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Факультет социальных наук, Москва, Россия, *E-mail: vladislavankushev@yandex.ru*

Dirty work is defined as humiliating human dignity [7]. Stigmatization of dirty workers can lead to deterioration in subjective well-being and spread of prejudice and discrimination [2,3], lack of social support [8], and dehumanization [9]. Dehumanization can increase antisocial behavior towards its targets [8,9].

Previous studies have shown the different patterns in dehumanizing workers with various dirty stigmas. Since it was shown that the moral dirty stigma (related with violation of norms) is connected with animalistic dehumanization [4,8], the results for other stigmas were more contradictory: physical (related to dirt or death) and social (related to 'slavery' position) dirty stigma can be associated both with animalistic and mechanistic dehumanization [8,10]. So, the question arises on what these contradictions depend on?

The main aim of this study is to examine how different factors are associated with the dehumanization of dirty workers. As potential factors, we consider the combination of different dirty stigmas (because dirty jobs may have more than one stigma), work status (because both a low- and high-status occupations can have dirty stigma), and worker' sex (because there can be a gendered-work stereotypes).

The preliminary study was conducted to select examples of jobs with different amounts of dirty stigma. The preliminary list of dirty jobs included 68 examples of occupations including from previous studies [1,8]. The respondents ($N = 250$) rated on a 100-point scale the extent of perceived dirtiness and status for occupations. We selected 10 occupations with a different combination of dirty stigmas and status for the main study.

The main study was conducted to examine the relationship between the dehumanization of dirty workers, the combinations of stigma, social status, and gender. The respondents ($N = 558$) were presented with a dirty worker and rated on a 7-point scale the degree of his associativity with animal- and machine-related words that measure animalistic and mechanistic dehumanization, respectively. The combination of stigma, status and gender of the worker varied. A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to achieve the aim of the study. The results demonstrated that dirty workers differently dehumanized in animalistic and mechanistic ways, $\Lambda = 0.99$, $F(1, 538) = 6.37$, $p = 0.012$, $\eta^2 p = 0.01$ and that dehumanization is connected with different combinations of dirty stigmas, $\Lambda = 0.86$, $F(4, 538) = 22.79$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 p = 0.15$, perceived status of dirty work, $\Lambda = 0.97$, $F(1, 538) = 17.63$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 p = 0.03$, and dirty worker' sex, $\Lambda = 0.99$, $F(1, 538) = 6.92$, $p = 0.009$, $\eta^2 p = 0.01$. In particular, different dirty workers are more animalistically ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.44$) than mechanistically dehumanized ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.50$, $d = 0.10$). High-status workers ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.51$) are more dehumanized than low-status workers ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.43$, $d = 0.10$), male workers ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 1.44$) more than female workers ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 1.49$, $d = 0.14$), and workers without dirty stigmas ($M = 2.24$, $SD = 1.33$) as

well as workers with social & physical stigmas ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.47$) are dehumanized less than workers with all dirty stigmas ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.40$) and moral & physical stigmas ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 1.44$).

In general, dirty workers are mostly dehumanized animalistically. This effect may arise due to the fact that two stigmas are more associated with animalistic view: moral due to moral distance [4] and physical taint due to the connection with real filth and disgust[6].

The combination of stigma also influences the type of dehumanization: the lowest dehumanization is in the absence of all stigma and a combination of social and physical stigma. It can be explained by the fact that occupations with social and physical stigmas are perceived as 'necessity' [1].

Meanwhile the highest dehumanization is in the presence of all three and a combination of physical and moral stigma. This may be due to the fact that moral stigma is perceived as a 'stain' on a person's character and 'evil', not 'necessity', and physical stigma provides visible evidence of dirty work [1].

High-status dirty workers are more dehumanized than low-status workers because according to attribution of responsibility, it was their own choice of job that increased negative perceptions.

Among the dirty jobs, there are many examples of female-dominated work that is perceived as appropriate for women. Men performing stereotypically women's work are perceived as effeminate [10], which is more associated with animals [5]. Mismatch of gender roles explains why men performing dirty work are more animalistically dehumanized than women.

References

- 1) Ashforth B. E., Kreiner G. E. "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity // *Academy of management Review*. – 1999. – T. 24. – №. 3. – С. 413-434.
- 2) Barbosa L. Domestic workers and pollution in Brazil // *Dirt: New geographies of cleanliness and contamination*. – 2007. – С. 25-33.
- 3) King E. J. et al. The influence of stigma and discrimination on female sex workers' access to HIV services in St. Petersburg, Russia // *AIDS and Behavior*. – 2013. – T. 17. – №. 8. – С. 2597-2603.
- 4) Kteily N., Bruneau E. Backlash: The politics and real-world consequences of minority group dehumanization // *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. – 2017. – T. 43. – №. 1. – С. 87-104.
- 5) Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S.. Dehumanization and prejudice. // J. Dixon, & M. Levine (Eds.), *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality, and social change*. Cambridge University Press.-2012.- С.89-104
- 6) Hodson, G., Kteily, N., & Hoffarth, M. Of filthy pigs and subhuman mongrels: Dehumanization, disgust, and intergroup prejudice // *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*. – 2014. – T. 21. – №. 3. – С. 267–284
- 7) Hughes E. C. Good people and dirty work // *Social problems*. – 1962. – T. 10. – №. 1. – С. 3-11.
- 8) Terskova M. A., Agadullina E. R. Dehumanization of dirty workers and attitudes toward social support // *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. – 2019. – T. 49. – №. 12. – С. 767-777.
- 9) Valtorta R. R. et al. Dirty jobs and dehumanization of workers // *British Journal of Social Psychology*. – 2019. – T. 58. – №. 4. – С. 955-970.

- 10) Weaver R. et al. Men in nursing on television: exposing and reinforcing stereotypes
//Journal of Advanced Nursing. – 2014. – Т. 70. – №. 4. – С. 833-842.