A research agenda for dignity in international development

Tom Wein. The Dignity Project. tom.wein@dignityproject.net

Abstract: Dignity is much discussed in development, but only rarely investigated in any depth. This working paper highlights the major gaps in the literature, and suggests a series of research questions and possible projects that might help address those gaps. It is intended as a resource to guide all those doing research on dignity and development. We highlight a need for more research in three areas: measurement, describing the operation of dignity and respect, and testing acts that will increase respectfulness.

1. Introduction[1]

Dignity and its relationship to international development should be studied in greater depth. It is an important concept in international development and aid, with a major role to play in debates around economics, displacement, conflict, gender, disability and more. Dignity is also an essential concept in related fields, including law, medicine, and psychology. There are some indications of public support for more respectful international development, and the idea is related to many of the most important ideas in development discourse, such as capabilities, rights and wellbeing. There are extremely extensive Western and non-Western philosophical and popular traditions of using and interpreting dignity. All of this is covered in some detail in a previous narrative review of the literature on dignity by the same author (Wein, 2020). That review is an essential companion to this working paper, and should be read alongside this work.

If dignity is important, it is also under-defined and under-researched in international development (Wein, 2020). The very large philosophical literature has only rarely been brought to bear on the many uses of the word dignity, such that dignity is often used as an all-purpose repository for positive aspirations, employed without careful definition. There have been a few sustained interrogations of dignity among particular populations and in particular situations - for instance, the work on refugees by ODI (Mosel & Holloway, 2019), or on palliative healthcare (Chochinov et al, 2008) and maternal care (Kruk et al, 2018). These are noteworthy exceptions. There have been only a handful of attempts at measurement. Many places and popular understandings of dignity have received no academic attention. Only a handful of NGO programs have been evaluated for their

respectfulness. There has been even less attention to the roles of governmental or commercial interactions (Wein, 2020).

There are countless approaches to defining dignity. Investigating those, and their variance across cultures, is an important research question. However, for the purposes of this paper, in order to ground us in a loose common understanding, we borrow from the ideas of Remy Debes and others, to suggest that dignity is an innate kernel present in every person. It is inalienable; it cannot be increased or decreased, or stripped away. Because each person has dignity, they can make a claim upon others that they be treated with a basic level of 'recognition respect'. This differs from 'merit-based' conceptions of dignity, in which dignity and respect are accorded only to those who achieve a particular rank or feat, or conduct themselves in a particular way. We may wish to give additional respect to those people, but in the first place, everyone has dignity, and deserves that basic level of respect (Debes, 2017). For an in-depth discussion of the different contributions to this vigorous philosophical debate, see Wein (2020).

Drawing on the previous literature review, we can identify five main research questions: (1) How is dignity to be defined? (2) How can respectfulness be measured? (3) How does dignity and respect operate? (4) What acts increase perceptions of respectfulness, and what are the consequences of that? (5) How does international development regard dignity, and what actions will increase support for a dignity agenda?

We can organise our approach to these research questions by employing Evan Lieberman's handy research cycle model. Lieberman emphasizes the need to conduct and publish studies appropriate to the stage that the literature is at. In particular, he warns against skipping too quickly to causal identification, which is crucial but can come to dominate the literature on a topic, especially in economics and political science, to the exclusion of other vital parts of the research cycle. Lieberman suggests that we move progressively through six types of research: theoretical/normative reviews, descriptive, associational/predictive, natural experiments, early-stage experiments, and then late-stage experiments (Lieberman, 2016). We employ this approach below, with the addition of measurement as an important stage also.

In the second section of this paper, I summarise the state of the literature in respect to each of these research questions, highlighting the main relevant papers and the gaps. That work highlights the special urgency of research in response to the second, third and fourth research questions. In the following sections, I outline specific research projects that would address those gaps on measurement, describing the operation of dignity, and increasing respectfulness.

2. State of the literature

In the table below, we outline the available relevant research for each of the five research questions.

Question	Stage (Lieberman, 2016)	Published research
(1) Defining dignity philosophically	Theoretical and normative reviews	There is an extremely extensive literature from law, medicine, philosophy and psychology. Witte (2003) estimates that 1200 books and 11,000 articles were published on dignity in English from 1970-2003. Debes (2017) and Düwell et al (2014) are the central texts. Some limited exploration of an Africa-specific concept, including by Molefe (2019), and of other traditions around the world. A conceptual paper from ODI (Holloway & Grandi, 2018) usefully applies some of this work to international development, but it is rare in doing so.
(2) Measuring respect	Measurement[2]	There is only one published survey measure in international development: Shapiro, 2019. Some proposed measures include those by Twaweza, AfroBarometer, Integrity Action, PSJP, and the Dignity Project, but none of these are peer reviewed. In psychology, attempts have been made to measure respect for persons (Lalljee et al, 2008) and to chart the causal pathways of respect (Huo et al, 2010). In medicine, the Patient Dignity Inventory (Chochinov et al, 2008) has been extended to 9 countries. There is also the ICU-RESPECT measure (Geller et al, 2016). Measures for respectful maternal care have been developed in Pakistan (Hameed & Avan, 2018; Azhar et al, 2018) and Tanzania (Kruk et al, 2018; Sando et al, 2016).
(3) Describing the operation of dignity and respect	Descriptive research	Six country case studies have been produced by the ODI programme: Syrians in Lebanon (Grandi et al, 2018), Rohingya in Bangladesh (Holloway & Fan, 2018), IDPs in Afghanistan, Colombia and the Philippines, and South Sudanese in Uganda and Egypt (Holloway, 2019). Paller (2019) examines dignity in Ghanaian politics in detail. There is also some work on India (Roy, 2013; 2014), Southern Africa (Coundouriotis, 2006; Molefe, 2018), and on South Korea (Jo & Doorenbos, 2009). Discussions of the historical, religious and legal traditions of dignity in many different parts of the world are available in Debes (2017) and Düwell et al (2014).
	Associational / predictive	No published work has been identified within development studies. Some psychologists have looked empirically at the emotions around dignity: Badcott (2003), de Melo-Martín & Salles (2011), Fierke (2015), McCauley (2017), Hartling & Lindner (2017), Laham et al (2010a), and Laham et al (2010b).
(4) Increasing perceptions of respectfulness. Consequences of respectfulness	Natural experiment	None identified.
	Early-stage experiment	Thomas et al (2020) have looked at respectful treatments by NGOs in Nairobi. There are no equivalent studies for governmental or commercial interactions.

---

[2] Lieberman does not insert measurement as a separate stage of research, but he does describe it as a "prerequisite for excellence". I have included it as a separate stage, though naturally it has relevance for all stages.

		There are a large number of empirical studies in psychology on the effects of respectfulness, conducted mostly with Western populations in the laboratory (Huo et al, 2009; Dunning et al, 2016; Lalljee et al, 2007; van Quaquebeke et al, 2007; Pagliaro et al, 2011; Ellemers et al, 2004; Tyler & Smith, 1999; Simon & Stürmer, 2003; Smith & Tyler, 1997), and its implications (Voltmer & Lalljee, 2007; Lalljee et al, 2013, Huo & Molina, 2006, de Cremer, 2002; Sleebos et al, 2006, Miller, 2001).
	Late-stage experiment	One development-focused paper was identified which examines the effect of a randomized control on respect: Shapiro, 2019. In this case it focused on cash transfers vs in-kind interventions.
(5) Increasing support for respectfulness in development	Early-stage experiment	None identified.

As this table shows, there is a strong base of research that approaches dignity philosophically, and there is a need only to apply that to international development, as Holloway & Grandi (2018) have done, and as Wein (2020) does. When it comes to measurement, there is some existing work to draw on, but little has been directly applied to international development. A good start has been made on conducting descriptive research among several populations, but the vast majority of the world has not yet been covered. Almost no associational or predictive work has been published. Consequently it is not yet possible to generate descriptive or predictive theories of how dignity and respect vary across different populations or situations. A handful of early stage experiments make some contribution to our understanding of how to increase perceptions of respectfulness. All bar one of these was conducted in labs, mostly with WEIRD populations. There are no natural experiments, and only one late-stage experiment, in response to this question. No research has been identified on how to increase support for respectfulness, and there is consequently no base of research to begin to draw on. In the following sections, I discuss specific projects that would address some of these gaps. Where I am aware of in-progress but not-yet-published research projects that address these questions, I note these in the footnotes.

3. Measuring respect

In development studies, there have been few attempts at measurement. The one academic paper that does so (Shapiro, 2019) provides a valuable bank of questions, but little link to theory or definitions. Attempts in medicine are more developed, with several measures emanating from theoretical discussion. Yet even among these, there is significant variation in topics covered even when measuring identical interactions in similar contexts. Among the medical indexes, only the Patient Dignity Inventory (Chochinov et al, 2008) has been extensively validated. The most comprehensive measurement attempt is that put forward by Mansur Lalljee and colleagues, which is a developed and well-validated measure rooted in theory and deployed across cultures (Lalljee et al, 2008). This index, developed for use in social psychology, measures participants' unconditional respect for persons as a trait - a slightly different task to what we propose here. As yet, all the identified measures have been

in the form of surveys, and there has been no published attempt to develop incentive compatible measures.

In order to conduct quantitative research, unlocking many of the stages of Lieberman's research cycle, it is necessary to create reliable, valid quantitative measures. Many different approaches could be taken, but I suggest three types of measure that might be prioritised: a survey measure of respectfulness, a survey measure of respectedness, and an incentive compatible approach to measurement. Fourthly, it will be equally valuable to develop template qualitative protocols that might be adapted to a wide range of circumstances.

The first quantitative measure is perhaps the most intuitive - a simple survey measure of whether people felt that a particular interaction or process was respectful.[3] Such a question can easily be employed in measurement and evaluation surveys conducted by NGOs, governments or indeed businesses. It has the advantage of being direct and comparatively easy for participants to answer. However, this measure can only be retrospective. It would not be usable in pre-post studies, or indeed in studies where a control group did not experience the interaction in question. Consequently, a second survey measure is necessary, which asks people to assess their general or global sense of respectedness in their life. Asking people to make a global assessment of this kind unlocks different research methods - but risks more measurement error, since it will surely be harder for participants to assess, as those measuring wellbeing have often found (Weimann et al, 2015).

Survey measures of this kind are likely to be the most widely used. Such modules can tell us much. However, measurement is generally more accurate when it is 'incentive compatible' - that is, when people are incentivised to reveal their true answer. Behavioral games are often designed to elicit these true preferences, and are now widely used across experimental economics (Camerer, 2011) to address a huge range of research questions (Gintis, 2009). An incentive compatible measure of respectfulness can be used to diminish the strong social desirability bias associated with being asked to evaluate an aid-giver. Options are likely to include the range of incentive-compatible belief elicitation approaches surveyed by Schotter & Trevino (2014). Adding this third measure to the toolbox would allow greater rigor - as well as fine-tuning of the simpler-to-administer survey measures.

In developing all these measures, it would be necessary to follow the guidelines laid out by Devellis (2016), using the theoretical foundations and a clear definition laid by the literature review to develop an item pool and validation items. These items could then be reviewed by fellow researchers and through cognitive interviews (Collins, 2003) with people from the populations that might be asked to complete this measure. Such measures would be translated (a tricky task with dignity), programmed and administered to a sample in order to calculate item-scale correlations, item variances and item means, and undertake factor analysis, allowing the researcher to determine the main or leading items to be included in the scales. Then, they would test for reliability by calculating alpha. Where alpha is sufficiently high, the researcher may minimize the length of scale (Devellis, 2016). These would then

---

[3] A measure of this kind has been drafted and shared by the Dignity Project, but it has not yet been validated through the rigorous process outlined here. The Dignity Project will be attempting to develop and validate all three measures in 2021.

need to be administered to a wider pool of people in diverse cases. Construct and content validity could be assessed through a review of the method by a range of subject matter experts. Reliability would be assessed through a test-retest method in which participants repeatedly take the test until learning effects tail off, and then the final two tests are compared. Upon completion, participants could also undertake an exit survey checking comprehension.

For any measure, given the variety of ways that respect can be experienced by different groups, it is essential that it be rooted in the subjective experience of the participants, with the minimum possible external imposition.

4. Describing the operation of dignity

In describing the operation of dignity, we have a fairly rich literature on different philosophical, historical and legal traditions around the world (Debes, 2017; Düwell et al, 2014). We also have a number of qualitative case studies, covering Syrians in Lebanon, Rohingya in Bangladesh, IDPs in Afghanistan, Colombia, and the Philippines, South Sudanese in Uganda and Egypt, Ghana, Southern Africa, and South Korea (Wein, 2020).[4] I am not aware of any published associational or predictive studies focused on international development.[5]

There are many other locations that would benefit from qualitative examinations of the popular understandings and operation of dignity and respect. The studies of displaced populations listed above could be complemented by more in-depth studies of host communities - in Lebanon, Bangladesh, Uganda, and Egypt. In Ghana, India, Colombia, Afghanistan and the Philippines, there are one or two studies to build on, with plenty of room for more. There are no other studies from West Africa, Latin America, East Asia, or indeed the vast majority of the world.

Similarly, there are many opportunities to examine different social situations. We have an examination of dignity in relationships with an elected representative in Ghana, and several investigations of relationships in maternal care in Pakistan and Tanzania, and ICU care in a number of countries (Wein, 2020). Many different social situations deserve similar treatment. What does respectful treatment look like in teacher-pupil relations? In customer service and other commercial transactions?[6] For employees within a business? For people obtaining government services? For NGOs distributing aid and running programs? For researchers and their participants? In marital and romantic relationships? Of especially urgent interest, what are the experiences of those seeking help from the police? In all of these, and many more, qualitative work conducted through a dignity frame has the potential to be extraordinarily generative.

---

[4] The Dignity Project has conducted as-yet-unpublished studies on understandings of dignity in an informal settlement in Nairobi, Kenya, and among Kenyan feminists.
[5] The Dignity Project has conducted an analysis of correlates of disrespect in AfroBarometer data across Africa, and in Twaweza data from Kenya.
[6] Cait Lamberton, Neela Saldanha and Sakshi Ghai are presently working on a project examining what they call marketplace dignity.

When it comes to associational and predictive studies, there are a couple of major existing datasets that should be analysed. The Gallup World Poll contains several questions on respect, collected annually for 17 years and in 167 countries.[7] The European Social Survey has sometimes asked questions about respect as a value, and about respect for the police. Many police services around the world have collected and published data on whether the public perceive the police as respectful. These could yield new understandings of what demographic and other features are associated with experiencing respect.

In commissioning new associational and predictive studies, the work on respect for persons by Mansur Lalljee's research group, which covers Northern Ireland, England, UAE and India (Lalljee et al, 2007; 2008), could be extended and validated in many other locations. Beyond that, future studies in all sorts of countries might examine frequency of different types of experiences of disrespect, the emotions associated with them (using e.g. Cowen & Keltner, 2017), and a selection of psychometric measures. Those measures might include scales for self-efficacy (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), the OCEAN psychological traits (Gosling et al, 2003), Satisfaction with Life (Diener, 2005), moral foundations (Doğruyola et al, 2019), and potentially many others.

Across all these qualitative and associational quantitative studies, there are a whole range of interesting theoretical questions that could be addressed, beyond simply describing the nature and distribution of experiences of (dis)respect. As outlined in the literature review that accompanies this working paper (Wein, 2020), a number of factors have been suggested which could explain how understandings of dignity vary. Exploring these factors could make important contributions to a general theory of how dignity is defined. These suggested factors include gender, age, individualism-collectivism, social position in the aid chain (INGO vs local NGO vs recipient), membership of the Global North or Global South, and expertise (philosophers vs highly educated lay people vs less educated). The role of historical evolution and the interruptions of colonialism in popular traditions of dignity could be productively examined. Gesa Lindemann has offered an intriguing sociological theory of different understandings of dignity, which should certainly be tested (Lindemann; Düwell et al, 2014). The relationships between dignity and other important ideas in international development - such as capabilities, wellbeing, and power - could be carefully traced. There is a persistent difference between the commonalities identified in quantitative studies and the differences across countries identified in qualitative studies, that should be explored and explained (Wein, 2020). Finally, all of this can be used to generate hypotheses of the actions that can be used to reduce experiences of disrespect, to be tested in the experimental studies described in the next section.

5. Increasing perceptions of respectfulness

The next research question concerns how to increase people's perceptions of respectfulness within particular interactions, and to study the consequences of doing so. We should be

---

[7] A list of the universities with access to the Gallup World Poll is available here: https://www.gallup.com/analytics/214565/universities-colleges-using-gallup-analytics.aspx

sensitive to Lieberman's caution that we often conduct experiments prematurely, and be aware that the work on measurement, and well-founded hypothesis generation from descriptive studies, are essential prerequisites for good experiments. However, we can identify a number of hypotheses that already exist, which could at least inform early-stage experiments.

At present, we have observed no natural experiments focused on dignity. There is one international development-focused early-stage experiment (Thomas et al, 2020), as well as a large number of psychology studies, referenced above.[8] The only late-stage experiment that we identified was squarely within international development, since it focused on dignity as one outcome of cash versus in-kind transfers in Kenya (Shapiro, 2019).

Perhaps the first experimental task is to replicate what already exists. Given the longstanding concerns about the validity of many experimental findings, especially in social psychology (Bohannon, 2015), and especially outside of WEIRD contexts (Henrich et al, 2010), replications are critical to advancing knowledge responsibly. This perhaps applies most clearly to the psychology studies cited above, but could also be applied to both Thomas et al (2020) and Shapiro (2019). Any replication is positive, but ideally this would follow an orderly structure for eliciting generalisability (Strohm, 2019). Additionally, the Thomas et al paper (2020), given its strong results in an early-stage experiment, seems a strong candidate to be developed into a late-stage experiment.

To go beyond replicating and extending those studies, we must examine the hypotheses suggested by current theoretical work. These suggest a number of ideas that should inform a series of early-stage experiments. Three pathways for showing respect seem to recur frequently across different philosophical traditions: seeing people, providing choice, and treating people as equals (Wein, 2020). Each of those hypotheses might yield a whole range of experimental treatments or alterations to processes, programs and communication materials.

The importance of being 'seen' is a consistent theme across global ideas of dignity (Wein, 2020; Debes, 2017). People want to be able to formulate, display and have recognised a distinct personality, and see that represented in media and elsewhere. Sometimes concepts of being seen focus on individual traits. Being treated as a number or one of a mass, not being addressed properly, or using procedures that are poorly suited to people's needs, might be common ways in which people feel their dignity is not respected. Sometimes this is being seen as an individual personality, while other traditions of dignity focus on recognition of one's group identity. For instance, the Rohingya concept of *ijjot* requires a proper recognition of their social identity, as shown through religious practice (Holloway & Fan, 2018). Sometimes it is seeing and feeling empathy for the relationship the individual has to others, including noting that individual's markers of identity and status, and seeing the ways

---

[8] Two experiments have been conducted by Busara and The Dignity Project. One focuses on the effects of small acts of respectfulness in the laboratory (addressing people by name, and giving them a choice of when to show up). The second examines 'localisation' framings in encouraging people to take part in a study.

in which they face oppression in their life (Debes, 2017; this is also discussed in relation to the Filipino concept of *maratabat* in Holloway, 2019).

The second pathway is being given choices. People want to be treated as autonomous, rational beings, who have agency over their environment, actions, and body (Wein, 2020). They want the ability to consent to what happens to them (Speer & Stokoe, 2014), and they want to be reasoned with as adults. This quality was emphasized by Colombian IDPs when asked about dignity (Holloway, 2019), and appears also in Kantian conceptions of dignity, which emphasize that people must be reasoned with and should not be instrumentalized for other purposes (Sensen; Debes, 2017). It is also important in many conceptions of respectful care in medicine (Chochinov et al, 2008). Showing respect in this way might be done negatively, by not impinging on their ability to choose or interfering in their pursuit of goals, and not forcing them to do anything - or it might be done positively, by proactively protecting them from threats to their autonomy, and promoting the conditions that permit autonomy and increase their capabilities (Dillon, 2018).

The third pathway is to treat people as equals. Dignity implies that there is a fundamental equality between individuals (and, in some conceptions, between groups) - this is what allows them to make claims upon one another (Darwall; Debes, 2017). That idea of egalitarianism is central to the idea of rights (Debes, 2017), and equality is mentioned as the immediate consequence of dignity in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Philosopher Jeremy Waldron (2012) places equal rank at the centre of his conception of how dignity operates, as does social psychologist Bernd Simon (2007). The power imbalances between humanitarian actors and their 'beneficiaries' is central to Colombian IDPs frustrations about dignity (Holloway, 2019). These power imbalances have been described as central to the disrespect exhibited in medical care (Jacobson, 2007). Ideas of empowerment are closely entangled with dignity - as illustrated, for instance, in Indrajit Roy's (2013) recounting of the respect experienced by lower caste Indians before and after a particular political campaign.

In addition to generating hypotheses and treatments based on those three pathways, we should look out for approaches that cut across all these three, which might apply in a wide range of situations where respectfulness is valued, and which are endorsed by a rich theoretical and empirical literature. One such approach is listening. Listening of some kind is common to recommendations for how to be more respectful across many domains, including medicine (Gawande, 2015), sales (Aggarwal et al, 2015), branding (Fournier & Avery, 2011), international development (Brown & Mansfield, 2009; Tesseur, 2019), and research (De Vicki Strange et al, 2001; Leavy, 2017). Paller (2019), who examines dignity in the politics of Ghana, argues that listening is essential to what he calls 'dignified public expression'. Yet these mandates to listen vary in the detail with which they are conceptualised and theorised, and I am not aware of experimental evaluations of differing listening strategies (Bodie, 2011). Listening is a stable category of behaviour and its own field of research (with its own journal, the International Journal of Listening), yet it is also exceedingly broad, with relevance to a great many human processes. There are different techniques of listening, and listening as a skill can be performed more or less adroitly (Fedesco, 2014; Ratnam, 2019). It can be done interpersonally, but organisations can also listen (Burnside-Lawry, 2012).

Different versions of listening could draw on each of the three strategies outlined above. For instance, effective listening is essential to the process of being seen (Thill, 2018), can be a tool through which autonomy is achieved (Scott, 2014), and can address unequal power (Proctor, 2010). Early-stage experiments testing different forms of listening could be exceptionally valuable.

Other such generally applicable treatments may exist. For instance, building on the work by Thomas et al (2020), there are many alternative narratives that could be employed in how an interlocutor presents themselves. This could certainly build on the widespread calls for familiarity and localisation in aid (Roepstorff, 2020) - though we should note that ODI's work did not find that more local NGOs were necessarily regarded as more respectful (Mosel & Holloway, 2019). Looking at respectfulness in the context of apologies could be productive, or in who sets the agenda for a discussion. This could build on the fruitful work on gender, speaking time and interruptions in meetings (Gnisci et al, 2018). Much discussed in recent years, different ways of expressing privilege and solidarity might be important in addressing the equality pathway above. A large literature has shown that different methods for selecting representatives can have widely differing outcomes - examining how different methods of election and selection address concerns about representation and respect would be very fruitful (Deserranno et al, 2019). Length of interaction could be equally productive. Again, each of these ideas can be tested in online or laboratory experiments, but it will have to rely on a clear linkage to the theoretical literature, descriptive evidence to support the hypothesis, and - if it shows positive results - replication to assess generalisability.

Most of these studies can be done through developing treatments that are more respective than the status quo. It is obviously potentially informative to also study reactions to deliberately inflicted disrespect. However, if such studies were to be proposed, they should meet an exceptionally high bar for ethical approval, given the harm that disrespect may do that has been gathered so far in the study of dignity (Wein, 2020).

The research questions outlined above apply to many different social situations. However, there are also a number of studies that have particular relevance to the conduct of research. There has been plenty of criticism of Western-led, RCT-dominated, research, as being extractive and unethical (Hoffman, 2020). Many measures have been suggested to help ensure research is as ethical as possible. For instance, there is debate as to whether cash or in-kind incentives are better (Biruk, 2017). Reporting back the results of research to individuals or communities is often suggested, but rarely done (Naidu & Prowse, 2018). Sometimes research methods that are more participatory are implicitly represented as more respectful (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995). Specific phrasings or formats for explanations for why a participant was selected, or why the study is being done, or where the results will be shared, might be important. Consent is at the heart of many approaches to research ethics, but procedures for obtaining it are rarely examined or grounded in theory (Malich, 2018). The length of studies is important. No doubt any researcher can easily extend this list. Adopting a dignity frame might be one way to establish a theoretical basis for generating and prioritising among these ideas, and for testing their efficacy in ensuring that participants felt respected.

We should take care not to rush towards experimentation. However, when we are ready, there are plenty of studies available to us. We can replicate existing work. We can test strategies based on seeing people, giving them choices and treating them as equals. We can study how to listen to people, and other generally applicable treatments. This can inform practice in research, international development and humanitarian aid, government services, commercial transactions, medical provision and many other domains. There may be particularly fruitful work to be done around research ethics.[9]

6. Conclusion

In understanding the relationship of dignity to international development, a profusion of possible studies offer themselves. Having reviewed the existing literature, we can identify five research questions, of which three seem to present particular opportunities for research at present: measurement, description, and experimental testing. Scholars of international development, political science and microeconomics have been paying increasing attention to dignity (Banerjee & Duflo, 2019). As that circle of researchers expands, there is plenty of room for many more projects. I hope this paper will help guide them.

7. Bibliography

Aggarwal, P., Castleberry, S. B., Ridnour, R., & Shepherd, C. D. (2005). Salesperson Empathy and Listening: Impact on Relationship Outcomes. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 13(3), 16–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2005.11658547

Azhar, Z., Oyebode, O., & Masud, H. (2018). Disrespect and abuse during childbirth in district Gujrat, Pakistan: A quest for respectful maternity care. PLOS ONE, 13(7), e0200318. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200318

Badcott, D. (2003). The basis and relevance of emotional dignity. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 6(2), 123–131.

Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2019). Good Economics for Hard Times. PublicAffairs.

Biruk, C. (2017). Ethical Gifts?: An Analysis of Soap-for-data Transactions in Malawian Survey Research Worlds. Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 31(3), 365–384. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12374

Bodie, G. D. (2011). The understudied nature of listening in interpersonal communication: Introduction to a special issue. The Intl. Journal of Listening, 25(1–2), 1–9.

Bohannon, J. (2015). Many psychology papers fail replication test. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

---

[9] I have not provided research ideas for the fifth research question, on building support for respectfulness, since there is so little to build on at present. However, I should note that there is one survey experiment that has been conducted by the Dignity Project examining messages to persuade US non-profit professionals.

Brown, D., & Mansfield, K. (2009). Listening to the experiences of the long-term displaced. Forced Migration Review, 33, 15.

Burnside-Lawry, J. (2012). Listening and participatory communication: A model to assess organization listening competency. International Journal of Listening, 26(2), 102–121.

Camerer, C. F. (2011). Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments in Strategic Interaction. Princeton University Press.

Chochinov, H. M., Hassard, T., McClement, S., Hack, T., Kristjanson, L. J., Harlos, M., Sinclair, S., & Murray, A. (2008). The patient dignity inventory: A novel way of measuring dignity-related distress in palliative care. Journal of Pain and Symptom Management, 36(6), 559–571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2007.12.018

Collins, D. (2003). Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. Quality of Life Research, 12(3), 229–238. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023254226592

Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? Social Science & Medicine, 41(12), 1667–1676.

Coundouriotis, E. (2006). The Dignity of the 'Unfittest': Victims' Stories in South Africa. Human Rights Quarterly, 28(4), 842–867. JSTOR.

Cowen, A. S., & Keltner, D. (2017). Self-report captures 27 distinct categories of emotion bridged by continuous gradients. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(38), E7900–E7909. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702247114

De Cremer, D. (2002). Respect and cooperation in social dilemmas: The importance of feeling included. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28(10), 1335–1341. https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702236830

de Melo-Martín, I., & Salles, A. (2011). On disgust and human dignity. The Journal of Value Inquiry, 45(2), 159.

De Vicki Strange, S., Forrest, S., & Oakley, A. (2001). A listening trial: 'qualitative methods within experimental research. Using Research for Effective Health Promotion, 138.

Debes, R. (2017a). Understanding Persons and the Problem of Power. Making Sense of the World: New Essays on the Philosophy of Understanding, 54.

Debes, R. (Ed.). (2017b). Dignity: A History (1 edition). Oxford University Press.

Deserranno, E., Stryjan, M., & Sulaiman, M. (2019). Leader selection and service delivery in community groups: Experimental evidence from uganda. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 11(4), 240–67.

Devellis, R. F. (2016). Scale Development: Theory and Applications (Fourth edition). Sage Publications, Inc.

Diener, E. (2005). About Subjective Well-being (Happiness and Life Satisfaction).

Doğruyol, B., Alper, S., & Yilmaz, O. (2019). The five-factor model of the moral foundations theory is stable across WEIRD and non-WEIRD cultures. Personality and Individual Differences, 151, 109547.

Dunning, D., Fetchenhauer, D., & Schlösser, T. (2016). Chapter One - The Psychology of Respect: A Case Study of How Behavioral Norms Regulate Human Action. In A. J. Elliot (Ed.), Advances in Motivation Science (Vol. 3, pp. 1–34). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2015.12.003

Düwell, M., Braarvig, J., Brownsword, R., & Mieth, D. (Eds.). (2014). The Cambridge Handbook of Human Dignity: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Cambridge University Press.

Ellemers, N., Doosje, B., & Spears, R. (2004). Sources of respect: The effects of being liked by ingroups and outgroups. European Journal of Social Psychology, 34(2), 155–172. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.196

Fedesco, H. N. (2015). The Impact of (In)effective Listening on Interpersonal Interactions. International Journal of Listening, 29(2), 103–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2014.965389

Fierke, K. M. (2015). Human dignity, basal emotion and a global emotionology. In Emotions, Politics and War (pp. 67–79). Routledge.

Fournier, S., & Avery, J. (2011). The uninvited brand. Business Horizons, 54(3), 193–207.

Gawande, A. (2015). Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End. Picador.

Geller, G., Branyon, E. D., Forbes, L. K., Topazian, R. J., Weir, B. W., Carrese, J. A., Beach, M. C., & Sugarman, J. (2016). ICU-RESPECT: An index to assess patient and family experiences of respect in the intensive care unit. Journal of Critical Care, 36, 54–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2016.06.018

Gintis, H. (2009). Game Theory Evolving: A Problem-Centered Introduction to Modeling Strategic Interaction - Second Edition (2 edition). Princeton University Press.

Gnisci, A., Graziano, E., Sergi, I., & Pace, A. (2018). Which criteria do naïve people use for identifying and evaluating different kinds of interruptions? Journal of Pragmatics, 138, 119–130.

Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. Journal of Research in Personality, 37(6), 504–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1

Grandi, F., Mansour, K., & Holloway, K. (2018). Dignity and displaced Syrians in Lebanon (HPG Integrated Programme 2017-19. From the Ground up: Understanding Local Response in Crises). Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11236-dignity-and-displaced-syrians-lebanon

Hameed, W., & Avan, B. I. (2018). Women's experiences of mistreatment during childbirth: A comparative view of home- and facility-based births in Pakistan. PLOS ONE, 13(3), e0194601. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194601

Hartling, L. M., & Lindner, E. G. (2017). Toward a globally informed psychology of humiliation: Comment on McCauley (2017). American Psychologist, 72(7), 705–706. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000188

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. Nature, 466(7302), 29–29.

Hoffmann, N. (2020). Involuntary experiments in former colonies: The case for a moratorium. World Development, 127, 104805.

Holloway, K. (2019). Dignity in displacement: Case studies from Afghanistan, Colombia, the Philippines and South Sudan (HPG Integrated Programme 2017-19. From the Ground up: Understanding Local Response in Crises). Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11285-dignity-displacement-case-studies-afghanistan-colombia-philippines-and-south-sudan

Holloway, K., & Fan, L. (2018). Dignity and the displaced Rohingya in Bangladesh (HPG Integrated Programme 2017-19. From the Ground up: Understanding Local Response in Crises). Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11179-dignity-and-displaced-rohingya-bangladesh

Holloway, K., & Grandi, F. (2018). Dignity in displacement: A review of the literature (HPG Integrated Programme 2017-19. From the Ground up: Understanding Local Response in Crises). Overseas Development Institute. https://www.odi.org/publications/11148-dignity-displacement-review-literature

Huo, Y. J., Binning, K. R., & Molina, L. E. (2010). Testing an Integrative Model of Respect: Implications for Social Engagement and Well-Being. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36(2), 200–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209356787

Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Is Pluralism a Viable Model of Diversity? The Benefits and Limits of Subgroup Respect. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9(3), 359–376. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430206064639

Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., & Binning, K. R. (2010). Chapter 4 The Interplay between fairness and the experience of respect: Implications for group life. In Fairness and Groups (Vol. 13, pp. 95–120). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1534-0856(2010)0000013007

Jacobson, N. (2007). Dignity and health: A review. Social Science & Medicine, 64(2), 292–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.08.039

Jo, K.-H., & Doorenbos, A. Z. (2009). Understanding the meaning of human dignity in Korea: A content analysis. International Journal of Palliative Nursing, 15(4), 178–185.

Kruk, M. E., Kujawski, S., Mbaruku, G., Ramsey, K., Moyo, W., & Freedman, L. P. (2014). Disrespectful and abusive treatment during facility delivery in Tanzania: A facility and community survey. Health Policy and Planning, 33(1), e26–e33.

Laham, S. M., Chopra, S., Lalljee, M., & Parkinson, B. (2010). Emotional and behavioural reactions to moral transgressions: Cross-cultural and individual variations in India and Britain. International Journal of Psychology, 45(1), 64–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590902913434

Laham, S. M., Tam, T., Lalljee, M., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2010). Respect for persons in the intergroup context: Self—other overlap and intergroup emotions as mediators of the impact of respect on action tendencies. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13(3), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430209344606

Lalljee, M., Laham, S. M., & Tam, T. (2007). Unconditional respect for persons: A social psychological analysis. Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift Für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO), 38(4), 451–464. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-007-0037-0

Lalljee, M., Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Laham, S., & Lee, J. (2009). Unconditional respect for persons and the prediction of intergroup action tendencies. European Journal of Social Psychology, 39(5), 666–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.564

Leavy, P. (2017). Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches. Guilford Publications.

Lieberman, E. S. (2016). Can the Biomedical Research Cycle be a Model for Political Science? Perspectives on Politics, 14(4), 1054–1066. https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759271600298X

Malich, E. (2018). Consent Documentation and the Accessibility of Research Results in International Development Research. Canadian Journal of Bioethics / Revue Canadienne de Bioéthique, 1(1), 40–42. https://doi.org/10.7202/1058315ar

McCauley, C. (2017). Toward a psychology of humiliation in asymmetric conflict. American Psychologist, 72(3), 255–265. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000063

Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the Experience of Injustice. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 527–553. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.527

Molefe, M. (2018a). Personhood and Rights in an African Tradition. Politikon, 45(2), 217–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2017.1339176

Molefe, M. (2018b). Personhood and partialism in African philosophy. African Studies, 0(0), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00020184.2018.1519337

Mosel, I., & Holloway, K. (2019). Dignity and humanitarian action in displacement (HPG Integrated Programme 2017-19. From the Ground up: Understanding Local Response in

Crises). Overseas Development Institute.
https://www.odi.org/publications/11293-dignity-and-humanitarian-action-displacement

Pagliaro, S., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2011). Sharing Moral Values: Anticipated Ingroup Respect as a Determinant of Adherence to Morality-Based (but Not Competence-Based) Group Norms. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37(8), 1117–1129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211406906

Paller, J. W. (2019). Dignified public expression: A new logic of political accountability. Comparative Politics. https://jeffreywpaller.files.wordpress.com/2018/07/paller-2019.pdf

Proctor, G. (2001). Listening to Older Women with Dementia: Relationships, voices and power. Disability & Society, 16(3), 361–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687590120045932

Ratnam, C. (2019). Listening to difficult stories: Listening as a research methodology. Emotion, Space and Society, 31, 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2019.03.003

Roepstorff, K. (2020). A call for critical reflection on the localisation agenda in humanitarian action. Third World Quarterly, 41(2), 284–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2019.1644160

Roy, I. (2013). Development as dignity: Dissensus, equality and contentious politics in Bihar, India. Oxford Development Studies, 41(4), 517–536.

Roy, I. (2014). Reserve labor, unreserved politics: Dignified encroachments under India's national rural employment guarantee act. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 41(4), 517–545. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.922551

Sando, D., Ratcliffe, H., McDonald, K., Spiegelman, D., Lyatuu, G., Mwanyika-Sando, M., Emil, F., Wegner, M. N., Chalamilla, G., & Langer, A. (2016). The prevalence of disrespect and abuse during facility-based childbirth in urban Tanzania. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 16(1), 236.

Schotter, A., & Trevino, I. (2014). Belief Elicitation in the Laboratory. Annual Review of Economics, 6(1), 103–128. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080213-040927

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio. Causal and Control Beliefs, 1(1), 35–37.

Shapiro, J. (2019). The impact of recipient choice on aid effectiveness. World Development, 116, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.10.010

Simon, B. (2007). Respect, equality, and power: A social psychological perspective. Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift Für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO), 38(3), 309–326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-007-0027-2

Simon, B., & Stürmer, S. (2003). Respect for Group Members: Intragroup Determinants of Collective Identification and Group-Serving Behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(2), 183–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202239043

Sleebos, E., Ellemers, N., & de Gilder, D. (2006). The paradox of the disrespected: Disrespected group members' engagement in group-serving efforts. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42(4), 413–427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.06.002

Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33(2), 146–170. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1996.1318

Speer, S. A., & Stokoe, E. (2014). Ethics in action: Consent-gaining interactions and implications for research practice. British Journal of Social Psychology, 53(1), 54–73.

Strohm, R. (2019). Generalizability in the Social Sciences. Working Paper. https://developmentdaily.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/strohm-generalizability-2-may-2019.pdf

Tesseur, W. (2019). Listening, languages and the nature of knowledge and evidence: What we can learn from investigating 'listening' in NGOs. Learning and Using Languages in Ethnographic Research, 193–206.

Thill, C. (2018). Listening with Recognition for Social Justice. In T. Dreher & A. A. Mondal (Eds.), Ethical Responsiveness and the Politics of Difference (pp. 57–73). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93958-2_4

Thomas, C. C., Otis, N. G., Abraham, J. R., Markus, H. R., & Walton, G. M. (2020). Toward a science of delivering aid with dignity: Experimental evidence and local forecasts from Kenya. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1917046117

Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1999). Justice, social identity, and group processes. In The psychology of the social self (pp. 223–264). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

van Quaquebeke, N., Henrich, D. C., & Eckloff, T. (2007). "It's not tolerance I'm asking for, it's respect!" A conceptual framework to differentiate between tolerance, acceptance and (two types of) respect. Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift Für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO), 38(2), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-007-0015-6

Voltmer, K., & Lalljee, M. (2007). Agree to disagree: Respect for Political opponents. British Social Attitudes, 23, 95.

Waldron, J. (2012). Dignity, Rank, and Rights (M. Dan-Cohen, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Weimann, J., Knabe, A., & Schob, R. (2015). Measuring happiness: The economics of well-being. MIT Press.

Wein, T. (2020). Dignity and development: A review of the literature on its application, definition and measurement. Working Paper. https://dignityproject.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Wein-Dignity-Literature-Review-291120.pdf