



**Indian Institute of Management Calcutta**

**Working Paper Series**

**WPS No 871 / December 2021**

**Dignity and the Consumer-Entrepreneur Duality in Bottom-of-Pyramid  
Markets**

**Sarthak Mohapatra**

PhD Candidate, Marketing

IIM Calcutta, Joka, Kolkata – 700104, India

Email: sarthakm19@iimcal.ac.in

**Prof. Ramendra Singh\***

Professor, Marketing Group

IIM Calcutta, Joka, Kolkata – 700104, India

Email: ramendra@iimcal.ac.in

\*Corresponding author

**Indian Institute of Management Calcutta, Joka, D.H. Road, Kolkata 700104**

**URL: <https://www.iimcal.ac.in/faculty/publications/working-papers/>**

# Dignity and the Consumer-Entrepreneur Duality in Bottom-of-Pyramid Markets

Sarthak Mohapatra<sup>1</sup>

Ramendra Singh<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Scholars have admitted that the notion of dignity is central to any poverty alleviation approach, yet it remains under-represented. Since the concept appears across multiple disciplines, the current study focuses on positioning 'dignity' in Marketing by exploring its dimensions in the BoP context. Specifically, the study explores the interplay between dignity and consumer-entrepreneur duality of roles in Bottom-of-Pyramid (BoP) markets. Invoking extant literature, this study examines subaltern's experiences of employment, using dual dimensions of 'dignity in work' and 'dignity at work' framework, arguing how 'dignity' in itself gets problematized. The study argues that this de-dignification can possibly be resolved with the help of 'entrepreneurship'. We also conceptually argue that highly skilled entrepreneurs receive more 'dignity at work' than unskilled and servile entrepreneurs. In fact, the nature of work plays an important role, since subalterns engaged in stigmatized 'dirty' jobs experience both lack of dignity in and at work. Thus, it is expected that the interplay between the duality of roles effectively manifests itself where BoP consumers experience greater dignity in their marketplace experiences as consumers, as a result of their entrepreneurial endeavors. Finally, we emphasize upon the spill-over effects of dignity, where it gets transferred from a dignified consumer or entrepreneur to the entire household. We expect that the findings would guide marketers design effective anti-stigmatization cues for subalterns. It would also possibly help managers inculcate elements, which in turn, would convert de-dignified jobs into meaningful work.

**Keywords:** Dignity, BoP, Consumer-Entrepreneur Duality, subsistence markets, poor consumers.

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, IIM Calcutta ,Email: sarthakm19@iimcal.ac.in

<sup>2</sup> Professor, IIM Calcutta , Email:ramendra@iimcal.ac.in

# Dignity and the Consumer-Entrepreneur Duality in Bottom-of-Pyramid Markets

## Introduction

*“Two-thirds of people in India live in poverty: 68.8% of the Indian population lives on less than \$2 a day. Over 30% even have less than \$1.25 per day available - they are considered extremely poor. This makes the Indian subcontinent one of the poorest countries in the world; women and children, the weakest members of Indian society, suffer most”.<sup>3</sup>*

These alarming statistics are common to a developing economy like India, and has stirred the interest of the academic community in recent times. Resultantly, scholars have posited various approaches to study the ‘poor’. For instance, the Bottom-of-Pyramid (BoP) approach, capabilities approach, moral economy approach and the subsistence marketplaces approach have been the common, and have been used extensively by marketing scholars. In fact, the BoP approach emphasizes upon the potential rewards of developing subaltern markets, because of the huge populous at that section of society (Prahalad and Hammond, 2002). Herein, the term ‘subsistence’ indicates the daily struggle of both individuals and groups to meet their daily basic needs (Viswanathan and Venugopal, 2015). People hereby face several challenges, including lack of income, low literacy, and low access to resources. Thus, the stream of research on ‘subsistence marketplaces’ garnered attention, since it emphasizes the need to learn to devise solutions for such contexts, rather than impose solutions derived or learnt from other contexts with pre-conceived ideas. The moral economy approach on the other hand, prioritizes non-market solutions over market-driven solutions (Varman and Vikas, 2007; Weinberger and Wallendorf, 2012). Finally, the capabilities approach discusses the development of capabilities to lead the kind of life that an individual actually values. This capability to lead a good life is posited to be a function of ‘beings and doings’ (Sen, 1985). Scholars in the past have acknowledged ‘dignity’ to be a central component of every policy formulation or marketing intervention (Jagadale et. al., 2018; Lambertson, 2018). Yet the construct of dignity, discussed abundantly in sociology, legal studies, philosophy, and organizational studies, does remain under-represented in

---

<sup>3</sup> Retrieved from <https://www.soschildrensvillages.ca/news/poverty-in-india-602>

marketing literature (Barki and Parente, 2010). The scope of this work is to position the concept of dignity in Marketing, more specifically within the context of BoP markets.

The remainder of the study is structured thus: the next section encompasses a brief literature review, followed by the proposed research questions. Then, it develops certain propositions based on insights drawn from extant literature, and finally discusses the implications of the study.

## **Concept of Dignity**

Dignity has been differently conceptualized in extant literature. In fact, the terminology has etymologically derived itself from Cicero's idea of 'dignitas' (meaning, worth) from a confluence of Greek and Roman heritage. In ancient Rome, the social concept of 'dignitas' indicated the social role of an individual; it was seen as a duty paid to the social role by both the bearers of the role as well as the commoners. There is also a biblical idea of men and women being created in the image of God, also called 'imago dei'. Then, there's Immanuel Kant's notion of dignity as being 'incommensurable'. According to Kant, everything that has a price attached to it can be exchanged with similar items; whereas, dignity is priceless, and thus cannot be exchanged with any value of worth. People by virtue of their humanity and reasoning possess dignity; and this puts everyone under a moral obligation to never treat someone as a mere means to an end. The fourth conception of dignity emerged when 'human dignity' was established as a fundamental right of every citizen in several declarations following 1945. According to such thesis, dignity is inviolable. In effect, this is the normative conceptualization of dignity, as it appears on Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." It posits that every human being does have an inherent worth.

Dignity has also been classified in various ways; for instance, Kaufmann, Kuch, Neuhauser, Webster (2011) classified it as being both inherent and contingent. Inherent dignity cannot be acquired, lost or restored. Contingent dignity on the other hand, may be gained or lost. Contingent dignity may be further divided into two, including social and expressive dignity. Social dignity is dependent on social functions that we perform. For example, a judge or a head-of-department possesses social dignity by virtue of becoming office holders.

Expressive dignity on the other hand, is dependent on a person’s behavior. Furthermore, Formosa and Mackenzie (2014) classified dignity into status and achievement dignity. Status dignity comes as a virtue of the ‘respect-worthiness’ of a person; while achievement dignity is temporary or unstable (i.e. it comes and goes with time). Thus, everyone commands dignity by virtue of being human, but qualified remarks could be reserved for those who achieve.

As mentioned at the outset, the construct of ‘dignity’ appears across a wide range of disciplines, ranging from Philosophy to Sociology, Theology, legal studies, organizational studies, etc. Some of them have been tabulated below.

SL. No.	Conceptualization	Authors	Year	Source
1	Dignity as status: “Social status is one’s position in a hierarchy in which respect is due to superiors. A professional gains status from a role he acquires by competitive effort.”	Rosen	2014	Philosophy
2	Dignified manner or bearing: “dignity can be a vice when it takes the forms of pomposity, self-importance and the inability to laugh at oneself.”			
3	Dignity as intrinsic values: “Kant located human dignity in our rational capacity as moral legislators to make laws, according to reason, for our own conduct.”			
4	Dignity as respectful treatment: “We should treat one another respectfully because if we don’t, we will cease to be the people that we are.”			
5	Dignity in work refers to the “micro relationships of day-to-day work that allows mutual respect, autonomy, trust and ‘meaningful interpersonal interactions with co-workers and clients.”	Cockburn-Wootten	2012	Sociology
6	Dignity is the “absolute-worth of human beings.”	Adler	1967	Philosophy
7	“The standard principle of dignity declares that human beings deserve extreme respect and reverence by virtue of simply being human.”	Egonsson	2012	Theology
8	“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”	Universal Declaration	1948	Constitutional law

		of Human Rights		
9	Dignity refers to “autonomy, for to respect someone implies refraining from attempting to colonize or control their lives and keeping a certain ‘respectful’ distance from them.”	Sayer	2007	Organizational Behavior
10	Dignity includes “recognition of a distinct personal identity, reflecting individual autonomy and responsibility.”	Schachter	1983	International law
11	“We need at all times to respect people’s dignity and the choices they make; otherwise, we fail to both honor them and have relationships with them for value creation.”	Lefebvre	2012	Social Marketing

## Related Constructs

A review of the literature suggests that dignity is often closely associated with respect, honor, civility, rights, humiliation, and shame. Their relatedness to dignity is discussed below.

- a. **Respect** is the perceived worth conferred to individuals or groups by one or more external others. There are two types of respect: generalized respect and particularized respect. The former (i.e. generalized respect) is the worth conferred by one or more relevant others. It is deserved by the virtue of simply being human. It is not contingent on a person’s status or achievements, and thus, it cannot be gained, lost, or restored. On the other hand, particularized respect is the worth conferred by others, which is contingent on personal attributes and achievements. Dignity is thereby closely related to respect. In other words, when acts of respect are internalized by a receiver, it leads to feeling dignified and perceiving dignity. Thus, dignity may be defined as the feeling of being valued, and worthy to enjoy the respect being conferred. It may be noted herein that ‘perceived respect’ is thus an antecedent of dignity (Rogers and Ashforth, 2017).
- b. While dignity ensures that every individual is equal because of the inherent worth, the notion of **honor** assumes an inherent hierarchy. This leads to asymmetric

relationships between the bearers of honor and the non-bearers of honor; it has an 'elitist' undertone. Here, elite humans or communities strive to establish and maintain dominant-subordinate relationships. For instance, kings protect their honor. As stated by Aslani et al. (2016), honor effectively depends upon a person's reputation and their own evaluation of what external agents think.

- c. **Self-respect** and **self-esteem** are often used interchangeably with dignity. But literature suggests that these are instead the 'acts' of being dignified. This in fact, has been a concern for many scholars, who proposed that researchers should make a distinction between dignity, and a 'sense' of dignity (Debes, 2009).
- d. **Civility** focuses on behaviors that uphold norms. Receivers of dignity exhibit civility in their behaviors. On similar lines, rights are the norms of conduct. Notably, both civility and rights follow the normative conception of dignity. Interestingly, this is in contrast to the subjective conceptualization of dignity (Essays, 2018).
- e. **Humiliation** and **shame** are proposed to be antithetical to dignity (Statman, 2001). It falls under the 'loss of dignity' literature. Here, dignity refers to the moral right of not being subjected to humiliation and shame. The concepts are so inter-twined that scholars have often found it difficult to discuss humiliation without mentioning dignity. Humiliation could also have several shades to it; for instance, 'honor humiliation'; it is used to keep the subordinates under subjugation. It could also encompass 'dignity humiliation', which is when the inherent worth of someone is degraded by enforced lowering of an individual (Hartling and Lindner, 2017). This conception of humiliation is the closest to dignity. Unlike humiliation, which is always interactional, shame is more personal. That is, to feel shame is to fail according to one's own set standards (Reyles, 2007). Humiliation is posited to be an emotional experience combining both anger and shame (McCauley, 2017).

### **The dignity of a collective or of an individual?**

Dignity by its very conceptualization of inherent self-worth indicates that it is accorded to an 'individual self'. It is thereby treated as a very personal subject, because of an individual's sense of self-respect and self-worth, and because of how we build standards for ourselves, and measure up against them. Hence, dignity is not just about how others build standards for us (Sayer, 2007). Following this line of argument, people perceive a gain or loss of dignity

by themselves. However, Schachter (1983) clarified that human dignity does assume a more complicated idea of an individual. It acknowledges a distinct individual identity, celebrating thereby the independence of human beings, and the responsibility they assume. It recognizes that although dignity is associated with individuals, in themselves individuals are a part of a larger collective. So, these collectivities or groups must be taken into account in forming the conceptualization of the inherent dignity of the individual. Thus, we have the concept of 'social dignity, which acknowledges the roles that the groups we belong to, play in society. It dictates in effect, the dignity conferred to individuals with respect to their social groups (Kaufmann, Kuch, Neuhauser, Webster, 2011). Additionally, Catholic Social Teachings (CST) dictated that the idea of dignity should not be evaluated in isolation. Importantly, although dignity is an inherent worth, it does require a broader socio-political context for recognition (Sison et. al., 2016).

## **Dignity and Roles**

A large portion of extant literature conceptualized dignity as 'workplace dignity' in organizational studies (Hodson, 2001; Crowley, 2012; Sayer, 2007). Here, dignity is associated with employees/workers/laborers/staff. Workplace dignity has been as "the ability to establish a sense of self-worth and self-respect and to appreciate the respect of others" (Lucas et. al., 2017). Within the ambits of Marketing literature, dignity has been associated with consumers (Sunstein, 2015; Costley, Friend, and Babis, 2005; Varela-Neira et. al., 2014). Because of the non-neutral nature of marketing actions and failure of anti-stigmatization cues, scholars have proposed moving towards 'dignity architecture' (Lamberton, 2018). Jagadale et. al., (2018) indicated the failure of marketing systems to be the reason for subaltern quandary, and thereby associated dignity with subalterns. However, as seen thus far, the normative conceptualization of dignity is closely associated with individuals assuming the role of citizens (Shultziner and Rabinovici, 2012). Developmental studies have also associated dignity with the role of refugees, evaluating dignity from legal, social, and political lenses thereof (Grandi, Mansour and Holloway, 2018). Through some studies, scholars in the past have even debated if dignity can be conferred to creatures beyond human beings. 'Dignity of living beings' has thus been coined to encompass the inherent worth of all living creatures (Jaber, 2000).



## **Dignity and BoP markets**

There has been a dilemma for scholars in associating poverty and dignity. The confusion primarily arises from the fact that whether poverty symbolizes a violation of human dignity. Herein, it may be noted that some of the original conceptions of human dignity stated that for any violation to be caused, an individual/group must exist as the carriers of the cause. As a rebuttal, or a counter-argument, several scholars argued that poverty is not intentionally caused by external agents. Instead, it is an unintentional side-effect of the different acts (Kaufmann, Kuch, Neuhauser, Webster, 2011). However, it is important to acknowledge that poverty does not violate human dignity because of the lack of basic goods, or because they fail to realize their rights or they encounter violence to the body. But it violates human dignity because of dependency i.e., when the survival of the poor is at the mercy of others. This dependence tie becomes stronger as the poverty intensifies (Schaber et. al., 2011; Hochfield and Plageron, 2011). When the poor depend on institutional support, these institutions themselves become the sources of disrespect and feeling of inferiority (Grossmann and Trubina, 2021). Relative poverty violates human dignity by humiliating and destroying an individual's self-respect. Relative poverty is also humiliating, because low-income groups, due to the low-quality services experienced by them including housing, public transport, health, etc., do perceive themselves as second-class citizens, which in turn, undermines their self-respect. Such individuals tend to exhibit a desire to compensate for a 'dignity deficit', aspiring for a stronger affinity towards social relationships, just to be a part of larger groups or communities, with a priority towards materialistic gains (Barki and Parente, 2010). For the poor, both dignity and self-respect reverberate in their daily experiences of not being a burden on others, living without being submissive, and being able to bury dead family members with honor. It also includes having a voice, being socially valued, and being able to fulfill social duties, while being able to help others (Narayan et. al., 2000). Subalterns' lived marketplace experiences manifests as apophatic dignity, wherein individuals saliently perceive what is absent in the market system. This apophatic dignity manifests in the form of symbolic anchoring, instrumentalization and de-humanization (Jagadale et. al., 2018). When the very right to subsistence is threatened due to lack of property, the poor experience a severe damage to their dignity (Sanghera and Satybaldieva, 2012). Although they don't engage in physical assault or open insults to cope against indignity, they use covert strategies such as sabotaging work, arson, delaying work,

gossiping and character assassination (Scott, 1985). Since marketing actions are never neutral towards dignity, Lambertson, Saldanha, and Ghai (2020) introduced marketplace dignity as a processing system, distinguishing it from the dual-processing systems that is dominantly present in the Marketing literature. Lambertson, Saldanha, and Ghai (2020) in fact, proposed three components that go on to contribute to marketplace dignity; they include recognition, equality, and agency.

## **Research Gaps**

1. Extant literature has been relatively silent about how dignity is effectively earned and upheld by producers in BOP markets, and how does the interplay between consumer-entrepreneurial roles impact the concept of dignity.
2. Extant research also doesn't seem to have addressed the distinction between dignity in work and dignity at work, especially for subaltern producers, which in effect, is essential to understand where 'de-dignification' derives itself from.

## **Research Objectives**

To explore the interplay between dignity and consumer-entrepreneur duality of roles -

- a. How is dignity delegated between the dual roles of consumers and producers?
- b. How does the earned dignity spill-over within a household?

## **Propositions Development**

We invoke Bolton's (2007) broadened view of the dignity of labor, wherein, meaningful work along with autonomy and self-esteem constitute dignity in work. Practices that allow equal opportunities, voice to workers, security, and safe working facilities, do go on to contribute to dignity at work. In the context of a country like India, where the society follows several bases of stratification, such as class, caste, religion, gender, wealth, etc., the BoP populous is characterized by privileged groups, asserting their dominance over the under-privileged (Vikas, Varman, and Belk 2015). This is certainly a sorry state of affairs, given the fact that a section within the BoP populous thrives under life-threatening poverty, and are impoverished both financially and otherwise. It is this section of people that are

referred to as 'subalterns', who usually practice peasantry or belong to working class (Varman and Belk, 2008). Importantly, these superior-subordinate relationships give rise to indignity, which manifests when individuals suffer instrumentalization, i.e. when they are treated as means to an end (Jagdale et. al., 2018), being dehumanized and de-realized (Varman and Vijay, 2018), discriminated and stigmatized (Sutton, Pemberton, Fahmy, Tamiya, 2014), subjected to physical violence (Viswanathan, Arias, and Sreekumar, 2021) and experience marketplace trauma (Bennett et. al., 2016). We argue that such experiences surface within the work environment via employee-employer relationships, working terms and conditions, meaningfulness of work, etc. BoP individuals are exposed to working under several socio-psychological, and economic constraints, such as low wages, unhealthy working environments, stigmatized jobs, public humiliation and violence, and lack of job security due to transient and chronic factors (Venugopal, Viswanathan and Jung, 2015). Hence, we propose:

***P1: Subalterns' experience of 'dignity in work' dimensions is majorly problematized by lack of autonomy in labor and lack of respect conferred by the employers.***

***P2: Subalterns' experience of 'dignity at work' dimensions is majorly problematized by exploitative working conditions/wages, lack of voice, and absence of a sense of security at work.***

It is well known that exploitative employment terms do compromise the subalterns' dignified way of living. But isn't 'employment', by definition compromising dignity? Employees are hired as a means to others' ends, dictated by their employers. Thus, it may be argued that 'employment' at the first place, does not happen out of a sense of respect. This in effect, runs contrary to Kant's injunction of treating people as ends in themselves. According to Sayer (2007), "although 'employment' can be argued to be a de-dignifying instrument, yet it is at least possible to treat others in these instrumental economic contexts in ways that signal a non-instrumental valuation of them as persons in their own right, and hence as having dignity." But such employee-employer relations are often absent in the BOP context, where the terms of employment are rigid, exploitative, and de-dignifying. Hence, to break away from the grips of undignified treatment, we argue in favor of self-employment or entrepreneurship. By virtue of self-employment, can one experience autonomy (Rauch and Frese, 2007), build strong interpersonal relationships that alleviate individual

deficiencies (Viswanathan et. al., 2012), create an identity for oneself, build respect and status, as well as derive a sense of meaning from one's work (Krishan, Latha, and Kamalanabhan, 2013). We thereby posit:

***P3: Subalterns experience dignity in work through self-employment or entrepreneurship.***

However, at times subalterns are 'pushed' or forced to undertake entrepreneurship because of absence of other opportunities. This suggests a failure at the overall institutional level.

### **Skilled vs Servile Entrepreneurs**

Extant literature has distinguished between two kinds of labor, based on the task difficulty, and the proficiency of workers; namely skilled Vis a Vis servile jobs (Sayer, 2007). Skilled jobs command dignity, because those who need them cannot perform it themselves. On the other hand, jobs that could easily be performed by others, yet involve the hiring of a labor to do it are called servile jobs. Servility is associated with the absence of self-respect (Dillon, 1992). BoP literature indicated that there has been an increase in unskilled jobs as compared to the skilled domain. It as if, policy formulations are targeting heavily at improving 'functionings' instead of 'capabilities' of subalterns (Ansari, Munir, and Gregg, 2012).

For instance, consider a tenant farmer. The farmer does not own land on his/her own, and thus s/he decides to cultivate the land of a landowner. The farmer is thereby providing a skilled service. Such skilled labor would lead to dignification if the landowner does not have the knowledge and skill related to farming. But if such farming is part of servility, it might lead to de-dignification, because the tenant farmer would assume a subordinate position under the landowner, and the landowner also has the farming skill required to render the tenant farmer's skills non-distinctive. Thus, it is important for entrepreneurs operating in the BoP context to develop distinctive skills. We thereby posit:

***P4: Everything else remaining constant, highly skilled BoP entrepreneurs do receive more 'dignity at work' than unskilled and servile entrepreneurs.***

### **Stigmatized Professions**

Professions that have some taboo or stigma attached to them are also a source of indignity (Sayer, 2007). They are also referred to as 'dirty jobs'. In India, where caste is a determining

factor behind the work individuals do, manual scavenging is arguably the most stigmatized profession, and is the occupation of the bottom-most layer in the caste hierarchy. Such workers have very limited access to opportunities because of the discrimination they face. This discrimination also manifests in the form of extremely low wages they receive. They often cope with such indignity by invoking coping mechanisms like humor and other ways of letting off steam. They suffer severe discrimination (Narula, 2001), work in dehumanizing working conditions, and have very limited opportunities by being labeled as ‘untouchables’ (Rajagopal, 2006). The meaningfulness of the work is lost for the worker, since s/he exists in a state of ambivalence, oscillating between experiencing shame, while also feeling a sense of pride of being able to do such work nonetheless. Therefore, we posit:

***P5: Subalterns engaged in stigmatized ‘dirty’ jobs experience both lacks of ‘dignity in work’ and ‘dignity at work’.***

#### **Dignity Spill-overs**

When livelihood opportunities are scant, BoP consumers engage in entrepreneurship, which in turn, helps them exercise agency, build identity, and also helps in fulfilling the basic consumption needs of their households (Webb et. al., 2013). Dignity is shared in groups and the ‘sense’ of dignity, self-respect is heavily reliant on the social role played by our groups. When we compare from a societal lens, we are in fact discussing ‘social dignity’ which problematizes relative poverty individuals’ experience (Kaufmann, Kuch, Neuhauser, Webster, 2011). Since the roles of consumer and entrepreneur are inter-twined in subsistence marketplaces, which in turn, is subsumed under BoP markets, it is expected that:

***P6: BoP consumers experience greater social dignity in their marketplace experiences as consumers as a result of their entrepreneurial endeavors.***

Similarly, a dignity spill-over to the household is also expected. By escaping the clutches of poverty, subalterns enjoy a higher social, political, and economic advantage, and thus “a halo of respectability hovers over them” (Sylvester, 2000). Moreover, philosophically, although dignity does address the inherent worth of an individual, it acknowledges the individual as a part of larger collectivities (Schachter, 1983). Hence, we posit:

***P7: In BoP context, social dignity gets spilled over from the dignified consumer or dignified entrepreneur to the entire household and it reflects in their lived consumer experiences.***

### ***Propositions***

*P1: Subalterns' experience of 'dignity in work' dimensions are majorly problematised by lack of autonomy in labour and lack of respect conferred by the employers.*

*P2: Subalterns' experience of 'dignity at work' dimensions are majorly problematized by exploitative working conditions/wages, lack of voice and absence of sense of security at work.*

*P3: Subalterns experience 'dignity in work' through self-employment or entrepreneurship*

*P4: Everything else remaining constant, highly skilled subsistence entrepreneurs receive more 'dignity at work' than unskilled and servile entrepreneurs.*

*P5: Subalterns engaged in stigmatised 'dirty' jobs experience both lack of 'dignity in work' and 'dignity at work'.*

*P6: BoP consumers experience greater social dignity in their marketplace experiences as consumers as a result of their entrepreneurial endeavors*

*P7: In BoP context, social dignity gets spilled over from the dignified consumer or dignified entrepreneur to the entire household and it reflects in their lived consumer experiences*

## **Implications and concluding remarks**

When employers foster dignity in and at work, it leads to higher productivity, better learning, and lower mental stress. Several scholars have stressed the move towards a dignity-architecture that would help marketers to design effective dignifying cues in the marketplace (Lamberton, 2018; Lamberton, Saldanha, and Ghai, 2020). Emphasizing 'human worth' empowers subalterns and resolves the subaltern quandary (Jagdale et. al., 2017). Theoretically, it comprehensively captures one of the sources of indignity and disrespect in the BoP context that is the work that subalterns undertake. Dignity being an under-researched concept in marketing literature, does provide a novel conceptualization of BoP markets. Dignity also unifies various approaches to alleviating poverty, such as the BoP approach, capabilities approach, moral economy approach, etc. The ability to lead a life without shame is a crucial social dimension of absolute poverty (Relyes, 2007). Even in the presence of functional hierarchy, it is possible to exist with equal dignity as others, referred to as egalisation. In turn, this facilitates equal chances, and an enabling environment (Lindner, 2002). Becoming self-sufficient ensures that the poor do not build unhealthy dependence relationships, which makes their living contingent on the mercy of others

(Hochfeld and Plageron, 2011). As already stated above, employment itself is a tool for instrumentalization of human beings. Thus, marketers and policy makers are required to put conscious effort to make such experiences less de-dignifying, especially for the vulnerable sections of the society. An employment scenario comprises not just of singular controls but instead, bundles of control. In such conditions, dignity comes at a cost, in the form of stress, lesser space for creativity, personal growth, learning etc. (Crowley, 2012). Thus, alternate mechanisms for workplace dignification could be devised or a balance should be sought.

## References

- Adler, Mortimer J. (1967), *The Difference of Man and the Difference It Makes*. New York: Fordham University Press
- Ansari, S., Munir, K., & Gregg, T. (2012). Impact at the 'bottom of the pyramid': The role of social capital in capability development and community empowerment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 813-842.
- Aslani, S., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J., Yao, J., Semnani-Azad, Z., Zhang, Z. X., ... & Adair, W. (2016). Dignity, face, and honor cultures: A study of negotiation strategy and outcomes in three cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(8), 1178-1201.
- Barki, E., & Parente, J. (2010). Consumer Behaviour of the Base of the Pyramid Market in Brazil. *Greener management international*, (56).
- Bennett, A. M., Baker, S. M., Cross, S., James, J. P., Bartholomew, G., Ekpo, A. E., ... & Taylor, C. R. (2016). Omission and commission as marketplace trauma. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 35(2), 280-291.
- Berg, P., & Frost, A. (2005). Dignity at work for low wage, low skill service workers. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, 60(4), 657-682.
- Bolton, S. (Ed.). (2007). *Dimensions of dignity at work*. Routledge.
- Cockburn-Wootten, C. (2012). Critically unpacking professionalism in hospitality: Knowledge, meaningful work and dignity. *Hospitality & Society*, 2(2), 215-230.
- Costley, C., Friend, L., & Babis, P. (2005). Respect in the Marketplace. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, (9), 1.
- Crowley, M. (2012). Control and dignity in professional, manual and service-sector employment. *Organization Studies*, 33(10), 1383-1406.
- Debes, R. (2009). Dignity's gauntlet. *Philosophical Perspectives*, 23, 45-78.
- Debes, R. (2018). Dignity is delicate. *Aeon* (17 September).
- Dillon, R. S. (1992). How to lose your self-respect. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 29(2), 125-139.
- Egonsson, Dan (2012), *Dimensions of Dignity: The Moral Importance of Being Human*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Formosa, P., & Mackenzie, C. (2014). Nussbaum, Kant, and the capabilities approach to dignity. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 17(5), 875-892.
- Grandi, F., Mansour, K., & Holloway, K. (2018). Dignity and displaced Syrians in Lebanon. 'There is no karama here'.
- Grossmann, K., & Trubina, E. (2021). How the concept of dignity is relevant to the study of energy poverty and energy justice. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 3, 19.
- Hartling, L. M., & Lindner, E. G. (2017). Toward a globally informed psychology of humiliation: Comment on McCauley (2017).



- Hochfeld, T., & Plageron, S. (2011). Dignity and stigma among South African female cash transfer recipients. *IDS Bulletin*, 42(6), 53-59.
- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jaber, D. (2000). Human dignity and the dignity of creatures. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 13(1), 29-42.
- Jagadale, S. R., Kadirov, D., & Chakraborty, D. (2018). Tackling the subaltern quandary: Marketing systems of dignity. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 38(1), 91-111.
- Kaufmann, P., Kuch, H., Neuhäuser, C., & Webster, E. (2011). Human dignity violated: a negative approach—introduction. In *Humiliation, degradation, dehumanization* (pp. 1-5). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Krishnan, L., & Kamalanabhan, T. J. (2013). Entrepreneurial Success and Life Satisfaction Among Women Entrepreneurs in Micro Enterprises. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 20(2).
- Lamberton, C. (2019). Toward a dignity architecture: The critical challenges of stigmatized-identity cues for consumer psychology. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 29(1), 152-159.
- Lamberton, C., Saldanha, N., & Ghai, S. (2020). Introducing System Zero: The Drive for Marketplace Dignity. Available at SSRN 3745882.
- Lefebvre, R. C. (2012). Transformative social marketing: co-creating the social marketing discipline and brand. *Journal of Social Marketing*.
- Lindner, E. G. (2002). Humiliation or dignity: regional conflicts in the global village. *Expediente*, 146.
- Lucas, K., Manikas, A. S., Mattingly, E. S., & Crider, C. J. (2017). Engaging and misbehaving: How dignity affects employee work behaviors. *Organization studies*, 38(11), 1505-1527.
- Manohar Vikas, R., & Varman, R. (2007). Erasing futures: Ethics of marketing an intoxicant to homeless children. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 10(2), 189-202.
- McCauley, C. (2017). Toward a psychology of humiliation in asymmetric conflict. *American Psychologist*, 72(3), 255.
- Narayan-Parker, D., & Patel, R. (2000). *Voices of the poor: Can anyone hear us?* (Vol. 1). World Bank Publications.
- Narula, S. (2001, December). Caste discrimination. In *SEMINAR-NEW DELHI-* (pp. 17-20). MALYIKA SINGH.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. (2002). Serving the world's poor, profitably. *Harvard business review*, 80(9), 48-59.
- Rajagopal, B. (2007). The caste system—India's apartheid?. *The Hindu*, 18.
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 16(4), 353-385.

- Rogers, K. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2017). Respect in organizations: Feeling valued as “we” and “me”. *Journal of Management*, 43(5), 1578-1608.
- Rosen, M. (2012). Dignity. In *Dignity*. Harvard University Press.
- Sanghera, B., & Satybaldieva, E. (2012). Ethics of property, illegal settlements and the right to subsistence. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*.
- Sayer, A. (2007). Dignity at work: Broadening the agenda. *Organization*, 14(4), 565-581.
- Schaber, P., Kaufmann, P., Kuch, H., Neuhaeuser, C., & Webster, E. (2011). Human dignity, self-respect, and dependency. *Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy*, (24), 151-158.
- Schachter, O. (1983). Human dignity as a normative concept. *American Journal of International Law*, 77(4), 848-854.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1973). *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, NY: Alfred K.
- Shultziner, D., & Rabinovici, I. (2012). Human dignity, self-worth, and humiliation: A comparative legal–psychological approach. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 18(1), 105.
- Sison, A. J. G., Ferrero, I., & Guitián, G. (2016). Human dignity and the dignity of work: Insights from Catholic social teaching. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 26(4), 503-528.
- Statman, D. (2001). Humiliation, dignity and self-respect. In *The concept of human dignity in human rights discourse* (pp. 209-229). Brill Nijhoff.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2015). Manipulation, Welfare, and Dignity: A Reply.
- Sutton, E., Pemberton, S., Fahmy, E., & Tamiya, Y. (2014). Stigma, Shame and the Experience of Poverty in Japan and the United Kingdom—ERRATUM. *Social Policy and Society*, 13(1), 155-155.
- Sylvester, R. P. (2000). Making an Appearance: Urban “Types” and the Creation of Respectability in Odessa's Popular Press, 1912-1914. *Slavic Review*, 59(4), 802-824.
- Varela-Neira, C., Vázquez-Casielles, R., & Iglesias, V. (2014). Intentionality attributions and humiliation: the impact on customer behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*.
- Varman, R., & Costa, J. A. (2008). Embedded markets, communities, and the invisible hand of social norms. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28(2), 141-156.
- Varman, R., & Vijay, D. (2018). Dispossessing vulnerable consumers: Derealization, desubjectification, and violence. *Marketing Theory*, 18(3), 307-326.
- Venugopal, S., Viswanathan, M., & Jung, K. (2015). Consumption constraints and entrepreneurial intentions in subsistence marketplaces. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 34(2), 235-251.
- Vikas, R. M., Varman, R., & Belk, R. W. (2015). Status, caste, and market in a changing Indian village. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(3), 472-498.
- Viswanathan, M., & Rosa, J. A. (2007). Product and market development for subsistence marketplaces: Consumption and entrepreneurship beyond literacy and resource barriers.

In *Product and market development for subsistence marketplaces*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Viswanathan, M., & Rosa, J. A. (2010). Understanding subsistence marketplaces: Toward sustainable consumption and commerce for a better world. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(6), 535-537.

Viswanathan, M., & Venugopal, S. (2015). Subsistence marketplaces: Looking back, looking forward. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 34(2), 228-234.

Viswanathan, M., Alfonso Arias, R., & Sreekumar, A. (2021). Extreme exclusion and relative deprivation in subsistence marketplaces: A study in a refugee settlement in Nakivale, Uganda. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 55(1), 87-117.

Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., & Ritchie, R. (2008). Marketing in subsistence marketplaces. In *Alleviating poverty through business strategy* (pp. 209-231). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., Ritchie, R., Venugopal, S., & Jung, K. (2012). Marketing interactions in subsistence marketplaces: A bottom-up approach to designing public policy. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 31(2), 159-177.

Webb, Justin W., Garry D. Bruton, Laszlo Tihanyi, and R. Duane Ireland (2013), "Research on Entrepreneurship in the Informal Economy: Framing a Research Agenda," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28 (5), 598–614.

Weinberger, M. F., & Wallendorf, M. (2012). Intracommunity gifting at the intersection of contemporary moral and market economies. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(1), 74-92.

Zavaleta Reyes, D. (2007). The ability to go about without shame: A proposal for internationally comparable indicators of shame and humiliation. *Oxford Development Studies*, 35(4), 405-430.