Research Methods and Professional Practice June 2022

« Collaborative Learning Discussion 1

Suresh Sigera

Initial Post

74 days ago

1 reply

Last 71 days ago

Workplace harassment comes in many forms. Some employers hurl insults, some deny promotions and some scream at their teams at every weekly meeting. The case study I have decided to focus on, from the selection provided by ACM, is that of abusive workplace behaviour (ACM, n.d).

Over the years, an increase in involvement has been seen in the workforce by the underrepresented sections of society. As a result nowadays, people differ noticeably in visible attributes of race, sex and age within organizations(Singh, Shu Qing Teng, Bhullar and Sankaran, 2016). For the profitable advantage and reputation of an organisation, such demographic diversity is now considered very important. Diversity, however in addition to multiple visible categories such as race, age, sex and dress; can also be in multiple invisible categories such as attitudes, values and knowledge (Mannix & Neale, 2006). Such diversity is found in the culture of Pakistani organisations but while diversity is advantageous for the organisations to grow and prosper, on the other hand, diverse workgroups pose several challenges (Tsui, Egan and III, 1992) which also leads to some negative behavioural outcomes like workplace bullying. Therefore, managers of diverse workgroups at a practical level, along with managing the conflict events in the groups should also manage the reaction to conflict among them as the research shows that bullying was a result of conflict while emotional reactions to bullying were a result of negative reaction to conflict (GIORGI, ARENAS and LEON-PEREZ, 2011).

References

Emdad, R., Alipour, A., Hagberg, J. and Jensen, I., 2013. Comment on "Can observations of workplace bullying really make you depressed? A response to Emdad et al. 2013" by Nielsen and Einarsen. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 86(6), pp.723-724.

GIORGI, G., ARENAS, A. and LEON-PEREZ, J., 2011. An Operative Measure of Workplace Bullying: The Negative Acts Questionnaire Across Italian Companies. Industrial Health, 49(6), pp.686-695.

Giorgi, G., Leon-Perez, J. and Arenas, A., 2014. Are Bullying Behaviors Tolerated in Some Cultures? Evidence for a Curvilinear Relationship Between Workplace Bullying and Job Satisfaction Among Italian Workers. Journal of Business Ethics, 131(1), pp.227-237.

Mannix, E. and Neale, M., 2006. Diversity at Work. Scientific American Mind, 17(4), pp.32-39.

Singh, R., Shu Qing Teng, J., Bhullar, N. and Sankaran, K., 2016. Positive Affect Moderates Partner's Liking Effects on Trust and Attraction. SSRN Electronic Journal,.

Tsui, A., Egan, T. and III, C., 1992. Being Different: Relational Demography and Organizational Attachment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 37(4), p.549.

Tsui, A., Porter, L. and Egan, T., 2002. When Both Similarities and Dissimilarities Matter: Extending the Concept of Relational Demography. Human Relations, 55(8), pp.899-929.

Reply

1 reply

1

Post by **Doug Leece**
Peer Response

71 days ago

The posting cites a number of sources regarding diversity in the workplace (Sigera, 2022), highlighting both visible and invisible diversity as factors for consideration. Unfortunately, the posting comes up short with respect to the case study analysis.

While it is true that the research leader's habitual behaviour of yelling at other team members was not in alignment with ACM 2.2's definition of professional conduct (ACMa, N.D.) little has been said of the mistakes made by the new graduate student that came very close to discrediting the team. ACM principle 2.1 asks that computer professionals *strive* to achieve high quality work (ACMb, N.D.). The very use of the word *strive* was singled out by ACM code of conduct task-force chairman Don Getterbarn as a compromise made to avoid holding people to a legal standard and trusting their personal integrity to do their best (Getterbarn, 1999). While there is no indication that the new graduate had any intention of sabotaging the project, ACM principle 2.6 requires computer professionals to evaluate their work and call out when they suspect they are exceeding their current skill levels (ACMb N.D).

Complaining about exclusion from the team's public presentation (ACMa, N.D.) versus reflecting on how inclusion could generate resentment amongst team members who did contribute acceptable work conflicts, to a small degree, with ACM principle 1.1 when the overall moral of the research group is considered (ACMb, N.D).

References

ACMa. (ND) Case: Abusive Workplace Behavior. https://ethics.acm.org/code-of-ethics/using-the-code/case-abusive-workplace-behavior Available from: [Accessed 18 June 2022]

ACMb. (ND) ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Available from: https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics [Accessed 19 June 2022]

Getterbarn, D. (1999) Two Approaches to Computer Ethics. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin* Available from: **https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/571535.571540** [Accessed 23 June 2022]

Sigera, S. (2022) Initial Post. Available from **https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/hsuforum/discuss.php?d=314317** [Accessed 23 June 2022]

Reply

Maximum rating: -

Add your reply

Your subject

Type your post

Choose Files   No file chosen

Submit

Use advanced editor and additional options