

Pierre De Oliveira¹, Auzoult Auzoult²¹Université de Bourgogne, France²Université de Bourgogne Franche Comté, France

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR – Auzoult Auzoult, laurent.auzoult-chagnault@u-bourgogne.fr

How is objectification related to a devaluation of people in the workplace?

Abstract: In this study we examine the relationship between the perception of being objectified in the workplace and the self-assessment of worth on a personal level, i.e. social desirability and social utility. This relationship is thought to be mediated by self-objectification in the workplace. 241 participants responded to an online questionnaire to measure these different variables. The results confirm a negative relationship between the perception of being objectified and the people's worth, as well as mediation through self-objectification. This phenomenon could describe a deleterious spiral where the worker, through the internalization of a low social value, contributes to their dehumanization at work.

Keywords: *Perception of objectification, Self-objectification, Social Utility, Social Desirability, Action economy*

INTRODUCTION

Dehumanization can manifest in various ways in different life contexts (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014). It can lead to individuals being treated as lacking attributes typically associated with human beings. The term “animal dehumanization” is used to describe this phenomenon. Additionally, it can result in individuals being perceived or treated as devoid of attributes associated with living beings. This is referred to as objectification, a phenomenon in which people are perceived or perceive themselves as objects (Gervais, Bernard, Klein, Allen, 2013). More precisely, objectification describes interpersonal relationships where people are considered as deprived of humanity, i.e., perceived as a thing or through his/her form (Haslam, 2006).

In this study, we specifically focus on objectification within the workplace. More precisely, we aim to investigate whether and how the perception of being objectified by others can result in a diminished sense of personal social value.

OBJECTIFICATION, THE ORIGIN OF THE PHENOMENON

Objectification occurs in contexts of uncertainty (Haque & Waytz, 2012; Landau, Sullivan, Keefer, Rothchild & Osman, 2012; Timmermans & Almeling, 2009), in the context of work when activity is repetitive, fragmented, and under external control (Andrighetto, Baldissari & Volpato, 2017; Baldissari, Andrighetto & Volpato, 2017; Baldissari, Andrighetto, Gabbiadini & Volpato, 2017), in the context of power relations (Gruenfeld, Inesi, Magee & Galinski, 2008), or in the context of inter-categorical conflictual relationships (Leyens, 2015).

Auzoult (2021) proposed a theoretical framework for thinking about the origin and use of objectification. Specifically, by revisiting the various contexts in which objectification occurs, it is observed that it takes place in situations where control over action is crucial. This happens in cases where power relations are prominent and involve assessing the action possibilities of others to exploit them, or in contexts of relational uncertainty that



require evaluating how to interact with others. Similarly, repetitive, fragmented, and externally controlled activities often involve the coordination of humans and technology, a coordination principle that requires comparative evaluation of the action possibilities of humans and other elements in the context, such as other workers, machines, and robots. The observation is consistent in the medical context (Haque & Waytz, 2012). In this case, the objectification of the patient is a mechanism aimed at dispelling subjectivity and facilitating the medical act.

These contexts that threaten the possibilities of interacting with others involve the restoration of what Auzoult calls a potential for action through the mechanism of social perception known as objectification. Assimilating humans to objects or reducing them to elemental attributes allows a simplification of the complexity of interactions. This simplification of the perception of the person can lead to their cognitive treatment in the same way as an object (Bernard, Gervais & Klein, 2018). Objectification mechanisms thus account for an economy of action (Proffitt, 2006) in which a person perceives their environment through the possibilities and costs of action.

CONSEQUENCES OF OBJECTIFICATION IN THE WORKPLACE

The consequences of objectification are numerous and most often harmful to health. Objectification is associated with emotional numbing, lack of empathy and meaningful thought (Bastian & Haslam, 2011; Christoff, 2014), with a decrease in job satisfaction (Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2018; Szymanski & Feltman, 2015), with sexual harassment (Wiener, Gervais, Allen & Marquez, 2013; Gervais, Wiener, Allen, Farnum, & Kimble, 2016) and with the risk of occupational burnout (Baldissari, Andrighetto & Volpato, 2014; Caesens, Stinglhamber, Demoulin, & De Wilde, 2017; Szymanski, & Mikorski, 2016).

Objectification is also associated with dementalization (Baldissari, Andrighetto & Volpato, 2014; Auzoult & Personnaz, 2016), i.e., the feeling of having lost the ability to think or feel emotions (Gray, Knobe, Sheskin, Bloom & Barrett, 2011) and with the perception of people as instruments and as being deprived of humanity (Andrighetto, Baldissari, & Volpato, 2017; Loughnan, Baldissari, Spaccatini & Elder, 2017). The perception of oneself as an instrument and the de-mentalization account for the phenomenon of self-objectification, that is, to perceiving oneself as an object devoid of human characteristics. Yet, they must be distinguished. For example, in a study by Auzoult (2020), we observe that the perception of being objectified is strongly associated with representations of oneself as human (humanness) or as an instrument (instrumentality) but not with dementalization. These different constructs seem to be based on different levels of functioning, dementalization taking into account both the affects and the perceptions accounting for the Self. Based on the literature, the perception of being

objectified would be expected to be associated negatively with humanness (H_1) and mentalization (H_2) and positively with instrumentality (H_3).

Desirability and Utility, two dimensions of personal social value

Numerous studies have highlighted the existence of two evaluative dimensions which would serve to characterize objects and people (Beauvois, 2002; Peeters, Cornelissen & Pandelaere, 2003). The first dimension, called desirability, accounts for the fact that an object or a person is sought or avoided, or even felt as having pleasant or unpleasant relationships, while the second, social utility, designates the value of adaptability with regard to the object or the person's adequacy with regard to social functioning. The first dimension therefore denotes sociability issues while the second dimension denotes performance issues (Darnon, Dompnier, Delmas, Pulfrey, & Butera, 2009). These two dimensions are expressed through judgments and self-defining traits, most often in assessment situations where they are relevant. From a personological point of view, desirable traits refer to sociability (warmth, sympathy) or morality (honesty, coldness) while utility refers to skill (intelligence, efficiency) or power (dominance, ambition) (Cambon, 2006).

Utility and desirability traits carry important information in evaluation situations. Social utility traits are relevant in school assessment situations for understanding academic performance while social desirability traits are associated with the perception of friendliness (Pansu, & Dompnier, 2011; Matteucci, 2014). In the field of organizations, useful traits are invoked to describe the skills of high-level hierarchical superiors, while desirable traits are invoked to describe immediate, close-level superiors (Dubois, 2010). In general, the emphasis on normativity is positively associated with judgments of social utility (Cambon, Djouari & Beauvois, 2006).

Objective and hypotheses

The objective of this study is to describe the process of objectification from the perspective of consequences related to self-perception. Specifically, the goal is to establish that there is a connection between the perception of being objectified at work, self-objectification, and, in turn, a modification of self-evaluation.

The fact of perceiving oneself as objectified reflects the fact of maintaining relations of use for the benefit of a third party, of functionality in an uncertain environment or of being assigned to an unrewarding, repetitive, fragmented activity or one under external control. From this point of view, the fact of seeing oneself as an object should lead to perceiving oneself as having few interpersonal skills or skills at work, these qualities being attributed more to employees in high status positions in the organization. In another context, this is indeed what is observed. For example, Heflick et al., 2011 (see also Heflick & Goldenberg, 2009) found that people who are sexually objectified are perceived to have low competence

and warmth. In the extension of these results, Loughnan, Baldissarri, Spaccatini and Elder (2017) have highlighted that woman who remember themselves as sexually objectified and that employees remembering themselves as objectified at work perceive themselves as having little warmth and competence. We would therefore expect the perception of objectification to be negatively associated with self-evaluations on the register of social desirability (H_4) or social utility (H_5).

This devaluation of the self-concept should occur when the gaze of others is internalized in the form of self-objectification. Thus, the fact that the perception of being objectified is associated with self-objectification should also lead to self-objectification being linked to self-devaluation in terms of utility and social desirability. Indeed, perceiving oneself as an object should be accompanied by perceiving oneself less through traits describing a person's worth. Therefore, we expect that the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-devaluation is mediated by the level of self-objectification (H_6).

METHOD

Participants & procedure

Participants were 241 volunteers ($N = 151$ females and $N = 90$ males, $Age = 31.23$ years) who worked in different professional sectors (health / social, trade / service, industry, civil service, transportation). They were senior managers ($N = 31$), middle managers ($N = 48$), or workers/employees ($N = 162$). 24 participants had a diploma less than or equal to the French *baccalauréat* and 217 higher or equal to the French *baccalauréat*.

The study was disseminated by the research team's Laboratory. One online questionnaire was submitted via a professional forum dedicated to the publication of job offers. Its contents indicated that the researchers were looking for volunteers to participate in a study on workplace relationships. The questionnaire allowed us to measure the study variables and answers were anonymous. The inclusion criteria for participants were to be employees in work, be between 18 and 62 years old (legal retirement age), work in organizations with more than 25 employees and to endorse the objective of and participation in this study.

Measures

Perception of being Objectified (PBO) – Perception of being objectified was measured using the 26-item scale of Auzoult & Personnaz (2016). This scale measures the frequency of perceived behavior on the part of co-workers and the respondent's supervisor. Participants responded using 5-point scales ranging from "not at all" (1) to "quite" (5). We averaged the 26 items' scores to account for the perception of being objectified ($\alpha = .90$).

Self-objectification – Instrumentality and humanness were measured using the 2X5-item scale of Andrighetto, Baldissari, and Volpato (2017). To answer, participants must indicate how they perceive themselves as a human

person (human being, person, individual, subject, and guy) or an instrument (instrument, device, tool, thing and machine) using a 5-point scale ranging from "not at all" (1) to "quite" (5). We averaged the 5 items' scores to account for instrumentality ($\alpha = .87$) and humanness ($\alpha = .75$). Mentalization was measured using the 19-item scale of the Self-Mental State Attribution Task by Baldissari and al. (2014). This scale allows the attribution of different mental states during a working day (e.g., wants, desire, sensing a smell or having an intention). Participants responded using 5-point scales ranging from "not at all" (1) to "quite" (5). We averaged the 19 items' scores to account for mentalization ($\alpha = .93$).

Social values – Social utility and social desirability were measured using traits used by Le Barbenchon, Cambon and Lavigne (2005). These traits referred to Desirability (Pleasant, Open, Sympathetic), Social Utility (Dynamic, Ambitious, Hardworking), Lack of Desirability (Petty, Boastful, Annoying), and Lack of Social Utility (Shy, Unstable, Vulnerable). Participants were asked to describe themselves as a person using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "does not describe me at all" to 5 "fully describes me". Negative scores were reversed and averaged with positive scores (α for desirability = .76; α for utility = .65).

RESULTS

Common method variance and descriptive statistics

We performed the *Harman's single-factor test* in order to control Common Method Biases. The analysis highlighted 12 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first factor accounted for only 26.8% of the variance for 65.4% for the 12 factors. This led us to consider as negligible the risk of common variance bias.

Means, standard deviations, intercorrelations among all variables and internal consistency indexes are presented in Table 1.

Except for hypothesis 2, hypotheses 1 through 5 were supported by the data. Perception of being objectified was positively associated with instrumentality ($r = .57, p < .01, H3$), negatively with humanness ($r = -.42, p < .01, H1$), negatively with desirability ($H4; r = -.19, p < .01, H4$) and utility ($r = -.27, p < .01, H5$). Instrumentality was negatively associated with humanness ($r = -.44, p < .01$), desirability ($r = -.26, p < .01$) and utility ($r = -.29, p < .01$). Humanness was positively associated with desirability ($r = .25, p < .01$) and utility ($r = .26, p < .01$). There was no correlation between the perception of being objectified and mentalization (H_2). Perception of objectification is negatively associated with social desirability (H_4) or social utility (H_5).

We used the population correlation coefficient (r) between the perception of being objectified and instrumentalization/humanness as the effect size measure. The post hoc analyses (Sample size = 241; Significance level = .001) revealed a statistical power as being .99 for PBO/instrumentalization and for POB/humanness.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations between all variables (Cronbach' alpha between brackets)

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. PBO	2.11	.63	(.90)	.01	.570**	-.422**	-.191**	-.273**
2. Mentalization	3.94	.91		(.93)	-.129**	.207**	.036	.145*
3. Instrumentality	2.19	1.04			(.87)	-.441**	-.258**	-.294**
4. Humanness	3.93	.79				(.75)	.248**	.256**
5. Desirability	4.37	.55					(.76)	.482**
6. Utility	3.93	.63						(.65)

Note : * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. PBO = Perception of being Objectified

Hypotheses testing

Our hypotheses predicted a mediation of self-objectification (i.e., instrumentality and humanness) between the perception of being objectified and social values. We used the procedure Process (Hayes, 2013) under the SPSS (model 4, 5000 bootstraps, 95% CI) to test this hypothesis. We can observe (Table 2) an effect of instrumentality and humanness between the perception of being objectified and desirability or utility.

Social Desirability. Analyses confirmed a significant total effect of the perception of being objectified on social desirability ($b = -.17$, $p = .001$; CI: -0.27, -0.06). When controlling for the instrumentality and humanness components, the direct effect of POB on desirability became non-significant (direct effect $b = -.02$, $p = .75$; CI: -0.15, 0.11). Specifically, as expected, the bootstrap procedure showed significance only for the indirect effect of POB on desirability through the instrumentality component of self-objectification (indirect effect $b = -.09$; CI: -0.18, -0.01). The indirect effect of the humanness component was not significant ($b = -.06$, CI: -0.14, 0.00). Therefore, only the instrumentality self-objectification process significantly mediated the effect of POB on desirability value (see Table 2).

Social Utility. Analyses revealed a significant total effect of POB on social utility ($b = -.27$, $p = .001$; CI: -0.39, -0.15). The direct effect became non-significant upon introducing the instrumentality and humanness processes ($b = -.12$, $p = .11$; CI: -0.27, .03). Similar to the findings for social desirability, the bootstrap test of indirect effects revealed significance only for the impact of

POB on social utility through the instrumentality component of self-objectification (indirect effect $b = -.09$; CI: -0.19, -0.02). The indirect effect of the humanness component ($b = -.06$, CI: -0.12, 0.01) was not significant. Therefore, only the instrumentality self-objectification process significantly mediated the effect of POB on desirability value (see Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Main result of this study

In this study, we analyzed the relationships between the perception of objectification in the workplace and the perception of the personal and social value of employees, this relationship being supposed to take place through self-objectification. Several observations can be made in this study.

First, the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification depends on the type of indicator. The relationship appears stronger and more systematic when measuring self-objectification using a representational indicator such as humanness or instrumentality rather than an indicator involving mental health states such as mentalization. Second, as expected, the perception of being objectified is associated with a loss of personal value, i.e. desirability and utility. This relationship is mediated by instrumentality self-objectification. As observed in Auzoult's study (2021), a proximity between indicators of humanness and instrumentality is not evident. The humanness indicator reflects the explicitation of the self-concept, whereas the instrumentality

Table 2. Indirect, direct, and total effects of Multiple Mediation Models.

	Indirect effect	Direct effect	Total effect
<i>Predicted multiple mediators' model</i>			
POB à Instrumentality à Desirability	$b = -.09$; CI: -.18, -.01	$b = -.02$; CI: -.15, .11	$b = -.17$; CI: -.27, -.06
à Humanness à Desirability	$b = -.06$; CI: -.14, .00		
POB à Instrumentality à Utility	$b = -.09$; CI: -.19, -.02	$b = -.12$; CI: -.27, .03	$b = -.27$; CI: -.39, -.15
à Humanness à Utility	$b = -.06$; CI: -.12, .01		

Note. b = unstandardized beta coefficient; CI = 95% Confidence Interval (lower and upper bound).

indicator appears as a metaphorical and indirect measure of self-objectification, conveying how an individual interprets the world. Consequently, the loss of social value in terms of desirability and utility appears to result from a process of inferring social relationships rather than internalizing detrimental interpersonal relationships at the self-level. In doing so, the process revealed by this outcome accounts for a set of perceptual activities where perceiving oneself as an object leads to representing oneself as an entity devoid of the qualities associated with being a human being, such as the ability to establish positive interpersonal relationships and to perform according to dominant social expectations. This result constitutes the main contribution of this study.

In terms of evaluation as a person, the traits used describe an individual having both poor interpersonal skills and a poor quality of professional success. Our results therefore seem to describe a process where the perception of being objectified leads to a double social disqualification where all personological attributes are achieved. This process could account for a detrimental spiral in which employees perceiving themselves as objectified by others are led, through the internalization of the gaze of others, to see themselves as lacking the attributes that contribute to professional performance (e.g., utility traits). This could lead these employees to accept objectification relationships as legitimate, and for those who objectify others, as an incentive to reinforce such relationships. The lack of social utility can indeed translate into the assessment of a person's potential actions as being instrumentalized by others. Future research should explore these potential consequences associated with the results of this study.

Limitations and futures directions

This study highlights a link between objectification and loss of personal and social value. It is part of an explanatory perspective of objectification which considers that the establishment of this process occurs when it comes to assessing the potential for action of people in the workplace in order to decide how to act with them. The perception of being objectified is associated with a loss of value for the employee when they self-assess and is likely to be accompanied by a knock-on effect, so that this loss of value impacts preferences, aspirations, decisions, or even the employee's behavior in a negative way. We must therefore assume that the relationship between objectification and devaluation of the person can operate in a circular fashion, one feeding the other reciprocally and indirectly. At the same time, it should be established that this relationship operates at interpersonal level in a direct way, the objectification of others leading to the implementation of an interpersonal devaluation process at individual or social level. An overview of the phenomenon would imply moving to an experimental design, the correlational and cross-sectional design constituting the main limits of this study.

A second limitation of this study is the fact that it is difficult to establish an equivocal relationship between the

perception of being objectified and mentalization. As we have pointed out, in one study after another the relationship is reported as existing, but is weak or difficult to establish. A study by Baldissari, Andrighetto and Volpato (2014) reveals that this relationship operates via a state of burnout at work. However, a second study by Auzoult and Personnaz (2016) fails to replicate this result. It would be appropriate for future research to establish the conditions necessary for the elaboration of the relationship between these two dimensions of the process of objectification.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the perception of being objectified at work is associated with a devaluation of people on an individual and collective level. This relationship appears to be mediated by self-objectification. Taken together, these results point to a new deleterious consequence associated with objectification in the workplace. As people's social value is an important dimension for explaining professional trajectories and accounting for behavior in the workplace, this study specifically aims to explore the process by which objectification at work contributes to shaping how individuals perceive themselves and, in turn, how they interact with each other.

REFERENCES

- Andrighetto, L., Baldissari, C., & Volpato, C. (2017). (Still) Modern times: objectification at work. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 25-35. Doi: [10.1002/ejsp.2190](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2190)
- Auzoult, L. (2020). Can meaning at work guard against the consequences of objectification? *Psychological Reports*, 123, 872-884. Doi: [10.1177/003329411982689](https://doi.org/10.1177/003329411982689)
- Auzoult, L. (2021). Can self-consciousness and team reflexivity guard against the consequences of objectification? *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 1, 67-75. Doi: [10.24425/ppb.2021.136817](https://doi.org/10.24425/ppb.2021.136817)
- Auzoult, L., & Personnaz, B. (2016). The role of organizational culture and self-consciousness in self-objectification in the workplace. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 23, 271-284.
- Baldissari, C., Andrighetto, L., Gabbiadini, A., & Volpato, C. (2017). Work and freedom? Working self-objectification and belief in personal free will. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 56, 250-269. Doi: [10.1111/bjso.12172](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12172)
- Baldissari, C., Andrighetto, L., & Volpato, C. (2014). When work does not enoble man: Psychological consequences of working objectification. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 21, 327-339.
- Baldissari, C., Andrighetto, L., & Volpato, C. (2017). Workers as objects: the nature of working objectification and the role of perceived alienation. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 24, 1-14. Doi: [10.4473/TPM24.2](https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM24.2)
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2011). Experiencing dehumanization: cognitive and emotional effects of everyday dehumanization. *Basic Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 295-303. Doi: [10.1080/01973533.2011.614132](https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2011.614132)
- Beauvois J.-L. (2002). Judgment norms, social utility and individualism, in N. Dubois (Ed.), *A Sociocognitive Approach to Social Norms*, London, Routledge.
- Bernard, P., Gervais, S. J., & Klein, O. (2018). Objectifying objectification: When and why people are cognitively reduced to their parts akin to objects. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 29(1), 82-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1471949>

- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin, S., & De Wilde, M. (2017). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: the mediating role of organizational dehumanization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26, 527-540. Doi: [10.1080/1359432X.2017.1319817](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1319817)
- Cambon, L. (2006). Social Desirability and Social Utility: Two evaluative dimensions of Personality Traits. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 19, 3, 125-151.
- Cambon, L., Djouari, A., & Beauvois, J.L. (2006). Social Judgment Norms and Social Utility: When It Is More Valuable to Be Useful Than Desirable. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 65, 3, 167-180.
- Christoff, K. (2014). Dehumanization in organizational settings: some scientific and ethical considerations. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 8, 1-5. Doi: [10.3389/fnhum.2014.00748](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00748)
- Darnon, C., Dompnier, B., Delmas, F., Pulfrey, C., & Butera, F. (2009). Achievement Goal Promotion at University: Social Desirability and Social Utility of Mastery and Performance Goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 1, 119-134. Doi: [10.1037/a0012824](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012824)
- Dubois, N., (2010). Theory of the social value of persons applied to organizations: typologies of "good" leaders and recruitment. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 60, 255-266. Doi: [10.1016/j.erap.2010.01.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2010.01.002)
- Gervais, S. J., Bernard, P., Klein, O., & Allen, J. (2013). Toward a unified theory of objectification and dehumanization. In *Objectification and (de) humanization* (pp. 1-23). Springer, New York, NY.
- Gervais, S. J., Wiener, R. L., Allen, J., Farnum, K. S., & Kimble, K. (2016). Do you see what I see? The consequences of objectification in work settings for experiencers and third party predictors. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 16, 143-174. Doi: [10.1111/asap.12118](https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12118)
- Gray, K., Knobe, J., Sheskin, M., Bloom, P. & Barrett, L. F. (2011). More than a body: Mind perception and the surprising nature of objectification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 1207-1220. Doi: [10.1037/a0025883](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025883).
- Gruenfeld, D. H., Inesi, M. E., Magee, J. C., Galinski, A. D. (2008). Power and the Objectification of Social Targets. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 95, 111-127. Doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111).
- Haque, O. S., & Waytz, A. (2012). Dehumanization in medicine: causes, solutions, and functions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 176-186. Doi: [10.1177/1745691611429706](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611429706)
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 252-264. Doi: [10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4)
- Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 399-423.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Heflick, N. A., Goldenberg, J. L., Cooper, D. P., & Puvia, E. (2011). From women to objects: Appearance focus, target gender, and perceptions of warmth, morality and competence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(3), 572-581. Doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.020)
- Heflick, N. A., & Goldenberg, J. L. (2009). Objectifying Sarah Palin: Evidence that objectification causes women to be perceived as less competent and less fully human. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 598-601. Doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2009.02.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.02.008)
- Landau, M. J., Sullivan, D., Keefer, L. A., Rothschild, Z. K., Osman, M. R. (2012). Subjectivity uncertainty theory of objectification: Compensating for uncertainty about how to positively relate to others by downplaying their subjective attributes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1234-1246. Doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.003)
- Le Barbenchon, E., Cambon, L., & Lavigne, F. (2005). Désirabilité et utilité sociale de 308 adjectifs de personnalité et 297 professions. *Année psychologique*, 105, 2, 307. 322.
- Leyens, J.-P. (2015). *L'humanité écorchée, humanité et infrahumanisation*. Grenoble: PUG.
- Loughnan, S., Baldissarri, C., Spaccatini, F., & Elder, L. (2017). Internalizing objectification: Objectified individuals see themselves as less warm, competent, moral, and human. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 56, 217-232. Doi: [10.1111/bjso.12188](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12188)
- Matteucci, M. C. (2014). Social utility versus social desirability of students' attributional self-presentation strategies. *Soc Psychol Educ*, 17, 541-563. Doi : [10.1007/s11218-014-9256-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-014-9256-8)
- Nguyen, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2018). Emotional labor and core self-evaluations as mediators between organizational dehumanization and job satisfaction. *Current Psychology*.1-9. Doi: [10.1007/s12144-018-9988-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9988-2)
- Pansu, P., & Dompnier, B. (2011). A bidimensional scale of scholastic value: Social Desirability and social utility, two dimensions of personological judgment. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 61, 31-41. Doi: [10.1016/j.erap.2010.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2010.08.001)
- Peeters G., Cornelissen I., Pandelaere M. (2003). Approach-avoidance values of target-directed behaviors elicited by target-traits : The role of evaluative trait dimensions. *Current Psychology Letters I Behavior, Brain, Cognition*, 11, 2. Doi: [10.4000/cpl.396](https://doi.org/10.4000/cpl.396)
- Proffitt, D. R. (2006). Embodied perception and the economy of action. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 1, 110-122. Doi: [10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00008.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00008.x).
- Szymanski, D. M., & Feltman, C. E. (2015). Linking Sexually Objectifying Work Environments Among Waitresses to Psychological and Job-Related Outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 39, 390-404. Doi: [10.1177/0361684314565345](https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314565345)
- Szymanski, D. M., & Mikorski, R. (2016). Sexually objectifying restaurants and waitresses' burnout and intentions to leave: The roles of power and support. *Sex Roles*, 75, 328-338. Doi: [10.1007/s11199-016-0621-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0621-2)
- Timmermans, S., & Almeling, R. (2009). Objectification, standardization, and commodification in health care: A conceptual readjustment. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69, 21-27. Doi: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.04.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.04.020)
- Wiener, R. L., Gervais, S. L., Allen, J., & Marquez, A. (2013). Eye of the Beholder: Effects of Perspective and Sexual Objectification on Harassment Judgments. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 19, 206-221. Doi: [10.1037/a002849](https://doi.org/10.1037/a002849)