

THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS IN SELF-OBJECTIFICATION IN THE WORKPLACE

LAURENT AUZOULT

UNIVERSITY PAUL VALÉRY – MONTPELLIER 3

BERNARD PERSONNAZ

SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES – PARIS

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH – PARIS

In this study, we examine the process of self-objectification in the workplace. In a previous study on this subject, it was highlighted that the perception of being objectified induces self-objectification via the mediation of burnout in the workplace. We introduce the hypothesis that organizational culture could also explain self-objectification. Likewise, the shift from the perception of being objectified to self-objectification may be moderated by the level of self-consciousness. Employees ($N = 363$) from various economic sectors replied to a questionnaire measuring organizational culture, the perception of being objectified, self-objectification, burnout, and self-consciousness. The results did not support the mediation of the levels of burnout, but highlighted that culture is associated with self-objectification. The moderation effect of private self-consciousness on the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification was also observed.

Key words: Organizational culture; Focus; Perception of being-objectified; Self-objectification; Self-consciousness.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Laurent Auzoult, Laboratoire Epsilon (EA 4556), University Paul Valéry, Rue du Pr. Henry Serre, 34000 Montpellier, France. Email: laurent.auzoult-chagnault@univ-montp3.fr

Initially, objectification refers to the experience of being regarded solely on the basis of one's body and, in particular, concerns the perception of people from a sexual point of view (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Sexual objectification (most often women's objectification) can lead to various mental health disorders (anxiety, food disorders, and depression). The various studies, which have been conducted in this field, highlight a process according to which objectification by others can be internalized and expressed through self-objectification, that is, a perception of the self and an evaluation which takes on the point of view of others, leading in certain cases to a denial of subjectivity (loss of human attributes).

More broadly speaking, objectification expresses a process of subjugation whereby people, like objects, are treated as a means to an end (Gruenfeld, Inesi, Magee, & Galinsky, 2008) or the process of reducing a person to one of his/her attributes, body, illness or power, for instance (Inesi, Lee, & Rios, 2014). It appears as a form of dehumanization (Volpato & Andrighetto, 2015) which potentially jeopardizes several forms of interpersonal relationships (Nussbaum, 1995). Objectification may occur when the individual is perceived as being interchangeable with another (fungibility), like a mere piece of property (ownership), as being susceptible of suffering physical

violence (violability), as lacking autonomy (denial of autonomy), agency, and personal feelings (denial of subjectivity) or is perceived as an instrument (instrumentality). Langton (2011) cited other types of attitudes to express the objectification process: the fact of identifying individuals by their body, or body parts (reduction to the body); the fact of interacting with individuals mainly on the basis of their physical appearance (reduction to appearance); the fact of treating individuals as if they were silent or incapable of speaking (reduction to silence).

OBJECTIFICATION IN THE WORKPLACE

The objectification process has also been cited in medicine to express patient care (Leroy, Caron, & Beaune, 2007; Timmermans & Almeling, 2009) or in the social field to describe homelessness (Hoffman & Coffey, 2008). More broadly speaking, objectification may explain health levels in the workplace. For example, according to Schwalbe (1986), who draws on Marx's analyses (see Berger & Luckmann, 1966), the process of objectification and self-objectification describes the process by which workers construct a world external to themselves, one which reflects their will, their thoughts, their sensitivity, and their abilities. This process leads to natural labor, which Schwalbe contrasts with alienated labor, and becomes the means of exercising an activity associated with a positive experience.

Other researchers have studied the opposite processes according to which it is not the external world but workers themselves who are perceived as an object instrumentalized by others. For example, Fromm (2010) considers that the industrialized structure of work has placed the worker in the role of an instrument at the service of machines, an instrument constrained in its movements and pace of work. Other aspects of industrial activity can be cited to express this process: fragmentation of the activity, repetitiveness of tasks, and external control of the activity (Baldissari, Andrighetto, & Volpato, 2014; Fromm, 2010), and promotion of competition (Szymanski, Moffitt, & Carr, 2011). Nussbaum (1995) describes this phenomenon on the whole as an expropriation of labor.

From an empirical point of view, Baldissari et al. (2014) observe that the fact of being perceived as an object (perception of being objectified), as an instrument at the service of superiors, is associated with the fact of self-objectifying, that is, of perceiving oneself as lacking mental states in the workplace (emotional or rational experience). This process is said to be mediated by a mechanism linked to burnout (exhaustion, cynicism) in such a way that objectification by others results via burnout in self-objectification by employees. In this case, the fact of perceiving oneself as being instrumentalized by others may lead employees to feeling emotionally drained and to distance themselves from their work, this process leading to a self-perception of lacking fundamental human attributes (emotions, reasoning, and sensations). To our knowledge, this study is the first test of objectification theory in a workplace context. Its two essential limitations are that it is based on a limited sample (supermarket employees) and that the measure of objectification is based on only one interaction modality, here instrumentalization. As Baldissari et al. indicate, it appears necessary to replicate and extend this observation to other professional contexts and other forms of interaction in addition to instrumentalization.

AIMS AND HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Our study has three aims. The first, which falls within a perspectivist framework (Jost, Banaji, & Prentice, 2004; Jost & Kruglanski, 2002; McGuire, 1999), is to disseminate the observations of Baldissari et al. (2014), while identifying replications in other observational contexts and through alternative hypotheses. In this study, which takes place in a different cultural context from that of Baldissari and colleagues, we will adopt a wider measure of objectification, reflecting different types of attitude, and will introduce a different measure of burnout. Replication of the results would demonstrate the strength of the relationship between the perception of being objectified, burnout, and self-objectification (Hypothesis 1).

Our second aim is to introduce the context of the workplace as an explanatory factor of self-objectification. Organizational culture may be a factor which contributes to the explanation of self-objectification. We based our approach on Quinn's (1988) model, which describes organizational effectiveness through four types of cultures: *support*, an orientation which encourages participation, cooperation, trust, and verbal and informal communication; *innovation*, a position where creativity is sought, and employees' openness to change, participation and involvement are encouraged; *rules*, where respect for authority, rationality of procedures, and division of labor is emphasized and written formal communication is practiced; *objective/goal*, reflecting an orientation where attention is paid to performance indicators and the accountability and accomplishment of employees is encouraged. These four types of cultures reflect the way in which members of the organization interpret and give meaning to their work environment.

Objectification may be a means of reducing complexity and, consequently, of facilitating interactions by perceiving others in terms of simple attributes (Landau, Sullivan, Keefer, Rothschild, & Osman, 2012). These authors highlight that, in order to face up to the difficulty of taking into account employees' subjectivity (their personality, their values, etc.), managers, anticipating difficulties in fulfilling their role, focus on the professional attributes of employees (exclusion of personal life, reduction to activity, evaluation of subordinates on the basis of organizational goals). From this point of view, it may be thought that a strong organizational culture, whatever its orientation, is likely to reduce uncertainty by providing a common interpretive framework and strong values, making behaviors predictable. The level of culture would be expected to be negatively associated with the perception of being objectified and the resulting self-objectification. At the same time, studies by Gruenfeld et al. (2008) highlight that objectification (instrumentalization) is a result of the use of formal power. From an organizational point of view, this type of behavior refers to a rules-oriented culture where management is *expressed* via a centralization of instructions and a decentralization of the exercise of power through the use of rules, standards and procedures. It would be expected therefore that the level of rules-oriented culture would be positively associated with the perception of being objectified (Hypothesis 2) and of self-objectification (Hypothesis 3), and that the levels of innovation, goal and support oriented culture would be negatively associated with the perception of being objectified (Hypothesis 4) and of self-objectification (Hypothesis 5).

Our third aim is to account for the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification through a process of self-regulation. Specifically, the majority of self-regulation models (Carver & Scheier, 1981; Duval, Silvia, & Lalwani, 2001; Duval & Wicklund, 1972; Gibbons, 1990) highlight the importance of self-consciousness in initiating the trans-

fer of the standards and the expectations of others with regard to the self. Within these different theoretical frameworks, it is via a transient increase in the level of self-attention (self-awareness) or in the dispositional level of self-attention (self-consciousness) that a comparison is initiated with the standards proposed by others or with internal states. Most often, this comparison leads to a modification of the self in the direction of an alignment with the standards or internal states. This process describes fairly faithfully the observations of Baldissari et al. (2014) and Lindner, Tantleff-Dunn, and Jentsch (2012), which highlight the fact that the shift from objectification to self-objectification is accompanied by a process of social comparison which is expressed by a focus on others. At the same time, these studies highlight the fact that the shift from the perception of being objectified to self-objectification is based on dysfunctional emotional states, here burnout. The majority of studies in this field highlight the positive impact of heightened self-consciousness on the regulation of stress (Ghorbani, Cunningham, & Watson, 2010; Mullen, & Suls, 1982; Suls & Fletcher, 1985) and the regulation of emotions in the workplace (Andela, Auzoult, & Truchot, 2014). Only chronic self-attention in a context where stress conditions are chronic could lead to dysfunctional regulations (Frone & McFarlin, 1989). In the present case, objectifying behaviors can be considered as infrequent and likely to occur under particular conditions where social interactions become uncontrollable. The underlying mechanism could be that the perception of being objectified increases self-objectification only for people with low private self-consciousness (Hypothesis 6).

METHOD

Participants

Three hundred and sixty-three employees participated in this study ($M_{\text{age}} = 44.4$ years; 194 males). They worked in the civil service (28.1%), industry (22%), trade/service (13.2%), healthcare (12.1%), the social sector (3.9%), building and public works (7.2%), the hotel industry/catering (4.7%), banking/real estate (3.9%), green spaces/agriculture (2.2%), arts and crafts (0.6%), and transport (1.7%); for others, information was not provided (0.4%). They worked as operators (60.3%), supervisors (34.2%), and managers (5.2%); for others, information was not provided (0.3%).

Procedure

Participants were approached to take part in a study regarding social relationships in the workplace. They completed a paper questionnaire which allowed us to measure the study variables and participants' personal characteristics (age, length of service, sector of activity, qualification, and status). The questionnaire was applied at the workplace. Participants answered the following questions: "What is the highest diploma you have obtained?" (*No diploma, Bachelor degree, Higher degree, PhD*) and "What is your status now?" (*Executive, Supervisor manager, Middle manager, Employee, Worker*). For coding, see Table 2. Once data were completed and results processed, respondents received a report of the study's main results by email.

Measures

Perception of being objectified. We used some of the items included in Baldissari et al.'s (2014) scale assessing instrumentalization, and developed a new scale taking into account the other sources of objectification, namely reduction to appearance, reduction to body, reduction to silence, denial of autonomy, denial of subjectivity, passivity, interchangeability, violability, and possession (see the Appendix). Participants responded on a 7-point scale: 1 = *Never*; 2 = *Almost never*; 3 = *Rarely*; 4 = *Sometimes*; 5 = *Often*; 6 = *Very often*; 7 = *Always*.

Burnout. We used the Maslach-Pines Burnout Measure Short version (BMS-10), validated in French by Lourel, Gueguen, and Mouda (2007). The scale (10 items) assesses the degree of physical exhaustion (e.g., "When thinking about your work, do you feel tired?"), mental exhaustion (e.g., "When thinking about your work, do you feel desperate?"), and emotional exhaustion (e.g., "When thinking about your work, do you feel neglected?"). Participants responded on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 = *Never* to 7 = *Always*.

Self-objectification. We adopted the Self-Mental State Attribution (SMSA) measure, developed by Baldissari et al. (2014). It includes 19 items measuring different mental states to be attributed to the self, during a day in the workplace: feeling attraction, feeling a need, desiring, wishing, expressing a desire, expressing a wish, imagining, having an intention, deciding, seeing, reasoning, reflecting, choosing, knowing, planning, understanding, smelling, anticipating, tasting. Participants indicated, on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = *Never* to 7 = *Always*, whether they were likely to experience these states during a day in the workplace. A high mental state attribution score expressed a low level of self-objectification.

Organizational culture. Participants replied to the FOCUS questionnaire of van Muijen et al. (1999). This tool allows culture to be understood on the basis of four different dimensions: support (e.g., "How often are new ideas about work organization encouraged?"); innovation (e.g., "How often is there a lot of investment in new products?"); rules (e.g., "How often are jobs performed according to defined procedures?"); goal orientation (e.g., "How often is competitiveness measured in relation to other organizations?"). We used the first part of the questionnaire, measuring the overall climate, composed of 40 items to which participants replied on a 6-point scale (from *Never* to *Always*).

Self-consciousness (SC). Participants replied to the French version of the dispositional SC scale (Pelletier & Vallerand, 1990), in which nine items referred to the private dimension of SC (e.g., "I constantly examine my reasons for acting"), and seven referred to public SC (e.g., "I am aware of the impression I give"). A 4-point scale was used, ranging from 0 = *Not at all like me* to 3 = *Very like me*.

RESULTS

Perception of Being Objectified: Psychometric Structure

We carried out a principal axis factor analysis. The inspection of the scree plot revealed five factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Together, the five factors accounted for 54.99% of the total variance (Table 1). We, nevertheless, considered that a solution with one factor was preferable; in fact, 21 items were loaded on the first factor which explained 32.36% of the total vari-

ance. In addition, there was a crossloading for 13 items (loadings higher than .30 simultaneously on several factors); moreover, 24 out of the 26 items were positively and significantly correlated with the score of burnout ($.50 > r > .19$). Reliability for the 26 items was good (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$).

The Role of Burnout, Self-Consciousness, and Organizational Culture in the Relationship between Perceptions of Being Objectified and Self-Objectification

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2. As regards our main variables, we observed: a relatively low score, below the mid-point of the scale, for the perception of being objectified, $M = 2.70$, $t(362) = -17.3$, $p < .001$; a low burnout score, below the mid-point of the scale, $M = 2.80$, $t(362) = -12.9$, $p < .001$; a high score for the attribution of mental states to the self (SMSA), $M = 4.53$, $t(362) = 21.6$, $p < .001$. A negative relationship was observed between the perception of being objectified and the SMSA score, as in the study by Baldissari et al. (2014). Likewise, the perception of being objectified and the level of burnout were positively associated whereas a negative relationship was observed between the SMSA score and the level of burnout. Organizational culture scores were associated with the perception of being objectified and with the SMSA attribution score, with the exception of goal orientation which was not correlated with the perception of being objectified. More precisely, innovation orientation, $r(363) = -.11$, $p < .03$, and support orientation, $r(363) = -.40$, $p < .001$, but not goal orientation, $r(363) = -.05$, $p < .36$, were correlated with the perception of being objectified (Hypothesis 4 was confirmed for innovation and support orientations). Rule orientation was negatively associated with perception of being objectified, $r(363) = -.19$, $p < .001$ (Hypothesis 2 was contradicted). Otherwise, goal orientation, $r(363) = .18$, $p < .001$, innovation orientation, $r(363) = .28$, $p < .001$, support orientation, $r(363) = .31$, $p < .001$, and rule orientation, $r(363) = .11$, $p < .05$, were positively associated with SMSA score: Hypothesis 5 was confirmed and Hypothesis 3 was contradicted. Finally, public and private self-consciousness scores were associated with the SMSA score but not with the perception of being objectified (Table 2).

We carried out a hierarchical regression analysis in order to gradually introduce our categories of variables and assess their contribution to the explanation of the outcome. We, therefore, introduced the SMSA score as the dependent variable and as independent variables the perception of being objectified (Step 1), burnout and self-consciousness (Step 2), and then the context variables (Step 3). We observed that the perception of being objectified explained the SMSA score, but at a very low degree ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$). In this case, the more participants perceived themselves as being objectified the more they self-objectified. The introduction of burnout and self-consciousness at Step 2 added little explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .06$).

Only private self-consciousness contributed positively to explaining SMSA attributions ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$). The addition of the context variables (Step 3) increased the explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .09$). In addition to private self-consciousness ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$), support orientation ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$), and innovation orientation ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$) contributed positively to explaining the attribution of mental states to the self, which reflected a negative relationship between these two types of contextual factors and self-objectification. In contrast, rule orientation contributed negatively to explaining the SMSA score ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$), reflecting a positive relationship between rule orientation and self-objectification.¹

TABLE 1
 Factor structure (principal factor analysis) of the perception of being objectified scale
 (for the contents of the items, see the Appendix)

Sources of objectification and item numbers	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		Factor 5	
	Eigenvalue	% explained								
	8.41	32.36	2.01	7.75	1.63	6.26	1.20	4.63	1.04	3.99
Instrumentalization										
2 (R)	.28		.32		.49		.14		-.04	
9	.70		.14		-.13		.02		.20	
13 (R)	.09		.35		.47		.05		.38	
19	.64		.25		-.08		-.12		.13	
22	.07		.02		-.62		-.12		.18	
26	.60		.21		-.004		-.21		.09	
Reduction to appearance										
1	.44		-.36		.005		.03		.44	
17	.33		-.30		-.34		.44		.29	
Reduction to body										
14	.49		-.48		.13		.16		.06	
11	.63		.28		-.14		-.06		-.13	
Reduction to silence										
8	.58		.10		-.06		.44		-.29	
3	.72		.02		.02		.17		.01	
Denial of autonomy										
4	.43		.15		-.14		.66		-.14	
10	.58		-.30		-.04		.04		.13	
15	.61		-.35		.07		-.01		-.23	

(table 1 continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Sources of objectification and item numbers	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		Factor 5	
	Eigenvalue	% explained								
	8.41	32.36	2.01	7.75	1.63	6.26	1.20	4.63	1.04	3.99
Denial of subjectivity										
16 (R)	.65		.08		-.15		-.16		.24	
7	.36		.47		.43		.20		.08	
20	.66		.12		-.20		-.09		-.18	
Passivity										
21	.58		-.26		.07		-.09		-.36	
25	.74		-.04		-.11		-.14		-.22	
Interchangeability										
6	.49		-.40		.38		-.11		.06	
12	.49		-.51		.40		-.09		-.04	
Violability										
18	.74		.22		-.02		-.05		.10	
23	.67		.28		-.03		-.19		-.11	
Possession										
5	.63		-.08		-.01		-.05		.11	
24	.79		.11		-.01		-.21		-.05	

Note. R = reverse coded.

TABLE 2
 Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations between all the variables (Cronbach's alphas between parentheses)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	44.4	12.2	-.06	-.19***	-.20***	.03	.07	-.03	-.01	-.16**	-.14**	.08	.007	.07
2. Sex (1)	—	—		.07	.12*	-.14*	-.16*	-.06	-.12*	.20**	.04	.05	-.07	-.04
3. Qualification	—	—			-.41**	.12*	.06	.08	.15**	.04	.09	-.04	-.07	.19***
4. Status	—	—				-.09	-.10*	-.12*	-.17***	-.04	-.07	.08	.09	-.21***
5. Goal	3.72	0.93				(.84)	.65***	.58***	.45**	.06	.04	-.04	-.05	.18***
6. Innovation	3.40	0.72					(.82)	.48***	.54***	-.002	.08	-.06	-.11*	.28***
7. Rules	4.07	0.86						(.67)	.52***	.05	-.009	-.20**	-.19***	.11*
8. Support	3.20	0.88							(.81)	.05	.03	-.30**	-.40***	.31***
9. Public SC	1.96	0.66								(.82)	.48***	.01	-.09	.18***
10. Private SC	2.13	0.41									(.66)	.13**	.03	.22***
11. Burnout	2.80	1.03										(.87)	.62***	-.10*
12. Perception of objectification	2.70	0.88											(.90)	-.13*
13. SMSA	4.53	0.91												(.89)

Note. (1) = Male (53.4%); Qualification (the higher the score, the higher the degree; i.e., No diploma = 0, Bachelor degree = 1, Higher degree = 2, PhD = 3); Status (the higher the score, the lower the status; i.e., Executive = 0, Supervisor manager = 1, Middle manager = 2, Employee = 3, Worker = 4); SC = self-consciousness; SMSA = Self-Mental State Attribution.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

To test mediation and moderation, we used the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2013). This procedure allowed us to estimate the significance of mediation and moderation effects through the use of bootstrapping. We considered 1000 resamples and the bias-corrected 95% CI. These analyses contradicted the hypothesis that burnout mediates the link between the perception of being objectified and the SMSA score: $b = -.02$, $SE = .05$, 95% CI $[-.12, .08]$. Hypothesis 1 is contradicted. Furthermore, findings supported the moderating role of private self-consciousness: actually, when self-consciousness was high, the link between the perception of objectification and self-objectification was nonsignificant (Table 3). Hypothesis 6 is confirmed.

TABLE 3
 Conditional effect of the perception of objectification on Self-Mental State Attribution
 in terms of values of private self-consciousness

Private SC	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
1.72 (low)	-.18	.06	-.31	-.05
2.13 (medium)	-.14	.05	-.24	-.03
2.53 (high)	-.10	.07	-.23	.02

Note. SC = self-consciousness; SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit of confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit of confidence interval.

The explanation of the perception of being objectified, based on context variables, revealed a significant model, $R^2 = .19$, $F(4, 362) = 20.42$, $p < .001$, where two variables helped to explain the level of the perception of being objectified: goal orientation ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .02$) and support orientation ($\beta = -.47$, $p < .001$); the effects of innovation ($\beta = -.07$, $p < .29$) and rules ($\beta = -.08$, $p < .20$) were, in contrast, nonsignificant.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to replicate and develop the results obtained by Baldissari et al. (2014), while considering the moderating role of self-consciousness and the impact of organizational culture on self-objectification. Our measure of the perception of being objectified included all types of behaviors envisaged by the objectification theory, and our measure of burnout was based on a different tool from the original study, the survey being conducted in a different cultural context. Our findings confirm the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification in the workplace: the employees who perceive themselves as objectified have a tendency to self-objectify. At the same time, the mediating role of burnout was not revealed in our sample of participants. For Baldissari et al., the disparity between the positive identity expected in the workplace and the fact of perceiving oneself as being objectified was likely to lead to exhaustion (overstrain and fatigue) and then, in accordance with the classic burnout pattern, to self-regulation, to cynicism, and to self-objectification. The tool which we used mainly measures exhaustion in its mental, physical, and emotional dimensions (Schaufeli & Van Dierendonck, 1993). Our findings do not lead to conclude that burnout has a weak effect on self-objectification. The fact of not having measured cynicism (the second mediator in Baldissari et al.'s model) can

be an explanation of the missed mediation role of burnout in this study. However, our sample of participants expressed a high level of private self-consciousness ($M = 2.13$, with a maximum of 3) and a relatively low level of burnout. The combination of these two states could explain why the effects associated with burnout are difficult to observe. This analysis is consistent with the observation of the relatively weak relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification.

We observed a moderating effect of self-consciousness on the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification. A high level of private self-consciousness leads to the dissociation of the two phenomena and prevents the internalization by workers of the objectification that they perceive from other workers. This internalization process which is at the origin of the objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) only appears to be operational in particular conditions where the level of dispositional private self-consciousness is average or low. It can therefore be considered that self-consciousness acts as a means of initiating efficient self-regulation which acts against the objectified image reflected by others. Future studies on this subject should explore this hypothesis while explaining the nature of standards which serve as a framework for the perception of oneself as a person being able to express his/her subjectivity.

Another contribution of our study concerns the identification of the predominant role of the context, that is, of the organizational culture, in self-objectification. Thus, goal and support orientations protect workers from objectification whereas support and innovation orientations (flexible culture with low control/power) protect workers from self-objectification. In contrast, a rule-oriented culture (culture with high levels of control) promotes the self-objectification of workers but not the objectification by others, as expected. This result confirms the overriding direct impact of power on self-objectification in a professional environment and suggests that it is in the organizations, where involvement/commitment is encouraged via participation, cooperation (support) and accountability (goals), that objectification is less likely to occur.

CONCLUSIONS

This research confirms the importance of studying objectification and its corollaries in organizations. In this narrow context, organizational culture appears to be a major determinant of the dehumanization process in the form of self-objectification which confirms the importance of taking organizational characteristics into account in the management of health in the workplace (Dextras-Gauthier, Marchand, & Haines, 2012). Our results question the role which burnout may play in this process and, more particularly, the type of self-regulations likely to encourage or prevent this process from occurring. We, therefore, observed that the relationship between the perception of being objectified and self-objectification, which is at the heart of objectification theory, is only effective when self-consciousness and the associated regulations are low. This result opens new avenues for the study of self-objectification outside the field of organizations.

NOTE

1. The contradiction between the analysis of correlation and regression analysis is trivial. The regression gives coefficients while controlling for the other variables (perception of being objectified, burnout, self-consciousness). Simple correlation coefficients do not control for the other variables and, therefore, can give false relationships.

REFERENCES

- Andela, M., Auzoult, L., & Truchot, D. (2014). An exploratory study of self-consciousness and emotion regulation strategies in health care workers. *Psychological Reports, 115*, 106-114. doi:10.2466/20.16.PR0.115c17z4
- Baldissari, C., Andrighetto, L., & Volpato, C. (2014). When work does not ennoble man: Psychological consequences of working objectification. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 21*, 327-339. doi:10.4473/TPM21.3.7
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality, a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control theory approach to human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Dextras-Gauthier, J., Marchand, A., & Haines III, V. (2012). Organizational culture, work organization conditions, and mental health: A proposed integration. *International Journal of Stress Management, 19*, 81-104. doi:10.1037/a0028164
- Duval, T. S., Silvia, P., & Lalwani, N. (2001). *Self-awareness & causal attribution: A dual systems theory*. London, UK: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Duval, T. S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A theory of objective self-awareness*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T.-A. (1997). Objectification theory, toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x
- Fromm, E. (2010). *The pathology of normalcy*. New York, NY: AMHF.
- Frone, M. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1989). Chronic occupational stressors, self-focus attention and well-being: Testing a cybernetic model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 876-883.
- Ghorbani, N., Cunningham, C. J. L., & Watson, P. J. (2010). Comparative analysis of integrative self-knowledge, mindfulness and private self-consciousness in predicting responses to stress in Iran. *International Journal of Psychology, 45*, 147-154. doi:10.1080/00207590903473768
- Gibbons, F. X. (1990). Self-attention and behaviour: A review and theoretical update. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 23*, 249-303. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60321-4
- Gruenfeld, D. H., Inesi, M. E., Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Power and the objectification of social targets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 111-127. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hoffman, L., & Coffey, B. (2008). Dignity and indignation: How people experiencing homelessness view services and providers. *The Social Science Journal, 45*, 207-222. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2008.03.001
- Inesi, M. E., Lee, S. Y., & Rios, K. (2014). Objects of desire: Subordinate ingratiation triggers self-objectification among powerful. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 53*, 19-30. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2014.01.010
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Prentice, D. A. (2004). *Perspectivism in social psychology, the yin and yang of scientific progress*. Washington, DC: First Edition.
- Jost, J. T., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2002). The estrangement of social constructionism and experimental social psychology: History of the rift and prospects for reconciliation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 168-187. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0603_1
- Landau, M. J., Sullivan, D., Keefer, L. A., Rothschild, Z. K., & Osman, M. K. (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
- Langton, R. (2011). Sexual solipsism: Philosophical essays on pornography and objectification, by Rae Langton. *European Journal of Philosophy, 19*, 327-334. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0378.2011.00478.x
- Leroy, F., Caron, R., & Beaune, D. (2007). Objectivation du corps en médecine et incidences subjectives [The objectification of the body in medicine and subjective consequences]. *Annale Médico Psychologiques, 165*, 465-471. doi:10.1016/j.amp.2006.04.013

- Lindner, D., Tantleff-Dunn, S., & Jentsch, F. (2012). Social comparison and the “circle of objectification”. *Sex Roles, 67*, 222-235. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0175-x
- Lourel, M., Gueguen, N., & Mouda, F. (2007). L'évaluation du burnout de Pines: Adaptation et validation en version française de l'instrument Burnout Measure Short version (BMS-10) [The burnout assessment of Pines: A French adaptation and validation of the Burnout Measure Short version (BMS-10)]. *Pratiques Psychologiques, 13*, 353-364. doi:10.1016/j.prps.2007.06.001
- McGuire, W. J. (1999). *Constructing social psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, B., & Suls, J. (1982). Know thyself: Stressful life changes and the ameliorative effect of private self-consciousness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*, 43-55. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(82)90080-4
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1995). Objectification. *Philosophy and Public Affairs, 24*, 249-291. doi:10.1111/j.1088-4963.1995.tb00032.x
- Pelletier, L. G., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). L'Échelle Révisée de Conscience de Soi: Une traduction et une validation canadienne-française du Revised Self-Consciousness Scale [The Revised Self-Consciousness Scale: A translation and a French-Canadian validation of the Revised Self-Consciousness Scale]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 22*, 191-206. doi:10.1037/h0078983
- Quinn, R. E. (1988). *Beyond rational management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Van Dierendonck, D. (1993). The construct validity of two burnout measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 631-647. doi:10.1002/job.4030140703
- Schwalbe, M. L. (1986). *The psychosocial consequences of natural and alienated labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Suls, J., & Fletcher, B. (1985). Self-attention, life stress and illness: A prospective study. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 47*, 469-481. doi:10.1097/00006842-198509000-00007
- Szymanski, D. M., Moffitt, L. B., & Carr, E. R. (2011). Sexual objectification of women: Advances to theory and research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 39*, 6-38. doi:10.1177/0011000010378402
- 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
- van Muijen, J. J., Koopman, P., De Witte, K., De Cock, G., Susanj, Z., Lemoine, C., ... Turnipseed, D. (1999). Organizational culture: The focus questionnaire. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*, 551-568. doi:10.1080/135943299398168
- Volpato, C., & Andrighetto, L. (2015). Dehumanization. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 6*, 31-37. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.24035-X

APPENDIX

Scale of Perception of Being Objectified in the Workplace

Sources of objectification	N	Items
Instrumentalization	2.	My boss and/or my colleagues appreciate me even when I am not useful to them. (R)
	9.	My boss and/or my colleagues think more about what I can do for them than what they can do for me.
	13.	The relationship with my boss and/or my colleagues is based on the fact that we appreciate one another from a human point of view rather than on the fact that I am productive. (R)
	19.	If I was no longer useful to my boss and/or my colleagues, my relationship with them would come to an end.
	22.	My boss and/or my colleagues consider the relationship they have with me to be important because it allows them to achieve their objectives.
Reduction to appearance	26.	My boss and/or my colleagues only seek me out when they need something.
	1.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues only consider me on the basis of my physical appearance.
Reduction to body	17.	The only thing that counts in my workplace is that I present myself well physically.
	14.	For my boss and/or my colleagues, what I feel or what I think is of little importance, what counts is that I am physically able to work.
Reduction to silence	11.	My boss and/or my colleagues consider that my physical aptitudes are my only skills.
	8.	My boss and/or my colleagues do not listen to what I have to say about my work.
Denial of autonomy	3.	My boss and/or my colleagues never ask my opinion at work, as though I had nothing to say.
	4.	My boss and/or my colleagues never ask if I would like to work in a different way.
	10.	My boss and/or my colleagues tell me how to do my work even when I do not ask anything.
Denial of subjectivity	15.	My boss and/or my colleagues give me no latitude in my work as they think that I would not know how to do it differently.
	16.	My boss and/or my colleagues are often interested in what I feel because they want to get as close to me as possible. (R)
	7.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues act as if my private life was of no importance and shouldn't be taken into account.
Passivity	20.	At work, people make me do as they wish without asking me if I want to or if I like doing it.
	21.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues reflect back the image of someone who is subject to events and incapable of taking the initiative.
Interchangeability	25.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues behave with me as someone to whom one says what must be done and who always follows suit.
	6.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues, give me the impression that my work could be replaced by that of a machine.
Violability	12.	In my workplace, my boss and/or my colleagues think that if I was replaced by a machine, the work would be done just as well, or even better.
	18.	At work, my boss and/or my colleagues act as if my health was of no importance and should not be protected.
Possession	23.	My health and my physical state are of secondary importance for my boss and/or my colleagues.
	5.	I sometimes have the impression that I am the possession of my employer and that I will easily be transferred or sold to another company.
	24.	It's as if my employment contract made me into an object or a product which my employer could dispose of as they see fit.

Note. R = reverse coded.