ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Who tends to perceive other people as useful objects? The relationship between the general tendency to objectify other people and basic and dark personality traits

Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek [ID] 1 · A,C,D,E,F,G, Beata E. Andrzejewska [ID] 2 · A,B,C,E,
Anna Juszkiewicz [ID] 3 · A,B,C,E, Jolanta Babiak [ID] 4 · B,D,E,G

1: Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland
2: Institute of Psychology, University College of Professional Education, Wroclaw, Poland
3: Independent researcher
4: Psychology and Ergonomics Group, Faculty of Management, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Wrocław, Poland

BACKGROUND

Objectification involves perceiving and instrumentally treating other people as mere tools useful for satisfying the perceiver's goals. While several situational factors facilitating objectification have been identified, only a few studies have examined personal predictors of objectification. To find out more about personality correlates of the objectifying approach towards other people, we examined its relationship with basic and dark personality traits.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

The sample comprised 372 participants (222 women), ranging in age from 18 to 55 years ($M = 34.14$, $SD = 8.48$). To measure study variables, we used a modified version of the Objectification Scale (objectification), the IPIP-BFM-20 (Big Five personality dimensions), DTDD-P (dark personality traits of Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy), HSNS (vulnerable narcissism), PES (psychological entitlement), IES (interpersonal exploitativeness), PRNS (positive reciprocity norms), and NRNS (negative reciprocity norms).

RESULTS

We found that, when controlling for other personality variables and demographics, agreeableness, intellect, and a tendency to use positive norms of reciprocity negatively predicted objectification, and exploitativeness and entitlement were positively associated with the general tendency to objectify others.

CONCLUSIONS

Our findings suggest that a propensity for objectification is predicted by an unwillingness to maintain positive relationships with others, lower intellectual openness, higher entitlement and exploitativeness, and low tendency to positively respond to others' favors. The associations with these personality traits may allow for better understanding of – typical for objectification – high focus on fulfilling one's own interests and readiness to exploit others while disregarding their interests and ignoring human attributes such as subjectivity and uniqueness.

KEY WORDS

objectification of other people; Dark Triad of personality traits; Big Five model of personality; exploitativeness; entitlement

BACKGROUND

Objectification is a reduced and dehumanized kind of social perception which is accompanied by a tendency to deny the agency, individuality, and subjectivity of the objectified person (Andrighetto et al., 2017; Baldissarri & Andrighetto, 2021; Gruenfeld et al., 2008; Nussbaum, 1995). As originally proposed by Martha Nussbaum (1995), objectification occurs when individuals are viewed and treated as mere tools, solely for the benefit of the perceiver's own objectives. This instrumental view of a person further drives their perception as an *object* that can be owned (perception of ownership), exchanged with other people in the same category or group (perception of fungibility), lacking boundary integrity and therefore prone to violent treatment (perception of violability). Moreover, it may involve perceiving and treating a person as if they were *non-subject*, which manifests in failing to recognize their human attributes, such as subjectivity (a person is perceived as lacking subjective feelings), autonomy (a person is treated as lacking self-determination), and agency (a person is attributed inertness) (see: Holland & Haslam, 2013; LaCroix & Pratto, 2015).

Objectification can occur in different contexts, including sexual (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), professional (Andrighetto et al., 2017; Belmi & Schroeder, 2021) and romantic (Mahar et al., 2020). However, regardless of the context, objectified individuals are seen as less human, stripped of the capacity for emotion and reason. Such an approach to another person can penetrate her self-perception, potentially resulting in self-objectification and various psychological and health issues (Andrighetto et al., 2017; Baldissarri et al., 2014; Baldissarri & Andrighetto, 2021; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Loughnan et al., 2017).

Already, much is known about objectification that results from situational factors in a specific social context that leads to perceiving individuals as mere objects. Scant research, however, has investigated personal dispositions which may facilitate a tendency to view other people as instruments and to deny their personhood.

Since objectification can occur in various social situations, it is worthwhile to study it beyond a specific social context. Notably, recent research suggests that objectification can manifest as a general tendency to objectify other people, regardless of the context (Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al., 2021). To learn more about dispositions that may be associated with this tendency, in this paper we examine the relationships between the general tendency to objectify others and some basic and dark personality traits.

WHY STUDY OBJECTIFICATION?

Objectification, regardless of the domain in which it occurs, poses a threat to the well-being and psychological health of the objectified person. Studies on sexual objectification suggest that perceiving another person as a purely sexual object leads to seeing them as less human, i.e., less capable of feeling and reasoning, and increases the likelihood of committing aggression towards them (Loughnan et al., 2013; Vasquez et al., 2018). Objectification that occurs in the workplace involves perceiving a person solely as an instrument to achieve organizational goals and, similar to the sexual context, leads to attributing the perceived person fewer human capacities to reason and feel (Andrighetto et al., 2017).

Whether in a sexual or work-related sphere, there is a risk that those who experience objectification internalize these external opinions, which can result in objectification of the self. This may lead to multiple psychological and health problems, including the occurrence of depressive symptoms, eating disorders, and a decrease in intellectual functioning, as well as seeing oneself as less competent, moral, warm, and less human but more instrumental (Andrighetto et al., 2017; Baldissarri et al., 2014, 2017; Fredrickson et al., 1998; Loughnan et al., 2017; Tiggemann & Kuring, 2004). Objectification may also result in a higher vulnerability to occupational burnout (Baldissarri et al., 2014). Since objectification has so many significant negative effects on the psychological well-being of the objectified individual, it is essential to identify factors that accompany this phenomenon and potentially contribute to its emergence.

CONTEXTUAL AND SITUATIONAL DETERMINANTS OF OBJECTIFICATION

Until now, several factors have been identified that facilitate objectification in different contexts. In line with Nussbaum's (1995) conceptualization, these factors seem to favor the perception of a person as instrumental to the perceiver's current goal or need (sexual, intimate, or professional).

In the sexual context, objectification can be triggered by perceptual stimuli which inspire the process of perceiving other people as mere sexual objects (Bernard et al., 2021; Loughnan et al., 2013). In the work context, occupying a position of power can lead to the objectification of subordinates, which involves seeing them as fungible and denying their subjectivity (Gruenfeld et al., 2008). Also, job functions that involve repetitive and fragmented movements promote the perception of a target person as more like an inanimate object (such as a machine, device, or tool) and attribution of fewer human

mental states to her, including reduced agency and capacity for cognition and emotional experiences (e.g., Andrighetto et al., 2017).

PERSONAL CORRELATES OF OBJECTIFICATION

Existing studies suggest that objectification is not only the derivative of playing social roles or stemming from triggering situational conditions but may also be associated with individual (personal) predisposing characteristics. Sainz and Baldissarri's (2021) findings indicated that the leader's management style has a greater influence on objectification than work-related conditions. Research by Gervais and colleagues (2018) showed that a tendency to objectify others in a sexual context is related to different types of sexism. In turn, Bernard et al. (2021) suggested that a tendency to sexual objectification manifested at the perceptual level is positively related to the Dark Triad of personality traits, i.e., Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy.

The individual tendency to objectify others, regardless of the social environment, has recently been explored (Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al., 2021) using a modification of Greunfeld et al.'s (2008) method to measure objectification. This tool was originally designed to assess a tendency for someone in a position of power to objectify a person in a subordinate role within a work context. The results of Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al.'s (2021) study, using Greunfeld et al.'s (2008) tool in a form that may refer to any situational context, demonstrated that objectification, measured as a general tendency, is related to grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Both types of narcissism are classified within the dark personality traits, described as malevolent tendencies underpinned by antagonism (Rogoza et al., 2022) and proneness to exploit other people (Brunell et al., 2013). Such aspects are also present in Machiavellianism and psychopathy, which together with narcissism constitute the Dark Triad of personality (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) and could potentially be linked to objectification.

Thus, the main aim of our study was to identify personality correlates of a general tendency to objectify other people, understood based on Nussbaum's (1995) theory of objectification, as an individuals' tendency to perceive others, regardless of the context, in a reduced, instrumental (only as useful *objects*) as well as in a dehumanized (as *non-subjects* devoid of subjectivity and uniqueness) way. To this end, we examined the associations between the general tendency to objectify other people and some basic and dark personality traits (i.e., antagonistic and malevolent) that presumably facilitate an objectifying approach to other people.

Since objectification involves a socially aversive approach to other people, we predicted that it would be positively associated with low agreeableness (H1), which is defined by the Big Five model of personality as a low tendency to maintain positive relationships with other people, and manifests in a cold and unfriendly attitude towards them (Goldberg, 1992; see Topolewska et al., 2014).

Low agreeableness – or antagonism – is considered the core of several antagonistic (dark) individual traits that reflect low motivation to maintain harmonious relationships with other people. These traits include callousness, immorality, or arrogance as well as psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism, which constitute the Dark Triad of personality traits (Lynam & Miller, 2019). The tendency to objectify other people includes features of the antagonistic trait, as it involves prioritizing one's own goals and interests, treating other people as mere instruments. Thus, we anticipate the tendency to objectify others to be positively associated with the Dark Triad of personality traits, i.e. psychopathy (e.g., callousness, impulsivity, antisocial tendencies), narcissism (e.g., superiority, entitlement, exploitativeness) and Machiavellianism (e.g., manipulativeness, cynicism, disregard for conventional morality) (H2a) (e.g., Jonason & Webster, 2010; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Pilch et al., 2020).

It is widely recognized that narcissism is a multidimensional phenomenon. Whereas grandiose narcissism is typified by high self-esteem, dominance, and assertiveness, vulnerable narcissism is distinguished by low self-esteem and hypersensitivity, and defensiveness in interpersonal relations (Miller et al., 2011). Since existing instruments for measuring the Dark Triad mostly capture its grandiose dimension (e.g. Vize et al., 2018), we decided to include in our study a separate measure of vulnerable narcissism and predicted its positive relationship with the tendency to objectify others (H2b). We also expected a positive association between the tendency to objectify others and broader antagonistic traits that underpin both forms of narcissism, such as a sense of entitlement (i.e., a belief that one deserves more than others; Campbell et al., 2004) and exploitativeness (i.e., a tendency to use other people's resources without feeling obliged to reciprocate; Brunell et al., 2013) (H2c).

An instrumental approach to others, which is associated with a tendency to objectify others, may reduce the willingness to reciprocate favors and increase the tendency to retaliate against behavior perceived as threatening to one's own interests. Thus, we also assumed a negative relationship between objectification and personal norms of positive reciprocity (H3a) (i.e., readiness to reciprocate others' favorable treatment and helping behavior) and a positive relationship with personal norms of negative reciprocity (i.e., manifested in a tendency to retaliate against others' behavior that is perceived as unfair) (H3b).

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

PARTICIPANTS

We recruited 509 participants from the Ariadna Research Panel, an online survey platform that allows researchers to collect data primarily in the fields of market research and social sciences. Pre-recruited participants are segmented according to their demographic characteristics, and after balancing gender and age categories from early (18 years) to middle adulthood (55 years) they were invited to participate in the study via an e-mail. They completed surveys on the platform in exchange for points redeemable for gifts.

Following the collection of data, the dataset was screened for unreliable and carelessly provided answers (invariant responses or a response time of less than 3 seconds per item). The final sample comprised 372 participants (222 women) of Polish origin, ranging in age from 18 to 55 years (M = 34.14, SD = 8.48).

PROCEDURE

The invitation to participate in the study included a brief description and a link to the survey. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and anonymous. After reading the instructions and providing informed consent, participants completed demographic details, and a series of questionnaires presented in a randomized order. All data collection procedures were reviewed and approved by the Committee on Ethics of Scientific Research at the University of Wrocław.

MEASURES

General tendency to objectify other people. We measured the participants' tendency toward objectification of other people using the Polish version of the Objectification Scale by Gruenfeld et al. (2008), rephrased to measure the general tendency to objectify others instead of measuring objectification of a subordinate by a supervisor as originally designed. The modified version of this scale (Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al., 2021) contains 10 statements measuring a general tendency to engage in objectification (e.g., "I tend to contact other people only when I need something from them"; see OSF for full version), which refers to treating other people instrumentally, perceiving people as fungible, and ignoring their human attributes (i.e., subjective feelings). The participants responded using a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*).

The Big Five personality. To evaluate the Big Five personality dimensions, we used the Polish adaptation of the International Personality Item Pool-Big Five Factor Markers-20 (IPIP-BFM-20; Donnellan et al., 2006; Topolewska et al., 2014). The IPIP-BFM-20 contains 20 items measuring extraversion, emotional stability, intellect, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. The participants were asked to respond how much they felt each item described them on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 5 (*very accurate*).

The Dark Triad of personality. The Dark Triad of personality was measured with a Polish adaptation of the Dirty Dozen scale (DTDD-P; Czarna et al., 2016; Jonason & Webster, 2010). The DTDD-P comprises 12 items (four items per subscale) measuring narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. The participants responded using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 5 (*completely true*).

Vulnerable narcissism. We evaluated vulnerable narcissism using the Polish translation of the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin & Cheek, 1997). The scale comprises 10 items to which participants responded using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Psychological entitlement. We used the Polish translation of the Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES; Campbell et al., 2004) to measure the extent to which individuals believe that they deserve and are entitled to more than others. The PES comprises nine items. To rate the degree to which each statement reflects their self-beliefs, participants used a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Interpersonal exploitativeness. Exploitativeness was measured using the Polish translation of the Interpersonal Exploitativeness Scale (IES; Brunell et al., 2013). The IES comprises six items to which participants answered on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Norms of reciprocity. To measure individual differences in positive and negative reciprocity we used the Positive Reciprocity Norms (PRNS) and Negative Reciprocity Norms (NRNS) subscales from the Personal Norm of Reciprocity Questionnaire (Perugini et al., 2003) translated into Polish. PRNS (nine items) measures a tendency to behave fairly in interpersonal exchanges and to reciprocate others' helping behavior and favorable treatment, whereas the NRNS (nine items) measures a propensity to reciprocate unfavorable treatment or behavior that has a negative effect on a person. Responses were measured using a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not true for me*) to 7 (*very true for me*). The items for each scale were averaged to create indexes of PRNS and NRNS subscales.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The levels of skewness and kurtosis for all measured variables (< |1| for skewness, < |1| for kurtosis) en-

Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek, Beata E. Andrzejewska, Anna Juszkiewicz, Jolanta Babiak

abled parametric tests to be used to conduct the main analyses. We calculated correlations between objectification and all measures of personality and demographic characteristics. To identify the unique predictors of objectification among basic and dark personality traits, and to assess the contribution of a particular set of variables in predicting a criterion variable beyond what can be accounted for by other important predictors, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis. To check whether the assumptions of non-multicollinearity were met, we calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values for each predictor variable in the study, at each step of the regression analysis ($1.03 <$ VIF < 3.15 and $.31 <$ tolerance $< .97$; see Table 2). As suggested by Cohen et al. (2003), the VIF value should not exceed 10 and the tolerance value should not be lower than .10. Even when applying much more stringent criteria for VIF and tolerance thresholds, the current results indicate that multicollinearity is not an issue in this dataset. The data that support the findings of this research are available in Open Science Framework at https://osf.io/y3vtr/?view_only=e6868f4047434a6bae bb73b075394131

RESULTS

We conducted Pearson's correlation analysis to test whether objectification is related to the Big Five of personality and to dark personality traits. We found large negative correlations between objectification and agreeableness, supporting H1, and small but statistically significant correlations with intellect and conscientiousness. There were no statistically significant correlations between objectification and extraversion and emotional stability. Detailed results of Pearson's correlation coefficients between objectification and all study variables are presented in Table 1, which also includes descriptive statistics and Cronbach's α values for each variable examined (for the full correlation matrix, see Table S1 in Supplementary materials).

The tendency toward objectification was positively and strongly related to dark traits of psychopathy and Machiavellianism, positively and moderately to narcissism, supporting H2a as well as positively and moderately to vulnerable narcissism, supporting H2b. The tendency toward objectification was also positively related to entitlement

Table 1

Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alphas and Pearson's correlation coefficients between general tendency to objectify other people and all study variables

Measure	Cronbach's α	*M*	*SD*	Objectification
				r
Gender	−	−	−	.20**
Age	−	34.14	8.48	−.03
Extraversion	.83	2.85	0.89	−.03
Agreeableness	.71	3.70	0.67	−.59***
Conscientiousness	.73	3.41	0.81	−.11*
Emotional stability	.76	2.74	0.79	.04
Intellect	.65	3.56	0.70	−.18**
HSNS	.74	3.06	0.57	.36***
Entitlement	.85	4.04	0.93	.40***
Exploitativeness	.80	3.16	1.21	.62***
PRNS	.86	5.23	0.83	−.40***
NRNS	.92	4.03	1.18	.38***
Narcissism DD	.87	2.12	0.94	.38***
Psychopathy DD	.73	2.00	0.81	.53***
Machiavellianism DD	.86	1.87	0.88	.52***
Objectification	.87	2.78	0.96	−

Note. HSNS – Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; PRNS – Positive Reciprocity Norms Scale; NRNS – Negative Reciprocity Norms Scale; DD – Dirty Dozen; female – 0, male – 1. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

and interpersonal exploitativeness, supporting H2c, negatively and moderately associated with positive reciprocity norms, supporting H3a, and positively related to negative reciprocity norms, thus supporting H3b.

To determine the contribution of basic and dark personality traits and, at the same time, to reveal specific predictors of objectification, we conducted a hierarchical linear regression analysis, controlling for age and gender (Table 2). In Step 1, gender signifi-

Table 2

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis of general tendency to objectify other people, VIF, and tolerance values for all independent variables at each step of regression analysis

Measure	Objectification					VIF	Tolerance
	b	SE	β	t	ΔR^2		
Step 1					.05***		
(Constant)	2.87	.20		10.85***			
Gender	0.42	.10	.22	4.16***		1.04	.96
Age	−0.01	.01	−.07	−1.33		1.04	.96
Step 2					.33***		
(Constant)	6.11	.34		16.77***			
Gender	0.14	.09	.07	1.58		1.18	.84
Age	−0.002	.01	−.01	−0.33		1.08	.93
Extraversion	0.16	.05	.15	3.39***		1.17	.85
Agreeableness	−0.83	.06	−.58	−13.04***		1.16	.86
Conscientiousness	−0.09	.05	−.08	−1.88		1.07	.94
Emotional stability	0.05	.06	.04	0.82		1.22	.82
Intellect	−0.16	.06	−.11	−2.58*		1.12	.89
Step 3					.16***		
(Constant)	3.49	.51		6.44***			
Gender	0.16	.08	.08	2.11*		1.23	.82
Age	0.001	.004	.01	0.32		1.10	.91
Extraversion	0.05	.05	.05	1.13		1.44	.69
Agreeableness	−0.36	.07	−.25	−4.88***		2.02	.50
Conscientiousness	−0.03	.05	−.03	−0.66		1.15	.87
Emotional stability	0.04	.05	.03	0.74		1.48	.68
Intellect	−0.15	.05	−.11	−2.82**		1.15	.87
HSNS	0.14	.08	.08	0.68		1.92	.52
Entitlement	0.12	.05	.12	2.38*		1.91	.53
Exploitativeness	0.13	.05	.16	2.82**		2.61	.38
Positive reciprocity	−0.19	.05	−.16	−3.98***		1.28	.78
Negative reciprocity	0.01	.04	.01	0.30		1.65	.61
Narcissism DD	0.03	.06	.03	0.54		2.31	.43
Psychopathy DD	0.12	.07	.10	1.65		2.74	.37
Machiavellianism DD	0.09	.07	.08	1.29		3.14	.32

Note. HSNS – Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; DD – Dirty Dozen; VIF – variance inflation factor; female – 0, male – 1. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

cantly predicted objectification and, together with age, explained about 5% of the variance (ΔR^2 = .05; ΔF(2, 369) = 8.80, p < .001). In Step 2, Big Five personality traits were entered, resulting in a significant change in explained variance in objectification (ΔR^2 = .33; ΔF(5, 364) = 39.17, p < .001). In Step 3, all dark personality traits were added, contributing to explaining an additional 16% variance in objectification, (ΔR^2 = .16; ΔF(8, 356) = 15.41, p < .001). The complete model at Step 3, adjusting for gender and age, was well fitted to the data, F(15, 356) = 27.76, p < .001, and explained about 54% of the variance in objectification, which can be considered a large effect (Cohen's f^2 > 0.42). In the final model, agreeableness and intellect were negatively associated with objectification. At the same time, among dark personality traits, exploitativeness, entitlement (in a positive direction) and positive reciprocity norms (negatively) were uniquely associated with objectification.

DISCUSSION

The findings from our study indicate that a significant portion of the variance in the general tendency to objectify others can be explained by some basic and dark personality traits. In line with our expectations, among the Big Five personality traits, agreeableness was found to best negatively predict objectification. Surprisingly, we discovered that when controlling for all other variables in the regression analysis, intellect was negatively associated with the tendency to objectify others. Thus, beside not caring for harmonious relationships with other people and displaying an unfriendly attitude towards others, individuals with a propensity for objectification tend to demonstrate less intellectual openness, imagination, and creativity. A low score on both agreeableness and high intellect implies diminished interest in the internal states, motives and needs of others, potentially leading to a reduced perception of their subjectivity and uniqueness.

The present findings support our predictions and extend previous results by showing that objectification measured as a general tendency was positively related not only to grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al., 2021) but also to other dark personality traits, which may facilitate different aspects of objectification. All the examined dark personality traits were associated with the tendency to objectify others in bivariate correlations, but unique predictions of objectification were observed only for high exploitativeness and high entitlement. Common to these unique predictors of objectification is a focus on achieving one's own interests and goals. This self-focus, which is particularly strong in both high tendencies to exploit others and high entitlement, may bias the perception of other people and

presumably contribute to viewing others as if they were merely an object that fulfills the perceiver's interests and goals. This objectifying view might be additionally strengthened by a low tendency to reciprocate others' favors, which in our study also proved to be associated with objectification. However, it is worth noting that objectification was not uniquely associated with negative reciprocity norms, implying that objectification has more to do with a desire to exploit people than with the propensity to satisfy vengeful feelings.

Interestingly, the general tendency to objectify others was not uniquely predicted by any specific dark personality trait (i.e., narcissism, psychopathy, Machiavellianism, vulnerable narcissism), but instead it was explained by broader dark personality traits, i.e., exploitativeness and entitlement and two basic personality dimensions, i.e., agreeableness and intellect. These results indicate the role of specific dark traits and broader personality traits in understanding the tendency to objectify other people. The fact that more general personality traits accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in the regression analysis – thereby reducing or eliminating the contribution of the specific dark traits – may suggest that some basic and broad dark personality traits can be seen as a more general basis upon which the tendency to objectify others emerges. Similarly, in relation to narcissism, entitlement (self-importance) is seen as a core dimension of narcissistic grandiosity and vulnerability (Krizan & Herlache, 2018), and antagonism (as opposed to agreeableness) is posited to underpin several dark personality traits (Lynam & Miller, 2019), including both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2016).

This study is not free from limitations, which however may provide valuable direction for future research. Although the measure of a general tendency to objectify other people enables one to assess the core components of objectification, it does not encompass all aspects of Nussbaum's theory (1995). Future studies could examine the invariance of the associations of the general tendency to objectify other people with other measures, while considering the remaining aspects of objectification in Nussbaum's (1995) approach, i.e., denying the autonomy of a perceived person, attributing them inertness, and perceiving them as violable.

Our study is inherently correlational, which does not allow us to determine the direction of the influence between the examined variables. An interesting question for future research (likely of a longitudinal design) may also address possible variations in the tendency to objectify others due to changes in personality characteristics found to predict objectification. Of particular significance are the findings concerning relationships of objectification with those predictors which have the potential for modification,

e.g., aspects of intellect that are possible to develop, such as imagination, curiosity, or greater interest in the inner states of other people.

CONCLUSIONS

To date, very scant attention has been devoted to understanding objectification in terms of its personality correlates. To gain insight into the personality characteristics of individuals who tend to objectify others, our research focused on establishing relationships between the inclination to objectify others and both basic and dark personality traits. Our research shows that each set of characteristics significantly contributed to explaining the complexity of objectification and enabled the identification of personality traits which proved to be best predictors for objectification.

Supplementary materials are available on the journal's website.

REFERENCES

Andrighetto, L., Baldissarri, C., & Volpato, C. (2017). (Still) Modern times: Objectification at work. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 47*, 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2190

Baldissarri, C., & Andrighetto, L. (2021). Being treated as an instrument: Consequences of instrumental treatment and self-objectification on task engagement and performance. *Human Performance, 34*, 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2021.1878182

Baldissarri, 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. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12172

Baldissarri, C., Andrighetto, L., & Volpato, C. (2014). When work does not ennoble man: Psychological consequences of working objectification. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 21*, 327–339. https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM21.3.7

Belmi, P., & Schroeder, J. (2021). Human "resources"? Objectification at work. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 120*, 384–417. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000254

Bernard, P., De Laet, M., & Gervais, S. J. (2021). Is body inversion effect a valid measure of women's objectification? Yes, it is! *Personality and Individual Differences, 175*, 110708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110708

Brunell, A. B., Davis, M. S., Schley, D. R., Eng, A. L., van Dulmen, M. H., Wester, K. L., & Flannery, D. J. (2013). A new measure of interpersonal exploitativeness. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, 299. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00299

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83*, 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G, & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlational analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Czarna, A. Z., Jonason, P. K., Dufner, M., & Kossowska, M. (2016). The Dirty Dozen Scale: Validation of a Polish version and extension of the nomological net. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*, 445. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00445

Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 192–203. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x

Fredrickson, B. L., Roberts, T. A., Noll, S. M., Quinn, D. M., & Twenge, J. M. (1998). That swimsuit becomes you: Sex differences in self-objectification, restrained eating, and math performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 269–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.269

Gervais, S. J., Davidson, M. M., Styck, K., Canivez, G., & DiLillo, D. (2018). The development and psychometric properties of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale – perpetration version. *Psychology of Violence, 8*, 546–559. https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000148

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five Factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111

Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: a reexamination of Murray's Narcissism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 588–599. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204

Holland, E., & Haslam, N. (2013). Worth the weight: The objectification of overweight versus thin targets. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 462–468. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312474

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: a concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 420–432. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019265

Krizan, Z., & Herlache, A. D. (2018). The narcissism spectrum model: a synthetic view of narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 22*, 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316685018

Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K., Lewandowska, B., Kochan-Wójcik, M., Andrzejewska, B. E., & Juszkiewicz, A. (2021). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism as predictors of the tendency to objectify other people. *Current Psychology, 40*, 5637–5647. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00569-3

LaCroix, J. M., & Pratto, F. (2015). Instrumentality and the denial of personhood: The social psychology of objectifying others. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 28*, 183–212.

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12188

Loughnan, S., Pina, A., Vasquez, E. A., & Puvia, E. (2013). Sexual objectification increases rape victim blame and decreases perceived suffering. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 455–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313485718

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2019). The basic trait of antagonism: an unfortunately underappreciated construct. *Journal of Research in Personality, 81*, 118–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2019.05.012

Mahar, E. A., Webster, G. D., & Markey, P. M. (2020). Partner-objectification in romantic relationships: a dyadic approach. *Personal Relationships, 27*, 4–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12303

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: a nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality, 79*, 1013–1042. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., McCain, J. L., Few, L. R., Crego, C., Widiger, T. A., & Campbell, W. K. (2016). Thinking structurally about narcissism: an examination of the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory and its components. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 30*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2015_29_177

Nussbaum, M. C. (1995). Objectification. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 24*, 249–291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1088-4963.1995.tb00032.x

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Perugini, M., Gallucci, M., Presaghi, F., & Ercolani, A. P. (2003). The personal norm of reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 251–283. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.474

Pilch, I., Lathia, N., & Wiesebach, K. (2020). The Dark Triad of personality and momentary affective states: an experience sampling study. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology, 8*, 10–17. https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2020.95146

Rogoza, R., Kowalski, C. M., Saklofske, D. H., & Schermer, J. A. (2022). Systematizing dark personality traits within broader models of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 186*, 111343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111343

Sainz, M., & Baldissarri, C. (2021). Abusive leadership versus objectifying job features: Factors that influence organizational dehumanization and workers' self-objectification. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 51*, 825–837. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12803

Tiggemann, M., & Kuring, J. K. (2004). The role of body objectification in disordered eating and depressed mood. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43*, 299–311. https://doi.org/10.1348/0144665031752925

Topolewska, E., Skimina, E., Strus, W., Cieciuch, J., & Rowiński, T. (2014). The short IPIP-BFM-20 questionnaire for measuring the Big Five. *Roczniki Psychologiczne, 17*, 385–402.

Vasquez, E. A., Ball, L., Loughnan, S., & Pina, A. (2018). The object of my aggression: Sexual objectification increases physical aggression toward women. *Aggressive Behavior, 44*, 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21719

Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among dark triad components: a meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*, 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222