Temporal effects of ostracism: A meta-analysis of Cyberball studies.

Hartgerink, C.H.J.1

Van Beest, I.1

Wicherts, J.M.1

Williams, K.D.2

1Tilburg University, the Netherlands

2Purdue University, United States of America

**Abstract**

We present a meta-analysis of randomized experiments that involved the use of Cyberball to determine whether effects of ostracism decrease over time. In addition we study whether moderation of the ostracism effect by theoretically hypothesized factors increases over time (e.g. nature of the group). To this end, we considered both the first and last outcome measures in 120 experiments (combined N = 11,869) and submitted the data to random- and mixed effects models. Results show that the estimated average ostracism effect is large (d > 1), decreases from the first to the last measure across types of measures, and that time does not predict the average effect size on the last measure. The analysis of moderation of the ostracism effect by crossed factors showed an average interaction effect of medium size on the first measure and on the last measure. However, the confidence intervals for these two average interaction effects overlap so we found no indication for change of the average interaction effect over time. This suggests that ostracism can be moderated immediately after an ostracism sequence, and equally so longer after. In addition, we found (in an exploratory analysis) that even substantively and methodologically similar studies showed considerable heterogeneity (I2 = 97%), posing the question whether the ostracism effect is actually a reflex. We discuss implications of the major findings.

*Keywords: Cyberball, meta-analysis, temporal, ostracism*

Since the seminal paper by Williams, Cheung and Choi introduced the Cyberball game in 2000, thousands of people have played it. Cyberball is a virtual ball-tossing game, used to manipulate the degree of social inclusion or ostracism in an experiment. Within the ostracism and exclusion fields, this paradigm has been widely used next to other paradigms, such as the future life rejection (see Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002). For ostracism however, Cyberball seems to be the major paradigm. More specifically, the literature search that formed the basis of this paper showed that at least 200 papers have been published that involved the use of the Cyberball paradigm, and that over 19,500 participants have played the game. It is therefore safe to say that, since its introduction, the Cyberball paradigm has received much traction in experimental work. In the thirteen years since its introduction several major developments have been made in the field of social ostracism.

**Historical background.** Throughout these years social ostracism has culminated in updated theory (i.e. Williams, 2009) and several meta-analyses (Blackhart, Nelson, Knowles, & Baumeister, 2009; Cacioppo, Frum, Asp, Weiss, Lewis, & Cacioppo, 2013; Gerber & Wheeler, 2009). Since the mid-1990s, the interest for this topic is on the rise (Williams & Jarvis, 2006), because of widespread interest in the topic (i.e. everybody gets excluded sometime) and because of its social relevance (e.g. in the context of school shootings; Leary, Kowalski, Smith, & Phillips, 2003). Through experimental work, it has been repeatedly shown that being ostracized has a detrimental effect on people—either their psychological functioning (e.g. decreases in mood; e.g. Lustenberger & Jagacinski, 2010) or certain interpersonal behavior (e.g. increases in aggressive behaviors; e.g. Van Beest, Carter-Sowell, Van Dijk, & Williams, 2012). In the current paper this detrimental effect of being ostracized will be referred to as the ‘ostracism effect.’ The theory and relevant meta-analyses on this ‘ostracism effect’ from recent years will be shortly reviewed below after which the goal and hypotheses of the current meta-analysis is described.

Williams (2009) proposed a temporal model of ostracism, in which he suggested three stages in the ostracism effect, namely: (1) a reflexive stage (also called ‘immediate’), (2) a reflective stage (also called ‘delayed’) and (3) a resignation stage of ostracism. The reflexive stage is where the response to the ostracism sequence occurs like a reflex. This initial response is theorized to be more painful and threatening than later on, due to evolutionary over-sensitivity to cues of ostracism. Such over-sensitivity does not take into account situational specifics, and provides no or little room for coping. The reflective stage, which follows this immediate response, is subject to more rational thought and coping with the threats. The resignation stage occurs after prolonged ostracism, causing prolonged periods of pain and threat. These prolonged ostracism sequences lead to helplessness, which is one of the characteristics of the resignation stage. This temporal model implies (note: it does not claim) that as time passes the effects of a singular occurrence of social ostracism will diminish and moderation of such effects will increase over time.

Previous meta-analyses on the topic of social exclusion have focused on estimating the effect of exclusion1 on different constructs (e.g. belonging, self-esteem, etc.; Gerber & Wheeler, 2009), moderation of effects by types of manipulation (Blackhart et al., 2009) and a meta-analyses on fMRI studies (Cacioppo, et. al, 2013). Specifically, Blackhart and colleagues’ focused on effect sizes in emotion, mood and self-esteem *and* considered on how study characteristics influence effect sizes (e.g. future-life rejection vs. Cyberball). Whereas these meta-analyses focused on the social ostracism effect within different constructs, in different exclusion paradigms, on specific constructs and on fMRI studies, the current meta-analysis limits the paradigm to that of Cyberball and looks to test more general ideas of social ostracism. Limiting the heterogeneity across study designs included is presumed to decrease variability due to design. This increases power for moderator analyses. In the current paper, we investigate the workings of the reflexive and reflective stages but *not* that of the resignation stage. More specifically, the current meta-analysis looks into whether the effects of social ostracism decrease over time; can be moderated, and whether this moderation increases over time.

Two elements are central to this meta-analysis: moderation and time. The operationalization of moderation is straightforward: many experimental designs include a second factor besides the factor related to ostracism, where interaction would indicate moderation. Take for example a 2 (social status: ostracized vs. included) by 2 (group: in-group vs. out-group; see Table 1 for example) design, where the ostracism effect is expected to be larger for the in-group level than for the out-group level. Such moderation can be numerically seen as an interaction effect. For instance, the difference between simple effects of ostracism for the in- and out-group conditions reflects this interaction (specific calculations are reported in the methods section and formulae in the Appendix). Time was estimated via number of items, which is incorporated in the analyses as a predictor. These elements make it possible to conduct the analyses needed for the confirmatory hypotheses described later on.

In this meta-analysis we included only randomized experiments with between-subjects designs that involved the use of the Cyberball paradigm. The main reasons for these inclusion criteria are (1) to guard study quality, (2) to encompass the typical Cyberball experiment, and (3) to remove the need for within-subjects correction of effect sizes. These criteria were also to ensure broad enough criteria to include as many studies as possible to test the hypotheses, while maintaining the quality of those included.

The measures included are only subject to the criterion that they were affected by ostracism, which does not limit the measures to just one type. In other words, we included multiple measures with varying psychometric properties in the primary studies. This increases the difficulty of assessing the moderating effect of psychometric qualities overall. The larger part of these measures are the ‘fundamental needs’ (i.e. belonging, self-esteem, control and meaningful existence) questionnaires, which were developed within the Cyberball paradigm (see Van Beest & Williams, 2006; Williams et al., 2000; Zadro, Williams, & Richardson, 2004). Next to these fundamental need questionnaires, the measures vary widely and no clear grouping can be made. A more thorough discussion of the psychometric properties of the ‘fundamental needs’ questionnaires will be given in the discussion section. Important to take away is that there are multiple types of measures included in the effect size calculation and subsequently the meta-analysis. This means that the estimated effect size will be an overall estimate and not one for a specific measure, such as belonging.

**Hypotheses.** The current meta-analysis is primarily concerned with investigating the effects of time and the effects of moderators through time. We will also explore whether specific changes to the Cyberball manipulation affect the average effect sizes and whether the average effect sizes differ between different types of measures. Below, the confirmatory hypotheses and the exploratory hypotheses will be outlined. These hypotheses were registered before the analyses were run on the Open Science Framework.2

**Confirmatory hypotheses.**One of the main ideas behind a temporal model of any construct is that the effect changes over time. In the current paper, we will analyze two changes across time. First, the traditional ostracism effect will be estimated on both the first and last measures as they were used in the primary studies. The main question is: does the effect size of ostracism decrease over time? A formal test of this time-based change is not possible in the current setting (reasons for this are further explained in methods section). Therefore two indirect approaches are taken: 1) the average effect size on the last measure is estimated within a mixed-effects model with time passed since the ostracism manipulation as a predictor, and 2) the confidence intervals of the average effects are compared for overlap. Formally, this first hypothesis can be regarded as

where δ represents the main effect between the ostracism and inclusion conditions and T1 indicates the first measure; T2 the last measure.

Second, the moderation of ostracism over time will be inspected. From the temporal model it follows that the reflexive response becomes less as time progresses, after which coping plays a larger role. This implies that as time progresses, moderation of the ostracism effect would *increase*. Hence, the main question behind this second hypothesis is: does the average moderation of ostracism increase over time? Formally,

where Δ is the interaction effect and T1 is the first measure; T2 the last measure. The interaction captures the difference between the main effects, as will be explained further in the methods section. In sum, the second hypothesis test whether the moderation effect of ostracism is itself moderated by time.

**Exploratory hypotheses.** For exploratory purposes, several compositional elements of the studies will be inspected. These elements can provide some nuances in how the composition of the study with regards to the Cyberball manipulation, sample composition or type of measure, affect the effect sizes. The effect of the composition of the manipulation and the sample are inspected via a mixed-effects model with the aforementioned indicators as predictors. The types of measures are subdivided into fundamental needs, intrapersonal and interpersonal measures and are tested separately for the ostracism effect and the interaction effect on both time points with time as a potential moderator on the last measure.

In sum, the hypotheses are subdivided into two main confirmatory and several exploratory questions. The two main questions underlying the confirmatory hypotheses are 1) does the ostracism effect diminish over time? and 2) does the moderation of the ostracism effect due to crossed factors increase over time? The question underlying the exploratory hypotheses is: do the study characteristics affect the estimated average effect? These questions will be answered below with random and mixed-effects meta-analytic models, encompassing 121 studies across the board.

**Method**

**Study inclusion criteria.** We included only studies that incorporated a between-subjects design with random assignment. These studies were also required to use at least an ostracism factor (i.e. included or ostracized) manipulated via the Cyberball paradigm. This was the bare minimum to be included. Studies that used other (between-subjects) factors alongside the ostracism factor were included as well—collapsed across irrelevant factors if there was no expected effect (i.e. non-moderating factors) or ‘as is’ if moderation by that factor was expected by authors of the primary study. These moderating factors were not required to involve random assignment (i.e. quasi-experimental was allowed). Dichotomized factors were collapsed to an ostracism factor due to the many problems dichotomization can cause (e.g. underestimation of effect size, spurious effects; see Hunter & Schmidt, 1990; MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, & Rucker, 2002). An example could be grouping participants into high- and low neuroticism groups based on a continuous measure of neuroticism (Boyes & French, 2009). Reasons for these inclusion criteria are threefold. First, these criteria were assumed to guard study quality, which is preferable to subjective quality assessment for individual studies. Second, such inclusion criteria made computational aspects much simpler given the effect size metric used (i.e. standardized mean difference). Third, most Cyberball experiments take place in such a format, making it also encompassing criteria for the purposes of this meta-analysis. Within-subject designs were excluded, for several reasons. Firstly, most within-subjects designs regard physiological measurements such as fMRI that fall outside the scope of expertise of the authors, and where this was not the case it was a priori expected that the correlations between measures would not be reliably reported in the papers. These correlations are required to compute corrected effect sizes, which would introduce more computational complexity in the design. Naturally, these criteria are no safeguards against bad studies, which should be kept in mind. However, in the end these inclusion criteria guard experimental rigor of the studies included and reproducibility of the selection.

For the dependent measures the criterion was that they were (expected to be) affected by the ostracism manipulation. Manipulation checks (i.e. I was ignored; I was excluded; I received X percent of the throws) were excluded due to them measuring the manipulation, not the ostracism effect. We only included studies reported in Dutch or English. In sum, all English and Dutch manuscripts that used at least a Cyberball manipulation in a randomly assigned between-subjects design were included.

**Literature search.** To have an encompassing meta-analysis of Cyberball studies, seven search strategies were used in the period of November 2012 through April 2013. These search strategies included 1) database searches, 2) a call for data, 3) cross-reference with an existing list of Cyberball studies, 4) Google Scholar alerts, 5) citation records, 6) SPSP conference abstracts and 7) personal communication. These will be further explained below.

The databases searched included “Web of Knowledge”, “PubMed”, “ScienceDirect” and “Worldcat”. The first three cover only published articles, whereas “Worldcat” also covers dissertations. All these databases were searched with the keywords “cyberball”, “ball-tossing” and “ball AND ostraci\*”. “Web of Knowledge” was the first database searched. For this database, an additional search term (i.e. “ball AND exclu\*”) was used, but this yielded zero relevant hits on a total of 501 hits. Due to specificity of the searches, this last search term was dropped for the remaining databases. Across all these searches, results included 1927 hits of which 109 were saved for coding. Within the database of “Web of Knowledge”, citation records of the seminal papers by Williams and colleagues (2000); Williams and Jarvis (2006) were looked through. These papers were cited 332 times (as of 5th of November, 2012), of which 43 papers were saved for coding. This literature search summed up to an initial of 2259 hits, of which 152 were selected to be included in the coding.

The call for data was put on the listservs or forums of Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), and Social Psychology Network (SPN; all on 3rd of December, 2012). This resulted in 9 replies, of which 3 were included in the coding procedure.

Kip Williams keeps a list of Cyberball studies on his personal website. This list was used to check for extra articles that did not turn up in the initial searches on the 15th of November.3 The list included 93 papers, of which 9 papers were included to be coded.

The final searches included Google Scholar alerts, SPSP conference abstracts and personal communication. The Google Scholar alerts were used to keep up to date with new literature. These alerts notify a user when new hits for a search term occur, and were used for “cyberball” and “ball-tossing”, which yielded 85 hits of which 25 were saved for coding. SPSP conference abstracts from 2006 through 2013 were searched for Cyberball studies. This led to personal communication with the authors of the conference abstracts and leads to additional studies. Pooled, the personal communication and the conference abstracts yielded 21 hits of which 20 were saved for coding. The seminal paper by Williams and colleagues (2000) was added separately.

In sum, the literature search spanned 2468 hits, resulting in 205 hits that were saved for coding. These papers spanned over 19,000 Cyberball players. During coding, papers were assessed to fit the inclusion criteria. These papers were published between 2000 (after the introduction of Cyberball) and April 2013. Several papers appeared to be non-applicable (e.g. within-subjects design, lack of data after multiple requests), causing them to be excluded from the meta-analysis. This resulted in a final, coded sample of 106 papers containing 121 studies, across 11921 Cyberball participants.4

**Coding procedure.** The first author coded all the studies, of which the second- and third author checked the coding for a subsample of studies. Due to the amount of studies included in coding (i.e. 121), such intercoder agreement was deemed adequate. For reproducibility purposes, an extensive account was kept of the decisions made during the coding, which is publicly available via Open Science Framework on a paper by paper basis (see Footnote 2 for the direct link).

The coding scheme was set up on the basis of substantive and methodological considerations. This resulted in a coding scheme primarily based on group means and standard deviations for effect size calculation. These statistics were retrieved for both the first and last relevant measure in each study. Relevant measures were defined as constructs that were expected to show an ostracism effect (e.g. fundamental needs, mood, prosocial helping behavior, etc.). Coding that was crucial for testing the confirmatory hypotheses was the amount of items from the first through last measure plus any additional time in between (e.g. rest period). This made up the estimation of time from the first to last measure, where each item was counted as lasting six seconds (the six-second rule was based on a practice used to estimate average completion time in the freshmen testing program of the University of Amsterdam). Any additional time reported in the procedure was also coded. Note that some measures are variable on time (e.g. persistence tasks) and that these are arbitrarily estimated in a conservative manner to at least take these measures into account at some level. The type of measure used was coded for in the following general terms: (1) fundamental needs, (2) intrapersonal and (3) interpersonal. Intrapersonal measures were defined as measuring constructs that relate only to the self (e.g. ‘how angry do you feel?’). Interpersonal measures were defined as measuring constructs that relate to (the self and) others (e.g. ‘how angry do you feel towards person X?’). Additional coding for the exploratory analyses was done for sample characteristics (e.g. age, gender composition) and Cyberball characteristics (e.g. amount of players, length of game).

Due to relevant measures being defined broadly, a consequence was that we included many different kinds of measures. Some measures are expected to show different directions of an ostracism effect. . For example, “belongingness need satisfaction” and “feelings of aggression.” Belongingness scores are expected to be lower for ostracized participants, whereas aggression scores are expected to be higher for ostracized participants, when compared included participants. To correct for any possible troubles (i.e. cancellation of effects) being caused by this bidirectionality of effects, we used absolute effect sizes to estimate effect sizes.5

Relevant information that was missing in the papers was requested from the authors via e-mail. In case of non-response, three follow-up e-mails were sent. All this communication was documented and can be found on the OSF page for this project. In case of non-response or non-willingness to send data, studies were either eliminated if the information was crucial (i.e. means and standard deviations of the measures per group), computed if possible (i.e. cell sizes), or assumed if reasonable (i.e. Cyberball manipulation characteristics).

Because of the subjectivity involved in such judgments, we did not assess the quality of studies. However, quality of studies was ascertained by setting relatively strict inclusion criteria (i.e. between-subjects; random assignment). The quality of the dependent measures cannot be guaranteed by this, however.

**Statistical analyses.** For the analyses, the “metafor” package (Viechtbauer, 2010) was used in the R statistical environment (R Core Team, 2013). This section discusses the effect size metric, meta-analytic model and its constituent elements, sensitivity analyses and funnel plot asymmetry tests.

**Effect size metric.**We used Hedges’ g version of the standardized mean differences as the effect size. Hedges’ g corrects for the slightly biased estimate Cohen’s d gives (Larry V. Hedges, 1981). Standardized simple effects were calculated across the ostracism factor and the interaction effect was calculated by taking the standardized difference between the unstandardized main effects (see the Appendix for the exact formulae used). This was done for both the first and last measurement. In other words, on the first measure a simple effect of ostracism is calculated and an interaction effect; similarly so on the last measure. Therefore, in a 2 (social status: ostracized vs. included) by 2 (moderator: present vs. absent) design with multiple measures, there are two simple effects and two interaction effects included in the data file.

**Meta-analytic model.**We used random- and mixed-effects models, since heterogeneity in the effect sizes is expected in the different measures included. The meta-regression element in some of the analyses is the variable time as moderator. Analyses without this predictor reduce to a random-effects model. We used ‘Restricted Maximum Likelihood’ (REML) to estimate tau-squared (the (residual) variance), as recommended by Viechtbauer (2005).. It should be noted that when estimating a mixed- or random effects model, an average effect is estimated—*not* the ‘true’ effect (Viechtbauer, 2005).

**Sensitivity analyses.**To test for robustness of the effects, we incorporated several sensitivity analyses. Possible problematic outliers were flagged and the effect of these outliers on substantial results were inspected in sensitivity analyses that eliminated these outliers. These outliers were flagged with the use of studentized deleted residuals, and further inspected with a Q-Q plot and Cook’s distance values. The Q-Q plot shows whether these outliers deviate from normality, and Cook’s distance indicates the effect the outlier has on the data. Another sensitivity analysis entails fitting the mixed-effects model with tau-squared fit at the upperbound value of the 95% confidence interval.

**Funnel plot asymmetry.**A ‘funnel plot’ plots each study’s effect size against its standard error. Larger studies have smaller standard errors, and vice versa for smaller studies. Following from a theoretical fluctuation of the population effect size due to sampling variance, a funnel plot should be symmetrical around the estimate effect size. Funnel plot *asymmetry* can indicate many things, including publication bias. To this end, we used Egger’s regression test (Egger, Smith, Schneider, & Minder, 1997) for mixed-effects models (Sterne & Egger, 2005). This tests whether the distribution of effect sizes is equal on both sides of the average effect, when accounting for true heterogeneity. Funnel plot asymmetry thus indicates bias in the estimated effect size, and possibly publication bias.

**Results**

The total sample included 98 papers (out of 205 examined), with a total of 120 studies including 11,869 participants with mean sample size being 98.91 and median sample size 74. Of the examined 205 papers, 99 papers were excluded for a variety of reasons, mainly because of the use of a within-subjects design (52 papers). Also, some papers could not be accessed (5 papers) or could not be included because we did not receive the required data on time (7 papers). Some had other reasons for exclusion (35 papers), such as not introducing data or a dissertation that had data included in a published paper.

In our reporting of the effect sizes, d indicates a main effect and Δd indicates an interaction effect. Even though Hedges’ g effect sizes were used, the notation of d was maintained, since it is only a minor correction to Cohen’s d. Sensitivity analyses are only reported if they show different effects (all sensitivity analyses can be freely inspected via the files available on OSF).

**Confirmatory hypotheses.** The two confirmatory hypotheses are tested in four meta-analyses. This includes estimation of the average simple effect of ostracism on the first measure, the average simple effect on the last measure and the estimation of the average interaction effect on the first and last measure. Multiple analyses are needed, because a singular approach would result in a within-subjects design of the meta-analysis, and correlations would be needed to correct for the violation of independent observations. Seeing how these correlations are absent in the coding (due to lack of reporting in papers), the current approach is used.

**Simple ostracism effect (Hypothesis 1).** A random-effects model on the main effect of ostracism (*k* = 120) was run. Heterogeneity was clearly significant, Q (119) = 3158.12, p < .0001, I2 = 97.88% and estimated τ2 = 2.726, 95% CI [2.183;3.771]. The analysis yields an estimated average effect of d = 1.96, p < .0001, 95% CI[1.66;2.26]. A random-effects version of the Egger’s test (Egger et al., 1997; Sterne & Egger, 2005) shows that there is funnel plot asymmetry, z = 10.75, p < .0001, indicative of bias in the estimated effect. Due to the size of the effect, we do not suspect publication bias to make up this asymmetry. In other words, immediately after being ostracized, the average ostracism effect is estimated at 1.96 standard deviations.

A mixed-effects model was fitted for the ostracism effect on the last measure (*k =* 95), including estimated time in seconds as predictor. Residual heterogeneity was clearly significant, QE (93) = 1422.44, p < .0001 and estimated τ2 = 0.933, 95% CI [0.669;1.399]. An average effect is found, dintercept = 1.03, p < .0001, 95% CI [0.669;1.399]. Estimated time in seconds did not moderate the average effect, b= .0023, p = .6835, 95% CI [-0.0089;0.0136]. We have to take into consideration the low power of the moderation analyses due to the large (residual) heterogeneity in effect sizes. A regression test for mixed-effects model with moderator showed no funnel plot asymmetry, z = 4.7794, p < .001. In short, long after ostracism has occurred (Mtime = 291.1833 seconds), ostracized participants on average score around 1.03 standard deviations differently from included participants, an effect that does not appear to be moderated further by time passed since the ostracism occurence.

It thus seems that there is a negative effect of ostracism on both the first and last measures, of which the latter is *not* moderated by time. The ostracism effect over time is alternatively inspected via confidence intervals. Comparing the 95% confidence intervals for the average ostracism effect on the first measure (i.e.1.66;2.26) and on the last measure (i.e. -0.669;1.399) shows that these do not overlap. Although the difference in average effect sizes between first and last measure cannot be formally tested (because of a lack of information on the correlation between measures in the primary studies), a difference is present and Cis suggests that the average ostracism effect is smaller for the last measure. Seeing that estimated time did not appear to moderate the ostracism effect on the last measure, this suggests that other factors besides time passed since the ostracism may account for the smaller effects on the last measure.

**Moderation of ostracism (Hypothesis 2).**A random-effects model on the interaction effect on the first measure (*k* = 52) shows no heterogeneity, Q (51) = 61.44, p = .1502, I2 = 21.30% and estimated τ2 = 0.05, 95% CI [0;0.157]. An average interaction effect was found, Δd = 0.593, p < .0001, 95% CI [0.453;0.732], indicating a change in the ostracism effect due to the moderator level and vice versa (i.e. moderation of the ostracism effect). There was indication of funnel plot asymmetry, z = 3.9112, p < .001. In other words, the data indicate that the ostracism effect *can* be moderated on the first measure following the ostracism sequence.

On the last measure (*k* = 46), the mixed-effects model (with estimated time as predictor) for the interaction effect showed no residual heterogeneity, QE (44) = 105.04, p = .6056 and estimated τ2 = 0.0039, 95% CI [0;.075]. The average interaction effect was estimated at Δdintercept­ = 0.477, p < .001, 95% CI [0.349;0.605] and no moderation of time was found, b = .0000, p = .8376, 95% CI [-0.0002;0.0002]. The regression test showed funnel plot asymmetry, z = 3.5921, p = .0003. These results indicate that moderation of the average ostracism effect is also found as time progressed, and time itself does not moderate this interaction.

To see whether the interaction decreases from the first to the last measure, the confidence intervals are compared once more. On the first measure, the 95% was [0.453;0.732] whereas for the last measure 95% CI [0.349;0.605]. It can be seen that these CIs overlap, hence there is no indication for decrease in the moderation across the measures examined.

In sum, the data tested on the confirmatory hypotheses indicate that the main effect of ostracism is very large (d = 1.96) at first, reducing to dintercept = 1.03 on the last measure. For the interaction effect, the data indicate there is an interaction effect on the first (Δd = 0.593) and the last measure (Δdintercept = 0.477), which are similar in size after inspecting CIs. In other words, the current data indicate that ostracism has a huge effect at first, which reduces later on in the studies (but not necessarily because of elapsed time) and this ostracism effect can be moderated equally across the first and last measure.

**Exploratory hypotheses.** The exploratory analyses concern simple effects of both ostracism and the moderators in the studies, subsetted for measure type, sample composition, scale composition, Cyberball specifics and inspecting variability in a homogeneous subset of studies.

**Simple effects.** When there is an interaction present, you are not allowed to interpret main effects. After all, the interaction indicates that the main effect of (e.g.) X is different for the different levels of (e.g.) Y. The confirmatory analyses showed that the effect of ostracism is different in the moderator level when compared to the non-moderator level. Running random effects models for the simple effects across all measures shows the nuances of the average interaction effect. We also inspected the simple effects per type of measure to see whether there were differences for the subsets (1) fundamental needs, (2) intrapersonal measures, and (3) interpersonal measures. We also coded whether the immediate or delayed measures were in line with the conceptual idea of immediate (i.e. related to during the game) and delayed (i.e. related to after the game). The simple effects overall and the subsets are represented in Figure 1 with dotplots. For space considerations and the exploratory nature of these analyses, test statistics are omitted and only represented in the dotplot figure; effect size estimates in text.

Inspecting the overall simple effects shows that the ostracism effect is present on both the moderator (d = 1.436, 95% CI [1.113;1.758]) and the non-moderator (d = 1.402, 95% CI [1.226;1.579]) levels on the first measure. The figure also shows that the moderator factor has an average effect on both the ostracism (d = 0.568, 95% CI [0.420;0.716]) and inclusion (d = 0.476, 95% CI [0.347;0.604]) levels. On the last measure, the ostracism effect decreases (moderator level: d = 0.797, 95% CI [0.592;1.001]; non-moderator level: d = 0.770, 95% CI [0.645;0.896]), whereas the effect of moderation is similar on the last measure (ostracism level: d = 0.404, 95% CI [0.310;0.498]; inclusion level: d = 0.350, 95% CI [0.258;0.442]). This thus indicates that the ostracism effect decreases over time, but the moderation effect stays similar in size.

**Measures.**To inspect how robust the overall estimate is, we ran similar simple effects models across several subsets of measures. These measures encompassed (1) fundamental needs (single- and composite measures), (2) intrapersonal measures (i.e. measures that relate only to the self), (3) interpersonal (i.e. measures that relate to others or the self in the context of others) measures and (4) measures that were coded by the first two authors as fitting the description of being immediate or delayed (i.e. questions related to during- or after the game, respectively). The analyses for the different measures are conducted for the two time points separately (i.e. first and last measure).

Figure 1 shows the results per subset. Comparing these dotplots shows that the trend across the subsets is similar, except that the ostracism effect is stronger in the subset of fundamental needs and weaker in the interpersonal behavior measures. Also, the moderator effect on the inclusion effect is not significant for the fundamental needs subset. These differences are only minor, but should be taken into consideration when estimating power for different kinds of measures. However, substantively, only one result is different and only in case of the fundamental needs. Hence, conclusions only change in one case and we therefor conclude that the findings of the overall estimates can be considered robust across the subsets.

**Composition.**We ran a mixed-effects model on the ostracism effect of the first measure (as in Hypothesis 1) for the composition effects, because we expected that the effects would be largest in this setting and the highest number of studies could be included in this analysis. The predictors in the mixed effects model were (1) number of players in the game, (2) length of the game, (3) number of throws in the game, (4) proportion of males in the study, and (5) mean age of the participants and (6) type of needs scale referenced. This model (*k =* 43) showed clear residual heterogeneity, QE(36) = 982.08, p < .0001, estimated τ2 = 2.01, 95% CI [1.29;3.44], but no moderation, QM(6) = 5.1031, p = .5307. Inspecting the predictors individually also showed no indication for moderation (*p*s > .1615). These analyses are again troubled by the large heterogeneity in the effect sizes, necessitating the moderators to have very a very large influence on the effect (i.e. half a standard deviation at least) in order to be detectable. However, even the overall moderator test showed no such effect. In sum, no compositional moderators were found, but this might be due to the large heterogeneity in the effect sizes.

An additional exploratory test was included, to seek for a more homogenous subset of studies. As was seen in the analysis of the ostracism main effect on the first measure, heterogeneity made up 97.88% of the variability. A subset of typical Cyberball studies was selected to further understand heterogeneity in outcomes. This type of study was defined as having 3 players in the game, 30 throws, lasting less than five minutes and measuring fundamental needs (single or composite). Performing a meta-analysis on these ‘typical Cyberball studies’ (*k =* 37) showed an I2 value of 97.02%, indicating there is much variability in the effect sizes even in this substantively homogenous subset of studies. In other words, the heterogeneity found in the overall analyses does not appear to have arisen from the inclusion of different measures and the use of alternative Cyberball setups.

In sum, the exploratory tests indicate several things. First, there appear to be no composition effects of the study on the average effect size. Second, the overall estimated effects of ostracism are robust for measure effects, except for the moderator effect on the inclusion level, where the fundamental needs measures shows no moderation effect on the last measure. Third, there is much heterogeneity in the effect sizes, even when taking a very heterogeneous setup of the study and its measures. Fourth, inspecting the simple effects for the moderator factor per ostracism level shows that moderation occurs on both the ostracism- and inclusion levels.

**Discussion**

This paper began with a deduction of several confirmatory hypotheses from theory and presenting several interesting avenues for exploratory hypotheses. After having presented the results concerning these hypotheses, we will elaborate on the implications for theory and practice. Thereafter, we discuss several limitations of the current meta-analysis and provide suggestions for future research.

For the confirmatory hypotheses, two questions were central: 1) “does the effect size of ostracism decrease over time?” and 2) “does the average moderation of ostracism increase over time?” The results from the analyses show that there is indication for a decrease in the effect from the first to the last measure, but that this is not moderated by the estimated time. In other words, the aggregated studies do show a decrease in the ostracism effect, but this cannot be simply ascribed to time passed since being ostracized. The interaction effect was present on the first measure, and on the last measure. In other words, the results indicate that the ostracism effect can be moderated equally across time.

The exploratory questions had the main goal of inspecting whether the make-up of a study influenced the effect sizes. The analyses showed that this was not the case for mean age of the participants, proportion of male participants and the make-up of the Cyberball manipulation. Exploratory analyses also showed that the effects of ostracism were equal across subsets of measures and the overall set of measures, except for interpersonal measures showing weaker ostracism effects and fundamental needs measures (single and composite) showing stronger ostracism effects on the first measure.Another exploratory analysis showed that there is much heterogeneity in the effect sizes found immediately after being ostracized, even when taking a subset of the studies that is highly homogeneous (i.e. the typical Cyberball study that measures fundamental needs). This seems to go against the idea of the reflexive response to ostracism, as Williams (2009) proposed. A reflex usually implies a similar response to a similar stimulus, which the data suggest is not the case for the ostracism effect within the Cyberball paradigm. The exploratory hypotheses indicate that the ostracism effect has some nuances that have not been suggested before.

It thus seems that the data provide some new insights to the workings of ostracism. Congruent is that the effect of ostracism seems to decrease as the studies progress (first alternative hypothesis: the ostracism effect is smaller on the last measure, when compared to the first). Time as a predictor seems to not play a role, even in the subsets of measures. This lack of moderation is possibly due to one of three reasons: (1) the heterogeneity in the effect sizes is too large to find moderation by time, (2) imprecise reporting of the measures in the papers led to faulty time estimation or (3) the difference in the effect size is not due to time but differences between the type of measures on the different time points. Heterogeneity was found to be large even within a homogenous subset of studies and further inspection of the data would thus be of no use, because the heterogeneity apparently is inherent in the data. For the imprecise reporting of the measures, authors could be contacted, but this also poses new problems (i.e. nonresponse or authors might not be willing to admit that measures were left out in the paper). The difference in measures can be inspected by creating a difference index between the types of measures and regressing that on the effect sizes. Doing this for the main effect on the last measure, shows no significant effect of this difference (b = -0.066, p = .3197). In short, there are some limitations of the analyses with time as a moderator, but these limitations are either hard to address (i.e. imprecise reporting or heterogeneity), or the data indicates the opposite (i.e. difference in measures).

Next to this first new insight, another is with regards to the direct moderation of ostracism (i.e. by the interaction, not the predictor). The data in this paper suggests that there is similar moderation on both the first and last measures in the studies, going directly against the second alternative hypothesis. The second hypothesis, derived from Williams (2009), postulated that as time since the ostracism occurrence increased, coping would increase after being numbed, facilitating an increase in moderation. The current data suggests that there is no such thing and that the ostracism effect can be moderated immediately *and* later on.

In sum, the results of the current meta-analysis extend the theory by Williams (2009), by indicating that the effect of ostracism decreases and also indicating that the ostracism effect can be moderated, regardless of the time point at which this happens.

**Limitations.** Within the current meta-analysis there are several limitations. Four limitations are discussed below.

First, the lack of direct testing in the differences between the first and last measure. In its current setting, the meta-analysis makes comparisons between the first and last measures based upon the confidence intervals of these estimates. This is an indirect and informal test of whether the effects differ. A direct test would provide more conclusive evidence on whether or not the effect is equal across the first and last measurements. However, such a direct test requires correlations between the measurements per study, per cell, which are (usually) not reported in papers. This would thus require a direct request for data from each paper, which would likely yield low response rates (Wicherts, Borsboom, Kats, & Molenaar, 2006), lowering the sample size of the meta-analysis overall.6 This lack of direct testing was thus chosen as a way of retaining sample size within the meta-analysis.

Second, not all measures are included and tested in a repeated-measures meta-analysis. Initially, a pre-test was run including all measures, but this showed that many papers did not include all statistics required for all measures. Requesting all of this information from the authors yielded a similar limitation as the first: a trade-off between retaining sample size and comprehensiveness. Another reason why only the first and last measures were included was that every measure would require two separate meta-analyses to test both the main- and interaction effect (increasing Type I error rates) if a similar analytical model was used. If all measures were included, it would increase the importance of including an effect size correction due to correlations between measures, to facilitate repeated-measures analyses to minimize Type I error rates. In other words, the failure to include all measures was to prevent the problem of multiple testing and nonresponse to data requests, which would lead to a smaller sample size.

Third, the heterogeneity in the effect sizes poses a problem for the power of finding any moderator effects. This could pose the problem that several of the non-effects found are actually there, but not detected (Type II errors). However, the substantively chosen subset of studies still showed variability in the effect sizes: I2 = 97.01%. This indicates that the effects are very variable to begin with, and makes it unlikely that the effects are misrepresented.

Fourth, the current meta-analysis only examined between-subjects designs. Possibly there is a difference for the ostracism effect in between- and within-subjects designs, something that we have not directly investigated. Also, the within-subjects designs often used fMRI data or other physiological data such as EEG (27 out of 49 at least), which pose an interesting avenue for further research in a meta-analytic domain of neurophysiological measures to add to the work of Cacioppo and colleagues (2013) within the physiological framework. These references can easily be retrieved from the database of examined papers, as is available on the OSF page of this paper.

A final note that needs to be made is that this paper only summarizes the results on the measures included in the studies. However obvious this might be, it should be pointed out, because some of the measures might be disputable. There are three types of scales that are typically used to measure fundamental needs: that by Williams (cf. 2009), that by Zadro and colleagues (2004) and that by Van Beest and Williams (2006). However, these scales can be grouped into two categories: asking state questions in general terms (e.g. ‘I feel excluded’; Williams, 2009) and those asking state questions in more direct terms with regards to the game (e.g. ‘I felt excluded during the game’; Van Beest, & Williams, 2006; Zadro et al., 2004). We did not find that the type of scale moderated effect sizes. However, this might be due to the heterogeneity in the effect sizes, improper reporting of the scale used (some authors assume all scales to be similar), due to other reasons, or there might truly be no difference. Either way, this is a crucial aspect in the ostracism field and thus is in need of more sensitive testing, to see whether the effects are dependent on the type of scale included. If it appears that this is the case, this might prove troublesome. Also, no proper psychometric validation has been performed on these scales, even though they are widely used.7 This indicates some possible problems with the fundamental needs scales, which make up many measures in Cyberball studies and thus should be investigated in future work.

Despite these limitations, the meta-analysis provides some interesting findings with regards to the workings of ostracism, and subsequently also poses interesting new questions. The findings show that the ostracism effect is huge, with an effect size approaching two. Additionally, and possibly more interesting, how can it be explained that ostracism can be moderated equally across the first and last measure within the studies? And finally, the heterogeneity in the effect sizes is high even when taking a homogeneous subset of studies. This poses the question whether the ostracism effect is actually as reflexive as has been proposed previously. These findings extend the need-threat model (Williams, 2009), which has played a major role in ostracism research until now. We invite fellow researchers to think and test ideas that might provide some explanation for these findings.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Nuss, C. K. (2002). Effects of social exclusion on cognitive processes: Anticipated aloneness reduces intelligent thought. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(4), 817–827. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.4.817

Blackhart, G. C., Nelson, B. C., Knowles, M. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). Rejection elicits emotional reactions but neither causes immediate distress nor lowers self-esteem: a meta-analytic review of 192 studies on social exclusion. *Personality and social psychology review : an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, *13*(4), 269–309. doi:10.1177/1088868309346065

Borenstein, M. (2009). Effect sizes for continuous data. In H. Cooper, L. V. Hedges, & J. C. Valentine (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

\*Boyes, M. E., & French, D. J. (2009). Having a Cyberball: Using a ball-throwing game as an experimental social stressor to examine the relationship between neuroticism and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(5), 396–401. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.005

Cacioppo, S., Frum, C., Asp, E., Weiss, R. M., Lewis, J. W., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2013). A quantitative meta-analysis of functional imaging studies of social rejection. *Scientific reports*, *3*, 2027. doi:10.1038/srep02027

Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*, *315*(7109), 629–634. doi:10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629

Gerber, J., & Wheeler, L. (2009). On Being Rejected: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Research on Rejection. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*(5), 468–488. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01158.x

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). Dichotomization of Continuous Variables: The Implications for Meta-Anafysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*(3), 334–349.

Larry V. Hedges. (1981). Distribution theory for Glass’s estimator of effect size and related estimators, *6*(2), 107–128.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*(3), 202–214. doi:10.1002/ab.10061

\*Lustenberger, D. E., & Jagacinski, C. M. (2010). Exploring the Effects of Ostracism on Performance and Intrinsic Motivation. *Human Performance*, *23*(4), 283–304. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.501046

MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods*, *7*(1), 19–40. doi:10.1037//1082-989X.7.1.19

Oaten, M., Williams, K. D., Jones, A., & Zadro, L. (2008). The effects of ostracism on self-regulation in the socially anxious. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *27*(5), 471–504.

R Core Team. (2013). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.

Sterne, J. A. C., & Egger, M. (2005). Regression Methods to Detect Publication and Other Bias in Meta-Analysis. In H. R. Rothstein, A. J. Sutton, & M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

\*Van Beest, I., Carter-Sowell, A. R., van Dijk, E., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Groups being ostracized by groups: Is the pain shared, is recovery quicker, and are groups more likely to be aggressive? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *16*(4), 241–254. doi:10.1037/a0030104

\*Van Beest, I., & Williams, K. D. (2006). When inclusion costs and ostracism pays, ostracism still hurts. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *91*(5), 918–928. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.918

Viechtbauer, W. (2005). Bias and Efficiency of Meta-Analytic Variance Estimators in the Random-Effects Model. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *30*(3), 261–293. doi:10.3102/10769986030003261

Viechtbauer, Wolfgang. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *36*(3), 1–48.

Wicherts, J. M., Borsboom, D., Kats, J., & Molenaar, D. (2006). The poor availability of psychological research data for reanalysis. *The American psychologist*, *61*(7), 726–8. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.726

\*Williams, K D, Cheung, C. K., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: effects of being ignored over the Internet. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *79*(5), 748–62.

Williams, K.D. (2009). Ostracism: a temporal need-threat model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *41*, 275–314. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)00406-1


Williams, Kipling D., & Jarvis, B. (2006). Cyberball: A program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods*, *38*(1), 174–180. doi:10.3758/BF03192765

\*Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How low can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(4), 560–567. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.11.006

**Footnotes**

1. Please note that exclusion encompasses both social rejection and social ostracism.
2. The direct link: <http://openscienceframework.org/project/HT25n/>
3. It has been updated since, but the list that was used can be found on the Open Science Framework page.
4. It should be noted that Oaten, Williams, Jones and Zadro (2008) was applicable, but was excluded due to being an outlier with respect to effect size (ds > 15). This in similar vein as in Gerber and Wheeler (2009; p. 473): “*One study (Oaten, Williams, Jones, & Zadro, 2007) had need effect sizes that were clear outliers (effect sizes were 5–7 standard deviations above the means)*[…and…]*were excluded from the analyses.*”
5. We initially coded for these expected effects to correct for this bidirectionality, but it did not solve the problem (i.e. cancellation of effects still occurred). We therefore decided to use absolute effect sizes and give up any directionality of the effect size estimates.
6. It should be noted, that out of the 72 data requests, we received timely replies of 52 (i.e. ~72%). However, these request were only for specific information and not for raw datasets, as was the case in Wicherts and colleagues (2006).
7. Some might say that *because* they are widely used, they do not require psychometric validation, that is, they would have been selected out of research if they were improper. This however is no argument for a lack of psychometric validation, because there are no arguments to oppose psychometric validation of any scale, that is there are no arguments for using unvalidated scales over validated scales.

| Table 1 – Effect sizes per study for the confirmatory hypotheses | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First\_author | Year | N | d T1 | (SE) | d T2 | (SE) | Δd T1 | (SE) | Δd T2 | (SE) |
| Alvares | 2010 | 74 | -2.06 | 0.08 | -1.32 | 0.07 | -0.15 | 0.24 | 1.12 | 0.23 |
| Ambrosini | 2013 | 40 | -1.64 | 0.13 | -0.94 | 0.11 | - | - | - | - |
| Anonymous | - | 49 | -3.88 | 0.24 | -1.29 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - |
| Anonymous | - | 91 | -8.01 | 0.40 | -1.43 | 0.06 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.18 |
| Aydin | 2012 | 68 | -0.81 | 0.06 | -0.31 | 0.06 | -1.19 | 0.24 | 0.72 | 0.23 |
| Banki | 2012 | 89 | -1.84 | 0.07 | -0.35 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Bastian | 2010 | 72 | -2.71 | 0.11 | -1.40 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Bernstein | 2012 | 24 | -0.39 | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bernstein | 2012 | 25.50 | -0.99 | 0.18 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bernstein | 2010 | 73 | -4.65 | 0.20 | -4.90 | 0.22 | -0.86 | 0.37 | -1.11 | 0.40 |
| Bernstein | 2010 | 138 | -5.46 | 0.14 | -4.06 | 0.09 | -0.53 | 0.22 | -0.51 | 0.17 |
| Bernstein | 2012 | 67 | -5.26 | 0.27 | -2.89 | 0.12 | -1.07 | 0.45 | -0.80 | 0.30 |
| Bernstein | 2012 | 27 | -1.32 | 0.18 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Boyes | 2009 | 89 | -0.43 | 0.05 | -0.79 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Boyes | 2009 | 87 | -0.19 | 0.05 | -0.83 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Brochu | - | 35 | -2.43 | 0.20 | -0.46 | 0.12 | - | - | - | - |
| Brown | 2009 | 52 | -0.63 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Carter | 2008 | 143 | -0.09 | 0.03 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.11 |
| Carter-Sowell | 2008 | 65 | -2.82 | 0.12 | -1.46 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Carter-Sowell | 2010 | 74 | -4.22 | 0.17 | -4.25 | 0.18 | -1.23 | 0.33 | -1.15 | 0.34 |
| Carter-Sowell | 2010 | 70.67 | -4.93 | 0.23 | -1.73 | 0.08 | -0.65 | 0.39 | -0.63 | 0.24 |
| Chen | 2012 | 60 | -0.97 | 0.07 | - | - | -1.35 | 0.27 | - | - |
| Chen | 2012 | 83 | -1.08 | 0.06 | - | - | -1.32 | 0.21 | - | - |
| Chernyak | 2010 | 76 | -1.49 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Chow | 2008 | 75 | -1.18 | 0.06 | -1.30 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - |
| Chrisp | 2012 | 77 | -0.69 | 0.06 | -0.14 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Coyne | 2011 | 40 | -0.54 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| De Waal-Andrews | 2012 | 136 | -4.84 | 0.12 | -3.92 | 0.09 | -1.29 | 0.24 | -0.87 | 0.18 |
| De Waal-Andrews | 2012 | 112 | -4.92 | 0.14 | -2.63 | 0.07 | -1.56 | 0.31 | -1.20 | 0.18 |
| DeBono | - | 57 | -1.08 | 0.08 | 0.38 | 0.07 | -1.55 | 0.29 | -0.48 | 0.27 |
| DeBono | - | 81 | -1.41 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.05 | -0.33 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 0.19 |
| DeBono | - | 83 | -0.81 | 0.05 | - | - | -0.75 | 0.19 | - | - |
| Dietrich | 2010 | 75 | 1.41 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Duclos | 2012 | 59 | -0.62 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Eisenberger | 2006 | 48 | -0.15 | 0.08 | -1.21 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - |
| Fayant | - | 60 | -4.00 | 0.20 | -1.36 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.38 | -0.44 | 0.28 |
| Floor | 2007 | 88 | -4.13 | 0.14 | -0.66 | 0.05 | -0.21 | 0.28 | -0.59 | 0.19 |
| Gallardo-Pujol | 2012 | 57 | -1.58 | 0.10 | -0.88 | 0.08 | -1.17 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.29 |
| Gan | 2012 | 72 | -0.59 | 0.02 | -0.15 | 0.02 | -0.62 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| Garczynski | 2013 | 83 | -2.31 | 0.12 | 1.01 | 0.08 | -1.29 | 0.33 | -0.01 | 0.29 |
| Geniole | 2011 | 74 | 0.19 | 0.06 | -0.11 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - |
| Gerber | - | 38 | -2.03 | 0.16 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gerber | - | 89 | -3.30 | 0.21 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gonsalkorale | 2007 | 97 | -3.03 | 0.13 | -0.85 | 0.07 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 1.31 | 0.25 |
| Goodwin | 2010 | 300 | -3.78 | 0.04 | -1.43 | 0.02 | 0.20 | 0.08 | -0.43 | 0.07 |
| Goodwin | 2010 | 314 | -0.12 | 0.01 | -0.04 | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.06 | -0.10 | 0.06 |
| Greitemeyer | 2012 | 56 | -0.47 | 0.07 | -0.23 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Gruijters | - | 113 | -0.25 | 0.06 | -1.05 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Hackenbracht | 2013 | 51 | -1.88 | 0.11 | -0.17 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Hawes | 2012 | 55 | -2.77 | 0.14 | 0.51 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.38 | -1.05 | 0.28 |
| Hellmann | - | 76 | -0.61 | 0.06 | -0.32 | 0.05 | -1.40 | 0.22 | 0.74 | 0.21 |
| Hess | 2010 | 162 | -2.33 | 0.04 | -0.86 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Hess | 2011 | 38 | -0.62 | 0.11 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Horn | - | 68 | -0.65 | 0.06 | -0.35 | 0.06 | -0.99 | 0.23 | 1.49 | 0.24 |
| Ijzerman | 2012 | 86 | -2.41 | 0.08 | - | - | -1.07 | 0.22 | - | - |
| Jamieson | 2010 | 33 | -1.50 | 0.16 | -1.02 | 0.14 | - | - | - | - |
| Jamieson | 2010 | 68 | -1.91 | 0.09 | -1.44 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Johnson | 2010 | 104 | -0.73 | 0.04 | -0.78 | 0.04 | - | - | - | - |
| Kassner | - | 85 | -4.60 | 0.17 | -2.36 | 0.08 | -0.87 | 0.31 | -0.30 | 0.21 |
| Kassner | 2012 | 49 | -2.07 | 0.13 | -1.74 | 0.11 | - | - | - | - |
| Kerr | 2008 | 250 | -1.65 | 0.02 | -0.05 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - |
| Kesting | 2013 | 76 | -0.27 | 0.05 | -0.78 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - |
| Knowles | 2010 | 62 | 0.21 | 0.07 | - | - | -0.99 | 0.25 | - | - |
| Knowles | 2012 | 60 | -0.59 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Krijnen | 2008 | 144 | -4.70 | 0.10 | -0.17 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Krill | 2008 | 119 | -2.09 | 0.05 | -0.56 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Lakin | 2008 | 36 | -1.48 | 0.14 | -0.49 | 0.11 | - | - | - | - |
| Lau | 2009 | 56 | -5.63 | 0.35 | -3.80 | 0.20 | -0.06 | 0.58 | 1.36 | 0.46 |
| Lustenberger | 2010 | 71 | -0.81 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - |
| Lustenberger | 2010 | 156 | -0.70 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MacDonald | 2008 | 63 | -0.15 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| McDonald | 2012 | 270 | -0.06 | 0.02 | -2.40 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Nordgren | 2011 | 71 | -0.73 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nordgren | 2011 | 74 | -0.79 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nordgren | 2011 | 46 | -2.18 | 0.14 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nordgren | 2011 | 44.67 | -0.54 | 0.09 | -0.73 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - |
| Nordgren | 2011 | 58.67 | -0.64 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oberleitner | 2012 | 88 | -2.33 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| OBrien | 2012 | 125 | -0.57 | 0.03 | -0.69 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Peterson | 2011 | 40 | -0.87 | 0.11 | -0.88 | 0.11 | - | - | - | - |
| Pharo | 2011 | 74 | -0.87 | 0.06 | -0.99 | 0.06 | -1.00 | 0.22 | -0.84 | 0.22 |
| Plaisier | 2012 | 149 | -0.87 | 0.03 | -0.20 | 0.03 | -0.40 | 0.11 | -0.56 | 0.11 |
| Ramirez | 2009 | 121 | -2.24 | 0.05 | -1.01 | 0.04 | - | - | - | - |
| Ren | 2012 | 53 | -2.13 | 0.12 | -0.17 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Renneberg | 2011 | 60 | -8.09 | 0.61 | -1.89 | 0.10 | 1.83 | 0.81 | 0.51 | 0.29 |
| Riva | 2011 | 100 | -2.05 | 0.13 | -1.06 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - |
| Ruggieri | - | 91 | -0.38 | 0.04 | -0.56 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Ruggieri | - | 74 | -0.49 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.05 | -0.31 | 0.24 | -0.68 | 0.23 |
| Sacco | 2011 | 51 | -2.35 | 0.13 | -1.42 | 0.10 | - | - | - | - |
| Sacco | 2011 | 21 | -2.15 | 0.29 | -1.38 | 0.23 | - | - | - | - |
| Sacco | 2011 | 38 | -1.69 | 0.14 | -1.01 | 0.12 | - | - | - | - |
| Salvy | 2010 | 59 | -1.43 | 0.09 | -1.41 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Salvy | 2009 | 103 | -1.46 | 0.05 | -1.30 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Schaafsma | 2012 | 720 | -2.55 | 0.01 | -1.32 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.03 |
| Segovia | 2012 | 56 | -1.61 | 0.09 | - | - | -1.89 | 0.32 | - | - |
| Staebler | 2011 | 68 | -0.59 | 0.06 | -0.53 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.23 |
| Stillman | 2009 | 121 | -0.82 | 0.05 | -1.31 | 0.06 | 0.57 | 0.22 | -1.19 | 0.24 |
| Stock | 2011 | 155 | -1.98 | 0.04 | -0.13 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - |
| Van Beest | 2011 | 87 | -2.16 | 0.07 | -1.15 | 0.05 | -0.40 | 0.24 | -0.44 | 0.19 |
| Van Beest | 2011 | 183 | -4.75 | 0.13 | -1.12 | 0.04 | -0.76 | 0.22 | -0.11 | 0.13 |
| Van Beest | 2006 | 135 | -2.43 | 0.05 | -1.18 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.12 |
| Van Beest | 2006 | 111.33 | -4.30 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.14 |
| Van Beest | 2012 | 125 | -6.53 | 0.20 | -2.66 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.35 | -0.23 | 0.15 |
| Van Beest | 2012 | 85 | -6.56 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.28 | 0.44 | 0.07 | 0.18 |
| Van Dijk | - | 51 | -1.47 | 0.10 | -0.04 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Webb | - | 170 | -1.78 | 0.03 | -0.74 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| Weik | 2010 | 65 | -0.04 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.06 | -0.43 | 0.24 | 0.66 | 0.24 |
| Wesselmann | 2009 | 82 | -2.77 | 0.10 | -4.01 | 0.15 | -1.30 | 0.24 | -0.20 | 0.28 |
| Wesselmann | 2012 | 91 | -1.44 | 0.06 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Williams | 2002 | 390 | -0.39 | 0.01 | -2.34 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - |
| Williams | 2000 | 732 | -0.79 | 0.01 | -1.43 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - |
| Williams | 2000 | 111 | -0.71 | 0.04 | -0.91 | 0.04 | -0.20 | 0.15 | -0.98 | 0.15 |
| Wirth | 2009 | 159.33 | -4.86 | 0.10 | -2.02 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.46 | 0.11 |
| Wirth | 2010 | 76 | -0.95 | 0.06 | -1.62 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Zadro | 2004 | 62 | -3.05 | 0.14 | -1.49 | 0.08 | -0.11 | 0.32 | -1.12 | 0.28 |
| Zadro | 2004 | 77 | -3.47 | 0.13 | -1.35 | 0.06 | -0.29 | 0.28 | -0.70 | 0.21 |
| Zadro | 2006 | 56 | -3.63 | 0.19 | -0.86 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - |
| Zhong | 2008 | 52 | -0.68 | 0.16 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Zoller | 2010 | 57 | -0.24 | 0.07 | -0.08 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Zwolinski | 2012 | 56 | -1.97 | 0.11 | -0.28 | 0.07 | - | - | - | - |



*Figure 1.* A dotplot of the average estimated simple effects with 95% confidence intervals.

Appendix

All formulae reported below originate from the chapter by Michael Borenstein (2009). Hedges’ g was calculated as

where d is the standardized main effect. For the standardized interaction effect d was calculated as

where the first term in the nominator is the ostracism effect and the second term is the ostracism effect in the moderator conditions. This Δd corresponds to the partial eta-squared of the interaction. Sampling variance of g was calculated by multiplying the sampling variance of d by the squared correction factor, that is

where the sampling variance of the interaction was calculated as the sum of the sampling variances of both the simple main effects.

**Supplemental materials**

Reference list of studies included

Alvares, G. A., Hickie, I. B., & Guastella, A. J. (2010). Acute effects of intranasal oxytocin on subjective and behavioral responses to social rejection. *Experimental and Clinical psychopharmacology*, *18*(4), 316–321. doi:10.1037/a0019719

Ambrosini, E., Blomberg, O., Mandrigin, A., & Costantini, M. (2013). Social exclusion modulates pre-reflective interpersonal body representation. *Psychological research*. doi:10.1007/s00426-012-0476-2

Anonymous. (*in preparation*). Partial Ostracism, Partial Pain, Partial Revenge.

Aydin, N., Krueger, J. I., Fischer, J., Hahn, D., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., & Fischer, P. (2012). “Man’s best friend:” How the presence of a dog reduces mental distress after social exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 446–449. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.011

Banki, S. (2012). *How much or how many? Partial ostracism and its consequences*. University of Toronto. Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/32659/3/Banki\_Sara\_201206\_PhD\_thesis.pdf

Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: The dehumanizing effects of social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(1), 107–113. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022

Bernstein, M. J., & Claypool, H. M. (2012a). Social exclusion and pain sensitivity: why exclusion sometimes hurts and sometimes numbs. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, *38*(2), 185–196. doi:10.1177/0146167211422449

Bernstein, M. J., & Claypool, H. M. (2012b). Not all social exclusions are created equal: Emotional distress following social exclusion is moderated by exclusion paradigm. *Social Influence*, *7*(2), 113–130. doi:10.1080/15534510.2012.664326

Bernstein, M. J., Sacco, D. F., Young, S. G., Hugenberg, K., & Cook, E. (2010a). Being “in” with the in-crowd: the effects of social exclusion and inclusion are enhanced by the perceived essentialism of ingroups and outgroups. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, *36*(8), 999–1009. doi:10.1177/0146167210376059

Bernstein, M. J., Sacco, D. F., Young, S. G., Hugenberg, K., & Cook, E. (2010b). Unpublished study of “Being ‘in’ with the crowd” paper.

Boyes, M. E., & French, D. J. (2009). Having a Cyberball: Using a ball-throwing game as an experimental social stressor to examine the relationship between neuroticism and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(5), 396–401. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.005

Brochu, P. M., Garcia, D. M., Smith, H. J., & Esses, V. M. (*working paper*). Ironic Effects of Ambiguous Weight Stigmatization on the Regulation of Eating Behavior.

Brown, C. M., Young, S. G., Sacco, D. F., Bernstein, M. J., & Claypool, H. M. (2009). Social Inclusion Facilitates Interest in Mating. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *7*(1), 11–27.

Carter, B. E. (2008). *When does ostracism decrease self-regulation?* Montana State University. Retrieved from http://etd.lib.montana.edu/etd/2008/carter/CarterB0508.pdf

Carter-Sowell, A R, Wesslemann, E. C., Wirth, J. H., Law, A. T., Chen, Z., Kosasih, M. W., Van der Lee, R., et al. (2010). Strides for belonging trump strides for superiority: Effects of being ostracized for being superior or inferior to the others. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *66*(1), 68–92.

Carter-Sowell, Adrienne R, Chen, Z., & Williams, K. D. (2008). Ostracism increases social susceptibility. *Social Influence*, *3*(3), 143–153. doi:10.1080/15534510802204868

Chen, Z., DeWall, C. N., Poon, K.-T., & Chen, E.-W. (2012). When destiny hurts: Implicit theories of relationships moderate aggressive responses to ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(5), 1029–1036. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.04.002

Chernyak, N., & Zayas, V. (2010). Being excluded by one means being excluded by all: Perceiving exclusion from inclusive others during one-person social exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 582–585. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.01.004

Chow, R. M., Tiedens, L. Z., & Govan, C. L. (2008). Excluded emotions: The role of anger in antisocial responses to ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 896–903. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2007.09.004

Chrisp, J. A. L. (2012). *Exploring the role of belonging in intergroup discrimination.* University of Otago. Retrieved from http://otago.ourarchive.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10523/2662/ChrispJulia

Coyne, S. M., Gundersen, N., Nelson, D. A., & Stockdale, L. (2011). Adolescents’ Prosocial Responses to Ostracism: An Experimental Study. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *151*(5), 657–661. doi:10.1080/00224545.2010.522625

De Waal-Andrews, W., & Van Beest, I. (2012). When you don’t quite get what you want: psychological and interpersonal consequences of claiming inclusion. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, *38*(10), 1367–1377. doi:10.1177/0146167212450463

DeBono, A. (*in preparation*). Understanding Maladaptive Responses to Social Exclusion: Aggression with an Audience.

DeBono, A., & Muraven, M. (*in preparation*). Personality traits that reduce and exacerbate aggression from social exclusion when depleted.

Dietrich, D., Hawkinson, K., & Palo, A. (2010). Self-monitoring as a moderating factor of aggressive responses to ostracism. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Duclos, R., Wan, E. W., & Jiang, Y. (2013). Show Me the Honey! Effects of Social Exclusion on Financial Risk-Taking. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(1), 122–135. doi:10.1086/668900

Eisenberger, N. I., Jarcho, J. M., Lieberman, M. D., & Naliboff, B. D. (2006). An experimental study of shared sensitivity to physical pain and social rejection. *Pain*, *126*(1-3), 132–138. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.06.024

Fayant, M. P., Lantian, A., Muller, D., & Hartgerink, C. H. J. (*working paper*). Is ostracism by a despised group suffering? A replication of Gonsalkorale and Williams (2007).

Floor, L. (2007). *De effecten van groepslidmaatschap op ostracisme en pesten. Wat is erger: genegeerd of gepest worden? [The effects of group membership on ostracism and bullying. What is worse: being ignored or being bullied?]*. University Leiden.

Gallardo-Pujol, D., Andrés-Pueyo, A., & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (2012). MAOA genotype, social exclusion and aggression: An experimental test of a gene-environment interaction. *Genes, brain, and behavior*. doi:10.1111/j.1601-183X.2012.00868.x

Gan, Y., & Liu, J. (2012). The mechanism by which interpersonal coping flexibility influences self-esteem. *The Psychological Record*, *62*, 735–746.

Garczynski, A. M., Brown, C. M., & Harvey, R. D. (2013). Temporal perspective moderates self-reported reactions to social rejection. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Geniole, S. N., Carré, J. M., & McCormick, C. M. (2011). State, not trait, neuroendocrine function predicts costly reactive aggression in men after social exclusion and inclusion. *Biological psychology*, *87*(1), 137–145. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.02.020

Gerber, J. P., Williams, K. D., & Wheeler, L. (*in preparation*). Clarifying the relationship between ostracism and relational devaluation.

Gonsalkorale, K., & Williams, K. D. (2007). The KKK won’t let me play: ostracism even by a despised outgroup hurts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*(6), 1176–1186. doi:10.1002/ejsp.392

Goodwin, S. A., Williams, K. D., & Carter-Sowell, A. R. (2010). The psychological sting of stigma: The costs of attributing ostracism to racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 612–618. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.02.002

Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, P., & Kastenmüller, A. (2012). The effects of social exclusion on confirmatory information processing. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*(4), 462–469. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1851

Gruijters, S. (*unpublished raw data*). Social connection and anthropomorphism.

Hackenbracht, J., & Gasper, K. (*in press*). I’m All Ears: The Need to Belong Motivates Listening to Emotional Disclosure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

Hawes, D. J., Zadro, L., Fink, E., Richardson, R., O’Moore, K., Griffiths, B., Dadds, M. R., et al. (2012). The effects of peer ostracism on children’s cognitive processes. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*(5), 599–613. doi:10.1080/17405629.2011.638815

Hellmann, J. H., & Echterhoff, G. (*in preparation*). Ostracism and Facebook.

Hess, Y. D., & Pickett, C. L. (2010). Social rejection and self- versus other-awareness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 453–456. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.12.004

Hess, Y., & Pickett, C. (2011). I’ll stick with my idea: exclusion increases socially dominant behaviors. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Horn, N. R. (*n.d.*). *Social exclusion and the bitter coldness of rejection: can drinking a warm drink after being socially excluded counterbalance the negative effects?* Retrieved from https://dspace.washcoll.edu/handle/10090/19133?show=full

Ijzerman, H., Gallucci, M., Pouw, W. T. J. L., Weiβgerber, S. C., Van Doesum, N. J., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Cold-blooded loneliness: social exclusion leads to lower skin temperatures. *Acta Psychologica*, *140*(3), 283–288. doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2012.05.002

Jamieson, J. P., Harkins, S. G., & Williams, K. D. (2010). Need threat can motivate performance after ostracism. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, *36*(5), 690–702. doi:10.1177/0146167209358882

Johnson, C. (2010). *Personality and ostracism: do hope, optimism, and forgiveness moderate the effects of social exclusion?* Purdue University. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/2778/CBJohnson\_Thesis\_FINAL.pdf?sequence=1

Kassner, M. P., Dongning, R., Law, A. T., & Williams, K. D. (*in preparation*). Effects of Mental Visualization and Degraded Presentation on Detection and Influence of Ostracism.

Kassner, M. P., Wesselmann, E. D., Law, A. T., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Virtually ostracized: studying ostracism in immersive virtual environments. *Cyberpsychology, behavior and social networking*, *15*(8), 399–403. doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0113

Kerr, N. L., Seok, D.-H., Poulsen, J. R., Harris, D. W., & Messé, L. A. (2008). Social ostracism and group motivation gain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 736–746. doi:10.1002/ejsp

Kesting, M.-L., Bredenpohl, M., Klenke, J., Westermann, S., & Lincoln, T. M. (2012). The impact of social stress on self-esteem and paranoid ideation. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, *44*(1), 122–128. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2012.07.010

Knowles, M. (2010). Use of social media in the service of belonging needs. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Knowles, Megan, & Caroll, C. (2012). Shifting perspectives: the impact of social rejection and acceptance on perspective-taking. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Krijnen, J. (*n.d.*). Research Report “BP29 Complete.”

Krill, A. L., Platek, S. M., & Wathne, K. (2008). Feelings of control during social exclusion are partly accounted for by empathizing personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(7), 684–688. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.016

Lakin, J. L., Chartrand, T. L., & Arkin, R. M. (2008). I am too just like you: nonconscious mimicry as an automatic behavioral response to social exclusion. *Psychological science*, *19*(8), 816–822. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02162.x

Lau, G., Moulds, M. L., & Richardson, R. (2009). Ostracism: how much it hurts depends on how you remember it. *Emotion*, *9*(3), 430–434. doi:10.1037/a0015350

Lustenberger, D. E., & Jagacinski, C. M. (2010). Exploring the Effects of Ostracism on Performance and Intrinsic Motivation. *Human Performance*, *23*(4), 283–304. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.501046

MacDonald, G. (2008). Use of pain threshold reports to satisfy social needs. *Pain Research & Management*, *13*(4), 309–319.

McDonald, M. M., & Donnellan, B. M. (2012). Is ostracism a strong situation? The influence of personality in reactions to rejection. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(5), 614–618. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2012.05.008

Nordgren, L. F., Banas, K., & MacDonald, G. (2011). Empathy gaps for social pain: why people underestimate the pain of social suffering. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *100*(1), 120–128. doi:10.1037/a0020938

Nordgren, L. F., McDonnell, M.-H. M., & Loewenstein, G. (2011). What constitutes torture?: psychological impediments to an objective evaluation of enhanced interrogation tactics. *Psychological science*, *22*(5), 689–694. doi:10.1177/0956797611405679

O’Brien, E., Ellsworth, P. C., & Schwarz, N. (2012). Today’s misery and yesterday's happiness: Differential effects of current life-events on perceptions of past wellbeing. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 968–972. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.018

Oberleitner, D. E. (2012). *Accessibility for aggression and negative self-views following ostracism*. Wayne State University. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1553&context=oa\_dissertations

Peterson, C. K., Gravens, L. C., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2011). Asymmetric frontal cortical activity and negative affective responses to ostracism. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, *6*(3), 277–285. doi:10.1093/scan/nsq027

Pharo, H., Gross, J., Richardson, R., & Hayne, H. (2011). Age-related changes in the effect of ostracism. *Social Influence*, *6*(1), 22–38. doi:10.1080/15534510.2010.525852

Plaisier, X. S., & Konijn, E. A. (2012). Rejected by Peers-Attracted to Antisocial Media Content: Rejection-Based Anger Impairs Moral Judgment Among Adolescents. *Developmental psychology*. doi:10.1037/a0029399

Ramirez, M. C. (2009). *The influence of contingent self-esteem and self-esteem variability on reactions to ostracism*. Universit of Texas at Arlington. Retrieved from http://dspace.uta.edu/bitstream/handle/10106/2034/Ramirez\_uta\_2502M\_10456.pdf?sequence=1

Ren, D., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Self-construals matter when coping with ostracism: but not when experiencing it. *SPSP Conference abstract*.

Renneberg, B., Herm, K., Hahn, A., Staebler, K., Lammers, C.-H., & Roepke, S. (2011). Perception of social participation in borderline personality disorder. *Clinical psychology & psychotherapy*. doi:10.1002/cpp.772

Riva, P., Wirth, J. H., & Williams, K. D. (2011). The consequences of pain: The social and physical pain overlap on psychological responses. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(6), 681–687. doi:10.1002/ejsp.837

Ruggieri, S., Bendixen, M., Gabriel, U., & Alsaker, F. (*submitted*). Do victimization experiences accentuate reactions to ostracism? An experiment using Cyberball.

Ruggieri, S., Bendixen, M., Gabriel, U., & Alsaker, F. (*in press*). Cyberball: the impact of ostracism on early adolescents’ well-being. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*. doi:10.1024/1421-0185/a000103

Sacco, D. F., Wirth, J. H., Hugenberg, K., Chen, Z., & Williams, K. D. (2011). The world in black and white: Ostracism enhances the categorical perception of social information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*(4), 836–842. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.001

Salvy, S.-J., Bowker, J. C., Nitecki, L. A., Kluczynski, M. A., Germeroth, L. J., & Roemmich, J. N. (2010). Impact of simulated ostracism on overweight and normal-weight youths’ motivation to eat and food intake. *Appetite*, *56*(1), 39–45. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2010.11.140

Salvy, S.-J., Bowker, J. C., Nitecki, L. A., Kluczynski, M. A., Germeroth, L. J., & Roemmich, J. N. (2012). Effects of ostracism and social connection-related activities on adolescents’ motivation to eat and energy intake. *Journal of pediatric psychology*, *37*(1), 23–32. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsr066

Schaafsma, J., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Exclusion, intergroup hostility, and religious fundamentalism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 829–837. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.015

Sebastian, C., Viding, E., Williams, K. D., & Blakemore, S.-J. (2010). Social brain development and the affective consequences of ostracism in adolescence. *Brain and cognition*, *72*(1), 134–145. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2009.06.008

Segovia, K. Y., & Bailenson, J. N. (2012). Virtual imposters: Responses to avatars that do not look like their controllers. *Social Influence*, *7*(4), 285–303. doi:10.1080/15534510.2012.670906

Staebler, K., Renneberg, B., Stopsack, M., Fiedler, P., Weiler, M., & Roepke, S. (2011). Facial emotional expression in reaction to social exclusion in borderline personality disorder. *Psychological medicine*, *41*(9), 1929–1938. doi:10.1017/S0033291711000080

Stillman, T. F., Baumeister, R. F., Lambert, N. M., Crescioni, A. W., Dewall, C. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2009). Alone and Without Purpose: Life Loses Meaning Following Social Exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(4), 686–694. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.007

Stock, M. L., Gibbons, F. X., Walsh, L. A., & Gerrard, M. (2011). Racial identification, racial discrimination, and substance use vulnerability among African American young adults. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, *37*(10), 1349–1361. doi:10.1177/0146167211410574

Van Beest, I., Williams, K. D., & Van Dijk, E. (2011). Cyberbomb: Effects of being ostracized from a death game. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *14*(4), 581–596. doi:10.1177/1368430210389084

Van Beest, I., Carter-Sowell, A. R., Van Dijk, E., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Groups being ostracized by groups: Is the pain shared, is recovery quicker, and are groups more likely to be aggressive? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *16*(4), 241–254. doi:10.1037/a0030104

Van Beest, I,, & Williams, K. D. (2006). When inclusion costs and ostracism pays, ostracism still hurts. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *91*(5), 918–928. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.918

Van Dijk, W. W., & Williams, K. D. (*unpublished raw data*). Social exclusion and schadenfreude.

Webb, T. L., Harris, P., & McAtamney, K. (*unpublished manuscript*). Self-Affirmation Moderates the Negative Effect of Ostracism on Perceptions of Control, But Not in Predictable Ways.

Weik, U., Maroof, P., Zöller, C., & Deinzer, R. (2010). Pre-experience of social exclusion suppresses cortisol response to psychosocial stress in women but not in men. *Hormones and behavior*, *58*(5), 891–897. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2010.08.018

Wesselmann, E. D., Bagg, D., & Williams, K. D. (2009). “I Feel Your Pain”: The effects of observing ostracism on the ostracism detection system. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(6), 1308–1311. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.08.003

Wesselmann, E. D., Wirth, J. H., Mroczek, D. K., & Williams, K. D. (2012). Dial a feeling: Detecting moderation of affect decline during ostracism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*(5), 580–586. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.039

Williams, K D, Cheung, C. K., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: effects of being ignored over the Internet. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *79*(5), 748–762.

Williams, K. D, Govan, C. L., Croker, V., Tynan, D., Cruickshank, M., & Lam, A. (2002). Investigations into differences between social- and cyberostracism. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *6*(1), 65–77. doi:10.1037//1089-2699.6.1.65

Wirth, J H, & Williams, K. D. (2009). `They Don’t Like Our Kind': Consequences of Being Ostracized While Possessing a Group Membership. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *12*(1), 111–127. doi:10.1177/1368430208098780

Wirth, James H, Lynam, D. R., & Williams, K. D. (2010). When social pain is not automatic: Personality disorder traits buffer ostracism’s immediate negative impact. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(3), 397–401. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.03.001

Zadro, L., Boland, C., & Richardson, R. (2006). How long does it last? The persistence of the effects of ostracism in the socially anxious. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *42*(5), 692–697. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.10.007

Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How low can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(4), 560–567. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.11.006

Zhong, C.-B., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2008). Cold and lonely: does social exclusion literally feel cold? *Psychological science*, *19*(9), 838–842. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02165.x

Zöller, C., Maroof, P., Weik, U., & Deinzer, R. (2010). No effect of social exclusion on salivary cortisol secretion in women in a randomized controlled study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *35*(9), 1294–1298. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2010.02.019

Zwolinski, J. (2012). Psychological and Neuroendocrine Reactivity to Ostracism. *Aggressive behavior*, *38*(2), 108–125. doi:10.1002/ab.21411