WARNING: This is a draft-y draft. Read it at your own peril...

1

'It is better to give than to receive': The role of motivation & self-control in determining the consequences of ostracism for targets and sources

Lisa Zadro, Karen Gonsalkorale and Alexandra Godwin
University of Sydney

Contact details:
Lisa Zadro
School of Psychology
University of Sydney
Sydney, 2006
Australia
Email: lisaz@psych.usyd.edu.au.

Introduction

Benjamin Franklin once said: "The only things certain in life are death and taxes". Far be it for us to correct one of the Founding Fathers, but we would, respectfully, add 'ostracism' (the act of being excluded and/or ignored; Williams, 2007) to the list. After all, look around--ostracism, in all its insidious glory, is literally everywhere; in the schoolyard, where children gleefully exclude each other from games in the playground, and teachers punish students by placing them in 'time-out' in the classrooms (Gruter & Masters, 1986); in the workplace, where bosses ignore the existence of subordinates, and colleagues deliberately keep each other out of the information loop, or exclude specific workmates from after-hours activities (Williams, 2007); it is even in the home in myriad forms, from the use of the silent treatment between spouses to teenagers ignoring their parents in favour of playing with the latest video game. In fact, in a phone survey of US citizens, 67% reported that they regularly give the silent treatment (a form of ostracism) to others whereas 75% of respondents reported that the silent treatment had been used on them (Faulkner, Williams, & Sherman-Williams, 1997). Clearly, ostracism--in one form or another--permeates our day-to-day lives.

Researchers have long established that belongingness (i.e. being included in the social group), is a fundamental human motivation and vital to the psychological and physical health of our social species (see Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Williams, 2007); yet, the prevalence of ostracism within society suggests that excluding and ignoring others also has an adaptive purpose, irrespective of its painful outcome (e.g., Gruter & Masters, 1986).

This chapter examines the ostracism experience from the perspective of both sources (i.e. ostracizers) and targets (i.e. the ostracized), specifically; the motivational forces at play for both roles (i.e. what motivates sources to ostracize? What factors motivate targets to respond to the ostracism episode in a pro-social or anti-social manner?); the consequences of ostracism with respect to primary need threat (i.e. threats to belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence; Williams, 2007); and finally, the role that self-control plays during the ostracism experience for both targets and sources.

Sources of Ostracism: Understanding the Motivation to Exclude and Ignore.

The ubiquity of ostracism across cultures (Mahdi, 1986), institutions and situations (Gruter & Masters, 1986), indicates that, at some point or another, we will all be a source of ostracism. Tellingly, the ability to use ostracism as an interpersonal tactic is evident very early in life. Barner-Barry (1986), for instance, documented a case where a group of six year old children systematically ostracized a bully, without any form of adult intervention, as a means of changing the bully's behavior. Moreover, Sheldon (1996) describes one particular incident of ostracism between three preschool girls during a role-play game whereby one girl tried to exclude another, who in turn attempted to resist the ostracism and find a role to play during the game. Eventually, the dominant girl gave the other girl a role, albeit one that would ensure she could not actively participate ("you can be the baby brother, but you aren't born yet"). According to Sheldon, such forms of "verbally engineered social ostracism" (p.57) are common between preschool children during such games. Such creative and effective use of ostracism by young children might indicate that ostracism, as a means of controlling the

behavior of others, is both innate and adaptive (Barner-Barry, 1986). That is, children are not only aware of the value of social inclusion, but are also able to recognise that excluding and ignoring others is a rather effective form of punishment.

Despite the fact that ostracizing others appears ubiquitous and innate, there has been very little empirical investigation into the nature and consequences of ostracizing others. Rather, the vast majority of ostracism research has focused on ostracism from the perspective of *targets* of ostracism. Although this investigation has yielded valuable information about the consequences of being excluded and ignored, it only tells half of the story; hence our knowledge of the dynamics underlying ostracism is incomplete at best. To date, our understanding of sources comes primarily from a series of structured interviews with real-world sources of long-term ostracism (Zadro, 2004; Zadro, Arriaga, & Williams, 2008) and a handful of experimental studies (e.g., Bastian, Jetten, Chen, Radke, Harding & Fasoli, 2012; Ciarocco, Sommer & Baumeister, 2001; Poulsen & Kashy, 2011; Zadro, Williams & Richards, 2005). The findings of these studies give a tantalising glimpse into the inner-workings of the mind of a source of ostracism, and provide promising evidence as to the motivations that underlie its use in a group or a one-on-one setting.

The motivations underlying the use of ostracism.

When investigating sources of ostracism, one of the first questions of inquiry is: why do people choose to ostracize rather than use other forms of interpersonal conflict? Part of the answer may lie with the nature of ostracism itself. Unlike physical or verbal forms of interpersonal conflict, ostracism is subtle, often undetectable, leaves no physical marks, and can be performed in the presence of others without creating a

scene. It is also, for the most part, socially condoned, primarily because the adverse psychological consequences of ostracism are not as widely recognized or as physically obvious as verbal or physical abuse. Moreover, unlike other methods such as argument, where both targets and sources can influence the dynamic of the interaction, a source of ostracism maintains sole control over the exclusionary episode, thereby affording the source a sense of power and command over the target and the situation that is simply not possible in an argument. Ostracism also has powerful, aversive consequences for targets. Specifically, Williams (2007) states that ostracism, in contrast to other forms of conflict, uniquely affects four primary human needs; belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. The threat to these primary needs ensures that the ostracism episode is universally aversive to targets (Williams, 2007), thus sources can be assured that the ostracism episode will have a powerful impact on the target. Thus, given that ostracism is, for the most part, 'invisible' to onlookers, (generally) socially condoned, immensely powerful, and allows the source full control over the interaction, it is unsurprising that ostracism is such a prevalent form of conflict.

Although the nature of ostracism itself may be one possible reason why people choose to ostracize others, it is not the sole motivation for its use. Williams (1997) outlined several 'motives' for ostracising others, which include; punitive, defensive, and oblivious ostracism[1]. First, sources may choose to *punitively* ostracize a target(s). That is, their motivation is to punish the target for actual or perceived wrong-doing, or to correct the behavior of a target(s) who is not complying with rules, group norms, or

---

[1] Williams also identifies two other motives: role-prescribed ostracism (socially-sanctioned forms of exclusion, such as being ignored/excluded in public transport) and not-ostracism (when a target perceives that they are being ostracized yet the source did not deliberately do so). Given that these two forms are benign or deliberate in intent, they will not be discussed further in this chapter.

social hierarchies. Punitive ostracism may occur on a group level in both human and animal species. For instance, Nishida, Hosaka, Nakamura, and Hamai, (1996) documented the case of a chimpanzee who was apparently attacked and then rejected from his group because he did not show the necessary signs of respect (pant-grunting) to the alpha male (or the other males) and had bullied the adult females of the group. This "ill-mannered member" was allowed to rejoin the group after three months after he had demonstrated a positive change in behavior (Nishida, Hosaka, Nakamura, & Hamai, 1996). Similarly, humans also physically ostracize law-breakers; for instance, by sending naughty children to time-out corners until they have demonstrated that they have learnt their lesson and can be (safely) reintegrated into the classroom; or sending perpetrators of crimes to prison. Punitive ostracism may also occur in interpersonal relationships, such as when a source ostracizes a romantic partner for not remembering their birthday. Overall, punitive ostracism is meant to punish wrong-doers, showing them what it is like to be separated from the safety of the group, and thereby motivating them to change their behavior.

Defensive ostracism is typically motivated by one of two primary aims. The first is the desire to protect oneself—for instance, to avoid unwelcome attention or dangerous individuals. Defensive ostracism is often used by animal and human groups. In the animal kingdom, for instance, members who behave abnormally or who are ill are often excluded by the rest of the group, thereby ensuring the physical safety of the remaining members (Goodall, 1986; Lancaster, 1986). Similarly, humans also physically ostracize those who may present a threat to the health or safety of the remaining group members (i.e. we quarantine those who are ill and send perpetrators of violent crimes to prison).

By removing undesirable members of the group, or those who pose some form of threat, the safety and security of the remaining group members is ensured.

The second aim of defensive ostracism is preventative in nature, whereby we ostracize the target to protect them or the relationship from further harm by our own hand. For instance, during an argument, we may choose to leave the room rather than staying behind and saying something we may regret. Although leaving may, in turn, cause distress to the target, if the refusal to continue the discussion is made explicitly and with a constructive tone, then further damage to the relationship may be avoided (see Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, Lipkus, 1991, on "accommodation.").

Sources may also be motivated to *obliviously* ostracize the target. Oblivious ostracism is acknowledged to be the most aversive form of ostracism as it is not designed as a punishment. Instead, it occurs when the source does not even deign to recognise the target's existence, thereby carrying with it the connotation that the target is not even worth the effort of punishing. One real-world source of ostracism stated that he often used oblivious ostracism on those that had committed some offense against him. He stated: "(the target) does not exist any more. They could be a statue...but nothing to me. That person has no existence" (p. XX; Zadro, Ariaga, Williams, 2008). Oblivious ostracism may be performed unconsciously, such as in the way in which society at large ignores the presence of homeless people on the streets; or deliberately as a consequence of some kind of infraction, such as the decision to ignore the very existence of someone who has mistreated you.

Consequences of ostracising: The Good, The Bad, and the Ugly.

Given the multiple motives for ostracizing, it is not surprising that the consequences of being a source of ostracism are not particularly straightforward nor, given the lack of empirical investigation into sources, well documented. Although Williams's model of ostracism (2001; 2009) asserts that targets of ostracism experience a uniform threat to primary needs post-ostracism, the model makes no predictions regarding the primary needs of sources. However, Zadro's (2004) interviews with real-world sources of long-term ostracism, and recent empirical investigations into sources, suggest that ostracising others may lead to both a threat and fortification of these four needs.

Ostracising and primary need-threat. Ostracism is thought to serve as a method of simultaneously removing undesirable members from a group whilst also raising cohesiveness among the remaining group members as they are united either against a common enemy or for a common cause (Gruter & Masters, 1986). Empirical findings within the ostracism literature appear to support this view. For example, in a role-play task, Zadro et al (2005) found that sources of ostracism reported greater levels of control and belonging compared to sources of argument. Moreover, sources of ostracism were also found to report higher levels of belonging and self-esteem compared to sources in the inclusion condition. Overall this suggests that ostracizing another individual may serve to unify the group (by elevating a sense of belonging), and empower and elevate the sources' feeling of self-importance (through increased levels of control and self-esteem).

Similarly, Poulsen and Kashy (2011) conducted a study involving a four-person interaction, whereby three participants were randomly assigned as sources and one

participant was assigned as a target. Participants had a 10 minute interaction and then completed ratings of themselves and others in the group. Poulsen and Kashy (2011) found that ostracism sources tended to view themselves and their fellow sources as more likeable than the ostracized target. Unsurprisingly, the targets were found to report low levels of liking towards the sources but interestingly, the sources also reciprocated this dislike towards the target.

Although elevations in belonging and self-esteem were found as a result of ostracizing in the laboratory, these findings may not tell the whole story. Typically, lab studies investigate group-based ostracism, where several sources ostracize a single target. Ostracising in a group may help to increase cohesiveness, but ostracising the target one-on-one (particularly if the target is a loved one, such as a child or relationship partner) often results in a *loss* of belongingness. Real-world sources of ostracism reported that they often had to look elsewhere (friends, family, colleagues etc) to replenish their sense of belonging that was threatened by the ostracism episode (Zadro, 2004).

Moreover, one-on-one ostracism may also lead to threats to self-esteem, as evident in interviews with sources of real-world ostracism. When ostracising in a group, there is a diffusion of responsibility (of sorts) for the ostracism episode and the effects that it may have on the target. However, a sole ostracizer must take full responsibility for the ostracism outcomes. Some ostracizers, termed 'Penitent' sources, are often distressed about their use of ostracism and the consequences that it may have on the target. For instance, one source stated: "I am not proud of giving this treatment, and often feel I have let myself down by doing it…" (Zadro, 2004). Penitent sources often show remorse for their use of ostracism and often find the experience aversive, guilt-

inducing, and express that they feel 'disappointed' in themselves for performing the tactic (hence adversely affecting their self-esteem).

Although needs such as belonging and self-esteem may be either fortified or threatened while ostracizing, it appears that control is universally fortified. Perhaps one of the most fundamental features that distinguishes ostracism from other forms of interpersonal conflict is the imbalance of power and control inherent in an ostracism episode. During other types of interpersonal conflict (such as argument), both targets and sources can attack, defend, retaliate and ultimately engage in actions which influence the dynamic of the interaction. However, during an ostracism episode, it is predominantly the source who wields power and control over the target and the interaction. That is, it is the source who decides when the silent treatment is initiated, and it is the source who determines if/when they will end the silent treatment and resume interacting with the target once more. This sense of heightened control over the target and the situation can be rather heady. One source reported that she will use the silent treatment 'till the day I die', stating: "the Rolling Stones talk about getting satisfaction--this is how I get mine' (Zadro, 2004).

From the perspective of the source, this enhanced sense of power is arguably a beneficial consequence of engaging in ostracism. Furthermore, this heightened sense of control experienced by sources has been demonstrated in the ostracism literature. For instance, Sommer, Williams, Ciarocco and Baumeister (2001) asked participants to recall and write about a time when they had been a source of ostracism. From this recall data, they found that ostracism sources' narratives frequently emphasized the utility of ostracism as a means of attaining power and control over the target. Moreover, in an experimental setting, Zadro, Williams and Richardson (2005) used a role-playing

paradigm to compare the experiences of targets and sources during an interaction that involved either inclusion, ostracism or a verbal dispute (argument). Zadro et al. (2005) found distinct differences between the self-reported experiences of sources of ostracism and argument, such that sources reported greater levels of control following the interaction compared to sources of argument.

Finally, within the current literature, there has been little research dedicated to examining how a source's meaningful existence is affected during an ostracism episode. Zadro et al. (2005) found that ostracism sources reported experiencing greater levels meaningful existence compared to sources of argument (however this difference was not statistically significant).

One could argue that acting as a source of ostracism may potentially have fortifying effects on the source's sense of meaningful existence. As previously discussed, initiating ostracism uniquely provides the source with a monopoly over the dynamic and ultimate outcome of the exclusionary episode. As such, implementing ostracism on a target can often result in the target resorting to drastic behavioral responses in attempts to manage or terminate the silent treatment (e.g., leading them to perform ingratiating acts towards the source; Zadro et al., 2008). Thus if the source's actions of implementing the silent treatment lead to such drastic behavioral responses from the target, this may enhance the source's perception of the inherent influence that their actions have over their environment and others (namely the target), which may in turn strengthen their sense of meaningful existence.

Other costs of ostracising. Although ostracism is widespread and may result in need-fortification, this does not necessarily mean that ostracising others is without cost.

One such cost may be a sense of self-dehumanisation. Bastian, Jetten, Chen, Radke, Harding and Fasoli (2012) conceptualise self-dehumanisation as arising from the recognition that one's own actions have caused unjustified harm to others. Moreover, they argue that when people perceive their behavior to be immoral, they will view themselves as having a diminished sense of humanity.

Across four studies, Bastian et al. (2012) found that participants who ostracized another individual reported perceiving themselves as less human and viewed their behavior as more immoral, compared to individuals who did not engage in ostracising behavior.

However, although experiencing self-dehumanisation is psychologically aversive for sources, Bastian et al. (2012) also demonstrated that this diminished perception of one's own humanity can ultimately motivate positive behavioral outcomes. Bastian et al. (2012) argue that when an individual perceives their own humanity to be reduced (via self-dehumanisation), they may be motivated to engage in prosocial, self-sacrificing behavior. This is also consistent with literature on moral cleansing whereby reminders of immoral behavior often motivate attempts to re-establish moral status through prosocial and altruistic acts (Jordon, Mullen & Murnighan, 2011).

Thus, in line with this, Bastian et al (2012) also demonstrated that ostracism sources who reported a decreased sense of humanity and who perceived their ostracising behavior as immoral, were more likely to engage in prosocial behavior (volunteering their time for another experiment) following the ostracism episode. Thus perhaps this increased propensity to engage in prosocial behavior is an ego-protective response to the guilt that a source may experience as a function of ostracising another individual.

Ostracizing and Self-control.

Although many forms of conflict involve emotional, spontaneous exchanges between targets and sources, ostracism involves the opposite--a considerable amount of self-control and an almost pathological vigilance regarding the self-monitoring of one's behavior. In fact, Zadro et al (2005) note that being an ostracism source is a cognitively taxing process - particularly given that sources must make a conscious effort to regulate their automatic verbal and non-verbal behavior in the presence of the target (i.e. to ensure that they do not accidentally engage with or acknowledge the target). This process of monitoring one's automatic behavior requires self-regulation.

There is some empirical support for this argument. Ciarocco, Sommer and Baumeister (2001) found that sources showed impaired executive functioning on a number of tasks following ostracism. For instance, ostracism sources were found to give up more quickly on an unsolvable anagram compared to control participants who did not ostracize. Similarly, ostracism sources performed less well on a physical stamina task compared to participants who had not ostracized.

Ciarocco et al. argued that these tasks both required self-control to override the impulse to quit due to frustration/fatigue yet sources were less able to override these impulses (compared to participants who did not ostracize others) because their self-regulatory resources had already been depleted during the ostracising interaction. Ciarocco et al (2001) also found that participants who had adopted a sources role reported the interaction as being more difficult and also reported more negative affect compared to control participants who simply conversed during the interaction. These findings suggest that an ostracism episode can have aversive, detrimental psychological

outcomes not only for the target but also for the source(s). While being on the receiving end of ostracism is an undoubtedly aversive experience, the cognitive effort and self-restraint required to maintain the silent treatment also appears to have negative outcomes for those who initiate ostracism.

Despite the need to maintain a high level of self-control to conduct an ostracism episode, it is ironic that sources often lose control over the ostracism episode itself. That is, several long-term sources reported that there are often times when they want to start speaking to the target but cannot do so. It appears that, even after a day of ostracising the target, many sources find that ignoring and silencing the target becomes a habit that is difficult to break. For instance, one source ostracized his son after an argument for over two weeks. After he observed the aversive effect that ostracism was having on his son, he decided to break his silence—only to find that it was close to impossible. He stated:

> *"To terminate the ostracism, however, was an extremely difficult process. I could only begin with grudging monosyllabic responses to his indirect overtures. I was only able to expand on these responses with the passing of time and it is only now, about six weeks since the ostracism ceased that our relationship appears to be getting back to pre-row normality...if it had lasted much longer, I might not have been able to stop and that not only would our relationship have been destroyed but also my son himself might have been permanently emotionally and physiologically disfigured. Further...it may have led to illness and perhaps, ultimately, to his premature death....ostracism can be like a whirlpool, or quicksand if you, the user, don't extract yourself from it as soon as possible, it is likely to become impossible to terminate regardless of the emergence of any subsequent will to do so."*

There may be several reasons why the source loses control of the episode. First, sources may fear a 'loss of face' if they start speaking to the target again, particularly if the initial reason for ostracizing the target is trivial; they may thus be forced to extend

the ostracism episode to make the cause of the ostracism appear more legitimate.

Second, sources may enjoy being the focus of the target's attention during the ostracism

episode, particularly if the target attempts to reconcile by ingratiating themselves or

offering tokens (e.g., buying the source presents, performing chores, or literally getting

down on their hands and knees to beg forgiveness; see Zadro et al., 2008). Such actions

may be both gratifying and enjoyable, and hence the source may drag out the ostracism

episode long after they have already forgiven the target and/or wish to reconcile. Finally,

some real-world sources stated that they eventually habituated to not acknowledging the

target and that this soon became their default means of interacting with them. For these

sources, such as the father who ostracized his son, they have had to literally re-learn

how to speak to the target once again.

Targets of ostracism

It has been well established that being a target of ostracism has a host of

detrimental psychological ramifications (for review, see Williams, 2007). Within the

literature, perhaps the most theoretically fundamental consequence of being ostracized

is the depletion of the four primary human needs: belonging (the need for social

connection and acceptance), control (the need for a sense of mastery over one's

environment and situation), self-esteem (the need to have a positive feeling of self-

worth) and meaningful existence (the need to have a sense of self-significance and

purpose; Williams, 2001; 2007). Additionally, targets have been shown to exhibit a

variety of behavioral responses to ostracism, ranging from positive, prosocial actions to

antisocial, aggressive attacks (see Williams, 2007; Williams & Nida, 2011).

According to Williams' theoretical model of ostracism (2007; 2009), this unique phenomenon of primary need depletion is the predominant force that dictates the manner in which a target will behaviorally respond to being ostracized. Specifically, primary need depletion is psychologically aversive and evolutionarily disadvantageous for targets and thus acts as a catalyst for targets to engage in behavioral responses which aim to fortify of their depleted needs and assist them in managing and recovering from the ostracism episode.

Prosocial Responding

Baumeister and Leary (1995) argue that people are motivated to maintain stable and on-going social connections. Our inbuilt propensity to seek out others for social interactions and to exist in groups is also thought to be an adaptive, evolutionary advantage; it increases our access to resources, to finding a mate and ultimately increases our chances of survival (Neuberg, Kenrick, Maner, & Schaller, 2005). As such, when an individual is ostracized, they experience a loss of social connection (by being ignored and excluded) which consequently threatens this fundamental need to belong.

Warburton and Williams (2005) argue that when an ostracized target experiences this depleted sense of belonging, they are motivated to implement either reparative strategies aimed to initiate their re-inclusion back into the group, or strategies which will minimize any further exclusion and foster re-inclusion into *new* social groups . Typically, these strategies take the form of prosocial, affiliative behaviors which foster positive social connections. For example, Williams, Cheung and Choi (2000) found that compared to included participants, ostracized targets were more likely to conform to group standards. Moreover ostracized targets have found to be

better able to recognised and process socially relevant information (e.g. recognising genuine versus fake smiles, Bernstein et al., 2008; discriminating between vocal pitches Gardner, Pickett & Brewer, 2000) which may enhance their ability to effectively socialise and connect with others.

Moreover, post-ostracism prosocial responding may also be motivated by a target's attempts to recover their depleted self-esteem. Targets may attempt to fortify depleted self-esteem by engaging in behaviors which may enable them to be more noticed by others or to appear more attractive and likeable. For example, ostracized targets have been shown to exhibit unconscious body language mimicry (Lakin, Chatrand & Akin, 2008) and engage in social compensation (Williams & Sommer, 1997).

Antisocial Responding

At the other end of the spectrum, ostracized targets have also been shown to exhibit a myriad of antisocial post-ostracism behaviors (for a review, see Williams, 2007; Williams & Nida, 2011). There are a number of hypotheses as to what motivates targets to respond in such a negative way. Initially one may assume that antisocial behavioral responding may be driven by the target's desires for revenge and retaliation against the ostracism sources. This justification would certainly seem logical in instances when a target's antisocial responding was directed toward the source(s) of ostracism (Chow, Tiedens & Govan, 2008).

However, there are also documented cases of ostracized targets exhibiting antisocial and aggressive responses which are not directed at the ostracism source but rather neutral third parties (e.g., Warburton, Williams & Cairns, 2006). In this case, the

antisocial and aggressive responding becomes more difficult to justify as mere revenge-seeking. Hence, Williams and Nida (2011) argue that antisocial and aggressive post-ostracism responses may also stem from the target's depleted sense of meaningful existence; leaving the target feeling invisible and unable to generate any kind of response from others. Consequently, the primary goal of the target purely becomes being noticed by others - regardless of whether or not they are liked by others.

Additionally, targets are also thought to engage in aggressive and antisocial behavior as a means of regaining their depleted sense of control (Williams & Nida, 2011). As previously discussed, ostracism uniquely diminishes a targets sense of control because the ostracism is imposed on the target--that is, any attempt the target makes at responding or interacting with the source is ultimately futile as it is the source who dictates if and when the ostracism episode will be terminated. Moreover, ostracism's depletion of the other primary needs (belonging, self-esteem and meaningful existence) may also further exacerbates a target's desire to regain control as the target must influence aspects of their environment to initiate changes necessary to fortify these depleted primary needs.

Williams and Nida (2011) argue that when reinclusion with another individual or group appears unlikely, the depleted control and meaningful existence needs are more likely to direct an ostracized target's coping behavioral responses. Empirical support for this has been found in the laboratory, with Warburton, Williams & Cairns (2006) demonstrating that only participants who were ostracized *and* whose control was further depleted post-ostracism (by being forced to listen to loud noise blasts) were found to exhibit significantly more aggressive behavior (operationalized by the quantity of hot sauce the participant chose to administered for an ostensible participant to

consume) compared to both included participants and participants who were ostracized but whose control was not further depleted.

Additionally, Twenge et al. (2001) suggest that social exclusion may weaken normal social restraints on selfish and aggressive behavior, thus causing socially excluded individuals to be less able to override aggressive impulses. Similarly, Baumeister, Twenge and Ciarocco (2003) suggested that because social exclusion may lead to emotional numbness, cognitive overload and self-regulatory deficits, it may also lead to aggression as individual's resources are too depleted to restrain aggressive impulses. Ostracized targets have been shown to exhibit depleted self-regulatory abilities following ostracism. For example, Oaten, Williams, Jones and Zadro (2008) found that ostracized targets consumed a significantly greater quantity of unhealthy food and significantly lower quantity of a health drink compared to included counterparts. Similarly, in a study examining ostracism in a child sample, Hawes et al. (2012) found that ostracized girls tend to perform worse on subsequent cognitive tasks compared to girls who were not ostracized. Hence given the detrimental impact that ostracism appears to have on self-regulatory capacity, depleted cognitive resources may also be a contributing factor which exacerbates a target's propensity to behave antisocially post ostracism.

Regulatory Responses of Targets During Ostracism

Within the current ostracism literature there is a plethora of research dedicated to examining how targets psychologically and behaviorally respond following ostracism (for review, see Williams, 2007). However, interestingly very little has been examined in

regards to the instantaneous regulatory behavior that targets engage in *during* the ostracism episode.

Emotion Expression During Ostracism. In addition to depleted primary needs, one may also question the role that emotion plays in motivating and regulating how a target responds to ostracism. Previous studies have examined post-ostracism affect in targets, with many demonstrating that being rejected and excluded results in a variety of negative affective states including sadness, anger and hurt feelings (Gerber & Wheeler, 2009; Smart Richman & Leary, 2009). However, the majority of these studies rely on self-reported measures of affect (e.g. the PANAS in Twenge, Catanese, & Baumeister, 2003). Moreover, they only assess that target's emotions after the ostracism episode and hence do not gauge the more instantaneous emotions that ostracized targets experience during the actual interaction.

Examining the emotion expressions displayed by ostracized targets can reveal not only the actual emotions they are experiencing during ostracism, but also the attempts the individual may be making to mask or conceal their feelings; that is, by consciously displaying positive emotion expressions (namely smiling) that are not actually being felt (Ekman, 2001).

Using the O-Cam paradigm (see Goodacre & Zadro, 2010), Svetieva, Zadro, Kim, Goodacre and Egnoto (2013) examined the emotion expressions (using EMFACS; Ekman, Irwin & Rosenberg, 1994) displayed by targets during ostracism or inclusion. Interestingly, Svetieva et al. did not find that the absolute frequency of facial expressions of negative affect were greater in ostracized participants compared to included counterparts during the experimental interaction. Rather, it was found that ostracized

participants showed greater frequency of emotion management expressions during the interaction, specifically in the form of 'management smiles' (Ekman, 2001). This is particularly interesting given that the ostracized participants reported greater need threat compared to their included counterparts following the O-Cam induction, yet the ostracized participants still managed to smile as much as include participants during the interaction. The presence of greater use of control in ostracized participants' smile expressions indicate a concerted effort by these participants to regulate and manage their emotion expressions during the ostracism episode.

Additionally, Svetieva et al. (2013) also examined whether emotion expression influenced the propensity to engage in vengeful, retaliatory post-ostracism behavior. Three types of vengeful, retaliatory behaviors were examined: active distancing, reputation and behavioral defamation, and physical aggression (Yoshimura, 2009). Svetieva et al. found that sadness expressions were a particularly strong predictor of vengeful behavior such that sadness expressions during the experimental phase were associated with increases in revenge and retaliation behavior.

In terms of specific types of vengeful retaliative behavior, Svetieva et al. (2013) found that inclusionary status alone was the strongest predictor for behaviors at the milder end of the retaliation spectrum (namely active distancing), inclusionary status coupled with emotion expression were significant predictor for responses at the mid-range of the relation scale (reputation defamation) and only emotion expressions of sadness were significant predictors at the most extreme end of the revenge and retaliation measures (physical aggression).

Future Directions: *Targets, Sources, Motivation & Self-Control.*

To be inserted after the conference

References

Bastian, B., Jetten, J., Chen, H., Radke, H. R. M., Harding, J. F., & Fasoli, F. (2012). Losing our humanity: The self-dehumanizing consequences of social ostracism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19,* 156-169.

Barney-Barry, C. (1986). Rob: Children's tacit use of peer ostracism to control aggressive behavior. *Ethology and Social Biology, 7,* 281–293.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497-529.

Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2003). The inner world of rejection: Effects of social exclusion on emotion, cognition, and self-regulation. In J. P. Forgas & K. D. Williams (Eds.), *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal and intergroup processes* (pp.161-174). New York: Psychology Press.

Bernstein, M. J., Young, S. G., Brown, C. M., Sacco, D. F., & Claypool, H. M. (2008). Adaptive Responses to Social Exclusion Social Rejection Improves Detection of Real and Fake Smiles. Psychological Science, 19, 981-983.

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

Ciarocco, N. J., Sommer, K. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). Ostracism and ego depletion: The strains of silence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1156-1163.

Ekman, P. (2001). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics, and marriage.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Ekman, P., Irwin, W., & Rosenberg, E. (1994). *Emotional Facial Action Coding System (EMFACS-8).* Unpublished manuscript, University of California at San Diego.

Faulkner, S. L., Williams, K. D., Sherman, B., & Williams, E. (1997). *The "silent treatment": Its incidence and impact.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Gardner, W. L., Pickett, C. L. & Brewer, M. B. (2000). Social Exclusion and Selective Memory: How the Need to belong Influences Memory for Social Events. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 486-496.

Gerber, J., & Wheeler, L. (2009). On Being Rejected: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Research on Rejection. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4,* 468-498.

Goodacre, R., & Zadro, L. (2010). O-Cam: A new paradigm for investigating the effects of ostracism. *Behavior research methods, 42,* 768-774.

Goodall, J. (1986). *The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behavior.* Havard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Gruter, M., & Masters, R. D. (1986). Ostracism as a social and biological phenomenon: An introduction. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 7,* 149-158.

Hawes, D., Zadro, L., Fink, E., Richardson, R., O'Moore, K., Griffiths, B., Dadds, M. R., & Williams, K. D. (2012) The effects of peer ostracism on children's cognitive processes. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9,* 599-613

Jordon, J., Mullen, E., & Murnighan, J. K. (2011). Striving for the Moral Self: The Effects of Recalling Past Moral Actions on Future Moral Behavior, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 701-713.

Lakin, J. L., Chartrand, T. L., & Akin, R. M. (2008). I Am Too Just Like You Nonconscious Mimicry as an Automatic Behavioral Response to Social Exclusion

Lancaster, J. B. (1986). Primate social behavior and ostracism. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 7,* 215-225.

Mahdi, N. Q. (1986). Pukhtuwali: Ostracism and honour among the Pathan Hill tribes. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 7,* 295-304.

Neuberg, S. L., Kenrick, D. T., Maner, J. K., & Schaller, M. (2005). From Evolved Motives to Everyday Mentation: Evolution, Goals and Cognition. In J. P. Forgas, K. D. Williams, & S. M. Laham (Eds.), *Social Motivation: Conscious and Unconscious Processes.* (pp. 133-152). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nishida, T., Hosaka, K., Nakamura, M., & Hamai, M. (1995). A within-group gang attack on a young adult male chimpanzee: Ostracism of an ill-mannered member? *Primates, 36,* 207-211.

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,* 471-504.

Poulsen, J. R., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). Two sides of the ostracism coin: How sources and targets of social exclusion perceive themselves and one another. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15,* 457-470.

Rusbult, C. E., Verette, J., Whitney, G. A., Slovik, L. F., & Lipkus, I. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationships: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(1), 53.

Sheldon, (1996). You Can Be the Baby Brother, But You Aren't Born Yet: Preschool Girls's Negotiation for Power and Access in Pretend Play. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 29,* 57-80.

Smart Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review, 116,* 365-383.

Sommer, K. L., Williams, K. D., Ciarocco, N. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). Explorations into the intrapsychic and interpersonal consequences of social ostracism. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 23,* 227-245.

Svetieva, E., Zadro, L., Kim, D., Goodacre, R., & Egnoto, M. (2013), Facing Exclusion: Facial

    expressions of emotion during ostracism and their relation to revenge behavior.

    Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York, Buffalo.

Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them,

    beat them: effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality*

    and Social Psychology, 81, 1058-1069.

Twenge, J. M., Catanese, K. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Social exclusion and the deconstructed

state: Time perception, meaninglessness, lethargy, lack of emotion, and self-awareness. *Journal*

of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 409-423.

Warburton W. A., & Williams, K. D. (2005). When Competing Motivations Collide. In J. P.

    Forgas, K. D. Williams, & S. M. Laham (Eds.), *Social Motivation. Conscious and*

    unconscious processes. (pp. 294-313).

Warburton, W. A., Williams, K. D, & Cairns, D. R. (2006). When ostracism leads to

    aggression: The moderating effects of control deprivation. *Journal of Experimental*

    Social Psychology, 42, 213-220.

Williams, K. D. (1997). Social Ostracism. In R. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversive interpersonal*

    behaviors (pp.133-170). New York: Plenum.

Williams, K. D. (2001). *Ostracism: The power of silence.* New York: Guilford.

Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 425-452.

Williams, K. D. (2009). Ostracism: A Temporal Need-Threat Model. *Advances in*

    experimental social psychology, 41, 275-314.

Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K. T., & Choi, W. (2000). CyberOstracism: Effects of being

    ignored over the Internet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 748-762.

Williams, K. D., & Nida, (2011). Ostracism: Consequences and Coping. *Current Directions in*

    Psychological Science, 20, 71-75.

Williams, K. D., & Sommer, K. L., (1997). Social ostracism by one's coworkers: Does rejection
lead to loading or compensation? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,*
693-706.

Yoshimura, S. (2007). Goals and emotional outcomes of revenge activities in
interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 24,* 87-98.

Zadro, L. (2004). *Ostracism: Empirical studies inspired by real-world experiences of silence
and exclusion.* Unpublished doctoral manuscript, University of New South
Wales.

Zadro, L., Arriaga, X. B., & Williams, K. D. (2008). Relational ostracism. In J. P. Forgas & J.
Fitness (Eds.), *Social relationships: Cognitive, affective, and motivational processes*
(pp. 305-320). New York: Psychology Press.

Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2005). Riding the 'O' Train: Comparing the
effects of ostracism and verbal dispute on targets and sources. *Group Processes
& Intergroup Relations, 8,* 125-143.