3

Inclusion as a Pathway to Peace: The Psychological Experiences of Exclusion and Inclusion in Culturally Diverse Social Settings

Sabine Otten, Juliette Schaafsma, and Wiebren S. Jansen

In times of globalization, international mobility, and growing emancipation of minority groups, social systems such as companies, schools, and universities are typically characterized by diversity, for example in terms of ethnicity, gender, age, religion, or sexual orientation. Yet, even though diversity has become a typical feature of modern social groups, it is a feature that may not only be experienced as enriching, but also pose a challenge to tolerance and peaceful relations among group members. Therefore, the growing complexity of modern societies has triggered an increasing interest in understanding how social exclusion can be prevented and how social systems can be built that provide safe feelings of inclusion for members of all groups involved.

Advantages of diverse as compared to homogeneous groups have been shown especially for the domain of creativity and innovation (e.g., Nijstad & Paulus 2003; van der Zee & Paulus 2008). Yet, regarding social functioning of diverse groups, outcomes are generally less positive. Research – especially in the work context – has revealed that diversity in groups may enhance the probability of conflict and communication problems (e.g., Williams & O'Reilly 1998; Joshi & Roh 2009). Rather than a larger diverse group seeing itself as an entity, it is often subdivided into subgroups, and these subgroups will typically differ in terms of status and access to relevant resources (e.g., Homan *et al.* 2007). Accordingly, group members – especially those from minority groups – may experience disadvantages and exclusion. As we will outline in more detail in this chapter, such experiences are costly as they not only are prone to negatively affect individual well-being and group functioning, but also may enhance the probability of conflict and aggression. Yet, while exclusion may pose a threat to peaceful relations within and between groups, the reliable experience of inclusion can be assumed to enhance and secure positive relations among the members of today's complex social groups.

In the present chapter, we summarize relevant theories and empirical evidence regarding the psychological experience of exclusion and inclusion in social groups, especially in groups that are diverse. The studies we report on mostly refer to *individual* experiences of inclusion and exclusion, and they measure how these experiences translate into well-being and harmonious – as opposed to conflictual – relations with others. Hence, when we refer to implications of these findings for securing or increasing

peaceful relations, we refer to this micro level. Our point is that through experiencing inclusion in diverse group settings, people will be less prone to have conflicts with members from other groups, and will be more prone to realize the added value of those who are different. However, we assume that the more social groups succeed in avoiding exclusion and fostering inclusion of their members from different subgroups, the more peace can be secured on a broader level (i.e., between subgroups as a whole).

In this chapter, we lean on theories from social, organizational, and evolutionary psychology and on research findings stemming from both experimental and field research, with a strong representation of research from the work and organizational contexts. In the first part of this chapter, we explain why inclusion is important but also why exclusion is highly likely, and we focus on the characteristics, underlying processes, and consequences of the experience of social *exclusion.* Next, we deal with the psychological experience of *inclusion*, its characterizing features, and its determinants and consequences.

Importantly, we argue that inclusion is more than just the absence of exclusion. In our view, inclusion not only implies that people can safely rely on being part of the group, but also means that both similarities and differences are appreciated and openly expressed, thereby supporting individual well-being, group performance, and peaceful, harmonious intragroup interactions (Otten & Jansen 2014).

The Importance of Inclusion and the Inevitability of Exclusion

Human beings are an exceptionally social species with a strong need to affiliate with others and to belong to social groups (e.g., Baumeister & Leary 1995; Williams 2001). It has been argued that this need is deeply rooted in our evolutionary past. Lacking the typical defenses of other large mammals (e.g., claws, fangs, speed, and physical strength) and with an extended period of offspring dependency on parental care, our ancestors were probably only able to survive harsh environments by living in cooperative groups. These groups could not only defend them against predators and rival outgroups, but also help them find nutritious food and take care of their offspring. Exclusion from the group most likely posed a serious threat to survival: excluded individuals were unlikely to reproduce themselves and probably also faced an early death (e.g., Leary & Cottrell 2013; see also Narvaez [this volume, Chapter 6] for a discussion on the importance of belonging in small-band hunter-gatherer societies).

There is reason to believe that, as a result of such evolutionary pressures, human beings have developed the ability to quickly notice even very subtle cues of exclusion and reflexively respond with pain once such signals are detected (see also Cacioppo *et al.* [2011], cited in Verbeek [2013], for similar effects of social isolation in other social animals). Research has found that even brief and seemingly innocuous episodes of exclusion are distressing and immediately threaten fundamental human needs such as the need to belong, the need for self-esteem, the need for control, and the need for a meaningful existence (e.g., Wirth *et al.* 2010; Cacioppo *et al.* 2011; Wesselmann *et al.* 2012). Furthermore, there is evidence that the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex – which is also involved in the experience of physical pain – is active when people are being excluded (e.g., Eisenberger *et al.* 2003). This initial pain response to exclusion tends to

be subject to few if any individual or situational moderators, suggesting that exclusion hurts regardless of the circumstances (e.g., Williams 2007).

Despite the importance of being included, exclusion is an inevitable part of life in contemporary society. Already at an early age, people may have their first experiences with being ignored, excluded, or rejected. Case studies among young children suggest that they use or experience exclusion in a variety of ways during supervised play (e.g., Barner-Barry 1986). And in their adult lives, people are also likely to become either a victim or a perpetrator of some form of exclusion. For example, in an event-contingent diary study in Australia, Nezlek *et al.* (2012) found that people reported on average one episode a day in which they had felt ignored or excluded. To some extent, this is because people simply lack the time and resources to establish social relationships with every-one they meet, but there are also evolutionary reasons for why people have to be selec-tive about whom they accept in their midst. Even though group living can be very beneficial, it also comes with risks as it may increase competition for resources (e.g., food and mates), attract free riders, and increase the likelihood of disease and parasite transmission. It has been argued that, in light of these potential threats, people should prefer groups of relatively moderate size and should not be willing to include everyone. More specifically, they should be motivated only to include individuals who provide fitness benefits and to exclude those who generate fitness costs (e.g., Brewer 1991; Leary 2001; Leary & Cottrell 2013).

Excluding People Who Are Different

So, groups tend to be critical about whom they include, and some people are more likely to be avoided or rejected than others. Members of other groups (i.e., outgroups), for instance, often tend to be less desirable interaction partners than those of one's own group (the ingroup). Evolutionary psychologists have argued that this is because outgroup members are unlikely to be close kin and also because – in our ancestral environment – humans had to compete (though not necessarily directly or violently) with other groups over valuable but sometimes scarce resources. Forming relationships with outsiders may not have been obvious for that reason, but it also may not have been desirable because it most likely increased the pressure on limited resources within a group. Furthermore, the game of reciprocity may have been more difficult with outgroup members, as they may have had different norms about mutual cooperation and sharing. Thus, establishing relationships with outgroup members may have created significant fitness costs in our evolutionary past, and by limiting their access to the group, these costs could be contained (e.g., Brewer 1999; Gil-White 2001; Leary & Cottrell 2013; but see Narvaez [this volume, Chapter 6] for examples of small-band hunter-gatherers with strong reciprocity norms, who easily share food with members of other groups).

The human tendency to create "us" versus "them" distinctions is likely to be a result of this evolutionary adaptation: group boundaries can be used as a proxy to determine who can be trusted, and who will probably cooperate (Brewer 1997, 1999; Brewer & Carporael 2006). Although people do not necessarily have hostile attitudes toward out-group members, research suggests that they generally do see them in a less positive light as compared to their ingroup members and also tend to favor the ingroup over the outgroup when allocating positive resources (e.g., Tajfel *et al.* 1971; Tajfel 1981). This

tendency to favor the ingroup has been found to extend across all forms of group membership – even when this is based on seemingly arbitrary criteria – and has also been found in cultures across the world. For example, in a study on reciprocal attitudes among 30 groups in East Africa, Brewer and Campbell (1976) found that almost all groups rated the ingroup more positively than the outgroup on a host of dimensions (e.g., friendliness and honesty).

Even though "ingroup love" rather than "outgroup hate" is typically the dominant motive in intergroup relations (Brewer 1999), the tendency to perceive one's own group as better typically also means that the ingroup and its members are seen as deserving more than those from other groups. Hence, as a result of the propensity to differentiate between ingroups and outgroups, many forms of direct or indirect discrimination may develop, leading to the avoidance, rejection, or exclusion of people who are different. In everyday society, this may particularly affect ethnic minority group members. They are often easily classified as outgroup members and are, as a result of this, likely to encounter discrimination and exclusion in many aspects of their everyday lives. For example, in a relatively recent large-scale study conducted in the European Union, a quarter of the ethnic minority group participants reported having recently felt discriminated against or excluded because of their ethnic background (Eurobarometer 2009). To some extent, this may occur relatively subtly during their daily interactions with majority group members. For instance, laboratory research has found that majority group members may indirectly express prejudice when they interact with ethnic minority group members, by expressing less nonverbal friendliness (e.g., Dovidio *et al.* 2002). In line with this, research on the quality of ethnic minority group members' everyday interactions shows that they tend to feel less liked, less respected, and less accepted during interactions that involve majority group members as compared to interactions that do not involve majority group members (Schaafsma *et al.* 2010).

But ethnic minority group members may also experience exclusion and discrimination at a broader or institutional level. For example, there is evidence that it is often more difficult for them to have access to or participate in a variety of domains such as schools, the housing market, and the labor market. In this regard, research demonstrates that they are more likely to be excluded from housing or rental opportunities (e.g., Turner & Ross 2003). Moreover, across various countries, employers have been found to be reluctant or unwilling to hire ethnic minority group members, even when they are equally qualified as compared to ethnic majority group members (e.g., Bertrand & Mullainathan 2004; Carlsson & Rooth 2006; EUMC 2006; Eurobarometer 2009; Andriessen *et al.* 2010, 2012; Brynin & Güveli 2012).

Research suggests that it may be relatively difficult for people to recover from such experiences with group-based exclusion or discrimination. For example, in a study by Goodwin *et al.* (2010), Caucasian and African American adults were either included or briefly excluded during a virtual ball-toss game (Cyberball). They found that participants responded more negatively to exclusion by outgroup members than by ingroup members and also had more difficulty recovering from outgroup exclusion because they were more likely to attribute it to prejudice or racism. In addition, survey data show that more chronic experiences with or perceptions of exclusion and discrimination are related to higher levels of depression and stress, lower levels of life satisfaction and happiness, and lower levels of self-esteem (e.g., Williams & Chung 1997; Branscombe *et al.* 1999; Pascoe & Smart Richman 2009). Thus, believing that one is the victim of

group-based exclusion or discrimination can result in a variety of negative mental health outcomes.

Moreover, in the work context, a recent survey among Dutch employees revealed that not only actual experiences of exclusion or unfair treatment but also the mere expectation of possibly being a target of prejudice were negatively related to organizational identification, trust in the organization, and trust in society (Otten & van der Zee 2014). Not surprisingly, such expectations were significantly higher among ethnic minority employees. In addition, de Vroome and collaborators (2011) found in a large survey among immigrants in the Netherlands that structural integration (i.e., having a job in a Dutch organization) only enhanced identification with the Dutch host society if immigrants did not experience exclusion and discrimination at work.

Exclusion as a Potential Threat to Peace

Given the importance of being included by others and the potential risks and negative effects of being excluded, one might expect that excluded individuals should engage in behaviors that are likely to promote inclusion and acceptance by others. Paradoxically, however, rejected individuals have often been found to become aggressive and to engage in behaviors that are likely to reduce the likelihood of them being accepted again. For example, in a series of experiments, Twenge *et al.* (2007) manipulated social exclusion by telling participants that they would later end up alone in life, or by telling them that nobody wanted to work with them. They found that exclusion caused a substantial reduction in prosocial behavior: socially excluded participants were less helpful, less cooperative, and also less willing to volunteer for follow-up experiments.

In another set of studies, Twenge and colleagues (2001) found that excluded participants were more likely to aggress toward someone not directly involved in the rejection experience (and as such seemed to redirect their aggression), by blasting them with higher levels of aversive noise. In addition, studies on real-world crime and violence have shown a link between perceived rejection and aggression in daily life, such as domestic violence, school shootings, homicides, and gang violence (e.g., Walsh *et al.* 1987; Garbarino 1999; Leary *et al.* 2001). For example, in an analysis of news reports of US school shootings, Leary and colleagues (2001) discovered that in 13 of the 15 instances, the shooters experienced chronic or acute social rejection.

Obviously, these antisocial reactions to exclusion are unlikely to promote social inclusion and may, for that reason, seem maladaptive. It has been argued, however, that when the need for control is sufficiently thwarted as a result of the exclusion, this can outweigh the desire to be liked. This may also happen when people believe that they have no opportunities for re-inclusion. In such a situation, aggression may actually be a functional response as it may be a means through which people are able to restore a sense of personal power or control over others (e.g., Warburton *et al.* 2006). In line with this idea, Warburton *et al.* (2006) found that participants who had been given a task that was designed to increase their feelings of control were less likely to aggress following exclusion than participants who had completed a task that decreased their feelings of control.

Nevertheless, even though – from an individual perspective – antisocial responses to exclusion may in some ways be functional, such reactions can also pose a serious threat to peace, particularly when exclusion takes place in an intergroup context.

For example, there is evidence that exclusion by ethnic outgroup members results in more hostile or aggressive reactions than exclusion by ethnic ingroup members. In a study among African American and Caucasian students, for instance, Mendes *et al.* (2008) found that social rejection by different-race evaluators resulted in more anger than rejection by same-race evaluators. Research by Schaafsma and Williams (2012) suggests that such negative feelings are likely to extend beyond those involved in the contact situation. They examined how adolescents from different ethnic groups in the Netherlands (of Dutch, Moroccan, and Turkish descent) responded to being excluded by ethnic in- and outgroup members. For this purpose, they let participants play an online game of Cyberball with two fictitious players who either had the same ethnic background as them or who belonged to a different ethnic group. They found that participants who had been excluded by outgroup members during this game not only expressed more aggressive intentions toward the excluders than participants who had been excluded by ingroup members, but also expressed more hostile feelings toward the outgroup at large. Importantly, this was because people were more likely to attribute the exclusion by outgroup members to prejudice and racism than exclusion by ingroup members.

Moreover, exclusion – and chronic exclusion in particular – may contribute to prejudice and intolerance toward outgroup members and impede the successful integration of ethnic minority members. For example, a recent study among German participants found that socially excluded participants showed less tolerance toward Muslims openly practicing Islam in Germany and also supported restrictive naturalization policies more (Aydin *et al.* 2014). People who experience exclusion on a regular basis may also assert their religious identity more strongly or become more susceptible to radical or religious fundamentalist beliefs. Several surveys have found relationships between feelings of social exclusion on the one hand, and religious identification or fundamentalist orientations on the other (e.g., Gijsberts 2010; Phalet & Ter Wal 2004; Verkuyten & Yildiz 2010).

Finally, evidence from laboratory studies indicates that excluded individuals experience higher levels of religious affiliation and also have stronger intentions to engage in religious behaviors as compared to non-excluded individuals (Aydin *et al.* 2010). According to Schaafsma and Williams (2012), fundamentalist religious beliefs may become particularly attractive for excluded individuals because such beliefs are likely to provide them with certainty and meaning again and may help them regain lost needs of control, belonging, and self-esteem. In support of this idea, they found in their study that adolescents with Christian and Muslim beliefs endorsed fundamentalist religious beliefs more strongly after having been excluded, but that this was most likely to occur following exclusion by ingroup members (see also Ali & Walter [this volume, Chapter 5], who make the case that empowerment is an essential element of peacebuilding transformation processes).

Taken together, the findings from the studies described here suggest that exclusion may be a precursor to the polarization and radicalization of ethnic groups and as such constitutes an important obstacle to establishing or maintaining peaceful interethnic relations. Given these potentially disruptive effects, it is important to focus on the social integration and inclusion of different ethnic groups within society, and to create opportunities for contact and cooperation between them.

Defining Inclusion

Indeed, the concept of inclusion has received increasing attention in the public debate, on political agendas, and in the literature (e.g., Roberson 2006; Bilimoria *et al.* 2008; Lirio *et al.* 2008; Shore *et al.* 2011). But what exactly is inclusion? Or, more correctly, how do we define this concept in the context of the present chapter?

Level of Analysis

First of all, inclusion can be seen as both a group-level and individual-level characteristic. On the group level, an organization or other social setting can be described as being more or less inclusive. In the most descriptive way, it means that a larger group comprises members from various subgroups, but it may also refer to actual organizational practices that are implemented to facilitate the inclusion of members from various subgroups (such as making sure that hiring committees in organizations comprise members from various subgroups). On the individual level, inclusion refers to a psychological experience. That is, inclusion has been defined as the degree to which the group member feels part of its group (e.g., Janssens & Zanoni 2008), or as the degree to which (s)he feels part of critical processes in the group (e.g., being informed about changes, being asked for an opinion, etc.; Mor Barak & Cherin 1998). In this section, and in line with the theory and research reported in the first part of this chapter, we will focus on the individual group member as the relevant unit of analysis. We assume that characteristics of the individual group member, and especially minority versus majority status, play a relevant role in the psychological experiences of inclusion and exclusion.

Inclusion versus Identification

A second relevant aspect is that inclusion is experienced based on signals that group members receive from the social group. Thus, even though perceived inclusion is a subjective experience, it is determined by the group (think, for example, of an organization that explicitly promotes diversity in its mission statement). This makes inclusion different from group identification (Jansen *et al.* 2014; Otten & Jansen 2014). Like inclusion, identification describes how closely individual group members feel linked to the group. Yet, in the process of identification, it is the individual who signals whether (s)he likes or dislikes a certain group. Therefore, identification and inclusion are in most instances related yet distinct concepts. A group may safely include me, but I need not necessarily value this inclusion a lot. Conversely, I may – at least in the short run – strongly identify with a group that fails to signal that I fit in.

Inclusion as a Two-Dimensional Concept

In theories of and research on peace, there is often a distinction made between negative peace, defined as the end of violence, and positive peace, characterized by reliable social justice (e.g., Christie *et al.* 2001). Similarly, and in line with previous literature (Shore *et al.* 2011), we assume that inclusion is not simply the absence of exclusion. It is more than that. More specifically, we have defined inclusion as "the extent to which an individual perceives that the group provides him or her with a sense of belonging and authenticity" (Jansen *et al.* 2014). This implies that, while a state of *inclusion* is achieved

if both belonging and room for authenticity are experienced as high, a state of *exclusion* entails that a group member neither gets signals that she safely belongs to and is appreciated by the group nor feels that she may exhibit her true self. Low scores on one dimension coupled with high scores on the other define two other psychological stages: *separation* implies that people dare to be authentic, but feel peripheral within the group, and *assimilation* means that a safe feeling to belong is coupled with the idea of having very little room for exhibiting the true self (Otten & Jansen 2014). Like the literature on social exclusion, the literature on inclusion leans on the need to belong as a fundamental human motive (Baumeister & Leary 1995). This need can plausibly account not only for the negative effects of exclusion but also for the beneficial effects of inclusion on human functioning and well-being. The authenticity dimension, however, is – at least at first glance – probably less obvious and self-evident. In situations where the group (e.g., the organization or a work team) is psychologically relevant, people's *social* rather than their *personal* self will typically be salient. According to Self-Categorization Theory (Turner *et al.* 1987), this implies that the focus of attention will shift from unique, individual characteristics to shared attributes within the group. Yet, the more groups become diverse and the more they comprise individuals from various subgroups, the higher the probability is that being different will become or stay psychologically relevant for the individual group members. And the more obvious such differences within the group are (e.g., because having a different ethnicity goes along with different looks and, often, different religious values), the more relevant the authenticity dimension should be for the well-being and well-functioning of group members (Homan *et al.* 2007).

We assume that group members' well-being is not only determined by the extent to which their need to belong is satisfied, but also depends on the degree to which they perceive to be valued for their idiosyncratic attributes. Such a two-dimensional approach already has some tradition in social psychology; first, according to Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (ODT; Brewer 1991), the need to belong has an antagonist, namely, the need to be distinct. Group memberships – but also interpersonal relations – are considered optimal if these two needs are in balance. Importantly, the idea is that the two needs are negatively interdependent: the more easily one can become and stay a member of a certain group, the more difficult it will be to feel unique and distinct as a member of this group. To resolve this conflict, ODT holds that people can also satisfy their need for uniqueness at the intergroup level. That is, they may feel more distinct by contrasting their own group from other groups (Brewer 1991). However, also within groups, there are possibilities to properly balance the two needs. A growing literature reveals that encouraging group members to use their individuality when becoming part of the group (i.e., by having a say in the creation of group norms) and acknowledging within-group differences need not weaken group members' commitment to and identification with their group (e.g., Jans *et al.* 2012; van Veelen *et al.* 2013a, 2013b; see also Otten & Jansen 2014).

A second theoretical concept that is closely associated with the present conceptualization of inclusion is Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan 2000). Similar to ODT, SDT posits that group membership and people's well-being and functioning in social groups are determined by the satisfaction of two fundamental needs: relatedness and autonomy. Relatedness is defined as the need to be connected to others (Deci & Ryan 2000); hence, this dimension can be seen as closely related or even equivalent to what has been labeled the "need to belong" in other literature (Brewer

1991; Baumeister & Leary 1995). The need for autonomy involves the desire to experience choice and the wish to behave in accordance with one's integrated sense of self (Deci & Ryan 2000; cf. Jansen *et al.* 2014). While the need to be distinct refers to the wish to be different and distinguishable from others, the need for autonomy comes closer to the authenticity dimension in our definition of inclusion. Autonomy can be experienced if group members feel that they are allowed to do and allowed to be what is in line with their own representation of the self. However, such a "true" self may either resemble or be different from other known group members. As we will outline further in this chapter, this is relevant if we consider how perceived inclusion may differ for minority and majority members.

In a recent review of the organizational literature on inclusion, Shore *et al.* (2011) also suggested a two-dimensional conceptualization, wherein inclusion is determined by perceived belonging and perceived room to be unique. However, we consider it relevant to have authenticity rather than uniqueness as the defining second dimension of inclusion. Only then, as we will argue in more detail here, can a possible negative interdependence between facilitating inclusion for minority and majority members be avoided.

Diversity Ideologies and Inclusion in Diverse Groups

In diversifying social contexts, the starting point is typically a situation in which the majority group defines the relevant norms and has most access to relevant resources, thereby regulating the exclusion or inclusion of minority members. Scoring high on prototypicality normally implies having a higher status within the diverse group (e.g., Mummendey & Wenzel 1999; Verkuyten 2006; Dovidio *et al.* 2007). Against this background, attempts to facilitate the inclusion of minority members have often focused on convincing the majority of the added value in diversity (e.g., Cox 1993; Ely & Thomas 2001). Striving for diverse and heterogeneous, rather than homogeneous, groups has been associated with a higher chance to be innovative and creative, with a better chance to reach out to diversifying markets, but also with acting according to relevant societal standards of fairness (see van der Zee & Otten 2014).

It is plausible to assume that such possible assets of the inclusion of minority members should also appeal to majority members. However, a strong focus on appreciating uniqueness in attempts to promote diversity may also imply that those who are mainstream (i.e., majority group members) experience a loss of status and appreciation by the organization. This suggests a possible negative interdependence between promoting uniqueness and enhancing the inclusion of majority and minority members: while promoting uniqueness could be experienced as an inclusion signal by the minority members, it might be experienced as undermining the inclusion (or at least the status) of majority members. In fact, recent research has shown that a mere focus on promoting diversity and the inclusion of minority group members may be associated with feelings of exclusion in majority members (Plaut *et al.* 2011).

Colorblindness versus Multiculturalism

In line with the above argument, there is evidence showing that the type of diversity ideology (i.e., the goals and procedures that are associated with the implementation and

management of diversity) are highly relevant for minority and majority members' well-being and functioning in diverse organizations (or other types of larger, complex social groups) (Stevens *et al.* 2008; Plaut *et al.* 2011). The two most prominent diversity ideologies are multiculturalism and colorblindness. In a nutshell, the multicultural ideology is pluralistic and sees diversity as an asset for the organization; group differences should be appreciated and used in order to maintain or improve the quality of the organization. In contrast, a colorblind ideology is assimilationist by ignoring or minimizing group differences and their possible role within the group (cf. Plaut *et al.* 2009). While the former ideology values being *a*typical and different, the latter values fitting in and being *prototypical*. Given these differences, it is not surprising that minority members often favor a multiculturalism ideology over a colorblind approach, while the reverse is true for majority members (e.g., Shelton *et al.* 2006; Verkuyten 2006; Wolsko *et al.* 2006). Moreover, recent research by Plaut and collaborators (2011) revealed that majority members (white Americans) implicitly associate multiculturalism with exclusion rather than inclusion.

Diversity ideologies not only may affect group members' feelings of inclusion or exclusion, but also are correlated with well-being and well-functioning. This was shown in a recent survey of Dutch employees by Vos and collaborators (Vos *et al.* 2014). Their data indicated that both minority and majority members benefit from high levels of perceived inclusion, in terms of not only their subjective well-being but also their (self-reported) functioning. In contrast, for majority members, these outcomes rely to a substantial extent on the degree to which they assume that their organization pursues a colorblind diversity ideology.

In a similar vein, Meeussen *et al.* (2014) found that the degree to which leaders of culturally diverse student groups endorsed multiculturalism was positively correlated with minority members' feelings of being accepted within the group. Conversely, the degree to which the team leaders endorsed colorblindness predicted how strongly minority members experienced conflict within the group and how much they distanced themselves from the group. In this study, majority members were not affected by the group leader's diversity ideology, suggesting that they did not feel threatened by the inclusion of cultural minority members in this specific social setting (i.e., the university).

All-Inclusive Multiculturalism

Taken together, the studies comparing the impacts of multiculturalism and colorblindness on the well-being and functioning of group members in diverse groups suggest that the diversity ideology that will most benefit a member depends on the individual's status (as either a minority or majority member). In particular, the fact that multiculturalism may succeed in signaling inclusion to minority members, but may also automatically be associated with exclusion by majority members, suggests a serious dilemma for those trying to properly implement and manage diversity.

A solution here may be provided by a diversity ideology that was coined "all-inclusive multiculturalism" by Stevens and collaborators (2008). This ideology not only promotes pluralism and group differences, but also makes explicit that majority members are a valuable part of that pluralism and diversity (see also Plaut *et al.* 2011). In this vision, it is explicitly stated that the organization relies on both the minority subgroups and the majority groups in order to function well. In fact, the all-inclusive multiculturalism

versus "standard" multiculturalism distinction nicely corresponds to the distinction between a focus on authenticity rather than uniqueness: in both cases, a potential negative interdependence between minority and majority inclusion is resolved or at least diminished. Authenticity means that exhibiting one's true self may mean both being and behaving mainstream as well as being and behaving different from what is prototypical. Similarly, all-inclusive multiculturalism allows equally cherishing being a minority and majority member.

Indeed, recent findings on how majority members react to an "all-inclusive" diversity ideology confirm that such an approach may be successful when trying to secure their feelings of inclusion. In two studies by Jansen *et al.* (2015), participants were confronted either with statements representing a multiculturalist ideology (i.e., focusing on the value of group-based differences and the opportunity to learn from these differences) or with statements that also explicitly mentioned the value that the majority has within the diverse group (e.g., "Our organization is happy to have employees from various cultural backgrounds; together with our Dutch employees, they can help us to secure our position jn the market"). Consistently, these studies revealed that majority members benefit from an all-inclusive multiculturalism approach. Compared with "standard" multiculturalism, this ideology elicited more positive expectations regarding being included in the organization. These inclusion perceptions, in turn, predicted the extent to which majority members supported organizational diversity efforts. Moreover, Plaut and colleagues (2011) showed that majority members' automatic association of multiculturalism with exclusion was attenuated when one's own group was explicitly included in the diversity ideology.

Cognitive Routes to Inclusion in Diverse Groups

A different approach to fostering inclusion and reducing exclusion in diverse social groups focuses on the cognitive processes that determine how group members create a link between themselves and their group. Typically, group members – at least those who identify with their groups – perceive an overlap between their mental representation of who they are individually, and how they see their group (van Veelen *et al.* 2011). This overlap can emerge in two ways: either a group member assumes that she fulfills the relevant stereotypes that are known about the group (self-stereotyping), or she assumes that characteristics that are defining for her will also apply to the group (self-anchoring). In principle, both cognitive projection processes can occur, and both predict a positive identification with the group (van Veelen *et al.* 2011). However, in diverse groups, comprising both a majority group and one or more minority groups, it matters *which* of these two cognitive processes is set in motion.

Seeking for overlap by considering how much one fulfills relevant group stereotypes should, by definition, be easier for majority than for minority members. After all, being a majority member implies being the standard rather than the exception to the rule (see also Dovidio *et al.* 2007). Taking the individual self as a starting point for defining one's fit with the group, however, should work similarly well (i.e., lead to comparable levels of identification and perceived inclusion) for minority and majority members. In principle, both minority and majority members are free to assume that traits they consider relevant for who they are as an individual person may also apply to their group as a

whole. For example, a Dutch person may describe herself as a diehard soccer fan and at the same time assume that most Dutch people will feel the same. *Which* traits are perceived as self-defining, however, is not predetermined. Using the self as anchor for defining one's social group allows individuals to consider both relatively unique and broadly shared characteristics. Thus, the process of self-anchoring may facilitate perceptions of authenticity for both minority *and* majority group members; the resulting representation of the diverse groups allows its members to be different, but similarly signals that "there is nothing wrong with being normal" (Jansen *et al.* 2015).

Recent research by van Veelen and collaborators (van Veelen *et al.* 2013a, 2013b) confirmed this assumption. In the self-anchoring condition, these authors first instructed group members of a newly formed work group to describe themselves in terms of five characteristic traits and then reflect on how much these traits would also apply to the work team as a whole. In the self-stereotyping condition, participants first generated five characteristic traits of their new team and then reflected on whether these traits might also apply to themselves. Afterward, measures on group identification and appreciation of diversity were taken. The findings revealed that projecting from the individual self to the group (i.e., self-anchoring) was beneficial for minority members, but also not disadvantageous for majority members. Minority members in the self-anchoring condition assumed that the team would value diversity more and identified more with the group than in the self-stereotyping condition. For majority members, however, identification was equally high in both conditions. Moreover, majority members who did engage in self-anchoring rather than self-stereotyping perceived a higher value in team diversity. Together, these findings suggest that assigning room and relevance to the self within the group can help with reaching high levels of inclusion and positive intergroup relations for all parties within diverse social groups (for a similar argument, see also Jans *et al.* 2012). Importantly, and in line with our previous reasoning regarding the authenticity dimension, giving room for the individual self within the group allows for focusing both on unique, unshared characteristics of the self and on those that are already prototypical and shared by many others in the group.

Conclusion

Experiencing both exclusion and inclusion touches upon the fundamental human need to belong and the fact that humans are social beings. Not surprisingly, then, both types of experiences have clear implications for human functioning and human relationships. We have shown that experiencing exclusion is detrimental for the individual, but may also endanger on a broader level peaceful and harmonious interpersonal and intergroup relations by enhancing the willingness to engage in antisocial, aggressive behavior (e.g. Schaafsma & Williams 2012; Aydin *et al.* 2014). Conversely, experiencing inclusion contributes not only to higher levels of well-being but also to better group functioning (e.g., Meeussen *et al.* 2014; Vos *et al.* 2014).

Moreover, we have argued that with increasing diversity and social complexity, facilitating inclusion and preventing exclusion have become pivotal. Importantly, inclusion means more than just incorporating several subgroups within a larger social setting (i.e., structural integration; de Vroome *et al.* 2011). Rather, inclusion implies that subgroup members also feel that they are accepted and appreciated within the group, irrespective of them

being different from or similar to the mainstream. In times of increasing diversity, managers and policy makers who strive for smoothly operating organizations and social systems should monitor carefully the possible differential effects that their diversity policies may have on minority and majority members. To this end, we have argued that it is relevant to focus on authenticity rather than uniqueness. While being unique is firmly associated with being different, being authentic is not. One can be true to oneself by being either different from or similar to others. It seems plausible that minority members are – on average – more concerned about whether they may safely exhibit their "true self" because they are different from the mainstream. Yet, and especially with increasing diversity, majority members' need for authenticity should not be underestimated.

The research summarized in this chapter mostly focused on the organizational context and on group members' well-being and functioning at the workplace. Severe aggression or warfare was not at stake. Rather, we focused on how positive, peaceful relations at a micro level (i.e., for individual minority and majority members in diverse groups) can be established. Yet, we think that this work can also be valuable more broadly. Our notion that inclusion implies more than the absence of exclusion resonates in the distinction between positive and negative peace (i.e., between a situation in which social justice is at least partly achieved or one in which only violence has stopped; e.g., Christie *et al.* 2001). As the recent winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace, Malala Yousafzai, put it in her speech when receiving the Freedom of Fear Award in May 2014: "peace is not only the absence of war, it is the absence of fear." In the work summarized in this chapter, the focus is on the psychological, subjectively felt experience of inclusion. This experience, a safe feeling to belong, be respected, and be allowed to be oneself, may be a pathway toward sustainable peace, that is, peace that is more than the end of fighting, but the end of fear through trusting and positive intergroup relations.

References

Andriessen, I., Nievers, E., & Dagevos, J. (2012). Op achterstand. Discriminatie van niet-westerse migranten op de arbeidsmarkt [Facing disadvantage: Discrimination of non-western immigrants on the labor market]. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Andriessen, I., Nievers, E., Faulk, L., & Dagevos, J. (2010). Liever Mark dan Mohammed? Onderzoek naar arbeidsmarktdiscriminatie van niet-westerse migranten via praktijktests [Better Mark than Mohammed? Research on discrimination of non-western immigrants on the labor market via practical tests]. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Aydin, N., Fischer, P., & Frey, D. (2010). Turning to God in the face of ostracism: Effects of social exclusion on religiousness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 742–753.

Aydin, N., Krueger, J.I., Frey, D., Kastenmüller, A., & Fischer, P. (2014). Social exclusion and xenophobia: Intolerant attitudes toward ethnic and religious minorities. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *17*, 371–387.

Barner-Barry, C. (1986). Rob: Children's tacit use of ostracism to control aggressive behavior. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *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*, 497–528.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Laskisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, *94*, 991.

Bilimoria, D., Joy, S., & Liang, X. (2008). Breaking barriers and creating inclusiveness: Lessons of organizational transformation to advance women faculty in academic science and engineering. *Human Resource Management*, *47*(3), 423–441. doi:10.1002/hrm.20225

Branscombe, N.R., Schmitt, M.T., & Harvey, R.D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 135–149.

Brewer, M.B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(5), 475–482. doi:10.1177/0146167291175001

Brewer, M.B. (1997). On the social origins of human nature. In C. McGarty & S.A. Haslam (Eds.), *The message of social psychology* (pp. 54–62). Oxford: Blackwell.

Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429–444.

Brewer, M.B., & Campbell, D.T. (1976). *Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Brewer, M.B., & Caporael, L.R. (2006). Social identity motives in evolutionary perspective. In R. Brown & D. Capozza (Eds.), *Social identities: Motivational, emotional and cultural influences* (pp. 135–152). Hove, UK: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Brynin, M., & Güveli, A. (2012). Understanding the ethnic pay gap in Britain. *Work Employment & Society*, *26*, 574–587. doi:10.1177/0950017012445095

Cacioppo, J.T., Hawkley, L.C., Norman, G.J., & Berntson, G.G. (2011). Social isolation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1231*, 17–22.

Carlsson, M., & Rooth, D. (2006). *Evidence of ethnic discrimination in the Swedish labor market using experimental data* (No. 2281). Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Christie, D.J., Wagner, R.V., & Winter, D.D.N. (2001). Introduction to peace psychology. In D.J. Christie, R.V. Wagner, & D.D.N. Winter (Eds.), *Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century* (pp. 1–13). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cox, T.H. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

De Vroome, T., Coenders, M., Van Tubergen, F.A., & Verkuyten, M.J.A.M. (2011). Economic participation and national self-identification of refugees in the Netherlands. *The International Migration Review*, *45*(3), 615–638.

Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another view of "we": Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 296–330.

Dovidio, J.F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S.L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 62–68.

Eisenberger, N.I., Lieberman, M.D., & Williams, K.D. (2003). Does rejection hurt? An fMRI study of social exclusion. *Science*, *302*, 290–292.

Ely, R.J., & Thomas, D.A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 229–273.

EUMC. (2006). *Muslims in the European Union. Discrimination and islamophobia.* Vienna: European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia.

Eurobarometer. (2009). *Discrimination in the EU in 2009* (Special Eurobarometer 263/ Wave 65.4). Brussels: TNS Opinion & Social.

Garbarino, J. (1999). *Lost boys: Why our sons turn violent and how we can save them.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gijsberts, M. (2004). Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2004: Minderheden en integratie [Social and cultural report 2004: Minorities and integration]. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Gil-White, F.J. (2001). Are ethnic groups biological "species" to the human brain? Essentialism in our cognition of some social categories. *Current Anthropology*, *42*, 515–554.

Goodwin, S.A., Williams, K.D., & Carter-Sowell, A.R. (2010). The psychological sting of stigma: The cost of attributing ostracism to racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 612–618.

Homan, A.C., van Knippenberg, D., van Kleef, G.A., & De Dreu, C.W. (2007). Bridging faultlines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and performance in diverse work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1189–1199.

Jans, L., Postmes, T., & van der Zee, K.I. (2012). Sharing differences: The inductive route to social identity formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(5), 1145–1149. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.04.013

Jansen, W.S., Otten, S., van der Zee, K.I., & Jans, L. (2014). Inclusion: Conceptualization and measurement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*(4), 370–385. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2011

Jansen, W.S., Otten, S., & van der Zee, K.I. (2015). Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *18*(6), 817–832.

Janssens, M., & Zanoni, P. (2008, November 9). What makes an organization inclusive? Organizational practices favoring the relational inclusion of ethnic minorities in operative jobs. Paper presented at the IACM 21st Annual Conference. SSRN. Retrieved from 10.2139/ssrn.1298591

Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(3), 599–627.

Leary, M.R. (2001). Toward a conceptualizaton of interpersonal rejection. In M.R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 3–20). New York: Oxford University Press.

Leary, M.R., & Cottrell, C.A. (2013). Evolutionary perspectives on interpersonal acceptance and rejection. In C.N. DeWall (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of social exclusion* (pp. 9–19). New York: Oxford University Press.

Leary, M.R., Kowalski, R.M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2001). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*, 202–214.

Lirio, P., Lee, M.D., Williams, M.L., Haugen, L.K., & Kossek, E.E. (2008). The inclusion challenge with reduced-load professionals: The role of the manager. *Human Resource Management*, *47*(3), 443–461. doi:10.1002/hrm.20226

Meeussen, L., Otten, S., & Phalet, K. (2014). Managing diversity: How leaders' multiculturalism and colorblindness affect work group functioning. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *17*, 629–644. doi:10.1177/1368430214525809

Mendes, W.B., Major, B., McCoy, S., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to social rejection and acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 278–291.

Mor Barak, M.E., & Cherin, D.A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work*, *22*(1), 47–64.

Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 158–174.

Nezlek, J.B., Wesselmann, E.D., Wheeler, L., & Williams, K.D. (2012). Ostracism in everyday life. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *16*, 91–104.

Nijstad, B.A., & Paulus, P.B. (2003). Group creativity: Common themes and future directions. In P.B. Paulus & B.A. Nijstad (Eds.), *Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration* (pp. 326–339). New York: Oxford University Press.

Otten, S., & Jansen, W.S. (2014). Predictors and consequences of exclusion and inclusion at the (culturally) diverse workplace. In S. Otten, K.I. van der Zee, & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Towards inclusive organizations: Determinants of successful diversity management at work* (pp. 67–86). New York: Psychology Press.

Otten, S., & van der Zee, K.I. (2011). Experiencing exclusion and disadvantage at work [Uitsluiting en benadeling op de werkvloer]. In S. Otten & K.I. van der Zee (Eds.), *Werkt diversiteit? Inclusie en exclusie op de werkvloer [Does diversity work? Inclusion and exclusion at work]*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Instituut ISW.

Pascoe, E., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*, 531–554.

Phalet, K., & Ter Wal, J. (2004). *Moslim in Nederland. Religieuze dimensies, etnische relaties en burgerschap: Turken en Marokkanen in Rotterdam* [Muslim in The Netherlands. Religious dimensions, ethnic relations and citizenship: *Turks and Moroccans in Rotterdam]* (SCP-work document No. 106c). The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Plaut, V.C., Garnett, F.G., Buffardi, L.E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 337–353. doi:10.1037/a0022832

Plaut, V.C., Thomas, K.M., & Goren, M.J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, *20*, 444–446.

Roberson, Q.M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*(2), 212–236. doi:10.1177/1059601104273064

Schaafsma, J., Nezlek, J.B., Krejtz, I., & Safron, M. (2010). Ethnocultural identification and naturally occurring interethnic social interactions: Muslim minorities in Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 1010–1028.

Schaafsma, J., & Williams, K.D. (2012). Exclusion, intergroup hostility, and religious fundamentalism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 829–837.

Shelton, J.N., Richeson, J.A., & Vorauer, J.D. (2006). Threatened identities and interethnic interactions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *17*, 321–358.

Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1262–1289. doi:10.1177/0149206310385943

Stevens, F.G., Plaut, V.C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity all-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*(1), 116–133.

Tafjel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M.G., Bundy, R.P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *1*, 149–177.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., & Wetherell, M.S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, M.A., & Ross, S.L. (2003). Discrimination in metropolitan housing markets: National results from phase 3 – Native Americans. Washington, DC: Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, C.N., Ciarocco, N.J., & Bartels, J.M. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 56–66.

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 behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 1058–1069.

Van der Zee, K.I., & Otten, S. (2014). Organizational perspectives on diversity. In S. Otten, K.I. van der Zee, & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Towards inclusive organizations: Determinants of successful diversity management at work* (pp. 29–48). New York: Psychology Press.

Van der Zee, K., & Paulus, P. (2008). Social psychology and modern organizations: Balancing between innovativeness and comfort. In L. Steg, A.P. Buunk, & T. Rothengatter (Eds.), *Applied social psychology: Understanding and managing social problems* (pp. 271–290). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2011). Linking self and ingroup: Self-anchoring as distinctive cognitive route to social identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 628–637. doi:10.1002/ejsp.792

Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2013a). A personal touch to diversity: Self-anchoring increases minority members' identification in a diverse group. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *16*, 671–683. doi:10.1177/13684302112473167

Van Veelen, R., Otten, S., & Hansen, N. (2013b). Enhancing majority members' pro-diversity beliefs: The facilitating effect of self-anchoring. *Experimental Psychology*. doi:10.1027/1618-3169/a000220

Verbeek, P. (2013). An ethological perspective on war and peace. In D.P. Fry (Ed.), *War, peace, and human nature: The convergence of evolutionary and cultural views* (pp. 54–77). New York: Oxford University Press.

Verkuyten, M. (2006). Multicultural recognition and ethnic minority rights: A social identity perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *17*, 148–184.

Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A.A. (2010). Religious identity consolidation and mobilization among Turkish Dutch Muslims. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 436–447.

Vos, M.W., Jansen, W.S., Otten, S., Podsiadlowski, A., & van der Zee, K.I. (2014). Colorblind or colorful? The impact of diversity approaches on inclusion and work outcomes among majority and minority employees. Manuscript under review.

Walsh, A., Beyer, J.A., & Petee, T.A. (1987). Violent delinquency: An examination of psychopathic typologies. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *148*, 385–392.

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.

Wesselmann, E.D., Cardoso, F., Slater, S., & Williams, K.D. (2012). "To be looked at as though air": Civil attention matters. *Psychological Science*, *23*, 166–168.

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

Williams, K.D. (2007). Ostracism: The kiss of social death. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *1*, 236–247.

Williams, D.R., & Chung, A.–M. (1997). Racism and health. In R. Gibson & J.S. Jackson (Eds.), *Health in black America* (pp. 71–99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly, C.A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *20*, 77–140.

Wirth, J.H., Sacco, D.F., Hugenberg, K., & Williams, K.D. (2010). Eye gaze as relational evaluation: Averted eye gaze leads to feelings of ostracism and relational devaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 869–882.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C.M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, *19*, 277–306.