

RESEARCH REPORT

Psychological Assessment

Editor

André Luiz Monezi de Andrade

Conflict of interest

The author declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Received


March 20, 2024

Approved

August 22, 2024

Personal dispositions of ostracizers and victims of ostracism

Disposições pessoais dos ostracizadores e vítimas do ostracismo

Victoriia Nazarevych¹ 

¹ Rivne State University of Humanities, Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology. Rivne, Ukraine.
E-mail: <nazarevich.v@gmail.com>.

How to cite this article: Nazarevych, V. (2025). Personal dispositions of ostracizers and victims of ostracism. *Estudos de Psicologia* (Campinas), 42, e12131. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0275202542e12131>

Abstract

Objective

This study aims to investigate the personality traits of individuals who engage in ostracism (ostracizers) and those who become victims of ostracism. It seeks to understand how specific traits influence behavioral patterns related to social exclusion, providing insights into preventive measures within educational environments.

Method

A total of 494 students participated in the study, of which 260 exhibited high levels of ostracizing behavior and 234 were frequently subjected to ostracism. Standardized psychological assessments and self-report questionnaires were used to evaluate personality traits, behavioral tendencies, and social interaction patterns. Statistical analyses, including regression modeling and group comparisons, were performed to identify predictors of ostracizing and victim behaviors.

Results

Findings indicated that individuals prone to ostracizing others were characterized by a strong leadership inclination, low adherence to group norms, tendencies toward intentional defiance, and inappropriate social responses. Victims of ostracism typically demonstrated negative self-perceptions, reluctance to engage in personal disclosure, and a preference for immediate gratification over delayed rewards. Additionally, gender and social status differences were observed between ostracizers and victims, highlighting important social dynamics influencing ostracism in educational settings.

Conclusion

The identified personality traits and behavioral patterns provide a foundation for developing targeted intervention and prevention programs aimed at reducing ostracism among students. Understanding the psychological profiles associated with both ostracizers and victims can assist educators and psychologists in creating supportive environments that foster inclusion and mitigate social exclusion.

Keywords: Social isolation; Social exclusion; Personality; Personality development; Educational environment; Psychological assessment.

Resumo

Objetivo

Este estudo tem como objetivo investigar os traços de personalidade de indivíduos que praticam o ostracismo (ostracizadores) e daqueles que se tornam vítimas de ostracismo. Busca compreender

como características específicas influenciam os padrões comportamentais relacionados à exclusão social, fornecendo subsídios para medidas preventivas no ambiente educacional.

Método

Participaram do estudo 494 estudantes, dos quais 260 apresentaram altos níveis de comportamento ostracizador e 234 relataram serem frequentemente vítimas de ostracismo. Foram utilizados instrumentos psicológicos padronizados e questionários de autorrelato para avaliar traços de personalidade, tendências comportamentais e padrões de interação social. Análises estatísticas, incluindo modelagem de regressão e comparações entre grupos, foram realizadas para identificar preditores dos comportamentos de ostracismo e vitimização.

Resultados

Os resultados indicaram que indivíduos propensos a ostracizar outros apresentaram forte inclinação para liderança, baixa adesão às normas do grupo, tendência à desobediência intencional e respostas sociais inadequadas. As vítimas de ostracismo, por sua vez, demonstraram percepções negativas de si mesmas, relutância em divulgar informações pessoais e preferência pela gratificação imediata em detrimento da recompensa tardia. Além disso, foram observadas diferenças de gênero e status social entre ostracizadores e vítimas, evidenciando dinâmicas sociais importantes que influenciam o ostracismo em ambientes educacionais.

Conclusão

Os traços de personalidade e padrões comportamentais identificados fornecem uma base para o desenvolvimento de programas de intervenção e prevenção voltados para a redução do ostracismo entre estudantes. A compreensão dos perfis psicológicos associados tanto a ostracizadores quanto a vítimas pode auxiliar educadores e psicólogos na criação de ambientes inclusivos que favoreçam a integração social e a redução da exclusão.

Palavras-chave: Isolamento social; Exclusão social; Personalidade; Desenvolvimento da personalidade; Ambiente educacional; Avaliação psicológica.

The American Psychological Association (APA) defines ostracism as ‘an extreme form of rejection in which one is excluded and ignored in the presence of others’ (American Psychological Association, n.d.). Ostracism manifests in various forms, ranging from withholding appreciation or affection to systematic exclusion from a group (Leary, 2001).

The adverse effects of ostracism are manifold, jeopardizing four fundamental psychological needs: the need for belonging, control, meaningful existence, and positive self-esteem (Williams, 2002). Consequently, ostracism detrimentally impacts mental well-being and cognitive performance (Williams, 2007). Individuals who experience ostracism often become more socially sensitive (Maner et al., 2007; Romero-Canyas et al., 2010) and may exhibit heightened tendencies towards antisocial (Buckley et al., 2004; Twenge & Campbell, 2003) or aggressive behavior (DeWall et al., 2009; Twenge et al., 2001), directed both at those who have previously ostracized them and those who have not.

Previous research indicates that individuals subjected to ostracism may exhibit violent behavior not only towards their ostracizer but also towards the broader group connected to the ostracizer, the one perpetrating the acts of exclusion (Gaertner et al., 2008; Jones & Kelly, 2010). Conversely, some victims of ostracism may adopt conforming, obeying, complying, and imitating behavior as a coping mechanism in response to their exclusion (Carter-Sowell et al., 2008; Lakin et al., 2008; Riva et al., 2014; Williams et al., 2000). They also tend to put more effort while performing group tasks in order to prevent any possible acts of ostracism by the in-group members towards them (Bozin & Yoder, 2008).

The experience of ostracism also brings different emotional reactions in people. When a person interpret ostracism as a sign that relationships with them are not so valuable for other people, they tend to respond to ostracism with jealousy, shame, guilt, social anxiety, and embarrassment (Leary, 2015). The reaction of anger to ostracism usually takes place when one considers the act

of ostracism towards them as unfair and unreasonable. The emotion of sadness is evoked by the feeling of loss of a person or a relationship as a consequence of ostracizing behavior.

Given the major negative effects of ostracism as well as its high prevalence, many researchers put efforts into studying factors that might result in ostracism. Many studies focus on the personality traits of ostracizers, people who commit acts of ostracizing behavior, and ostracized ones, those who experienced ostracism. It was revealed that people with high levels of negative affectivity, which is defined as 'the stable tendency to experience negative emotions' (Watson & Clark, 1984), are more likely to be ostracized (Coyne et al., 2000). People with a low level of emotional stability, self-esteem, and high levels of neuroticism more frequently reported cases of ostracism towards them (Bowling et al., 2010; Milam et al., 2009; Vartia, 1996). The lack of conflict management and coping skills, the tendency to avoid conflicts, and submissiveness also contributed to being ostracized (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000; Einarsen et al., 1994; Harvey et al., 2006). However, Leymann (1996) disagrees that certain personal characteristics can provoke ostracizing behavior toward an individual. He suggests that the discovered personal characteristics are adopted by an ostracized individual as a consequence of the experience of ostracism. Therefore, while there are different opinions on the personality traits that provoke ostracism, some research demonstrates that people with high levels of negative affectivity and neuroticism, the tendency to avoid conflicts, submissiveness, lack of coping and conflict management skills as well as low levels of emotional stability and self-esteem are more likely to experience ostracism.

Regardless of the culture, ostracism is generally believed to be evil and shameful (Over & Uskul, 2016), leading to negative reactions or punishments from others. The experiment conducted among 20-year-old young adults demonstrates, however, that the severity of punishment will vary depending on whether the ostracizer is likable and more familiar to the group than the victim (Güroğlu et al., 2013). Another study also states that the group tolerance of the ostracizing behavior of a particular group member will substantially decrease in time, making the punishment more severe and paying more attention to the slightest act of ostracism or mistreatment of others (Rudert et al., 2019). Therefore, it is generally believed that a person must have a solid reason for ostracizing behavior to not receive any severe negative reaction from other group members.

While the personal traits that provoke ostracism towards a person is an extensively explored subject, few research remain on the topic of the personal characteristics of an ostracizer. The results of Rabiner's et al. (2005) longitudinal study suggest that if a person experienced any form of violent behavior towards them in childhood, they are more prone to conducting acts of aggression, ostracism included, in adolescence and adulthood. Several researchers also state that low self-esteem may provoke one to ostracize other group members in order to eliminate the feeling of inferiority (Crocker & Park, 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2003). Such results remain consistent in cross-cultural studies as well (Ferris et al., 2015; Kong, 2016). Rudert et al. (2018) discovered that people who ostracized other group members acted out of spite or jealousy. Therefore, while the data on the topic is limited, existing research focuses on low self-esteem, jealousy, spite, and negative childhood experiences as causes of ostracizing behavior.

The phenomenon of ostracism has been systematically studied by researchers in various countries. However, most of the research focuses on ostracism among adults with a strong emphasis on the prevalence and roots of ostracism among colleagues in the workplace environment. Only a few researchers focus on the ostracism phenomenon among young adults, students in particular. Meanwhile, around 50% of all mental health problems are established by age 14 and 75% by the age of 24 (Kessler et al., 2005). This data demonstrates that young adults are a risk group for

developing mental health problems. Given the severe negative effects of ostracism on one's mental and physical well-being, the ostracizing experience may be one of the triggers of the various mental disorder manifestations among young adults. Therefore, the present article aims to determine personality traits that are common for ostracizers and victims of ostracizing behavior. Discovering the personality traits that lead to ostracizing behavior or the experience of being ostracized will be of great assistance for developing effective ostracism prevention programs for educational environments. It is believed that developing and adopting such a program will help to improve the mental wellbeing of young adults as well as to create a safe tolerant, and welcoming educational environment.

Therefore, the following hypothesis will be tested in the present research: H1: The observed correlations will require fewer factors than observed variables; H2: Significant differences in personal dispositions will exist between male and female ostracizers; H3: Significant differences in personal dispositions will exist between male and female victims of ostracism; H4: Personal dispositions among ostracizers will significantly differ based on their group status; H5: Personal dispositions among victims of ostracism will significantly differ based on their group status; H6: Individual personal dispositions will significantly predict the intensity of ostracizing behavior, encompassing exclusion, gossip, information withholding, subgroup creation, and embittering behavior; H7: Individual personal dispositions will significantly predict the intensity of behavior tendencies in ostracized individuals, including social withdrawal, attempts to regain inclusion, and displays of apathetic behavior.

Method

Participants

The study involved 1,300 undergraduate students majoring in Psychology, Sociology, and Social Pedagogy, with 858 females and 442 males. Their ages ranged from 18 to 24 years ($M = 21$; $SD = 1.3$). Participants engaged in the study as part of their psychology lessons and were informed of the study's objectives. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Additionally, 200 student mentors and tutors took part in the research doing the structured interview about the typical behavior of their students in a student group. After receiving the mentors' answers on each student, we identified 260 students (20% of all participants) who demonstrated high levels of ostracizing behavior towards their peers and 234 students (18%) who were reported to be frequently ostracized. These students were then included in the current research. Their ages ranged from 18 to 24 years ($M = 21$; $SD = 1.3$).

Procedure

During psychology classes, participants were assigned various psychological assessments with an assurance of confidentiality and anonymity in responses. Following this, student mentors and tutors were engaged in a structured interview with a researcher to discuss the phenomenon of ostracism within the student group they oversee (the details of the structured interview will be elaborated in the 'Measures' section). Students who received scores higher than 8 on the ostracism structured interview were selected for further research.

Subsequently, factor analysis was conducted, followed by the testing of research hypotheses.

Measures

Freiburger Persönlichkeitsinventar (FPI)

The inventory was translated into Ukrainian (Omelyanovich, 2017; Луценко, 2016). It comprises 138 items categorized into 12 scales: Neuroticism, Spontaneous aggressiveness, Depression, Irritability, Social orientation, Steadiness, Reactive aggressiveness, Shyness, Openness, Extraversion – introversion, Emotional lability, and Masculinity – Femininity. Participants responded ‘yes’ or ‘no’ based on whether the statements characterized them.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)

This personality test is translated and widely used by Ukrainian researchers (Cattell & Krug, 1986; Kokun et al., 2012). The test consists of 105 items that measure the following personality traits: warmth, reasoning, emotional stability, dominance, liveliness, rule-consciousness, social boldness, sensitivity, vigilance, abstractedness, privateness, apprehension, openness to change, self-reliance, perfectionism, tension.

The Self-Attitude Test

The construct of self-attitude was assessed through the 110-item test devised by Stolin and Pantelieiev (1978). The inventory consists of 8 scales: Self-Confidence, Self-Authority, Mirror Self, Self-Worth, Self-Acceptance, Self-Rigidity, Inner Conflict, Self-Accusation. Participants respond based on whether they agree or disagree with the displayed statements.

Leary Test. Diagnostics of Interpersonal Relations (DME)

The inventory assesses the structure of one’s interpersonal relationships and one’s most common behavior in a relationship context (Horowitz, 1996). The test consists of the list of 128 self-descriptive characteristics-epithets that participants should agree or disagree with. The test describes interpersonal relationships as domineering-leading, independent-dominant, straightforward-aggressive, distrustful-skeptical, submissively shy, dependent-obedient, cooperating-conventional and responsibly generous.

The Test of Social-Psychological Adaptability

Developed by Rogers and Diamond, the test measures the construct of adaptation and personality traits that are essential for successful adaptation (Autleva, 2020). The inventory contains scales: Adaptability, Acceptance of Oneself, Acceptance of the others, Emotional comfort, Internal-External Locus of Control, Dominating, Escapism. The inventory consists of 101 items that are evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale (‘0’ – ‘strongly disagree’; ‘7’ – ‘strongly agree’).

The Q-Sort

The version of the inventory used in the current research assesses the common behavior patterns in group interactions (Kokun et al., 2012). It consists of 6 scales: dependance, independence, sociability, unsociability, acceptance of disagreement, avoidance of disagreements. Participants should answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to 60 statements.

The Buss–Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI)

The 75-item inventory measures one's level of hostility using 8 scales: physical aggression, verbal aggression, indirect hostility, negativity, irritation, suspiciousness, offensiveness, guilt (Stepaniuk & Melnychenko, 2020). Participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale.

The Sociometric Test by J. L. Moreno

The Sociometric Test by J. L. Moreno was employed in its translated form to assess social relationships and the social status of a particular individual within the group (Fox, 1987). Consequently, all participants were categorized into four groups: stars, popular members, neglected members, and isolates – based on the number of connections within the group (Kovalenko & Korniev, 2006). Stars are participants with the most significant number of connections, popular members receive approximately half of all possible connections, neglected members receive less than half of all possible connections, and isolates do not establish any connections.

The Ostracism Structured Interview

The interview comprises questions exploring the behavior tendencies of students, specifically focusing on the typical patterns of both ostracizers and victims of ostracism. For ostracizers, the discussion includes acts such as excluding or ignoring others, spreading gossip, withholding information, creating subgroups, and engaging in behavior that embitters others.

To gather information about behavior tendencies in students who have experienced ostracism, questions cover acts like social withdrawal, attempts to regain inclusion, and displays of apathetic behavior. The interview consists of 15 questions addressing the behavioral patterns of ostracizers, assessed using the 'Behavior of the Ostracizer' Scale. Another 15 questions focus on the behavioral patterns of victims of ostracism, evaluated with the 'Behavior of the Victim of Ostracism' Scale. Mentors respond with a 'yes' or 'no' to each question, with each 'yes' corresponding to one point on the respective scale. A total of 15 points indicate the highest level of either ostracizing behavior tendencies or victim behavioral patterns.

Results

Data Reduction

Ostracizer

A total of 32 items (FPI, 16PF, The Self-Attitude Test, The Test of Social-psychological Adaptability, The Q-Sort, BDHI, DMI) underwent Principal Components Analysis, resulting in a six-factor solution that explained 58.4% of the variance. The extraction of these six factors relied on Eigenvalues and the outcomes of a scree test.

The first factor, describing dominating and leading tendencies, the need for control, the urge to defend one's viewpoint, and playing an essential role in decision-making, is termed 'Disposition to Personal Dominance', explaining 13.6% of the variance. This factor contains the following items: 'Dominance' (0.906), 'Acceptance of disagreement' (0.876), 'Dominating Tendencies' (0.842), 'Rule-consciousness' (-0.795), 'Sensitivity' (-0.754), 'Spontaneous Aggressiveness' (0.718), 'Domineering-leading Relationship Style' (0.685), 'Straightforward-aggressive Relationship Style'

(0.627), 'Reactive Aggressiveness' (0.593), 'Physical Aggression' (0.558), and 'Verbal Aggression' (0.514).

The second factor (11.5% of variance) is named 'Disposition to Egocentrism,' capturing tendencies to avoid decision-making, shift responsibility to others, and seek a privileged position in the group. The factor contains the following items: 'Independent-dominant Relationship Style' (0.887), 'Self-confidence' (0.836), 'Vigilance' (0.762), 'Distrustful-skeptical' (0.715), 'Acceptance of Others' (-0.669), 'Suspiciousness' (0.610), 'Self-Authority' (-0.548), and 'Internal-External Locus of Control' (-0.502).

The third factor (9.7% of variance), 'Disposition to Independence,' characterizes individuals who do not follow or respect the values or norms of others. The factor includes the following items: 'Independence' (0.781), 'Escapism' (-0.709), 'Inner Conflict' (-0.624), 'Guilt' (-0.558), and 'Offensiveness' (-0.514).

The fourth factor (8.9% of variance), 'Disposition to Closeness,' represents individuals who tend to keep a distance from others, not willing to share one's thoughts or emotions with others. The factor contains the following items: 'Openness' (-0.745), 'Warmth' (-0.676), and 'Sociability' (-0.548).

The fifth factor (8.0% of variance), 'Disposition to Negativity,' characterizes individuals purposefully acting against group members' expectations or needs. The factor includes the following items: 'Negativity' (0.690), 'Openness to Change' (0.622), and 'Privateness' (-0.537).

The sixth factor (6.7% of variance), 'Disposition to Personal Disadaptation,' characterizes individuals who fail to respond adequately and socially acceptably to social situations. The factor contains the following items: 'Adaptability' (-0.631) and 'Neuroticism' (0.544).

Victims of Ostracism

A total of 32 items (FPI, 16PF, The Self-Attitude Test, The Test of Social-psychological Adaptability, The Q-Sort, BDHI, DMI) underwent Principal Components Analysis, resulting in a six-factor solution that explained 59.7% of the variance. Extraction of the six factors was based on Eigenvalues and the results of a scree test.

The first factor (explaining 12.2% of variance), 'Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude,' characterizes an individual with a negative self-view, frequent inner conflicts, and significant adaptation difficulties. The factor contains the following items: 'Self-Acceptance' (-0.968), 'Self-Accusation' (0.920), 'Inner Conflict' (0.848), 'Acceptance of Oneself' (-0.763), 'Mirror Self' (-0.681), 'Self-Authority' (-0.616), 'Self-Confidence' (-0.538).

The second factor (explaining 11.9% of variance), 'Disposition to Suspiciousness,' pertains to an individual perceiving their social environment as unsafe and untrustworthy, maintaining distance from others, and neglecting others' needs. The factor contains the following items: 'Vigilance' (0.945), 'Irritability' (0.882), 'Suspiciousness' (0.806), 'Distrustful-skeptical' (0.747), 'Emotional Stability' (-0.698), 'Depression' (0.625), 'Apprehension' (0.543).

The third factor (explaining 10.4% of variance), 'Disposition to Dependence,' characterizes an individual feeling insecure in social contexts, leading to frequent conforming behavior. The factor contains the following items: 'Dependence' (0.928), 'Dependent-obedient' (0.835), 'Dominating' (-0.763), 'Submissively Shy' (0.696), 'Dominance' (-0.617), 'Hostility' (-0.530).

The fourth factor (explaining 9.3% of variance), 'Disposition to Closeness,' characterizes an individual who tends to be reserved, avoids contact with others, and is unwilling to share personal

information. The factor contains the following items: ‘Unsociability’ (0.825), ‘Warmth’ (-0.764), ‘Openness’ (-0.697), ‘Extraversion’ (-0.642), ‘Shyness’ (0.577)

The fifth factor (explaining 8.1% of variance), ‘Disposition to Low Self-Control’, refers to someone facing challenges in managing emotions and behavior, preferring immediate satisfaction over long-term benefits. The factor contains the following items: ‘Self-reliance’ (-0.776), ‘Tension’ (-0.715), ‘Sensitivity’ (-0.628), ‘Guilt’ (0.515).

The sixth factor (explaining 7.8% of variance), ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect,’ characterizes an individual neglecting their own needs, desires, and responsibilities towards others, opting for escapism in coping with difficulties. The factor contains the following items: ‘Avoidance of Disagreement’ (0.749), ‘Escapism’ (0.693), ‘Abstractedness’ (0.616), ‘Masculinity-Femininity’ (-0.528).

Comparative Analysis

Ostracizer

After conducting a comparative analysis using nonparametric statistical test The Mann-Whitney U test, it was revealed that there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in personal dispositions between male and female ostracizers. Male ostracizers have higher levels of ‘Disposition to Personal Dominance’, ‘Disposition to Negativity’, ‘Disposition to Independence’, and ‘Disposition to Closeness’ (Table 1). Female ostracizers demonstrate higher levels of such factors as ‘Disposition to Egocentrism’ and ‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation’.

Table 1
Comparative analysis of ostracizers’ personal dispositions by gender

Gender	Disposition to Personal Dominance M (SD)	Disposition to Egocentrism M (SD)	Disposition to Independence M (SD)	Disposition to Closeness M (SD)	Disposition to Negativity M (SD)	Disposition to Personal Disadaptation M (SD)
Female	1.75 (0.59)	1.68 (0.40)	1.58 (0.45)	1.67 (0.53)	1.72 (0.46)	1.64 (0.55)
Male	1.97 (0.57)	1.53 (0.43)	1.78 (0.56)	1.80 (0.49)	1.94 (0.52)	1.54 (0.59)
Total	1.86 (0.58)	1.60 (0.41)	1.68 (0.50)	1.73 (0.51)	1.83 (0.49)	1.59 (0.57)
Test Statistics	Disposition to Personal Dominance	Disposition to Egocentrism	Disposition to Independence	Disposition to Closeness	Disposition to Negativity	Disposition to Personal Disadaptation
Mann-Whitney U	1211.5	1079.5	1164.5	993.5	1189.5	982.5
Wilcoxon W	2582.5	2127.5	2279.5	1584.5	2426.5	1558.5
Z	-0.33	-0.24	-0.29	-0.18	-0.32	-0.16
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)	0.000	0.007	0.001	0.042	0.000	0.049

Note. Values are expressed as Mean (Standard Deviation). Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare gender differences. Statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

A comparative analysis, utilizing the nonparametric statistical test, the Jonckheere-Terpstra, was conducted to explore differences in personal dispositions among ostracizers with various social statuses. The level of ‘Disposition to Personal Dominance’ is significantly higher among ‘stars,’ gradually decreasing among ‘popular,’ ‘neglected members,’ and ‘isolates’. The levels of ‘Disposition to Egocentrism’, ‘Disposition to Independence’, and ‘Disposition to Negativity’ are the highest among ‘stars’ and the lowest among ‘neglected members’ (Table 2). However, differences in the levels of ‘Disposition to Closeness’ and ‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation’ among ostracizers of different social statuses appeared to be insignificant ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2
Comparative analysis of ostracizers' personal dispositions by social status

Social Status in Group	Disposition to Personal Dominance <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Egocentrism <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Independence <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Closeness <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Negativity <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Personal Disadaptation <i>M (SD)</i>
Isolates	1.55 (0.54)	1.61 (0.64)	1.53 (0.48)	1.66 (0.51)	1.58 (0.53)	1.74 (0.62)
Neglected members	1.68 (0.49)	1.60 (0.54)	1.52 (0.49)	1.64 (0.52)	1.55 (0.46)	1.75 (0.61)
Popular members	1.72 (0.54)	1.63 (0.55)	1.61 (0.47)	1.65 (0.59)	1.65 (0.52)	1.69 (0.61)
Stars	1.76 (0.61)	1.79 (0.57)	1.70 (0.60)	1.65 (0.57)	1.67 (0.52)	1.71 (0.59)
Total	1.68 (0.54)	1.66 (0.57)	1.59 (0.51)	1.65 (0.55)	1.61 (0.51)	1.72 (0.61)
Test Statistics	Disposition to Personal Dominance	Disposition to Egocentrism	Disposition to Independence	Disposition to Closeness	Disposition to Negativity	Disposition to Personal Disadaptation
Observed J-T Statistic	2147.0	1874.0	1706.0	-1672.0	1574.0	-1628.0
Mean J-T Statistic	1745.0	1745.0	1745.0	1745.0	1745.0	1745.0
Standard Deviation of J-T Statistic	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3
Standardized J-T Statistic	1.52	1.23	0.99	-1.44	0.67	-1.22
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.865	0.009	0.794

Note: Values are expressed as Mean (Standard Deviation). Jonckheere-Terpstra Test was used to analyze trends according to social status. Statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

Victims of Ostracism

After conducting a comparative analysis using the nonparametric statistical test, the Mann-Whitney U test, a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) emerged in the studied personal dispositions among male and female victims of ostracism, apart from ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’. Male victims of ostracism scored higher in ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect’ and ‘Disposition to Closeness’, while female victims of ostracism exhibited higher levels of ‘Disposition to Suspiciousness’, ‘Disposition to Low Self-Control’, and ‘Disposition to Dependence’ (Table 3).

Table 3
Comparative analysis of personal dispositions of victims of ostracism by gender

Gender	Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Suspiciousness <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Dependence <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Closeness <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Low Self-Control <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Self-Neglect <i>M (SD)</i>
Female	1.75 (0.45)	1.69 (0.47)	1.59 (0.54)	1.68 (0.51)	1.70 (0.53)	1.57 (0.49)
Male	1.76 (0.47)	1.58 (0.44)	1.51 (0.55)	1.78 (0.54)	1.62 (0.58)	1.67 (0.52)
Total	1.76 (0.46)	1.64 (0.45)	1.55 (0.54)	1.73 (0.53)	1.66 (0.56)	1.62 (0.50)
Test Statistics	Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude	Disposition to Suspiciousness	Disposition to Dependence	Disposition to Closeness	Disposition to Low Self-Control	Disposition to Self-Neglect
Mann-Whitney U	1146.5	1157.5	874.5	1092.5	957.5	1136.5
Wilcoxon W	2184.5	2268.5	1946.5	2173.5	2064.5	2214.5
Z	0.22	-0.27	-0.16	-0.21	-0.19	-0.24
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)	0.792	0.001	0.020	0.005	0.012	0.002

Note: Values are expressed as Mean (Standard Deviation). Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare gender differences among victims of ostracism. Statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

A comparative analysis, utilizing the nonparametric statistical test, the Jonckheere-Terpstra, was conducted to explore differences in personal dispositions among victims of ostracism with various social statuses. No statistical significance was found in the levels of ‘Disposition to Suspiciousness’, ‘Disposition to Low Self-Control’, and ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect’ among victims

of ostracism of different social statuses. However, a significant statistical difference was observed in the levels of ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’, ‘Disposition to Dependence’, and ‘Disposition to Closeness’. The highest levels of these dispositions were found among isolated victims of ostracism, while the lowest levels were observed among those considered to be either ‘popular group members’ or ‘stars’ (Table 4).

Table 4
Comparative analysis of personal dispositions of victims of ostracism by social status

Social Status in Group	Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Suspiciousness <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Dependence <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Closeness <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Low Self-Control <i>M (SD)</i>	Disposition to Self-Neglect <i>M (SD)</i>
Isolates	1.65 (0.49)	1.62 (0.55)	1.71 (0.51)	1.69 (0.49)	1.65 (0.49)	1.64 (0.57)
Neglected members	1.59 (0.52)	1.60 (0.54)	1.71 (0.51)	1.64 (0.47)	1.68 (0.51)	1.65 (0.59)
Popular members	1.56 (0.52)	1.64 (0.51)	1.69 (0.49)	1.64 (0.49)	1.61 (0.47)	1.63 (0.57)
Stars	1.43 (0.56)	1.57 (0.55)	1.56 (0.54)	1.58 (0.48)	1.63 (0.42)	1.62 (0.52)
Total	1.56 (0.52)	1.61 (0.54)	1.67 (0.51)	1.64 (0.48)	1.64 (0.47)	1.63 (0.56)
Test Statistics	Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude	Disposition to Suspiciousness	Disposition to Dependence	Disposition to Closeness	Disposition to Low Self-Control	Disposition to Self-Neglect
Observed J-T Statistic	2076.0	-1787.0	1694.0	1915.0	-1604.0	-1575.0
Mean J-T Statistic	1658.0	1658.0	1658.0	1658.0	1658.0	1658.0
Standard Deviation of J-T Statistic	170.4	170.4	170.4	170.4	170.4	170.4
Standardized J-T Statistic	1.49	-1.52	0.97	1.29	-1.37	-1.20
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)	0.000	0.894	0.001	0.000	0.855	0.783

Note: Values are expressed as Mean (Standard Deviation). Jonckheere-Terpstra Test was used to analyze trends according to social status. Statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

Regressions

Ostracizers

In a regression analysis, personal dispositions, including ‘Disposition to Personal Dominance,’ ‘Disposition to Egocentrism,’ ‘Disposition to Independence,’ ‘Disposition to Closeness,’ ‘Disposition to Negativity,’ and ‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation,’ were examined as predictors of ostracizing behavior towards other group members. The proposed multiple regression model successfully accounts for 61% of the variance in ostracizing behavior tendencies. Among the dispositions tested, only ‘Disposition to Personal Dominance,’ ‘Disposition to Independence,’ ‘Disposition to Negativity,’ and ‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation’ emerged as significant predictors of the model ($p < 0.05$), while scores for ‘Disposition to Egocentrism’ and ‘Disposition to Closeness’ were found to be non-significant (Table 5).

Victims of Ostracism

In a regression analysis, personal dispositions, including ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude,’ ‘Disposition to Suspiciousness,’ ‘Disposition to Dependence,’ ‘Disposition to Closeness,’ ‘Disposition to Low Self-Control,’ and ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect,’ were examined as predictors of the group behavior of ostracized individuals. The proposed multiple regression model successfully accounted

for 62% of the variance in ostracizing behavior tendencies. Among the dispositions tested, only ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’, ‘Disposition to Dependence’, ‘Disposition to Closeness’, and ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect’ emerged as significant predictors of the model ($p < 0.05$), while scores for ‘Disposition to Suspiciousness’ and ‘Disposition to Low Self-Control’ were found to be non-significant (Table 6).

Table 5
Multiple regression results for ostracizers

Model	Unstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	Sig
	Beta	Standard Error	Beta		
1					
(Constant)	20.358	0.450		45.274	0.000
Disposition to Personal Dominance	2.937	0.452	0.486	6.582	0.000
Disposition to Negativity	4.582	0.452	0.617	9.796	0.000
Disposition to Egocentrism	-0.314	0.452	-0.078	-0.736	0.619
Disposition to Closeness	0.423	0.452	0.103	1.536	0.082
Disposition to Independence	2.465	0.452	0.419	5.718	0.000
Disposition to Personal Disadaptation	1.948	0.452	0.362	4.894	0.000
2					
(Constant)	20.358	0.448		45.526	0.000
Disposition to Personal Dominance	2.937	0.450	0.486	6.609	0.000
Disposition to Negativity	4.582	0.450	0.617	9.823	0.000
Disposition to Independence	2.465	0.450	0.419	5.725	0.000
Disposition to Personal Disadaptation	1.948	0.450	0.362	4.918	0.000

Table 6
Multiple regression results for victims of ostracism

Model	Unstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	Sig
	Beta	Standard Error	Beta		
1					
(Constant)	20.516	0.454		45.587	0.000
Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude	1.875	0.456	0.316	4.318	0.000
Disposition to Dependence	1.497	0.456	0.267	3.629	0.000
Disposition to Suspiciousness	0.829	0.456	0.114	1.875	0.069
Disposition to Low Self-Control	0.234	0.456	0.092	1.197	0.095
Disposition to Self-Neglect	4.372	0.456	0.575	9.328	0.000
Disposition to Closeness	1.114	0.456	0.223	3.284	0.000
2					
(Constant)	20.516	0.452		45.768	0.000
Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude	1.875	0.454	0.316	4.327	0.000
Disposition to Dependence	1.497	0.454	0.267	3.641	0.000
Disposition to Self-Neglect	4.372	0.454	0.575	9.345	0.000
Disposition to Closeness	1.114	0.454	0.223	3.298	0.000

Discussion

The present study established a factor model delineating the personal dispositions of both ostracizers and victims of ostracism. We incorporated variables from several psychometric instruments, including the Freiburger Persönlichkeitsinventar (FPI), the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), the Self-Attitude Test, Leary test, Diagnostics of interpersonal relations (DME),

the Test of Social-psychological Adaptability, the Q-Sort, and The Buss–Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI). These variables were systematically organized into six factors for ostracizers, accounting for 58.4% of the variance, and six factors for victims of ostracism, explaining 59.7% of the variance.

For ostracizers such factors were ‘Disposition to Personal Dominance’ (13.6%), ‘Disposition to Egocentrism’ (11.5%), ‘Disposition to Independence’ (9.7%), ‘Disposition to Closeness’ (8.9%), ‘Disposition to Negativity’ (8.0%), and ‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation’ (6.7%). The ostracizers, therefore, may be characterized as individuals who might possess dominating and leading tendencies, feel the need to be in control and play the crucial role in decision making (‘Disposition to Dominance’), while not taking responsibility for the outcome of such decisions (‘Disposition to Egocentrism’). Ostracizers might also not respect or follow either social norms or values of other group members (‘Disposition to Independence’), even tending to purposefully rebel against group norms or groups member’s expectations (‘Disposition to Negativity’) and failing to give adequate response to different social situations inside the group (‘Disposition to Personal Disadaptation’). It was also revealed that ostracizers might prefer to avoid close emotional contact with any group members, being unwilling to share any personal information with others (‘Disposition to Closeness’). While the current research does not focus on the previous life experiences of the ostracizers, namely negative childhood experience (Rabiner et al., 2005), it aligns with the results of the previously conducted researches (Crocker & Park, 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2003) suggesting that acts of ostracism may be the result of jealousy and spite towards someone who, in the eyes of ostracizer, puts their leading and dominating position inside the group at risk.

The factors identified for victims of ostracism include ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’ (12.2%), ‘Disposition to Suspiciousness’ (11.9%), ‘Disposition to Dependence’ (10.4%), ‘Disposition to Closeness’ (9.3%), ‘Disposition to Low Self-Esteem’ (8.1%), and ‘Disposition to Self-Neglect’ (7.8%). Consequently, victims of ostracism may exhibit a negative perception of themselves, experiencing multiple inner conflicts (‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’), coupled with a sense of insecurity in social environments, leading to a preference for conforming behavior (‘Disposition to Dependence’). Moreover, victims perceive their social environment as unsafe and untrustworthy (‘Disposition to Suspiciousness’), prompting avoidance of contacts and a reluctance to share personal information (‘Disposition to Closeness’). Emotional regulation difficulties and a preference for immediate rewards (‘Disposition to Low Self-Control’) are also characteristic of victims of ostracism. Additionally, they tend to neglect their own needs and desires, resorting to escapism during challenging times (‘Disposition to Self-Neglect’). These findings align with previous research that highlights low self-esteem, challenges in emotion management, tendencies towards escapism, and conforming behavior as prevalent traits among victims of ostracism (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000; Bowling et al., 2010; Einarsen et al., 1994; Harvey et al., 2006; Milam et al., 2009; Vartia, 1996).

After conducting a comparative analysis, it was remarkably found that both male and female ostracizers exhibit higher levels of dominating and leading behavior (‘Disposition to Personal Dominance’) and a propensity to openly rebel against existing group norms (‘Disposition to Negativity’). Notably, among all the studied factors, female ostracizers scored lowest in ‘Disposition to Independence’ (rejecting adherence to group norms), while for male ostracizers, it was ‘Disposition to Egocentrism’ (tendency to avoid responsibilities for the outcome of decisions). While no other research on differences in personal dispositions of male and female ostracizers was found, our study suggests that distinct personality traits may be more prevalent among male and female ostracizers, leading to different reasons for engaging in ostracizing behavior.

The analysis also revealed that both male and female victims of ostracism scored highest in ‘Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude’ (characterizing negative self-view, frequent inner conflicts,

and difficulties in adaptation). However, while female ostracizers also scored almost as highly in 'Disposition to Low Self-Control' (indicating difficulties in emotional management and a preference for immediate over long-term satisfaction) and 'Disposition to Suspicion' (perceiving the social environment as untrustworthy and dangerous), male victims equally scored high in 'Disposition to Closeness' (avoidance of contacts and unwillingness to share personal information). Remarkably, for female victims of ostracism, 'Disposition to Self-Neglect' (tendency to neglect personal needs and responsibilities towards other people) had the lowest score, while for male victims, this was not the case. These findings suggest the existence of an underlying phenomenon leading to different personal traits in men and women, possibly developed in response to acts of ostracism or serving as one of the multiple reasons provoking such behavior.

When comparing the personal dispositions of ostracizers with different social statuses, no significant differences were observed in the levels of 'Disposition to Personal Disadaptation' and 'Disposition to Closeness' among individuals of varying social status. On the other hand, the levels of 'Disposition to Personal Dominance', 'Disposition to Egocentrism', 'Disposition to Independence', and 'Disposition to Negativity' were found to be the lowest among ostracizers with the social status of isolates. These levels gradually increased among neglected members, popular members, ultimately achieving the highest indicators among stars. These results clearly indicate that individuals engaging in acts of ostracism can hold distinct social statuses within a group. This suggests that not only do their personal dispositions vary based on social status, but these dispositions may also play a role in predicting social status itself.

Nevertheless, a notable distinction emerges in the levels of 'Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude', 'Disposition to Dependence', and 'Disposition to Closeness' among victims of ostracism with differing social statuses. Isolates exhibit the highest scores in these dispositions, while these scores gradually decrease among neglected members, popular members, and stars. These findings highlight that victims of ostracism can occupy various social statuses, not limited to isolation or neglect. However, isolated and neglected members consistently demonstrate the highest levels of negative self-attitude, conformity, and avoidance behavior. The reasons behind this phenomenon warrant further exploration in future research.

After conducting a multiple regression analysis to test the hypothesis predicting the intensity of ostracizing behavior based on personal dispositions, it was revealed that 'Disposition to Egocentrism' and 'Disposition to Closeness' were found to be insignificant. However, 'Disposition to Personal Dominance', 'Disposition to Independence', 'Disposition to Negativity', and 'Disposition to Disadaptation' collectively accounted for 61% of the variance. This implies that an individual's inclination to play a pivotal role in decision-making, disregard for group norms and values, purposeful rebellion against them, and a lack of appropriate responses to social situations predict the intensity of ostracizing behavior.

Similarly, concerning the behavior of a victim of ostracism, 'Disposition to Negative Self-Attitude', 'Disposition to Dependence', 'Disposition to Closeness', and 'Disposition to Self-Neglect' collectively accounted for 62% of its intensity. Interestingly, 'Disposition to Suspiciousness' and 'Disposition to Low Self-Control' were found to be insignificant in the displayed model. The intensity of a victim's behavioral patterns, characterized by negative self-view, frequent inner conflicts, feelings of insecurity within the group, avoidance of sharing personal information, and reluctance to establish strong emotional relationships within the group, along with a preference for immediate satisfaction over long-term goals, predicts typical behaviors of a victim of ostracism. These behaviors include social withdrawal, attempts to regain inclusion, and displays of apathetic behavior.

The present study offers a psychological portrait of both ostracizers and victims of ostracism, considering their gender and social status. The research delves into personal dispositions that may predict patterns of ostracizing behavior and the typical responses of ostracized individuals. This information is deemed valuable for establishing ostracism prevention programs, particularly within educational settings such as colleges and universities. Understanding the psychological portrait of both ostracizers and victims will facilitate working with specific dispositions that contribute to the typical behaviors associated with ostracism.

It is important to note that the limited number of studies on this topic emphasizes the necessity for further research across different age groups and in various countries. Expanding our knowledge of ostracism and the personal dispositions of both ostracizers and victims is crucial.

References

- American Psychological Association. (n.d). *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/ostracism>
- Aquino, K., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Perceived victimization in the workplace: the role of situational factors and victim characteristics. *Organization Science*, 11(5), 525-537. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.5.525.15205>
- Autleva, A. N. (2020). Psychological and pedagogical support of the First-Year students'adaptation process to a university. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 78, 240-248. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.01.30>
- Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., Bennett, M. M., & Watson, C. P. (2010). Target personality and workplace victimization: a prospective analysis. *Work & Stress*, 24(2), 140-158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.489635>
- Bozin, M. A., & Yoder, J. D. (2008). Social status, not gender alone, is implicated in different reactions by women and men to social ostracism. *Sex Roles*, 58(9-10), 713-720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9383-1>
- Buckley, K. E., Winkel, R. E., & Leary, M. R. (2004). Reactions to acceptance and rejection: effects of level and sequence of relational evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(1), 14-28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-1031\(03\)00064-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-1031(03)00064-7)
- Carter-Sowell, A. R., Chen, Z., & Williams, K. D. (2008). Ostracism increases social susceptibility. *Social Influence*, 3(3), 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510802204868>
- Cattell, R. B., & Krug, S. E. (1986). The number of factors in the 16PF: a review of the evidence with special emphasis on methodological problems. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46(3), 509-522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164486463002>
- Coyne, I., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2000). Predicting workplace victim status from personality. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 9(3), 335-349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943200417957>
- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of Self-Esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(3), 392-414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.3.392>
- DeWall, C. N., Twenge, J. M., Gitter, S. A., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). It's the thought that counts: the role of hostile cognition in shaping aggressive responses to social exclusion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(1), 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013196>
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: an exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4(4), 381-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329408410497>
- Ferris, D. L., Lian, H., Brown, D. J., & Morrison, R. (2015). Ostracism, Self-Esteem, and job performance: when do we Self-Verify and when do we Self-Enhance? *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 279-297. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0347>
- Fox, J. (Ed.). (1987). *The essential Moreno*. Springer eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1891/9780826197757>
- Gaertner, L., Iuzzini, J., & O'Mara, E. M. (2008). When rejection by one fosters aggression against many: multiple-victim aggression as a consequence of social rejection and perceived groupness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4), 958-970. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.004>

- Güroğlu, B., Will, G., & Klapwijk, E. T. (2013). Some bullies are more equal than others: peer relationships modulate altruistic punishment of bullies after observing ostracism. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 7(1), 13-23. <https://doi.org/10.3233/dev-1312117>
- Harvey, S., Blouin, C., & Stout, D. (2006). Proactive personality as a moderator of outcomes for young workers experiencing conflict at work. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(5), 1063-1074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.09.021>
- Horowitz, L. M. (1996). The study of interpersonal problems: a leary legacy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66(2), 283-300. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6602_7
- Jones, E. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2010). "Why am I out of the loop?" Attributions influence responses to information exclusion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(9), 1186-1201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210380406>
- Kessler, R. C., Berglund, P. A., Demler, O. V., Jin, R., Merikangas, K. R., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62(6), 593-602. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.593>
- Kokun, O. M., Pishko, I. O., Lozinska, N. S., Kopanytsia, O. V., Herasymenko, M. V., & Tkachenko, V. V. (2012). *Collection of methods for diagnosing the leadership qualities of cadet, sergeant and officer*. Ministry of Defence.
- Kong, D. T. (2016). Ostracism perception as a multiplicative function of trait self-esteem, mindfulness, and facial emotion recognition ability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 93, 68-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.08.046>
- Kovalenko, A., & Korniev, M. (2006). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). Geoprint.
- Lakin, J. L., Chartrand, T. L., & Arkin, R. M. (2008). I am too just like you. *Psychological Science*, 19(8), 816-822. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02162.x>
- Leary, M. R. (2001). *Interpersonal rejection*. Oxford University Press.
- Leary, M. R. (2015). Emotional responses to interpersonal rejection. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 17(4), 435-441. <https://doi.org/10.31887/dcms.2015.17.4/mleary>
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>
- Maner, J. K., DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., & Schaller, M. (2007). Does social exclusion motivate interpersonal reconnection? Resolving the "porcupine problem". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 42-55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.42>
- Milam, A., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 58-69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012683>
- Omelyanovich, V. (2017). Freiburg Personality Inventory for assessment of the police officers. *Psihosomatična Medicina Ta Zagal'na Praktika*, 2(1), e020120. <https://doi.org/10.26766/pmgp.v2i1.20>
- Over, H., & Uskul, A. K. (2016). Culture moderates children's responses to ostracism situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110(5), 710-724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000050>
- Rabiner, D. L., Coie, J. D., Miller-Johnson, S., Boykin, A. M., & Lochman, J. E. (2005). Predicting the persistence of aggressive offending of African American males from adolescence into young adulthood. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 13(3), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266050130030101>
- Riva, P., Williams, K. D., Torstrick, A., & Montali, L. (2014). Orders to shoot (a camera): Effects of ostracism on obedience. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 154(3), 208-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2014.883354>
- Romero-Canyas, R., Downey, G., Reddy, K. S., Rodriguez, S., Cavanaugh, T. J., & Pelayo, R. (2010). Paying to belong: when does rejection trigger ingratiation? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(5), 802-823. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020013>

- Rudert, S. C., Ruf, S., & Greifeneder, R. (2019). Whom to punish? How observers sanction norm-violating behavior in ostracism situations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(2), 376-391. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2606>
- Rudert, S. C., Sutter, D., Corrodi, V. C., & Greifeneder, R. (2018). Who's to blame? Dissimilarity as a cue in moral judgments of observed ostracism episodes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(1), 31-53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000122>
- Stepaniuk, O., & Melnychenko. (2020). *Methodical manual for specialists who implement programs for offenders*. Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine.
- Stolin, V. V., Panteleev, S. R. (1978). *Self-attitude test questionnaire*. http://ni.biz.ua/12/12_23/12_234049_test-oprosnik-camootnosheniya-vv-stolin-sr-panteleev.html
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2003). "Death of a (narcissistic) salesman": an integrative model of fragile self-esteem: Comment. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14(1), 57-62. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-99686-011>
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2003). "Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to deserve?" Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(2), 261-272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202239051>
- 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(6), 1058-1069. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.6.1058>
- Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying-psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 203-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414855>
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: the disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96(3), 465-490. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6393179/>
- Williams, K. D. (2002). *Ostracism: the power of silence*. Guilford Press.
- Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 425-452. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641>
- 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(5), 748-762. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.748>
- Луценко, О. (2016). Freiburg personality inventory FPI: validity testing and local standardization. *Visnyk of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series Psychology*, (61), 49-54.