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ABSTRACT

A common workplace problem, particularly for women and other minorities, is workplace ostracism and a lack of inclusion into social and professional networks. There are many negative effects of workplace ostracism including decreased job satisfaction and productivity and increased turnover intentions. Conversely, inclusion is associated with positive interpersonal, psychological, and work-related outcomes for individuals. Given the importance of ostracism and inclusion, understanding predictors of these variables may aid the design of successful, supportive organizational interventions to create a positive environment for employees. Based on the literature, it seemed that ostracism and inclusion would be impacted by feelings of institutional, supervisor, peer, and mentor support as well as work mattering. In the review, the position taken was that the most personal sources of support, mentoring and peer support, would be more powerful predictors of ostracism and inclusion than supervisor and organizational support. In addition, the possibility that there would be differences in the predictors of workplace ostracism and inclusion related to gender was explored. Specifically, it was hypothesized that the relationship between all four forms of support and the outcomes of inclusion and ostracism would be stronger for women than for men. A sample of 107 participants completed an online survey. Support was found for the importance of more personal forms of support for inclusion, but not ostracism. Support was also found for the importance of work mattering for both ostracism and inclusion. The only gender moderation supported was for the relationship between peer support and ostracism.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

One common social problem for minorities and women within organizational settings, particularly in non-traditional jobs, is ostracism and feelings of exclusion. When this makes its way into the workplace, ostracism is defined as an employee’s perceptions of being excluded or ignored by other employees at work (Liu et al., 2013). There are many forms that workplace ostracism can take. These include rejection, interpersonal mistreatment, shunning, and exclusion (Mao et al., 2018). It is thought that workplace ostracism has such a large emotional and cognitive impact on individuals because it threatens the four basic psychological needs of human beings. These are meaningful existence, self-esteem, belonging, and control.

The motive to belong is central to humans and drives much of the human experience (Levett-Jones et al., 2007). Research has found that belongingness is related to well-being and mental health. There is a direct link between belongingness and depression. This research also suggests that social exclusion is the most common cause of anxiety (Malone et al., 2012). A lack of belongingness is related to health problems and stress (Levett-Jones et al., 2007). Research has also suggested that it is from belongingness that humans find meaning in life (Stillman & Baumeister, 2009).

In contrast to ostracism, inclusion is defined as a supportive experience in an organizational environment that recognizes employee effort and provides a positive psychological climate. Research on workplace ostracism supports the importance of
employee’s inclusion related feelings, suggesting that the two constructs of inclusion and ostracism are related to some degree, although each has some unique aspects (Chen & Tang, 2018). Thus, both ostracism and inclusion are important variables in understanding the social climate experienced at an individual level.

While there has been significant research into workplace ostracism and inclusion, there are still some gaps in the literature. Although there is research suggesting that women are more likely to be marginalized than men, particularly in male-dominated occupations, the role of different sources of support in mitigating these effects merits further investigation. Specifically, examining the relative importance of different sources of support, including peer, mentor, supervisor, and organizational support, can help us understand how to decrease the negative effects of workplace ostracism and facilitate feelings of inclusion. This study attempted to fill these gaps in the literature by examining the relative importance of these four sources of support as predictors of ostracism and inclusion. Further, gender was examined as a potential moderator of the relationship between each of these predictors and the dependent variables, taking the position that the four sources of support would be even more critical for women than men under certain circumstances.

First, the dependent variables of ostracism and inclusion were reviewed along with the relevance of these variables in understanding psychological and organizational outcomes. Next, the four different types of support (organizational, supervisor, mentor, and peer support) and their potential positive predictive effects on organizational
outcomes, specifically reduction of ostracism and facilitation of inclusion were reviewed. Although supervisor and organizational support may be critical in outcomes related to productivity, it was contended that the greater psychological intimacy offered by mentoring and peer support may have the strongest impact on the psychologically oriented outcomes of ostracism and inclusion. The importance of organizational and supervisor support were acknowledged, and it was anticipated that they are significant predictors as well, although they were expected to be less powerful predictors.

In summary, the first goal of this study was to examine the relative predictive strength of different forms of social support. It was suggested that mentoring and peer support have the potential for the greatest psychological impact on the individual given the greater intimacy and frequency of contact that one has in these forms of support.

After a review of the literature on the relative importance of support on the outcomes of ostracism and inclusion, a potential moderator of the importance of each form of support was introduced. It was suggested that, in situations where women are underrepresented, gender may moderate the relationship between each form of support and ostracism and inclusion. Specifically, it is expected that each form of support will have a stronger relationship to the outcome variables for women than for men. The practical implications and benefits of providing a supportive organizational environment are emphasized throughout the discussion.
CHAPTER TWO
WORKPLACE OSTRACISM AND INCLUSION

As a first step in understanding the importance of ostracism and inclusion as dependent variables, a review of some of their associated psychosocial precedents and emphasized their outcomes was conducted. This provides an argument for implementing ways to decrease ostracism and increase inclusion.

Ostracism

There are several reasons why a person may be ostracized. These include their abilities/skills, their behavior, and the motivation of the perpetrator. If a person has unique expertise, they are more likely to experience ostracism. This is due to coworkers comparing themselves and seeing themselves lacking in the comparison. The coworkers then feel hostile emotions towards the person with the skills and, thus, ostracize the person with skills. Workplace ostracism can also occur because the victim is demonstrating behaviors with which the perpetrator does not agree (Mao et al., 2018). For example, if an employee is demonstrating actions that are not socially appropriate, such as counterproductive work behavior, then ostracism may occur. In this case, the ostracism would be due to a negative action by the individual experiencing the social punishment, but it is not always due to this. Social exclusion is so powerful that it is not
necessary for the ostracism to be face-to-face to make a large impact. Previous studies have shown virtual ostracism may have the same impact as in person ostracism (Mao et al., 2018). Thus, ostracism may take a number of forms, is multi-determined, and may stem from a number of sources.

The impact of ostracism on individuals has been documented by a number of researchers. A recent meta-analysis of workplace ostracism found that it is associated with turnover intentions, emotional exhaustion, increased workplace deviance and reduced psychological well-being of employees. There are also negative health outcomes such as a higher risk of depression and heart disease along with an increase in work stress (Bedi, 2021). Other research has shown that long term exposure to negative interpersonal behaviors is associated with poor physical health and psychological problems (Richman & Leary, 2009).

At a psychological level, ostracism and social isolation may have negative effects on mood and psychological distress, even impacting life outside of the work setting. The effects of workplace ostracism are so strong they can even cross over to an employee’s family. In fact, research has shown that experiencing ostracism is even a better predictor of job-related emotional exhaustion than experiencing sexual harassment or supervisor abuse, demonstrating the severity of the effects of being ostracized (Thompson et al., 2020)

Further work suggests that, although the ultimate impact of ostracism may depend on the reactions or responses of the target, the immediate effect is one of negative affect
and lowered self-esteem, suggesting that ostracism impacts emotional and cognitive well-being. The most common rejection-related emotion has been found to be “hurt feelings”. It is difficult to define exactly what “hurt feelings” can mean, but it has been previously suggested to be a mixture of emotions and the term implies that the exclusion causes psychological pain (Mao et al., 2018).

In terms of experimental manipulations of ostracism, there have been several different studies focused on feelings of rejection with methodologies including ball-tossing games, online versions of ball-tossing, being selected last for a team, providing participants with feedback that others did not want to work with them, and more (Blackhart et al., 2007; Bourgeois & Leary, 2001). In all of these studies, it was found that how accepted a participant felt was related to their hurt feelings or feelings of rejection. Additionally, the hurt was rated at such a high level that it was associated with some aspects of the pain cancer patients experience (Richman & Leary, 2009). This shows how strong the pain of ostracism is and how it can be comparable to some of the emotional aspects of physical pain. If ostracism can have such severe effects in temporary laboratory settings, the pain of extended exclusion is likely more severe and damaging.

As noted, ostracism seems to impact a range of psychological outcomes. Research suggests that, along with negative affective and psychological reactions to this social marginalization, ostracism even has adverse cognitive effects, impairing self-regulation in terms of attentional control and task persistence. This can be manifested in a number of ways. In laboratory studies, impaired self-regulation has been studied by increasing
ostracism and observing behavioral outcomes. In one study, ostracized people were likely to eat more cookies than people who weren’t ostracized, and less likely to drink a healthy beverage. These are just two examples of unhealthy behavior rejected people are likely to exhibit (Baumeister et al., 2005).

In summary, the wide range of damaging outcomes of ostracism incorporate a number of variables associated with lowered well-being. These personal consequences are in addition to a number of harmful consequences for the employer, making workplace ostracism an important issue for organizations who are invested in their own outcomes as well as in worker well-being. Additional research supports ostracism’s impact on organizational outcomes.

Negative implications of ostracized employees include lower job performance and job satisfaction of employees. In terms of organizational outcomes, ostracized employees may experience a reduction in productivity, job satisfaction, well-being, and affective commitment as well as an increase in turnover intentions. It is also common for victims to reduce their organizational citizenship behaviors and experience hostile emotions towards the perpetrators and even their work group in total (Mao et al., 2018; Zheng et al., 2016). For the employer, the main consequence is a negative change in work culture and work environment. Since victims tend to reduce their organizational citizenship behaviors, there can be further negative consequences stemming from feelings of alienation from the company and one’s workgroup (Mao et al., 2018).
In a recent meta-analysis that integrated both psychological and organizational consequences of ostracism, evidence was found that it is associated with turnover intentions, emotional exhaustion, increased workplace deviance and reduced psychological well-being (Bedi, 2021). This research suggests that understanding factors that decrease or mitigate ostracism may reduce these organizational and personal costs.

**Inclusion**

Given the negative effects of ostracism, one would expect that the more integrative social dynamic of inclusion would have positive effects on corporations and on individuals. Inclusion is a supportive experience in an organization that provides a positive psychological climate and recognizes employee effort. In fact, the importance of emphasizing the integration of diverse employees by corporations has risen to the level of “inclusion branding” where presenting a corporate image of diversity may even be viewed as a positive marketing strategy to attract desirable job candidates (Chen & Tang, 2018).

As distinguished from diversity management, inclusion not only incorporates diversity, but also has a focus on including everyone and ensuring that the employees work well together in a supportive environment (Jonsen et al., 2021). Sincere inclusion efforts imply that corporations are realizing the value of truly integrating a diverse set of employees into the firm and providing an accommodating environment. It is important to note that this type of marketing strategy, to portray a company as inclusive, may backfire
if individuals perceive portrayed diversity to be insincere and can end up perpetuating underrepresentation, further motivating companies to have authentic integrative and supportive programs in place (Kroeper et al., 2020).

While it is critical to consider inclusion for minorities at work, feelings of inclusion are important for all workers. Laboratory studies suggest that inclusion has important affective and work-oriented outcomes for individuals. On a personal level, inclusion may impact commitment to the firm, which may further influence job performance and team member performance. Inclusion-related emotions are also important for employees’ psychological satisfaction (Chen & Tang, 2018). In a similar study, inclusion was found to impact innovation and job satisfaction, which impacted job performance. These feelings of inclusion stem from a variety of sources, including from leaders who emerge as an important factor in creating a supportive climate (Brimhall & Mor Barak, 2018).

In summary, ostracism and inclusion are important to understand, not only because of personal consequences but also on the basis of organizational outcomes as well. These findings are important because they may motivate corporations to make more concerted and earnest efforts to increase the integration of individuals in the firm and decrease their marginalization. While ostracism and inclusion are dependent variables in this study, understanding their consequences may help researchers and practitioners convince organizational decision makers of the importance of maintaining healthy levels of both social climate indicators. It is also important to see ostracism and inclusion as
separate variables, as they may not be opposite ends of the same pole. It is possible that inclusion and ostracism have unique predictors and consequences.

The next segment focused on a set of predictors of ostracism and inclusion that may be modified by organizational interventions. These take the form of different types of support. The importance of organizational support, supervisor support, peer support, and mentor support as ways to enhance integration of individuals within the firm and simultaneously decrease marginalization and ostracism was examined.
CHAPTER THREE
SUPPORT SOURCES

Workplace ostracism and inclusion are so impactful because humans require relationships to thrive, and work is a source of these relationships. Previous research has shown that, when people have supportive relationships outside of those who ostracize them, they are able to decrease the pain of ostracism, supporting the criticality of relationships in positive emotional outcomes (Mao et al., 2018). Additionally, support is important for the health and work performance of an employee. Research has found that employees who are supported at work experience less stress symptoms, burnout, and other negative workplace outcomes.

A number of theories speak to the underlying dynamics between sources of support and the outcomes of inclusion and ostracism. For example, it is possible to consider the importance of support within the job-demand resource model (JDR). This model suggests that, when the demands of a job outweigh the resources available, workers experience negative outcomes. In terms of the current study, sources of support can be resources which help workers deal with the demands of their job (Olaniyan et al., 2020).

Another model to consider with regards to the importance of social support is Brewer’s optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT). This theory brings together the attachment of common connection seen in social settings with one’s need to define themselves as an individual. ODT suggests that there are tensions between the human
need for validation and similarities with others and a contrasting need to be unique. To fulfill the human need for belongingness, people need to join social groups. However, there is still a need for uniqueness. Thus, individuals choose their groups based on the ability to satisfy both of these needs, belonging and uniqueness (Shore et al., 2011).

Shore et al. further the ODT theory by suggesting that it is necessary to have both uniqueness and belongingness to experience feelings of inclusion. They suggest that people identify with groups when they allow for both uniqueness and belongingness. This emphasizes the criticality of supportive relationships and positive organizational environments. Logically, feelings of belongingness may be more strongly related to personal sources of support. Thus, inclusion may be particularly impacted by these personal forms of support.

As an example of outcomes related to support, research has shown that, when managers have high levels of positive and supportive relationships with their employees and their employees are diverse, there is less turnover. This shows the importance of both uniqueness and support in terms of inclusion (Shore et al., 2011) Furthermore, there may be different levels and types of support that contribute to feelings of integration and inclusion or, conversely, contribute to ostracism by their absence or by negative levels of these sources of support.

In the most general terms, social support can be defined as support individuals receive from interpersonal contact. Workplace support can be seen as a type of social support. In other words, since work does provide a social outlet for many people, it is
possible to look at workplace support as a subset of social support. The difference between the constructs is that the construct of workplace support is defined as stemming from those also involved in the organization. Workplace support can be looked at as a whole, or as further subsets such as organizational, supervisor support, mentor support, and peer support (Olaniyan et al., 2020). Given the suggestions of ODT, an examination of the relative importance of specific facets of support on ostracism and inclusion, the psychological feelings related to being integrated and valued at work, was conducted.

In this segment, the potential relationship between organizational support, supervisor support, mentor support, and peer support on employee well-being and outcomes of interest to firms were examined. The relationship of these sources of support to ostracism and inclusion merits further development. There has been previous research into different levels of workplace support on related outcomes, but these sources of support are generally treated as a single variable (Hughes et al., 2020). This means that it is not possible to see whether different levels or types of support are equally important determinants of ostracism and inclusion. The existing literature was used to argue that each source of support is likely to have a positive relationship to feelings of inclusion and will also be related to decreases in ostracism. Furthermore, it was argued that the most personal forms of support, mentoring and peer support, are likely to have the strongest relationships to feelings of inclusion and ostracism. So the first goal of the study is to compare the relative importance or predictive strength of more psychologically distant forms of support (organizational and supervisor) with the importance of more
psychologically intimate forms of support (mentor and peer). These suppositions were based on the literature that attests to the beneficial relationships between these sources of support and positive psychological and social outcomes.

Relative impact of types of support

Few studies have examined the relative strength of types of support on outcome measures, but some research has documented the importance of each particular type of support on employees. As an example, a recent review of the importance of different types of support among child welfare workers documented the positive effects of support and the negative effects of the absence of support for both employees and organizations (Olaniyan et al., 2020). In this review of 55 studies, supervisor, peer and organizational/social/managerial support were found to impact variables ranging from job satisfaction and engagement to stress and burnout. While the authors did not focus on the relative importance of the different types of support, their review provides evidence of the ubiquitous impact of different types of support on individual well-being and the importance of examining ways to enhance forms of support within organizations.

In the limited literature that compares the predictive strength of sources of support, more personal types of support (peer support) show stronger relationships to outcomes such as training transfer than do organizational or supervisor support. Results of this study implied that having a mentor can be a powerful source of encouragement and may have positive outcomes for the employee. Additionally, these authors found that
the more personal support sources (peer and supervisor support) were more impactful than less personal support (Hughes et al., 2020). Although this study did not include peer support in their measures, their findings do support the suggestion that peer support could be more important than other support sources due to their findings of more personal support sources being more impactful.

Similar findings were reported in a study of worker motivation that examined the role of different types of support (organizational and colleague support) for specific profiles of employees (Gillet et al., 2020). These researchers found that colleague support was particularly important for motivation as compared to organizational support. This may suggest that an individual's emotional or motivational states are more strongly impacted by more proximal forms of support.

Conversely, supervisor support was found to be more strongly linked to OCBs than was colleague support (Lavy, 2019). Similarly, supervisor support has been shown to predict employee learning from training and transfer of training into the workforce (Bozionelos et al., 2020). It may be the case that, in this circumstance, OCBs are work behaviors that reflect an employee’s interest in furthering the firm’s or the supervisor’s goals. More supportive supervisor behaviors may likely engender a desire to reciprocate in employees.

In investigations of other outcomes, the relationship between feeling called or meant for a profession and turnover intentions, were moderated by supervisor support (Presbitero & Teng-Calleja, 2020). This is logical in that this more career-oriented source
of support is more related to reactions to the firm and to work opportunities, while higher personal affect and motivation seem to be more strongly related to coworker or peer support. These findings also provide initial evidence for the idea that different forms of support are conceptually distinct in that they are related to different sets of outcomes.

This does not imply that supervisor support has no impact on psychological outcomes. Supervisor support has been shown to negatively impact employees’ ability to connect with others when an employee explicitly asks for supervisor support and does not receive it, which may be considered an unusually low level of support (McIlroy et al., 2021). In total, these findings simply imply that supervisor support and organizational support may be more strongly related than personal (peer, mentor) support to certain work-related outcomes (turnover, satisfaction with work itself), while the more personal forms of support may be more strongly related to affective outcomes (integration, ostracism) for the employee.

While more research is needed in this area, this provides preliminary evidence for the relative importance of more personal, proximal types of support (coworker or mentor) for more personal, emotionally laden outcomes over more distal forms such as organizational support.

Organizational Support

Organizational support was operationally defined as the extent to which an organization values its employees and their work. Thus, it was measured by capturing the
perception of support provided to employees from their point of view by asking employees whether they feel their organization is supportive (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Perceived organizational support encompasses the degree to which employees feel that their organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions (Nwanzu, 2017).

A recent review of research on child welfare workers focused on how workplace support influences work outcomes. The goal of the review was to summarize the results of the current research. Previous research had found that working in child welfare is one of the most stressful and emotionally demanding jobs in the field of human services. Thus, workplace support is especially important. Overall, the research reviewed mostly focused on negative outcomes such as turnover and turnover intentions, with a few studies focused on other topics. The review suggested that workplace support could be considered a resource in the JDR model, and thus reduce the impact of job demands on employees. They reviewed 55 studies for the research review. The research showed that a lack of support was implicated in the retention of workers, with the presence of support being related to lower turnover. Additionally, organizational support was related to lower intentions to leave. When more support was reported, there was also less burnout. In terms of more positive outcomes, organizational support was related to higher experiences of work-life balance. Workplace support was also found to be related to higher job satisfaction, engagement, and commitment (Olaniyan et al., 2020).
Hypothesis 1: Organizational support will be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism.

**Supervisor support**

The definition of this construct is the quality of the relationship between a supervisor and subordinate, from the point of view of the subordinate (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Typically, this is measured by items such as those found on the Leader Member Exchange (LMX). This theory suggests that, when a supervisor has a higher quality relationship with their follower, then the follower benefits from it (Bedi, 2021). Furthermore, the employee would be more likely to engage in mutually beneficial exchanges when they feel they are being treated in a collaborative and sustaining manner by their supervisor. Similar to research on organizational support, moderate to moderately high levels of supervisor support have been related to positive levels of employee motivation (Gillet et al., 2020).

Further research suggests that supervisor support is important in a range of settings. One study on supervisor support using a sample of teachers found that it was positively related to OCBs. Specifically, when teachers experienced negative emotions one day and supervisor support, they were more likely to perform OCBs the next day. This suggests that, even when employees experience harmful emotions or actions at work, such as ostracism, support from their supervisor may help negate the potentially widespread impact of these feelings (Lavy, 2019).
Other studies have shown that stronger supervisor support is related to the desire to stay with a firm while poor supervisor support is related to turnover and the decision to leave. Additionally, in a study focused on child welfare workers, it was found that better supervisor support is related to less stress and burnout. This is especially important when considering the work conditions of child welfare workers as this can be an especially stressful job with responsibilities for child wellbeing and witnessing events such as child neglect (Olaniyan et al., 2020). In addition, in the extreme case of explicitly asking for supervisor support and not receiving it, employees may experience a range of negative outcomes including lowered competence, autonomy and relatedness need satisfaction. This further corroborates the importance of supervisor support in terms of employee well-being and social inclusion (McIlroy et al., 2021).

Hypothesis 2: Supervisor support will be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism. Supervisor support will add incremental variance in the prediction of these outcomes over that offered by organizational support.

Mentor Support

Mentoring is defined as a relationship between an experienced individual and a more junior individual who is seeking guidance and support for their career or personal development. In this paper, there was a focus on mentoring solely in the professional realm. Mentorship has been found to be helpful for most workers. In fact, people who
have experienced mentorship have been found to consistently outperform those who have not, even after the mentorship relationship has ended. It can also help improve career outcomes, create networks, and even help reduce discrimination towards minority groups (Dashper, 2017).

Mentorship is not always enacted at an individual's own workplace. There are also professional organizations that provide mentorship opportunities. While these can help create a sense of belonging, it is important to remember that these may not help with barriers in one's own work environment (Lin et al., 2019). This is due to the fact that the mentor and mentee are not in the same environment and thus the mentor may not be able to help with more specific opportunities or problems. It may be important to compare mentorship outcomes due to internal mentorship relationships and outside mentorship.

In this study, there was a main focus on mentors located inside the organization, but it was also assessed whether individuals have mentor relationships located outside of the organization. If a significant number of individuals had mentoring relationships outside the workplace, then, outside mentorship would have been used as a control variable.

It was also assessed whether mentoring is formal or informal, given the relatively beneficial relationship between informal mentoring and work-related outcome. Research has shown that informal and formal mentoring have positive benefits for the mentee (Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018). An exploratory analysis was conducted to see if mentorship type had any effect on inclusion or ostracism.
Hypothesis 3: Mentoring will be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism. This variable will provide incremental variance in the prediction of ostracism and inclusion over and above the prediction offered by organizational and supervisor support.

Peer Support

Peer support was operationally defined as the extent to which coworkers care and value each other and their work (Ladd & Henry, 2000). Previous research has found that, when there is more peer support, there are fewer feelings of burnout as well as secondary traumatic stress (Olaniyan et al., 2020). As an example, in a study focused on teachers, it was found that support from peers was related to positive outcomes including increased work performance, engagement, and energy.

Peer support is also related to decreased stress, burnout, and exhaustion (Lavy, 2019). This is a logical relationship given that peers work more closely on a day-to-day basis and may be more impactful than other sources of support. This also means that there may be more proximal reinforcing or punishing behaviors related to either ostracism or inclusion at this level of support. Additionally, although there is little research looking into how different sources of support differ from each other, there has been some previous evidence of peer support being more impactful than other forms of support, specifically organizational and supervisor support. In a study looking into how
different sources of support assisted in training transfer and sustainment, it was found that supervisor support and peer support had stronger relationships than organizational support, but that peer support played the largest role in predicting training transfer. The authors suggested that this could be connected to the level of interaction between peers being higher than the level of interaction with the organization as a whole or with supervisors (Hughes et al., 2020). Given the significance of peer support as compared to other potential sources, it seems promising as a stronger relative predictor of other outcomes, particularly ostracism and inclusion given the centrality of peers in social relationships.

*Hypothesis 4:* Peer support will be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism. This variable will provide incremental prediction of ostracism and inclusion over and above the prediction offered by organizational, supervisor, and mentor support.
The relevance of supportive relationships may be particularly critical for marginalized groups in firms. As an example, research has shown that perceived support from relationships can moderate perceived racism and the associated negative consequences in organizations (Richman & Leary, 2009). It is possible that this moderation effect could also be true for workplace ostracism and inclusion in that, when women are a minority, support may be particularly important in decreasing ostracism and increasing inclusion.

The literatures on diversity, inclusion, and ostracism are not always well integrated. However, one intriguing study investigated how the different genders may react to being ostracized. They found that ostracized men were more likely to socially loaf and decrease their participation while women would compensate by increasing their participation. However, replications of the study added in additional variables of social status and control. These replications showed that social status and control were also important factors with men being more likely to contribute more when their status was considered higher (Bozin & Yoder, 2008; Williams & Sommer, 1997). The change in results following the addition of other variables suggests that there needs to be more research into the role of gender in workplace ostracism.
There is some research that suggests women are more likely to be ostracized in male-dominated workplaces such as academia but there is not a large amount of literature on this topic (Zimmerman et al., 2016). There is also some research into specifically science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) academia. This research investigated how women’s representation can vary across these disciplines, and how women’s representation can affect their experience. It was found that, in departments where women are a small minority, women faculty have the least satisfaction. On the other hand, when the number of women approaches 50% of the department, there are no significant differences in satisfaction between the genders. It is noteworthy that, in this study, the researchers measured minority status by the percentage of women in each department (Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018), one metric of minority status. This suggests that, along with certain fields having a higher probability of gendered ostracism, the actual percentage of workers is important.

Other organizational factors may create a less favorable and exclusive environment for women. For example, it has been found that organizations and their practices are structured around masculine norms, even if this is not immediately obvious. Although there may not be overt expectations, this can cause a problem when it comes to definitions of success in the workplace, as it creates an illusion that the ideal worker is male. Since these structures are generally invisible, it can be difficult to achieve gender equality in the workplace (Dashper, 2017).
Inclusion may be constrained when employees perceive others in terms of stereotypes. This can especially be harmful when it comes to gender. Diversity practices tend to focus on minorities such as women, but, by forcing diversity, inclusion can be hampered. This is due to people perceiving these minorities stereotypically and believing they did not earn their spot in the company, but were given it due to diversity practices. However, if a climate is inclusive, then gender diversity is related to less conflict (Nishii, 2013).

Organizational Support and Gender

There is a lack of literature that looks at how specifically organizational support can affect employees depending on gender. However, there are some informative studies that have considered this relationship. One study focused on how demographic characteristics were related to perceived organizational support. They had industrial workers fill out a survey during their lunch break. They found that females, married workers, satisfied workers, and older workers all expressed greater perceptions of organizational support. This study was conducted in Ghana which could cause some cross-cultural issues when generalizing the results to the United States, but the finding that females had a greater perception of organizational support was counter to their hypothesis. They suggested that this finding was due to collecting data in an area with more Western influences. Thus, it is possible to suggest that these findings would be similar in the current study (Gyekye & Salminen, 2009). It may be the case that there are
supportive mechanisms in place that foster support of female employees, which is also important to understand when trying to isolate the impact of gender and general organizational support on inclusion and ostracism.

In contrast, an additional study focusing on occupational stress, perceived organizational support, and gender among secondary school teachers found that male teachers were more likely to experience higher levels of perceived organizational support than females. A further study located in Nigeria surveyed workers in the public sector using non-random sampling. This study found that there were no significant differences between men and women on perceptions of organizational support. This was an unexpected finding and did not have any support from previous literature. It was suggested that the sample size was too small to have any significant findings (Nwanzu, 2017).

A further study focused on perceived occupational support among higher secondary education teachers. This study focused on demographic variables including gender. They found that there were gender differences on perceptions of occupational support with women having a lower perception of occupational support than men. In summary, while the findings surrounding gender differences in effects of perceived organizational support are not very consistent, they do suggest that there might be some gender differences (Khurshid & Anjum, 2012).
Hypothesis 5: The relationships between organizational support and inclusion/ostracism will be moderated by gender, with support having a stronger relationship to inclusion and ostracism for women than for men.

Supervisor Support and Gender

There has been some research into how the lack of equal supervisor support depending on gender can affect women. Leadership stereotypes already put women at a disadvantage, and, if supervisors do not provide the additional necessary support to help women overcome these disadvantages, then men are more likely to feel supported and helped by their supervisors than are women (Fritz & Knippenberg, 2020).

The importance of leadership and supervisor support of diversity has been recognized as a critical part of any successful inclusion initiative. For instance, in the context of diversity, increasing individual leader responsibility for attaining diversity outcomes and holding the leaders or supervisors accountable for these outcomes may be powerful ways to increase supervisor support and involvement. In terms of the current study this suggests that it is necessary for supervisors to support the women in their department, and that this support will help increase inclusion (Hayes et al., 2020).

One study without contrasting findings focused on the relationship between perceived supervisor support and organizational commitment after downsizing. This study focused on survivors of downsizing. They completed a survey looking into organizational commitment, perceived supervisor support, and leadership. This study
found that men were more likely to have their organizational commitment positively affected by perceived supervisor support, but it was suggested that this could be due to men having a greater need for job security than women. It is possible that this contrasting finding was due to the sample being taken after downsizing occurred, causing job security to be on the mind of the participants. Although the study does not explore this finding further, it is possible that this greater need for job security in men is due to societal gender norms where it is expected for them to take on the role of financial supporter. Even though this study does provide evidence for a contrasting relationship between supervisor support and gender, it is focused on organizational commitment, and not the outcomes of inclusion and ostracism. Due to this, it is still hypothesized that women will have greater effects from supervisor support. (Adair Erickson & Roloff, 2008).

**Hypothesis 6:** The relationships between supervisor support and inclusion/ostracism will be moderated by gender, with support having a stronger relationship to inclusion and ostracism for women than for men.

**Mentor Support and Gender**

It is accepted that mentoring can be an important contributor to a woman's success in her career. This has caused the creation of mentoring programs with the specific goal of mentoring women. However, it is possible that these specific programs may have
mixed outcomes. This is due to their ability to both challenge and reinforce gender stereotypes as they tend to frame women as a “problem” that needs to be fixed instead of focusing on fixing the masculine framework of work (Dashper, 2017).

Although mentorship is important and helpful to both men and women, it has been found that men are more likely to secure promotions due to their formal and informal mentorship relationships than women. This suggests that, while mentorship can be helpful for everyone, there is still something stopping women from experiencing all possible benefits. It has also been found that women are more likely to struggle in accessing mentoring networks. Due to gender patterns in organizations, it is more difficult for women to access informal mentorship. This can cause a dependence on formal mentorship programs (Dashper, 2017).

When looking specifically at STEM fields, there is also the issue of the “leaky pipeline”. This is due to the fact that 56% of women in IT leave their job and the field within 5 years. This rate is double that of men in IT and women in other professional fields. Although these women say they love their jobs, they are also experiencing many barriers including stereotypes, isolation, and masculine organizational climate. These outcomes, particularly isolation, are conceptually related to ostracism and inclusion and suggest that mentors may also have a positive impact on inclusion while reducing ostracism. It is possible that mentorship could circumvent these barriers and help repair the pipeline (Annabi & Lebovitz, 2018).
Positive organizational outcomes of mentorship may also emerge in addition to the psychological benefits. In a study of academics, faculty with mentors in their department were more likely to have a positive view of their department culture. There is no effect of gender on this finding (Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018). One explanation for this finding is that mentoring is so important that, even when women are in the minority of their department, and perhaps more likely to have an unfavorable view of their departmental culture, their mentoring relationship may make up for the lack of equality in the gender makeup. Another potential explanation is that well designed mentoring programs may have equally positive outcomes for both genders in terms of their view of the departmental culture. Perhaps the investment of the department in the mentoring program sends a positive message to both men and women.

Organizational interventions designed to support diversity often address the marginalization of women, and suggest increasing mentor support and other forms of social support as a means to increase inclusion in social networks and decrease isolation of women, particularly those in non-traditional or STEM occupations (Annabi & Lebovitz, 2018). These mentoring relationships may provide both instrumental and social support, facilitating integration and the career development of women (Hutchins & Kovach, 2019). In fact, interventions which facilitate the participation of women into female professional organizations may increase opportunities for mentorship and, relevant to this study, facilitate feelings of inclusion (Lin et al., 2019). Similarly, in studies in academic STEM fields, having a within department mentor may positively
influence perceptions of the firm’s climate and may be subsequently related to professional satisfaction (Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018).

In summary, while the findings regarding gender as a moderator are somewhat mixed, there is enough support for the differential impact of mentoring on men and women that the following hypothesis was formulated:

**Hypothesis 7:** The relationships between mentor support and inclusion/ostracism will be moderated by gender, with support having a stronger relationship to inclusion and ostracism for women than for men.

**Peer Support and Gender**

When looking at the research concerning how peer support interacts with inclusion and ostracism when concerning gender, there is some current research. First, there is some research focused on peer support related to bullying and externalizing and internalizing behaviors. One study looked at how different sources of support including peer, parent, and teacher interacted with internalizing and externalizing behaviors when mediated by victimization and moderated by gender. They found that the strongest source of support was peer support and that peer support was more important for females than males. The authors suggested that this finding was due to females being more likely to rely on social support relationships for psychological support than males. Thus, females would be more likely to benefit from social support. This suggests that it is possible that
peer support in the workplace would also be more important for females than males (Attar-Schwartz et al., 2017).

Another study looked into a possible mediating effect of peer support for the relationship between gender similarity in work groups and job attitudes. In this study they focused on gender similarity instead of just gender. Gender similarity is the extent that attitudes/behaviors associated with gender are perceived to be shared between or different between coworkers. They found that this relationship was supported. While this study did focus on a mediation and not a moderation as this study is suggesting, and used gender similarity instead of gender, it still seems to support the suggestion that gender may affect the relationship between peer support and inclusion/ostracism (Koseoglu et al., 2018).

Additional research has looked into the effects of job autonomy and peer support on job satisfaction. This study also looked at the mediating role of work-family conflict on this relationship when taking gender into account. They found that peer support was positively related to job satisfaction for both men and women. However, when it came to the addition of work-family conflict, peer support only had an effect for women. This suggests that peer support could be more important for women than men (Matijaš et al., 2018).

**Hypothesis 8:** The relationships between peer support and inclusion/ostracism will be moderated by gender, with support having a stronger relationship to inclusion and ostracism for women than for men.
CHAPTER FIVE

WORK MATTERING

Mattering is how much a person feels that they make a difference and is significant to the world (Haizlip et al., 2020). There are two types of mattering, societal and interpersonal. Societal mattering has to do with people feeling that they make a difference in society overall. Interpersonal mattering is how much a person feels that they matter to a group of people. Since this study focuses on interpersonal relationships, only interpersonal mattering was used (Jung & Heppner, 2017).

Research has shown interpersonal mattering to be more powerful than societal mattering. Interpersonal mattering has been found to be related to psychological well-being and mental health (Jung, 2014). In addition, work mattering has been found to help employees cope with stress (Haizlip et al., 2020). It has also been found that there are gender contingent effects of work mattering. For women, work mattering is positively related to education and negatively related to work-family conflict. For men, work mattering is positively related to family status (Schieman & Taylor, 2001).

Work mattering is still a relatively new field of research, so research is somewhat limited at this point. However, with the similarities between interpersonal mattering and peer support, it is possible to suggest that interpersonal mattering would be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism. It is also
possible that interpersonal mattering at work would predict these outcomes over and above the support sources.

_Hypothesis 9:_ Work mattering will be positively related to feelings of inclusion and negatively related to feelings of ostracism. This variable will provide incremental variance in the prediction of ostracism and inclusion over and above the prediction offered by organizational, supervisor, mentor, and peer support.
CHAPTER SIX

METHOD

Sample

The participants were gathered online through social media snowballing and Prolific. The survey was posted on Facebook pages and Reddit forums. It was also shared through word of mouth. Participants recruited through Prolific were given a payment of $3.20. A power analysis was conducted using G*Power to determine the number of participants needed (Faul et al., 2009). Typical effect sizes between support related variables and ostracism, inclusion and related outcomes are around .55 (Brimhall & Mor Barak, 2018). Individual effects in this area are more modest, such as effect sizes between supervisor support and ostracism being around $\Delta R^2 = -0.19$ (Attar-Schwartz et al., 2017). The power analysis was run using an effect size of .19. It was estimated that the study required at least 96 participants to find a significant effect ($p < .05$) at 80% power (Faul et al., 2009).

There were 149 people who started the survey. One person did not agree to participate, and 11 were not employed full-time. Twenty eight people did not complete the survey. Of those who completed the survey, one person missed all 3 attention checking questions and was deleted from the dataset. Another person missed two of the attention questions and was also deleted from the dataset. There were 7 people who missed one attention checking question by choosing the opposite option, such as selecting
“strongly disagree” instead of “strongly agree” as indicated in the question. Due to them answering the other two attention checking questions correctly, they were left in the sample. This left a total sample size of 107 participants. Twenty-eight of these participants were from Prolific, and the other 79 were from social media snowballing.

The participants were mostly female (59 female, 47 male, 1 non-binary/third gender) and Caucasian (82% Caucasian, 6% Asian, 5% Multiracial, 4% Black, and 3% other/prefer not to answer). The average age of the sample was 38 years old. (See Table 1).

In terms of mentorship, most participants experienced informal mentorship (65% informal mentorship, 35% formal mentorship). Most mentorship was inside the organization (91% inside the organization, 9% outside the organization), and the mentorship was mostly face to face (60% face to face, 26% hybrid, 13% virtual, 1% did not report).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary / third gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6 Months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months-1 Year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ Years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

Demographics

Participants were asked to provide their gender, race, and age for demographics (Appendix A).

Employment Status

In order to ensure that the study was measuring support and ostracism in the workplace, it was necessary to check that participants are currently employed. They were asked to verify that they are employed full-time. Additionally, participants were asked to indicate the industry in which they work (Appendix B).

Minority Status

In order to tell whether women consider themselves to be a minority in their organization, two questions were asked. The first was “What percentage of your peer coworkers are female?” with responses ranging from 10% to 90% or more. The second question was a statement of “I feel like a minority in this firm because of my gender” with responses being on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Appendix C). These two items were intended to capture two operationalizations of minority status: simple percentages of women in a job and subjective perceptions of minority status. These two operationalizations were not interrelated with a correlation of $r = -0.15 (p = 0.11)$.

Perceived Coworker Support
Peer support was measured using a measure of perceived coworker support. This measure has 9 items such as “My coworkers really care about my well-being” and is scaled on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Two items are reverse scored. The responses of the 9 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. It has been previously shown to be valid and reliable. The validity of the scale has been supported in that the scale has been shown to be a valid predictor of outcomes such as empathy and conscientiousness. Testing of the scale showed a coefficient alpha of .94 (Ladd & Henry, 2000). The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.98 (Appendix D).

**Mentor Support**

Mentor support was measured with a 5-item measure with items such as “My mentor and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship”. The items are measured with a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The scores of the 7 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. The scale has been shown to be reliable and valid with a coefficient alpha of .85. The validity of the scale has been supported in that the scale has been shown to be a predictor of outcomes such as mentorship duration and perceived similarity (Allen & Eby, 2003). The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.96. Additionally, there were some questions looking into whether the mentor is formal or informal and in the organization versus outside of the organization (Appendix E).

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**
Leader Member Exchange is a theory that organizational leaders develop relationships with their followers of varying quality. This theorizes that, when a supervisor has a higher quality relationship with their follower, then the follower benefits from the relationship, while a lower quality relationship has a negative effect on the follower (Bedi, 2021). Supervisor support was measured on the Leader-Member Exchange, which measures the relationship between a supervisor and subordinate. This is a 12-item measure with items such as “My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake”. Items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scores of the 12 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. The measure has been previously shown to be reliable and valid with a coefficient alpha of .91. The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.94. A previous validation study found the LMX scale to be valid via support due to exploratory analysis along with confirmation using CFA with independent samples. Additionally, the study reviewed the scale and found it to have convergent validity, discriminant validity, and criterion-related validity (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Wayne et al., 1997) (Appendix F).

Perceived Organizational Support

Organizational support was measured on a 1-item perceived organizational support scale. The item is “I felt like my organization was very supportive of me”. It is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Matthews et al., 2022). This scale is created from the perceived organizational scale,
36-item scale previously shown to be reliable and valid with a coefficient alpha of .97. The validity of the scale has been supported in that the scale has been shown to be a valid predictor of outcomes such as absenteeism (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The 1-item scale has shown reliability and validity during its creation and validation (Matthews et al., 2022) (Appendix G).

**Workplace Ostracism**

Workplace ostracism was measured using the Workplace Ostracism Scale. The scale is a 10-item measure that has acceptable validity as found during the creation and validation of the measure (Ferris et al., 2008). The scale is measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(*Never*) to 7(*Always*). An example item is “Others avoided you at work”. The scores of the 7 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. This scale has previously been shown to be reliable and valid with a coefficient alpha ranging from .89 to .96 (Ferris et al., 2008). The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.98 (Appendix H).

**Workplace Inclusion**

Workplace inclusion was measured on the Perceived Group Inclusion Scale. This is a 16-item scale consisting of four subscales: group membership, group affection, room for authenticity, and value in authenticity. Items are measured on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The scores of the 16 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. It showed acceptable validity during the creation and validation of the measure. The subscales have shown reliability
with coefficient alphas ranging from .87-.97. The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.99. The Cronbach’s Alpha was also calculated for each subscale. For the group membership subscale it was 0.99. For the group affection subscale it was 0.98. For the room for authenticity subscale it was 0.99. For the value in authenticity scale it was 0.98. As noted in the discussion, the scales were not counterbalanced and this may have inflated the internal consistency estimates. An example item is “This group gives me the feeling that I belong.” (Jansen et al., 2014) (Appendix I).

Work Mattering

Work mattering was measured using Factor 2: Interpersonal Mattering on the Work Mattering Scale. This is a 5-item scale measured on a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from 1(disagree very much) to 6(agree very much). The scores of the 5 items were averaged together to get a scale score for each participant. An example item is “I feel like I matter to my colleagues/coworkers.”. This scale has acceptable validity as found during the creation and validation of the measure. The scale has shown reliability with a coefficient alpha above .85 (Jung & Heppner, 2017). The Cronbach’s Alpha for this sample was 0.99 (Appendix J).

Procedures

The data was collected through a survey that was conducted online through social media snowballing. This included posting the survey on various Facebook pages, in Facebook groups, on Reddit forums, and sharing it with friends to pass on. Additional
participants were recruited using Prolific. Participants were screened to ensure that they are employed full time. Given issues with online data, the quality of the data was screened before the data analysis process began using the attention checking questions. As any participant who did not complete the survey was deleted from the dataset, there was no missing data in the sample.
CHAPTER SEVEN

RESULTS

As an initial step in data analysis, correlations between the social support predictors and between the dependent variables of inclusion and ostracism were examined to ensure that they were not highly correlated (See Table 2.). Of interest is the significant but moderate relationship between inclusion and ostracism ($r = -0.49$), suggesting that the variables overlap but are not redundant. It is also interesting to note the relationship between mattering and the other support variables, with peer support and mattering significantly and highly correlated ($r = 0.71$) and peer support and mattering more strongly related to ostracism and inclusion than the other support variables. Additionally, gender was not significantly related to any other variables (see Table 2).
Part One of Study (H1-H4): Tests of Incremental Significance of Forms of Support

Hypotheses 1-4 were tested using hierarchical regression. First, the hypotheses were tested using inclusion as the dependent variable. To test H1, organizational support was entered as a predictor and was found to be significant ($\beta = 0.29, p < .001$). To test H2, supervisor support was entered as a predictor after organizational support, and was found to be significant ($\beta = 0.13, p = 0.04$). To test H3, mentor support was entered as a predictor after the other predictors and found to be significant ($\beta = 0.13, p = 0.02$).

Finally, to test H4, peer support was entered as a predictor after the other three predictors.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Mattering</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>[60,.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer Support</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>[23,.55]</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>[33,.64]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor Support</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>[28,.58]</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>[26,.58]</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>[27,.58]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Support</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>[65,.82]</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>[61,.89]</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>[25,.56]</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ostracism</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>[-58,-27]</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>[-51,-18]</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>[-31,-06]</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>[-19,.19]</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>[-23,.13]</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>[-29,.09]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $M$ and $SD$ are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population correlations that could have caused the sample correlation (Cumming, 2014). * indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$. Gender is coded as 1 = female, 2 = male.*
and was found to be significant ($\beta = 0.52, p < .001$). As an additional test of H1-4 with inclusion as the dependent variable, a partial F test was completed to look at the change in $R^2 (p < .001)$. (See Table 3.)
The hypotheses were also tested concerning ostracism. To test H1, organizational support was entered as a predictor of ostracism and was non-significant ($\beta = 0.07, p =$
To test H2, supervisor support was entered as a predictor after organizational support and was not significant ($\beta = 0.07, p = 0.58$). To test H3, mentor support was entered as a predictor after the other predictors and was not significant ($\beta = 0.06, p = 0.37$). To test H4, peer support was entered as a predictor after organizational, supervisor and peer support and was found to be significant ($\beta = -0.30, p = 0.002$). As an additional test of H1-H4 with ostracism as the dependent variable, a partial F test was completed to look at the change in $R^2$ ($p = 0.002$). (See Table 4.).
Table 4.

**Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Ostracism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Support</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Mattering</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 107; *p < .1; *p < .05; **p < .01, ***p < .001*
The four support sources were also tested as sole predictors of ostracism. To test this, each support source was entered as a predictor of ostracism. Organizational support was found to not be significant ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = 0.056$). Supervisor support was found to not be significant ($\beta = -0.09$, $p = 0.18$). Mentor support was also tested by itself and found to not be significant ($\beta = -0.10$, $p = 0.08$). Finally, peer support was tested by itself and found to be significant ($\beta = -0.30$, $p < .001$).

Part Two of Study (H5-H8): Tests of Moderating Effects of Gender on Support Sources

To test H5-H8, a reduced model including the support source and gender as predictors was then compared to a full model with the two predictors as well as a gender X support source interaction. For example, for H5, the reduced model contained gender and organizational support as predictors and the full model contained gender, organizational support, and a gender X organizational support interaction as predictors.

Hypotheses were first tested with inclusion as the dependent variable. To test H5, gender and organizational support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, organizational support, and a gender X organizational support interaction. While organizational support was a significant individual predictor of inclusion, ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 4.85$, $p < .001$), the reduced model as a whole was not significant ($\beta = -0.21$, $p = 0.13$). The full model containing the interaction was also not significant ($\beta = 0.17$, $p = 0.14$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.14$) (See Table 5).
To test H6, gender and supervisor support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, supervisor support, and a gender X supervisor support interaction. While supervisor support was a significant individual predictor of inclusion (β = 0.25, \( t = 4.28, p < .001 \)), the reduced model was not significant (β = -0.16, \( p = 0.24 \)). The full model was also not significant (β = -0.05, \( p = 0.69 \)). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in \( R^2 \) when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant (\( p = 0.69 \)) (See Table 6).
To test H7, gender and mentor support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, mentor support, and a gender X mentor support interaction. While mentor support was a significant individual predictor of inclusion ($\beta = 0.23, t = 5.01, p < .001$), the reduced model was not significant ($\beta = -0.07, p = 0.62$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = -0.08, p = 0.40$), but mentor support emerged as a significant individual predictor ($\beta = 0.35, t = 2.38, p < .05$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.40$) (See Table 7).
To test H8, gender and peer support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, peer support, and a gender X peer support interaction. While peer support was a significant individual predictor of inclusion, ($\beta = 0.56$, $t = 10.13$, $p < .001$), the reduced model was not significant ($\beta = -0.07$, $p = 0.52$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.03$, $p = 0.79$), but peer support emerged as a significant individual predictor ($\beta = 0.52$, $t = 3.01$, $p < .01$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.79$) (See Table 8).
The hypotheses were then tested with ostracism as the dependent variable. To test H5, gender and organizational support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, organizational support, and a gender X organizational support interaction. The reduced model was not significant (β = 0.08, p = 0.63). The full model was also not significant (β = -0.20, p = 0.16). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.16$) (See Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support X Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 107; $p < .1$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$; Female is coded as 1, male is coded as 2*
To test H6, gender and supervisor support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, supervisor support, and a gender X supervisor support interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.05, p = 0.73$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.07, p = 0.60$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.60$) (See Table 10).
To test H7, gender and mentor support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, mentor support, and a gender X mentor support interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02$, $p = 0.92$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = -0.05$, $p = 0.67$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.67$) (See Table 11).

Table 10.

*Linear regression: Supervisor support and gender as predictors of ostracism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support X Gender</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F$ 1.03 0.77

$R^2$ 0.02 0.02

$\Delta R^2$ 0.00

*Note: $N = 107$; $p < .1$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$; Female is coded as 1, male is coded as 2*
To test H8, gender and peer support were entered into a regression, with the full model containing gender, peer support, and a gender X peer support interaction. While peer support was a significant individual predictor of ostracism, ($\beta = -0.30$, $t = -3.83$, $p < .001$), the reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.01$, $p = 0.95$). However, the full model was significant ($\beta = -0.33$, $p = 0.04$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to be significant ($p = 0.04$) (See Table 12).
In summary, the pattern of results suggested that gender did not operate as a moderator of the relationship between the support variables and ostracism or inclusion with the exception of the relationship between peer support and ostracism.

**Part Three of Study: Hypothesis 9**

To test Hypothesis 9, the model from H4 (with all four forms of support in it) was taken and work mattering was added with inclusion and then ostracism as the outcome variable. With inclusion as the outcome variable, the model was found to be significant (β
= 0.52, \( p < .001, \Delta R^2 = 0.11 \)). With ostracism as the outcome variable, the model was also found to be significant (\( \beta = -0.42, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = 0.07 \)). (See Table 3 and Table 4).

**Part Four of Study: Post-Hoc Analyses**

After testing H5-8, and finding little significance, the models were tested again, using minority status and percentage of females instead of gender. So a reduced model includes the support source and minority status as predictors and the full model includes the support source, minority status, and a support source X minority status interaction. The same was then done with percentage of females instead of minority status to see if perceiving oneself as a minority or considering the percentage of females in the organization would have an effect. First, minority status and inclusion were tested.

To test organizational support, organizational support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing organizational support, minority status, and an organizational support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant (\( \beta = -0.06, p = 0.32 \)). The full model was also not significant (\( \beta = 0.02, p = 0.76 \)). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in \( R^2 \) when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant (\( p = 0.76 \)).

To test supervisor support, supervisor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing supervisor support, minority status, and a supervisor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant (\( \beta = -0.09, p = 0.17 \)). The full model was also not significant (\( \beta = 0.02, p = 0.62 \)). A
partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.62$).

To test mentor support, mentor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing mentor support, minority status, and a mentor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = -0.07, p = 0.28$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.04, p = 0.34$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.34$).

To test peer support, peer support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing peer support, minority status, and a peer support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = -0.08, p = 0.72$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.06, p = 0.26$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.26$).

They were then tested with ostracism as the outcome. To test organizational support, organizational support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing organizational support, minority status, and an organizational support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.73$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.86$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.86$).
To test supervisor support, supervisor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing supervisor support, minority status, and a supervisor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.04, p = 0.62$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.80$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.80$).

To test mentor support, mentor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing mentor support, minority status, and a mentor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.03, p = 0.70$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.69$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.69$).

To test peer support, peer support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing peer support, minority status, and a peer support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.00, p = 0.998$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = -0.07, p = 0.30$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.30$).

Tests were then run using inclusion as the outcome and percent female as a predictor. To test organizational support, organizational support and percent female were entered into a regression, with the full model containing organizational support, percent
female, and an organizational support X percent female interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.41$). The full model was approaching significance ($\beta = -0.04, p = 0.07$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to be approaching significance ($p = 0.07$).

To test supervisor support, supervisor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing supervisor support, minority status, and a supervisor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.74$). The full model was approaching significance ($\beta = -0.04, p = 0.06$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to be approaching significance ($p = 0.06$).

To test mentor support, mentor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing mentor support, minority status, and a mentor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.76$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = -0.02, p = 0.12$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.12$).

To test peer support, peer support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing peer support, minority status, and a peer support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = -0.01, p = 0.78$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = -0.01, p = 0.65$). A partial F test was
also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.65$).

Finally, tests were then run using ostracism as the outcome and percent female as a predictor. To test organizational support, organizational support and percent female were entered into a regression, with the full model containing organizational support, percent female, and an organizational support X percent female interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.61$). The full model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.43$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to be non-significant ($p = 0.43$).

To test supervisor support, supervisor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing supervisor support, minority status, and a supervisor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.50$). The full model was not significant ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.56$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to be non-significant ($p = 0.56$).

To test mentor support, mentor support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing mentor support, minority status, and a mentor support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.48$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.36$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.36$).
To test peer support, peer support and minority status were entered into a regression, with the full model containing peer support, minority status, and a peer support X minority status interaction. The reduced model was not significant ($\beta = 0.03$, $p = 0.32$). The full model was also not significant ($\beta = 0.02$, $p = 0.48$). A partial F test was also completed to look at the change in $R^2$ when the interaction was added, and was found to not be significant ($p = 0.48$).

This suggests that neither definition of minority status moderated the relationship between support and inclusion and ostracism.

Part Five of Study: Additional Exploratory Analyses Regarding Mentorship Type

Finally, a simple regression analysis was conducted to see if mentorship type had any effect on inclusion or ostracism. To test this, mentorship type was entered into a linear regression as a predictor of inclusion and then ostracism. Mentorship type was not found to be significant for inclusion ($\beta = 0.15$, $p = 0.37$). It was also not found to be significant for ostracism ($\beta = -0.09$ $p = 0.58$)
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DISCUSSION

Results provided mixed support for the hypotheses, with evidence supporting the importance of peer support in predicting feelings of inclusion even when organizational, supervisor, and mentor support have been accounted for. With inclusion, every support source was significant, but the more personal forms of support provided incremental prediction of inclusion over and above the other predictors. This provides support for the hypotheses regarding the relationship between support sources and inclusion. These results suggest that organizations should focus on creating supportive environments, especially at the peer level, if they wish to create a truly inclusive and welcoming environment.

Furthermore, work mattering was a significant predictor of inclusion over and above all support sources. This suggests that, on top of focusing on creating supportive environments, organizations should also work to improve work mattering for employees while working to increase inclusion. A strong relationship between peer support and work mattering was also found. It is possible this is due to the use of the interpersonal work mattering factor as interpersonal mattering is focused on how much a person feels they matter to a group and peer support is focused on how much coworkers care and value each other. These two measures are similar with the exception that peer support is an external resource and work mattering is an internal resource. However, it is also
possible that peer support drives work mattering. In order to make a stronger claim about the relationship between these two variables, further research is necessary.

It is interesting to note that peer support and work mattering were the only significant predictors of ostracism, suggesting that ostracism and inclusion may have different precursors and unique underlying dynamics. As the support sources were not predictors for both inclusion and ostracism, it can be suggested that ostracism and inclusion do not share predictors. The empirical relationship between these two variables \( (r = -0.49) \) was significant but moderate, suggesting that they may be somewhat unique constructs. While ostracism and inclusion are moderately correlated with each other, the results from this study suggest that they are not exact opposites, but instead two distinct but related variables. This suggests that future research may want to investigate the relationship between the constructs of ostracism and inclusion. In this study, inclusion was predicted and significantly related to internal and external sources of support, while ostracism is not. It may be the case that ostracism is related to a different set of variables, perhaps variables related to active exclusion of individuals from social groups.

It is possible that there was more support for the inclusion hypotheses due to the support sources providing social support. In order to experience support, there must be interaction between the actors, thus they feel more included in the organization. Perhaps peer support and work mattering were the only significant predictor of ostracism since feelings of exclusion may depend largely on coworkers. Further research may reveal that they are the primary sources of interaction or exclusion in employees’ social life.
Additionally, peer support and work mattering were the most important predictors of inclusion providing additional significance over and above the other support sources. This suggests that overall organizations should focus on work mattering and peer support. Further research is needed to explore these relationships more in depth.

Furthermore, when looking at the results concerning gender, almost no results were significant. The only significant moderation found was of the relationship between peer support and ostracism. Additionally, gender was not significantly correlated with any support variables, inclusion, ostracism, or work mattering. This is especially interesting since the past research does show gender differences with support sources. While it is possible that the lack of significance is due to the relatively small sample size, other definitions of minority status were also not significant. Past research has shown the difficulty in finding significant moderation effects of categorical variables. Moderating effects tend to be very low at 0.002. Thus, it is also possible that there are gender effects in how the support sources affect inclusion and ostracism, but the relationship is not a moderation (Aguinis et al., 2005). However, with the difficulty in finding moderation effects of categorical variables, the finding that gender does moderate the relationship between peer support and ostracism is even more interesting. It is possible that there are stronger gender differences for ostracism than inclusion.

**Limitations**
This study had some limitations. The first is that most of the measures were based on the participants’ perceptions or self-report. With items such as minority status (i.e., the percentage of women at their job), this makes it difficult to tell whether the perceptions are the same as the reality. This is also true with items such as organizational support since perceptions of organizational support are being measured rather than more objective indices. It is possible that organizations could be providing support, but the participant does not perceive it to be at a high level.

A second limitation also stems from the use of self-report data. As in all self-report survey data, there could be some common method variance due to the use of the same survey methodology used to gather both predictor and dependent variable data.

Another limitation is the methodology itself. In some cases, online data can offer challenges in terms of the quality of responses. Attention check items were included in the survey to ensure the quality of respondent data. Additionally, the study was looking for a moderation effect of gender, but research has shown that finding moderation effects of categorical variables is very difficult (Aguinis et al., 2005).

Finally, every participant completed the survey in the same order, there was no counterbalancing of measures. It is possible that this is what caused the unusually high reliabilities for some of the measures such as work mattering. It is a possibility that participants experienced survey fatigue towards the end of the survey and this could have led to participants answering questions in the same manner instead of more varied responses.
Potential Contributions

This study has some potential contributions. The first is to show how important support sources are to workers, especially with increasing inclusion. Furthermore, since this study differentiates between the different support sources, it was possible to tell which support source is most essential. Most previous research has combined support sources or only looked at one source of support. By looking at four sources of support this study fills gaps in the literature concerning the effects of workplace support sources. Additionally, the study investigated whether there were gender differences in the importance of support sources. Most previous research has not looked at gender differences with all of the support sources, so again this study contributes to the need for more information on that issue.

This study also helped to establish inclusion and ostracism as separate variables, not two ends of the same pole. This was especially shown through the lack of support for hypotheses concerning ostracism. This shows that there are different predictors of ostracism and inclusion. The study also showed that while ostracism and inclusion are moderately correlated with each other, they are not strongly correlated. This provides additional support that inclusion and ostracism are two separate constructs.

The study also showed a strong relationship between work mattering and peer support. The results suggest that there may be an overlap between peer support and the interpersonal mattering factor of work mattering. Future research may want to look further into this relationship to explore why they are so strongly linked.
Additionally, results from this study showed that peer support is the most important to workers. This can help organizations know where they should put their support resources to have the largest possible impact.

**Conclusion**

Inclusion and ostracism are important social issues that are also part of the everyday social world of employees, with physical and psychological consequences associated with both outcomes. This study shows that support sources and mattering are important for fostering feelings of inclusion and decreasing ostracism, especially the more personal forms such as peer support. In order to foster a psychologically healthy climate, organizations may wish to consider the importance of these dynamics within the workplace.
Appendix A

Demographics

What is your age? ___________

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Non-Binary
- Other
- Prefer Not to Answer

What is your race?
- Caucasian
- Black
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other
- Prefer not to answer
Appendix B

Employment Status

Please choose your current employment status:

- Full-time employment
- Part-time employment
- Student
- Unemployed
- Other

What industry do you work in?
Appendix C

Minority Status

What percentage of your peer co-workers are female?

- 0-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-100%

Please select the response that best describes the statement below:

I feel like a minority in this firm because of my gender.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Agree
- Strong agree
Appendix D

Perceived Coworker Support

(Ladd & Henry, 2000)

1. My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values.
2. Help is available from my coworkers when I have a problem.
3. My coworkers really care about my well-being.
4. My coworkers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
5. Even if I did the best job possible, my coworkers would fail to notice. (R)
6. My coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work.
7. My coworkers show very little concern for me. (R)
8. My coworkers care about my opinions.
9. My coworkers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work.

*(R) indicates an item that should be reverse scored
Appendix E

Mentor Support

(Allen & Eby 2003)

1. The mentoring relationship between my mentor and I was very effective.

2. I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship that my mentor and I developed.

3. I was effectively utilized as a protege by my mentor.

4. My mentor and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship.

5. Both my mentor and I benefited from the mentoring relationship.

* Bold indicated adaptation for the study.
Appendix F

Leader-Member Exchange

(Liden & Maslyn, 1998)

1. I like my supervisor very much as a person.
2. My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
3. My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with.
4. My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
5. My supervisor would come to my defense if I were “attacked” by others.
6. My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.
7. I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.
8. I am willing to apply extra effort, beyond those normally required to meet my supervisor’s work goals.
9. I do not mind working my hardest for my supervisor.
10. I am impressed with my supervisor’s knowledge of his/her job.
11. I respect my supervisor’s knowledge of and competence on the job.
12. I admire my supervisor’s professional skills.
Appendix G

Perceived Organizational Support

(Matthews et al., 2022)

1. I felt like my organization was very supportive of me.
Appendix H

Workplace Ostracism

(Ferris et al., 2008)

1. Others ignored you at work.
2. Others left the area when you entered.
3. Your greetings have gone unanswered at work.
4. You involuntarily sat alone in a crowded lunchroom at work.
5. Others avoided you at work.
6. You noticed others would not look at you at work.
7. Others at work shut you out of the conversation.
8. Others refused to talk to you at work.
9. Others at work treated you as if you weren’t there.
10. Others at work did not invite you or ask you if you wanted anything when they went out for a coffee break.
Appendix I

Perceived Group Inclusion

(Jansen et al., 2014).

My coworkers…..*

1. … gives me the feeling that I belong.
2. … gives me the feeling that I am part of this group.
3. … gives me the feeling that I fit in.
4. … treats me as an insider
5. … likes me
6. … appreciates me
7. … is pleased with me
8. … cares about me
9. … allows me to be authentic
10. … allows me to be who I am
11. … allows me to express my authentic self
12. … allows me to present myself the way I am
13. … encourages me to be authentic
14. … encourages me to be who I am
15. … encourages me to express my authentic self
16. … encourages me to present myself the way I am

* Changed from “this group” to “my coworkers”.
Appendix J

Work Mattering

(Jung & Heppner, 2017).

1. My coworkers/colleagues would be disappointed if they knew that I may leave my job.

2. I feel like I matter to my colleagues/coworkers.

3. My coworkers/colleagues value my ideas and suggestions.

4. My boss-supervisor would be disappointed if they knew that I may leave my job.

5. My coworkers/colleagues appreciate my support and help.
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