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Abstract
Four studies present the first broad investigation into identity threats experienced in everyday life. Capturing more than 17,000 instances of identity threat experienced by more than 1,500 participants, we demonstrate that a lack of felt belonging and exclusion are distinct aspects of identity threats. Experiences of reduced belonging most strongly relate to feelings of inauthenticity, whereas experiences of exclusion most strongly relate to negative affect (sadness and anger). Furthermore, experiences with identity threats were related to loneliness, lower life satisfaction, and worse self-reported physical health (with reduced belonging and exclusion predicting distinct measures of well-being), and both aspects predict lower workplace satisfaction, identification and commitment when experienced in professional settings. By distinguishing feelings of reduced belonging from exclusion, we provide unique insights into affective and cognitive outcomes of identity threats experienced in everyday life across diverse marginalized identities.
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A large body of work demonstrates that individuals with marginalized identities can experience a host of negative outcomes, ranging from diminished performance (e.g., African Americans in academic environments), reduced commitment to the domain (e.g., women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics [STEM] positions), and reduced health and well-being (e.g., Destin, 2018; Dovidio et al., 2008; Major, 2003; Major et al., 2013; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008; Page-Gould et al., 2008). The pathway from holding a marginalized identity to these harmful outcomes is complex and multifaceted, and studies often focus on one particular group at a time (e.g., a particular racial minority, women in the workplace, sexual orientation, religion, country of birth, age, etc.). In the current work, we take a new approach to this important question by examining identity threats experienced in everyday life across diverse marginalized identities.

We operationalize identity threats as situations that make salient a conflict between one’s current context and a marginalized identity one has (see Branscombe et al., 1999; Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014; Steele et al., 2002). Drawing upon literatures on belongingness, rejection sensitivity, authenticity, and social identification and fit, we propose a model outlining two psychological experiences that likely follow from such identity threats. Specifically, we propose that identity threats will be related to feelings of (1) exclusion and (2) a lack of belonging and that these two experiences, in turn, are related to distinct affective and cognitive outcomes.

Feelings of Belonging and Inclusion
Whereas prior intergroup research has often treated feelings of exclusion as the inverse of feelings of belonging, we propose the two are separable constructs that operate in tandem. Indeed, prior work on interpersonal relationships suggests an important distinction. Feelings of rejection and exclusion are tied to whether one feels that another person values a relationship with oneself (Leary, 2010). If one perceives a slight of some kind, whether being excluded from a conversation, ignored, disrespected, or simply not considered, a feeling of rejection can follow (Leary, 2001). In contrast, one does not need to perceive any negative behavior from others to feel that they do not belong. Rather, a felt lack of belonging can follow from broader environmental cues that indicate one’s identity is not compatible with, or appropriate in, a given context (Walton & Cohen, 2007).

We propose that to the extent an identity threat evokes the feeling that one does not belong, people will feel less able to be their authentic selves. This prediction has been made by a recent theory of authenticity, which suggests that feelings of fit
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Across four studies, we measure responses to more specific situations and identities? To examine this question, we introduce a new instrument, the Identity Threats Questionnaire. Across four studies, we measure responses to more than 17,000 instances of identity threat experienced by more than 1,500 participants across a wide and diverse set of marginalized identities, in everyday life, and also in the workplace.

As we will show, across these 30 categories of identity threat situations, our diverse sample of participants experience an average of 11 of these situations in a week. Given that our participants commonly experience multiple identity threats, we analyze our data with multilevel modeling. Specifically, we implement cross-classified models as each identity threat is not bound to one specific identity (compared to classic multilevel examples such as how a student is only in one school and hence nested within it).

Accordingly, we treat identity threat and participant as cross-classified random factors and hence estimate the strength of the relationships between variables of interest that are not attributable to any participant nor identity threat. An advantage of this approach is that our model estimates therefore generalize across the large diversity of identities and identity threats we capture, and these estimates should thereby also generalize to unsampled identities and identity threats (see Judd et al., 2012). This approach moves beyond the limitations of studying only a single marginalized identity (e.g., race, gender, socioeconomic status [SES], sexual orientation) or studying a single context (e.g., academics, STEM, organizational culture).

**Study 1**

Study 1 examined participants’ experiences with social interactions and situations that recently threatened their identities. We first ran a large-scale study with 1,000 participants across a diverse spectrum of marginalized identities. These participants had experienced, in total, more than 10,000 recent identity threats. We then conducted three preregistered replications (the first an exact replication, the second and third, extensions and replications).

**Method**

**Participant Diversity**

Participants (455 men, 553 women, 8 other; $M_{age} = 34.91, SD = 11.31, 95$% CI = [33.32, 36.51], range = 18–73) were recruited from Mechanical Turk (four individuals who did not take the study entered a code on Mechanical Turk, thus yielding 996 participants who actually took the study). The advertisement read, “Have you ever felt like you don’t belong because of your social group? (e.g., race, gender, SES, sexual orientation, religion, and culture). If so, we would like to hear about your experience to help people cope with these kinds of challenges.”

As can be seen in Figure 1, this led to a diverse set of participants recruited. More than 75% of our participants were of a clear stigmatized identity, including women (such as in male-dominated fields), multiple racial groups, diverse sexual orientations, religions, regions, countries of birth, education, primary language spoken, and so on. Even among the 24%...
Figure 1. A visualization of the broad diversity of Study 1 participants (N = 996). Please see online version for color.
of our sample who were straight White males, participants reported a diverse set of identities, for example, being an immigrant, Jewish, non-native English speaker as well identities listed by participants in the “other” category (e.g., having a disability, being overweight, issues of health and mental health, being an ex-convict). In sum, our recruitment ad attracted diverse participants.

**Identity Threats Questionnaire**

Participants were next exposed to 30 identity threat situations, which form the basis of the Identity Threats Questionnaire (see Table 1 and Figure 2). The set of 30 situations was developed through an iterative process. First, multiple members of a diverse research lab were asked to generate a list of experiences, wherein one’s minority membership was made salient and/or delegitimized. An initial longer set of categories was refined to arrive at a nonoverlapping list of 30 situations that would fit a range of social identities. These range from more minorly threatening (e.g., a social situation where people are talking about their summer travel plans and one cannot afford to travel) to more major threats (someone assuming the target owes their success to affirmative action). Participants indicated whether they had that experience in the past week.

Per each identity threat participants reported experiencing in the past week, we measured participants’ feelings of a lack of
belonging (“I felt like I didn’t belong,” “I felt like I didn’t fit in,” “I felt like I really ‘stuck out’”), inauthenticity (“I felt like I could NOT be the ‘real me,’” “I felt like I was NOT being authentic,” “I felt like I was NOT able to be completely myself”), exclusion (“Others did things to reject me,” “Others did things to ignore me,” “Others did things to exclude me”), and negative affect, in the form of anger (“I felt angry,” “I felt frustrated,””) and sadness (“I felt sad,” “I felt hurt”; all from 1 [not at all] to 7 [very much]).

Factor analyses confirmed our predicted factors (see Supplemental Materials [SOM]), indicating that each should be treated separately in our analyses, rather than combined. For instance, while anger and sadness both capture negative affect, anger is high in motivational intensity and approach-oriented, whereas sadness is low in motivational intensity and avoidance-oriented (Adams & Kleck, 2005; Gable & Harmon-Jones, 2010). Thus, by entering anger and sadness into models simultaneously, we identify the effects of each that exist beyond any general tendency toward negative affect. By the same token, in all analyses, we also enter both a lack of belonging and exclusion simultaneously. In so doing, we identify the effects of each that exist beyond any general tendency toward feeling isolated. For these reasons, each analysis we conducted simultaneously entered all variables so as to parse out the variance shared between them.
Per each recent identity threat, participants were asked to indicate which identity was threatened (race, gender, culture/region, language, SES, sexual orientation, religion, political orientation, other). In Figure 2, we plot the social identities that felt threatened by each situation (across 40% of our observations, participants felt threatened on a single identity, and 60% represent perceiving a threat on multiple identities).

At the end of the study, participants completed an honesty check asking whether their responses were honest (we signaled understanding of why one might not provide truthful answers, and compensation was promised no matter their answer). Twenty-nine participants indicated that they fabricated their responses, and thus their data were excluded (3% of the data).

Results

Threatened Identities and Identity Threats

Across the 30 categories of identity threat situations, the remaining 967 participants in the past week had experienced 10,956 identity threats in total (with only 1% of participants not recently having experienced any of the identity threat situations). Participants on average had experienced 11.38 identity threats (from the set of 30) in the past week (SD = 7.83, 95% CI = [10.28, 12.48]).

Analysis Plan

Given multiple observations per participant, we analyzed the data via multilevel modeling, using the R package lme4. We calculated p values using the R package lmerTest, which uses a Satterthwaite approximation test to approximate the F distribution to calculate degrees of freedom (which are thus non-whole numbers differing by predictor; Kuznetsova, et al., 2013). We included identity threat situation as a random factor (along with participant) in these cross-classified multilevel models—as is the case in the studies that follow. Accordingly, we estimate our effects of interest that are not attributable to any identity threat situation (or participant). Thus, our effects should generalize to other types of identity threats unsampled in these studies (see Judd, et al., 2012).

Predicting Feelings of Inauthenticity

As predicted, above and beyond negative affect, a lack of felt belonging most strongly predicted feelings of inauthenticity (i.e., significantly more than did feeling excluded as indicated by nonoverlapping confidence intervals; Table 2).

Predicting Negative Affect

Aside from covariance between anger and sadness (see italics, Table 2), feelings of exclusion most strongly predicted sadness and anger (i.e., significantly more than did a lack of felt belonging as indicated by nonoverlapping confidence intervals; Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Study 1 Results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Per each analysis, all variables are entered simultaneously. Covariance between negative affective states is given in italics, and of remaining variables, strongest predictor (as indicated by nonoverlapping 95% CIs) is given in bold.

Studies 2 and 3

Study 1 found that when a situation threatens one’s identity, feeling a lack of belonging strongly predicted feeling inauthentic (i.e., not being able to express one’s true self), whereas resulting feelings of exclusion strongly predicted feelings of sadness and anger. To test the robustness of these results, Study 2 replicated Study 1’s design, as did Study 3, which also measured identity centrality (Sellers et al., 1997).

Identity centrality has been shown to positively correlate with psychological distress in the face of discrimination (Sellers & Shelton, 2003), and thus, greater identity centrality may predict a lack of felt belonging and exclusion experienced in response to perceived identity threats.

Method

Study 2 was identical to Study 1, as was Study 3, with the exception of the latter also measuring identity centrality. In Study 3, after selecting which of their identities had been previously marginalized and indicating the specific identity in a free-response box, participants also answered per each “In general, this identity is an important part of my self-image” for each selected identity (1 [not at all] to 7 [very much]). Subsequently, they completed the Identity Threats Questionnaire, and the follow-up measures per each recently experience identity threat (from the past week).

Per each study, we recruited 200 participants with the same ad from Study 1 (Study 2: N = 82 men, 116 women, 2 other; Mage = 37.08, SD = 11.10, 95% CI = [35.53, 38.62], range = 18–71; Study 3: N = 83 men, 114 women, 3 other; Mage = 37.51, SD = 13.41, 95% CI = [35.64, 39.38], range = 18–96).

Study 1 demonstrated that on average our participants recently experienced approximately 11 identity threat situations (of the 30). Thus, recruiting 200 participants yields a
sample size of over 2,000 observations of identity threats and thus highly powerful analyses. We thus recruit for this sample size for the remainder of the studies (using the same sample size as prior studies with this kind of design; see Slepian et al., 2017; Slepian & Moulton-Tetlock, 2019).

All elements of both studies were preregistered, including methods, sample size, analysis plan, and rules for data exclusions (Study 2: osf.io/b2ejw/; Study 3: osf.io/tucdf). Five Study 2 and six Study 3 participants indicated that they fabricated their responses, and thus their data were excluded.

Results

Study 2 participants recently experienced 2,191 identity threats ($M = 11.24, SD = 7.06, 95\% CI = [10.24, 12.23]$). Study 3 participants recently experienced 2,118 identity threats ($M = 10.92, SD = 7.11, 95\% CI = [9.91, 11.92]$).

As in Study 1, we entered all variables simultaneously to isolate unique and independent relationships. Again aside from the other variables, (1) a lack of felt belonging more strongly predicted feelings of inauthenticity (than did exclusion) and (2) feelings of exclusion more strongly predicted negative affect (than did a lack of belonging); see Tables 3 and 4. In Study 2, the notably strong link between feelings of exclusion and negative affect seemed specific to sadness, whereas in Studies 1 and 3, feelings of exclusion were strongly associated with both sadness and anger.

Study 3 also measured identity centrality, which did not moderate the relationship between a lack of felt belonging nor exclusion on our dependent measures (see SOM). We consequently, as specified by our preregistered analysis plan, then examined identity centrality as an antecedent to feelings of a lack of belonging and exclusion.

Identity centrality predicted a lack of felt belonging, $b = 0.19$, $95\% CI = [0.13, 0.25]$, $SE = 0.03$, $t(1,803.18) = 6.68$, $p < .00001$, as well as feelings of exclusion, $b = 0.18$, $95\% CI = [0.12, 0.23]$, $SE = 0.03$, $t(1,848.59) = 6.59$, $p < .00001$. Hence, the more central the identity that was threatened by the experience, the more individuals felt both excluded and that they did not belong.

Study 4

In Studies 1–3, we found that that when a social situation threatened one’s identity, a lack of felt belonging strongly predicted feeling unable to be one’s true self, whereas resulting feelings of being excluded strongly predicted negative affect (sadness in Study 2 and sadness and anger in Studies 1 and 3). To clarify the different patterns of negative affect across the two studies, we sought to examine these relationships again in Study 4.

In Study 4, we also sought to examine a new context and new outcome. Unlike at home or when with friends, when people are in the workplace, those with marginalized identities may be especially likely to feel that they do not belong. This is highly problematic given that feelings of belonging foster increased commitment to the workplace (Cole & Bruch, 2006; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Wiener, 1982). Study 4 thus examined whether these results would hold for identity threats faced in the workplace.

We again examined whether a lack of felt belonging would be particularly linked to feeling that one cannot be oneself, whereas feelings of exclusion would be particularly linked to negative affect. Additionally, we also examined whether these variables predicted reduced commitment to one’s workplace.
**Method**

The procedure was identical to Study 3 (79 men, 120 women, 1 other; \(M_{\text{age}} = 37.46, \ sigma = 11.05, 95\% \ CI = [35.92, 39.00], \) range = 19–66), with the exception that we now asked participants about identity threats recently experienced specifically at work and also measured workplace commitment (see Table 5). All elements of this study were preregistered, including methods, sample size, analysis plan, and rules for data exclusions (osf.io/63qmf). Five participants indicated that they fabricated their responses, and thus their data were excluded. An additional 15 participants indicated that they were not currently employed and were thus also excluded.

**Results**

Across the 30 categories of identity threat situations, our participants in the past week had experienced 2,107 identity threats at work, in total. Participants on average had experienced 11.77 identity threats in the past week (\(\sigma = 7.31, 95\% \ CI = [10.69, 12.85]\)).

**Predicting Feelings of Inauthenticity**

We conducted the same analyses as in the prior studies, entering each measured experience as simultaneous predictors of our outcome variables. Again, a lack of felt belonging most strongly predicted feelings of inauthenticity (as indicated by nonoverlapping confidence intervals; Table 6).

**Predicting Negative Affect**

As in Studies 1 and 3, aside from covariance between anger and sadness (see italics, Table 6), feelings of exclusion most strongly predicted sadness and anger (i.e., significantly more than did feeling a lack of belonging as indicated by nonoverlapping confidence intervals; Table 6).

---

### Table 5. Changes to Procedure to Capture Workplace Context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies 1–3</th>
<th>Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advertisement</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever felt like you don't belong because of your social group? (e.g., race, gender, SES, sexual orientation, religion, culture, etc.). If so, we would like to hear about your experience to help people cope with these kinds of challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Threats Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever felt like you don't belong AT WORK because of your social group? (e.g., race, gender, SES, sexual orientation, religion, culture, etc.). If so, we would like to hear about your experience to help people cope with these kinds of challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional measurement</strong></td>
<td>Have you been in a situation where...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional descriptive measures (Study 4)</strong></td>
<td>Have you been in a situation AT WORK where...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 6. Study 4 Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
<th>(df)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inauthenticity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[0.36, 0.44]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2,068.68</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>[0.12, 0.22]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2,072.89</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2,094.09</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.04, 0.14]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2,089.29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sadness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>[0.11, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2,083.13</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>[0.18, 0.27]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1,898.33</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.10]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2,074.12</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>[0.44, 0.52]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2,055.70</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Per each analysis, all variables are entered simultaneously. Covariance between negative affective states is given in italics, and of remaining variables, strongest predictor (as indicated by nonoverlapping 95\% CIs) is given in bold.

---

*Study 4 participants came from diverse industries: consumer goods (25), finance (22), service (20), education (18), technology (16), medical (15), manufacturing (15), arts (8), government (7), transportation (6), nonprofit (5), recreation (5), construction (4), corporate (4), media (4), legal (3), and agriculture (2).*
Identity Centrality

Given the lack of a moderation by identity centrality in Study 2, we did not predict it to moderate effects on inauthenticity or negative affect (SOM). We thus again examined identity centrality as a predictor of feeling a lack of belonging and exclusion. Indeed, identity centrality predicted a lack of felt belonging, $b = 0.10$, 95% CI $= [0.03, 0.17]$, $SE = 0.03$, $t(1,490.56) = 2.92$, $p = .004$, as well as feelings of exclusion, $b = 0.12$, 95% CI $= [0.06, 0.18]$, $SE = 0.03$, $t(1,839.85) = 3.75$, $p < .001$.

Workplace Commitment

We next examined all variables as simultaneous predictors of workplace commitment. Indeed, as can be seen in Table 7, each independently predicted lower workplace commitment.

In sum, it seems that feeling a lack of belonging/inauthenticity and exclusion/negative affect from identity threats faced in professional settings each relate to lower commitment to the workplace.

Studies 2–4: Well-Being

For ease of presentation, we finally report here that in each of these preregistered studies, we also collected three indicators of well-being: loneliness, life satisfaction, and global physical health. Given that the number of participants (and hence the number of observations for these person-level outcome measures) is far smaller than the number of identity threats experienced, our preregistered analysis plan was to analyze a pooled data set on these measures (yielding ~600 observations across the three studies, per well-being measure) to achieve statistical power that approaches the other analyses from these same studies (~2,000 observations per each analysis).

We measured loneliness with the 3-item Loneliness Scale (which performs as well as the longer UCLA Loneliness Scale; see Hughes et al., 2004; example item, “How often do you feel isolated from others?” from 1 [hardly ever] to 7 [often]). Participants also completed the Satisfaction With Life Scale (e.g., “In most ways my life is close to my ideal,” from 1 [not at all] to 7 [very much]; Diener et al., 1985) as well as the often used General Health subscale from the RAND 36-Item Health Survey (Hays et al., 1993; from 0 to 100, e.g., “I seem to get sick a little easier than other people” [rev], z-scored for ease of interpretation; see Slepian et al., 2017; Slepian & Moulton-Tetlock, 2019).

First, to fully present this pooled data from Studies 2 to 4, we conduct the prior analyses on the pooled data set. These pooled analyses replicate the prior effects: a lack of felt belonging more strongly predicting feelings of inauthenticity and exclusion more strongly predicting anger and sadness (Table 8).

Figures 3 and 4 present the demographics of the pooled Study 2–4 participants as well as how these varied by identity threat situations experienced.

As can be seen in Table 9, from an experienced identity threat, (1) sadness and anger were each associated with lower self-reported physical health and higher loneliness, (2) feelings of exclusion and inauthenticity were associated with higher loneliness, and (3) sadness was also associated with lower life satisfaction.

Loneliness

Note that a lack of felt belonging did not have an independent direct relationship with loneliness. Thus, feeling that one does not belong during an identity threat is not the same as feeling lonely in general (see also Slepian, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2019). However, there was a relationship between feelings of inauthenticity and loneliness, suggesting an indirect effect of reduced belonging on loneliness via inauthenticity. Given that there exists no current standard practice on how to bootstrap cross-classified multilevel models for indirect effect tests, we turn to a recently introduced formula for calculating an indirect effect that circumvents this issue, the $Z_{Mediation}$ statistic (Iacobucci, 2012). The logic of the standard indirect effect test is maintained in this method. By taking the product of the a and b coefficients divided by their standard errors, and dividing by the pooled standard error, this approach produces a $Z_{Mediation}$ statistic, a standardized representation of the strength of the
Figure 3. A visualization of the broad diversity of Studies 2–4 participants. Please see online version for color.
indirect effect, whereby its significance can be tested via a z-test.

Indeed, as can be seen in Table 10, feeling a lack of belonging predicted loneliness through feelings of inauthenticity (independent of feelings of exclusion, anger, and sadness). In contrast, swapping the proposed IV and mediator did not yield a significant indirect effect (Table 10).

**Self-Reported Physical Health**

Negative affective experiences were the only variables that had independent relationships with self-reported physical health (Table 9). Exclusion was the strongest predictor of negative affect, aside from covariance between anger and sadness (Table 8). This pattern of results suggests an indirect effect of exclusion on lower global physical health through anger and sadness.

Indeed, as can be seen in Table 10, feeling excluded from an identity threat predicted lower global physical health through anger and through sadness (independent of feelings of a lack of belonging, inauthenticity, and the other type of negative affect). In contrast to these significant indirect effects predicting self-reported physical health, swapping the proposed IV and mediator did not yield significant indirect effects (Table 10).

**Life Satisfaction**

Only sadness from an identity threat had an independent direct relationship with life satisfaction (Table 9). Given the strong

---

**Figure 4.** Per each recent identity threat (N = 6,416) faced in the past week by Studies 2–4 participants, frequencies of the social identity that was threatened, and the category of the identity threat situation. Please see online version for color.
Table 9. Predicting Well-Being Measures (Studies 2–4 Pooled Data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>[.06, .16]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>586.52</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>[.02, .09]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>592.41</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>[.05, .13]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>594.30</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[.03, .06]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>587.58</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>[.07, .17]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>586.82</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>[-.16, -.02]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>533.65</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>[-.17, -.04]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>528.00</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>[-.19, -.05]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>511.11</td>
<td>-3.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[.05, .10]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>532.54</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>[-.09, -.08]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>537.92</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>[-.08, -.02]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>528.44</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>[-.02, -.06]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>520.22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>[-.10, -.01]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>521.42</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>[-.07, -.03]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>525.52</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[-.01, -.09]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>531.94</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Indirect Effect Tests (Studies 2–4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
<td>Lack of belonging</td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-3.28</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-0.999</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>-0.995</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relationship between feeling excluded and sadness (Table 8), we tested the indirect effect of exclusion on life satisfaction via sadness (Table 10).

Indeed, feeling excluded from an identity threat predicted lower life satisfaction through sadness (independent of feelings of a lack of belonging, inauthenticity, and anger). As with the other analyses, swapping the proposed IV with the mediator did not yield an indirect effect (Table 10).

While the present results are correlational and therefore preclude causal claims, these findings on well-being outcomes (which fit models only where a lack of belonging and exclusion are IVs, and inauthenticity and anger/sadness are mediators, and not the reverse) are consistent with our broader conceptualization that feeling a lack of belonging promotes feelings of inauthenticity (as also predicted by Schmader & Sedikides, 2018) and that feeling excluded promotes negative affect (also consistent with prior experiments; see Leary, 2001, 2010).

Discussion

Several different research traditions have focused on feelings of belonging (e.g., the literatures on belongingness, role congruity, identity compatibility; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lee & Robbins, 1995; Sani et al., 2008), whereas a separate set of research traditions have examined feelings of inclusion/exclusion (e.g., ostracism, social exclusion, relational value, rejection sensitivity; Byrne, 2005; Downey & Feldman, 1995; Leary, 2015; Williams, 2007). Moreover, within a single empirical setting, different research traditions have often focused on a single distinct group and context (e.g., African Americans and education, women in STEM, bias against those who have less education, low SES, those who speak a different language, are elderly, are nonheterosexual, are overweight, have a mental illness). In the current work, we sought to bridge these separate research traditions by examining in the same empirical setting a highly diverse set of marginalized identities (i.e., all those in the preceding parenthetical and more; see Figures 1–4) while also simultaneously examining and distinguishing feeling a lack of belonging and feeling excluded.

This work clarifies that belonging and inclusion are distinct and separable constructs. A lack of felt belonging was most strongly related to feeling unable to be one’s true self (i.e., feeling inauthentic), whereas feelings of exclusion were most strongly related to negative affect (i.e., sadness and anger). In turn, feelings of inauthenticity and negative affect were more proximally associated with well-being than a lack of belonging and exclusion.

These findings were consistent with an indirect effect model, whereby a lack of belonging was linked to lower well-being through feeling unable to be one’s true self, and exclusion was linked to lower well-being through negative affect. That we did not find indirect effects on well-being when swapping our proposed IV and mediator points to a process model: (1) feeling unable to be one’s true self most strongly follows from a lack of felt belonging and (2) negative affect most strongly follows from exclusion, and both pathways, in turn, independently relate to an aspect of well-being. Importantly, the present results are correlational, and thus, no causal claims can be made. Future work could measure affect and state authenticity in paradigms that manipulate experiences of belonging and inclusion.

This research extends prominent theoretical perspectives that speak to the possible experiences tied to identity threats. For one, our results are consistent with the State Authenticity as Fit to the Environment model (Schmader & Sedikides, 2018). This model suggests that when an environment leads someone to feel that they do not fit in, the individual will experience reduced feelings of authenticity. In such situations, it has been theorized that subsequent feelings of self-consciousness, self-monitoring, and self-presentation may lead one to feel they are unable to be their true self. The present findings are consistent with this model. Similarly, our results are consistent with work on discrimination, whereby the degree to which one’s stigmatized identity is tied to one’s self-concept (i.e., identity
centrality) predicts increased experiences of discrimination and the negative psychological ramifications thereof (Sellers & Shelton, 2003). As a whole, our findings bring these literatures into dialogue by clarifying that feeling unable to be one’s true self is central to the marginalization experienced by those holding stigmatized identities.

As a benefit of our analytical methods, we estimate relationships between our variables of interest as they generalize across diverse identities and identity threats. Our findings cannot be attributed to any particular identity threat situation and hence must reflect more general processes that transcend the different identity threats. For instance, across diverse identities and circumstances, feeling excluded might correspond with perceiving others as having some personal bias against oneself, or other interpersonal dynamics (e.g., Chow et al., 2008; Henson et al., 2013; Richman & Leary, 2009), which result in negative affect. In contrast, across diverse identities and circumstances, feeling a lack of belonging might correspond with judging an environment as not being welcoming, explaining the feeling of not being able to be one’s authentic self in that environment (e.g., Walton & Cohen, 2007).

Finally, we encourage future implementation of the new Identity Threats Questionnaire introduced here. Our results are not specific to any social group or kind of identity threat. Rather, within the same empirical setting, our results span diverse marginalized identities and threats to those identities (see Figures 1 and 2 and 1–4). Across our 30 categories of identity threat situations, we found that participants with a marginalized identity, on average, had experienced 11 of these identity threats in the past week. Thus, an advantage of the Identity Threats Questionnaire is that it enables collecting large data sets from underrepresented groups and allows for testing specific theoretical hypotheses across a breadth of experience types.

While this article sought to estimate relationships that generalize across the diversity of marginalized identities that people can hold, future work could make more focused comparisons. For example, if a study aimed to compare gender discrimination to race discrimination, a researcher could specifically recruit individuals with experiences of gender identity threat or race identity threat. By examining responses to common identity threats that can be experienced across different social groups, the methods that we introduce might make such comparisons more tractable as well as examinations of intersectionality. Future research could also seek to experimentally reframe identity threats that have been experienced in order to identify means of mitigating the identified harms. Lastly, future work could more closely examine the role of identity centrality, in particular when it makes an identity threat more harmful, and when it provides a buffer.

In the current work, we treated the identity threat faced by participants as a random factor and also recruited a highly diverse set of participants with a broad array of marginalized identities. Our results thus not only generalize across the wide diversity of our participants but also should generalize to other unsampled identity threats and contexts (see Judd et al., 2012). Through these novel sampling techniques, we hope future work can gain better insight into downstream consequences of having a marginalized identity and how to intervene.
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Notes
1. Note that these specific indirect effects were not preregistered. Rather, we preregistered that we would enter all variables simultaneously when examining well-being outcomes. From this analysis, it was the dissociation that emerged (between our proposed IVs and mediators) on these well-being outcomes that suggested we conduct the specific indirect effect tests reported.
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