THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Stigma beyond levels

Citation for published version:

Zhang, R, Wang, MS, Toubiana, M & Greenwood, R 2021, 'Stigma beyond levels: Advancing research on stigmatization', *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 88-222.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2019.0031>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.5465/annals.2019.0031](https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2019.0031)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Academy of Management Annals

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**STIGMA BEYOND LEVELS: ADVANCING RESEARCH ON
STIGMATIZATION**

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Annals</i>
Manuscript ID	ANNALS-2019-0031.R3
Document Type:	Article
Keywords:	SOCIAL NORMS, INSTITUTIONAL THEORY, IDENTITY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

STIGMA BEYOND LEVELS: ADVANCING RESEARCH ON STIGMATIZATION¹

Rongrong Zhang
University of Alberta
rz5@ualberta.ca

Milo Shaoqing Wang
University of Alberta
swang7@ualberta.ca

Madeline Toubiana
University of Alberta
toubiana@ualberta.ca

Royston Greenwood
University of Alberta
University of Edinburgh
rgreenwo@ualberta.ca

ABSTRACT

Stigma has become an increasingly significant challenge for society. Recognition of this problem is indicated by the growing attention to it within the management literature which has provided illuminating insights. However, stigma has primarily been examined at a single level of analysis: individual, occupational, organizational, or industry. Yet, cultural understandings of what is discreditable or taboo do not come from the individual, occupation, organization, or industry that is stigmatized; on the contrary, they come from particular sources that transcend levels. As such, we propose that current silos within the literature may not only be preventing engagement with insights from different levels of analysis, but, importantly, may be preventing us from truly understanding stigmatization as a social process. To address this issue, we review the stigma literature and then present an across level integrative framework of the sources, characteristics, and management strategies. Our framework provides a common language that integrates insights across these levels and enables a shift in attention from how actors respond to stigma to broader processes of stigmatization.

Keywords: Stigma, Stigmatization, Dirty work, Taboo, Stigma Management

¹ We thank our editors Elizabeth Morrison and Carrie Leana for their support and developmental feedback throughout the review process. We would also like to thank Trish Ruebottom for her invaluable contributions to the paper, and David Deephouse and other faculty at the University of Alberta for their constant encouragement and enthusiasm for the paper.

INTRODUCTION

Stigma as a topic has been paid growing attention within the management literature. Building directly upon Goffman's (1963) classic work, social psychology and organizational behavior scholars have studied the stigma facing *individuals*, often examining the consequences and implications of personal stigma in the workplace (Clair, Beatty, & Maclean, 2005; Jones & King, 2014; Ragins, 2008; Stone, Stone, & Dipboye, 1992). In a related stream of literature, scholars have investigated stigma at the *occupational* level, and explored how those within stigmatized occupations cope by making their "dirty" work meaningful and attempt to construct positive work identities (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Bolton, 2005; Dick, 2005; Simpson, Slutskaia, Lewis, & Höpfl, 2012). Scholars have also sought to examine how *organizations* manage the risk or occurrence of stigma (Devers, Dewett, Mishina, & Belsito, 2009; Helms & Patterson, 2014; Hudson, 2008; Sutton & Callahan, 1987), and more recently, the coping strategies of organizations in *industries* characterized by stigma (Hsu & Grodal, 2020; Piazza & Perretti, 2015; Slade Shantz, Fischer, Liu, & Lévesque, 2019; Vergne, 2012).

Independently, these streams of stigma research have illuminated the impacts of stigma and how it can be managed at particular levels (individual, occupational, organizational, and industry). Such work is essential, because stigmatization² has become an increasingly problematic issue facing society. Its consequences range from murder and suicide to economic and social isolation (Lamont, 2018; Loyd & Bonds, 2018; Mueller & Abrutyn, 2016; Nature, 2020). However, our review reveals limited engagement between research conducted at different levels, resulting in conceptual redundancy and even confusion. Importantly, it has led to a missed opportunity to synthesize insights across levels to yield a more holistic consideration of stigmatization as a social

² While stigma "is the mark, the condition or status that is subject to devaluation, stigmatization is the social process by which the mark affects the lives of all those touched by it" (Pescosolido & Martin, 2015: 91).

process. We suggest that the social process of stigmatization involves (a) emergence, (b) potential transfer, (c) maintenance, and/or (d) removal, and that this takes place horizontally within levels and vertically across and between levels. We propose that more fully understanding stigmatization as a social process requires an integrative research agenda.

The purpose of this *Annals* article, thus, is two-fold. Our first goal is to put forward a common language that integrates insights across levels. To do so, we review the existing literature (Section I) and propose a framework of the (a) sources, (b) characteristics, and (c) management strategies for coping with stigma that apply to all levels (Section II). This framework enables us to meet our second goal: namely, setting a research agenda that moves the focus from the happenings at each level to the birds-eye view of stigmatization applicable at multiple levels. We outline this agenda for research in Section III.

I. STIGMA RESEARCH AT FOUR DIFFERENT LEVELS

Goffman’s (1963) groundbreaking analysis of stigma is often viewed as the major starting point for stigma research, and, as such, is the starting point for our literature review. We began by searching the *Web of Science* for articles that have published since 1963 in the top journals in management, sociology, and psychology with “stigma*” or “dirty work” in their titles, abstracts, keywords, or automated indexed keywords. We also consulted existing reviews to ensure that we did not omit important work (Jones & King, 2014; Pollock, Lashley, Rindova, & Han, 2019; Summers, Howe, McElroy, Ronald, Pahng, & Cortes-Mejia, 2018). Thus, our coverage is much broader than that of previous reviews that focused on one specific level. Table 1 summarizes the journals selected and the number of articles collected from each one.

Insert Table 1 about Here

We classified articles according to their primary levels of analysis. These efforts resulted in

a total of 239 articles: 138 at the individual level, 52 at the occupational level; 25 at the organizational level; and 24 at the industry/category level. The distribution of these articles over time is shown in Figure 1. We conducted an in-depth review of each paper and our overview of these papers is available as a supplementary document. In reviewing the literature, we discovered that researchers classified stigma in many different ways and highlighted a variety of management strategies, and that these classifications and strategies overlapped with each other across levels of analysis.³

Insert Figure 1 about Here

Below, we offer a brief summary of the stigma literature, categorized by level of analysis: individual, occupational, organizational, and industry. This type of multi-level overview is important because, as mentioned above, the siloed nature of the literature has unintentionally resulted in conceptual redundancy and some confusion. By reviewing studies based on the level of analysis, we can systematically present how scholars have approached stigma and clarify the conceptual language deployed across levels, thereby creating an integrative framework that connects insights from each level of analysis.

Individual level

As the earliest and the most dominant stream within the field (see Figure 1), studies at the individual level largely build upon Goffman's (1963) original typology of stigma as a discrediting

³ To confirm whether the literature was as siloed as it appeared in our reading, we cross-checked references to identify which studies cite each other. We selected a sample of all articles published between 2017 and 2019, and, following the approach of Haveman and Gualtieri (2017), checked the references cited therein. We discovered that the 49 articles published between 2017 and 2019 disproportionately cited studies at the same level. Individual-level studies are three times more likely to cite other individual-level studies than those at the occupational or organizational levels; and organizational-level studies are six times more likely to cite studies at the same level. The only exceptions are studies at the organizational and industry levels, which equally cite each other—which makes sense, given that organizations and industries are highly related and both employ a macro lens. Furthermore, as Figure 1 shows, much of the early work on stigma focused on individuals. Although an individual lens still dominates the field, more recently, scholars have begun to focus on occupations, organizations, and industries in an increasing number of studies.

attribute or “mark” that can be bodily, character-based, and/or tribal.⁴ A large portion of this research is focused on illuminating the negative consequences of having a mark and being stigmatized. For example, studies show that physical stigma disrupts social interactions (Kleck, 1968, 1969), such that job applicants with scars or port-wine stains on their faces received lower ratings because the interviewees’ attention was distracted by the facial stigma (Madera & Hebl, 2012; McElroy, Summers, & Moore, 2014). Bearing a character-based stigma, such as having a criminal record or being involved in practices that violate social norms, also was found to decrease future employment opportunities and income (Ali, Lyons, & Ryan, 2017; Harding, Morenoff, Nguyen, & Bushway, 2018; Konrad & Yang, 2012), or even reduce the likelihood of receiving prompt service in a public emergency room (Lara-Millán, 2014). Being a member of a stigmatized racial group (e.g., African Americans), negatively impacts morale, performance appraisals, and salaries (Hernandez, Avery, Tonidandel, Hebl, Smith, & McKay, 2016; Heslin, Bell, & Fletcher, 2012; Perrigino, Dunford, & Wilson, 2018).

In the above studies, stigma is seen as a “thing” that you do or do not have; thus, a secondary focus in the literature has been on how actors manage or cope with being stigmatized. The majority of studies build on Jones and colleagues’ (1984) notion of whether or not a stigma is concealable. A concealable stigma provides the bearer with opportunities to hide (Clair et al., 2005; Ragins, 2008) or disclose the stigma only in the “right” place at the “right” time (Follmer, Sabat, & Siuta, 2020; Jones & King, 2014). Researchers have sought to predict or better understand when actors with concealable stigmas might disclose, highlighting factors such as organizational support, professional norms, and legal protections (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Clair et al., 2005; Jones &

⁴ Several review and conceptual articles summarize this body of work (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Jones et al., 1984; Jones & King, 2014; Kurzban & Leary, 2001; Link & Phelan, 2001; Major & O’Brien, 2005; Stone et al., 1992; Pescosolido & Martin, 2015; Summers et al., 2018).

King, 2014; Ragins, 2008).

Although a large portion of the literature is focused on disclosure, other studies have examined more general coping responses. For example, individuals might disengage from stigmatized others to contain contamination (Lynch & Rodell, 2018; Jiang, Cannella, Xia, & Semadeni, 2017). Alternatively, people who belong to a stigmatized group might protect the boundary between the stigmatized and stigmatizers so that they can stick together and support each other (Gray, Johnson, Kish-Gephart, & Tilton, 2018; Moon, 2012). Individuals also may infuse positive values into stigmatized identities (Petriglieri, 2011; Slay & Smith, 2011).

The disproportionate emphasis on concealable stigma and its management reveals several blind spots for studies at this level. First, scholars have primarily assumed that stigma only has negative implications (as pointed out by Roulet, 2020, but for an exception see Cha & Roberts, 2019). Second, most research at this level treats stigma as a “mark” or a thing (Jones et al., 1984). When treating stigma as a “mark” that only has negative implications, the focus on a stigma’s concealability is understandable. Stigma, however, leads to stigmatization, which is a process not a thing; and this process has been underexplored (Link & Phelan, 2001; Lyons, Pek, & Wessel, 2017). Third, the lack of research on stigmatization as a process is partly explained by the fact that 71 studies at this level relied on experiments and cross-sectional survey data. Only 23 studies used interview and observation data to understand experiences of stigma. Although experimental methods are useful in building causality (i.e., testing how different stigmatizing conditions impact the consequences of stigma), longitudinal studies are likely needed to better decompose the stigmatization process.

Occupational level

Research at the occupational level is often referred to as the “dirty work” literature (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark, & Fugate, 2007; Kreiner, Ashforth, & Sluss,

2006). This literature connects to Goffman's (1963) early work, but also builds on the work of Douglas (1966) and Hughes (1951, 1958). The notion of "dirt" stems from Douglas's (1966) distinction between "purity" and "pollution." Hughes's (1958) classification of "taints" explained different types of stigma. Specifically stigma is seen as originating from "physical" taint, e.g., work involving refuse, death, or effluents (Courpasson & Monties, 2017; Soni-Sinha & Yates, 2013); "social" taint, e.g., work involving a servile relationship to others (Roca, 2010; Shantz & Booth, 2014) or membership in a particular social group (Fernando, Reveley, & Learmonth, 2020); or "moral" taint, e.g., work seen as sinful or of dubious virtue (Dick, 2005; Gonzalez & Pérez-Floriano, 2005), or involving a combination of these taints (Baran, Rogelberg, Carello Lopina, Allen, Spitzmüller, & Bergman, 2012; Benjamin, Bernstein, & Motzafi-Haller, 2011).

Stigma is attached to workers as soon as they engage in dirty work, and can lead to devalued identities and other negative social consequences (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Ruebottom & Toubiana, 2020). Importantly, this literature has uncovered strategies by which dirty workers cope with the stigma associated with their occupations (Johnston & Hodge, 2014; McMurray & Ward, 2014). They can reframe the meaning of their work as having positive value (Dick, 2005; Jensen, 2017), change the standards that are used to assess their jobs (Hamilton, Redman, & McMurray, 2019; Johnston & Hodge, 2014), focus their attention on the relatively "clean" aspects of the work (Grandy & Mavin, 2012; Tracy & Scott, 2006: 32), make favorable social comparisons (Brewis & Godfrey, 2018; Slutskaya, Simpson, Hughes, Simpson, & Uygur, 2016), and/or develop strong occupational ideologies and/or support communities (Ashforth et al., 2017; Bolton, 2005).

Dirty work scholars almost exclusively adopt ethnography, interview and archival data (41 papers at this level), and document the diverse ways in which individuals attempt to manage stigma and construct positive occupational identities. Similar to studies at the individual level, studies of

1
2
3 occupational stigma have largely left processes of stigmatization unexamined or treated them as
4 implicit. Two forthcoming papers are exceptions: one discusses how coping may inadvertently
5 maintain stigmatization for occupational members (Mikolon, Alavi, & Reynders, 2020), and the
6
7 other examines the emergence of professional stigma after ethical transgression (Wang, Raynard,
8 & Greenwood, 2020).
9

14 15 **Organizational level**

16 At the organizational level, researchers have sought to purposefully differentiate
17 organizational stigma from individual stigma (Devers et al., 2009; Hudson, 2008). For example,
18 Devers and colleagues (2009) suggested that, although Goffman's (1963) work was applicable at
19 the organizational level, most organizational stigma originates from "conduct" stigma related to
20 organizations' deviant behaviors (somewhat comparable to Goffman's character stigma), whereas
21 tribal and physical stigma occur much less frequently. Hudson (2008: 252–253) further elaborated
22 this distinction, and differentiated "event" stigma ("discrete, anomalous, episodic events" such as
23 an industrial crisis) from "core" stigma (the "nature of an organization's core attributes—who it
24 is, what it does, and whom it serves").
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Studies at this level have mostly focused on how organizations strategically manage stigma
38 (Carberry & King, 2012; Elsbach, 1994; Helms & Patterson, 2014; Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009).
39 An early study by Sutton and Callahan (1987) showed that, in response to bankruptcy, firms can
40 adopt a variety of strategies such as concealing, redefining, or denying/accepting responsibility for
41 a crisis. Hampel and Tracey (2017) summarized four generic approaches to managing
42 organizational stigma: shielding misbehaving firms (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009), straddling
43 stigmatized and clean markets (Vergne, 2012), co-opting the meaning of stigma (Helms &
44 Patterson, 2014), and destigmatization (Hampel & Tracey, 2017).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 At this level, scholars adopted a quantitative approach in 9 studies, a qualitative approach
56
57
58
59
60

in 10 studies, and mixed-methods in 1 study. Overall, scholars classified stigma as either core or event related, outlined the consequences of stigma for organizations, and, most predominately, revealed organizational responses to the attribution or risk of stigmatization. Again, less attention has been given to processes of stigmatization. One exception is Hampel and Tracey (2017), who outlined a process of destigmatization by Thomas Cook’s travel agency and how it manipulated a key audience’s perceptions to do so.

Industry level

Following Devers and colleagues (2009), Vergne (2012: 1028) indicated the categorical nature of certain types of stigmas and highlighted that stigma can be “a vilifying label that contaminates a group of similar peers” such as entire industries, categories, and markets. Slade Shantz and colleagues (2019) further suggested that an organization’s core stigma actually is tied to its membership in a stigmatized industry, whereas an organization’s event stigma may not be. At this level, stigma is classified as being core or event-based similar to the organization literature.

Our search yielded 9 quantitative, 12 qualitative, and 2 mixed-methods studies at this level. Despite claiming to be different from “organizational level” studies, most studies in this stream still focus on how individual firms manage their stigma in an already stigmatized category. For example, Vergne (2012) found that firms in the arms industry diverted stakeholders’ attention away from their stigmatized arms business by simultaneously operating in the civilian airline industry. Likewise, firms in Ontario’s fine wine industry hide their history of producing wine from labrusca grapes and/or their use of cheap, low-quality sparkling water in order to manage the stigma associated with local winery practices (Voronov, De Clercq, & Hinings, 2013).

However, a recent turn points to the importance of understanding the ways in which stigma can be removed or lost (Aranda, Conti, & Wezel, 2020; Lashley & Pollock, 2020; Siltaoja, Lahdesmaki, Granqvist, Kurki, Puska, & Luomala, 2020). For example, Piazza and Perretti (2015)

1
2
3 reported how firms operating in the nuclear power industry abandoned their nuclear power units
4
5 in order to disassociate from the stigma associated with that source of energy. Lashley and Pollock
6
7 (2020: 452) found that in order to manage stigma, firms in the medical cannabis industry
8
9 collectively created and disseminated a positive public image of “healing” and “patients’ rights.”
10
11

12 **Summary**

13
14 Our examination of work on stigma reveals that the literature is largely siloed by levels of
15
16 analysis, a problem alluded to by Pescosolido and Martin (2015) and Pollock and colleagues
17
18 (2019). More specifically, our review reveals several surprising issues associated with these silos.
19
20 First, studies at different levels have proposed diverse ways of classifying stigma—from body,
21
22 character, and tribal (at the individual level) to physical, social, and moral (at the occupational
23
24 level), to conduct, event, and core (at the organizational and industry levels). Although some
25
26 scholars have begun to compare certain components of these typologies (e.g., Devers et al., 2009;
27
28 Slade Shantz et al., 2019), we still lack a comprehensive understanding of their commonalities and
29
30 distinctions, which in turn impedes scholars from constructing a more generalized understanding
31
32 of stigma and stigmatization.
33
34
35
36

37
38 Second, previous studies have unearthed a laundry list of stigma management strategies—
39
40 different means of responding to, managing, and coping with stigma. They are, of course,
41
42 invaluable in helping actors navigate the everyday realities of being stigmatized. However,
43
44 whereas some of the strategies are distinct from each other, others seem rather similar, causing
45
46 conceptual overlaps and confusion when we start to consider stigma beyond one level, and as we
47
48 seek to examine stigmatization more specifically. Moreover, as most scholars only investigate
49
50 level-specific effects of stigma management strategies, the scope conditions and cross-level effects
51
52 remain poorly understood even though we know that individuals are in occupations, which
53
54 typically are associated with organizations and industries. Ignoring how actions at one level impact
55
56
57
58
59
60

stigma and stigmatization across levels impedes our ability to fully understand stigmatization as a phenomenon and as a social process.

Third, studies to date almost exclusively examine the impacts of stigma and various actors’ responses to it. Although these dimensions are very important, less understood are the dynamics of the stigmatization process itself and how it unfolds across, between, and within these levels. We know little about the emergence, transfer, maintenance, or removal of stigmatization.

To resolve these issues, we propose a framework that draws together the sources, characteristics, and management strategies of stigma. This framework provides the basis for an agenda for research on stigmatization, which we elaborate in the final section of the paper.

II. AN INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR STIGMA RESEARCH: SOURCES, CHARACTERISTICS, AND STIGMA MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Our purpose in reviewing the stigma literature across levels of analysis has been to identify conceptual overlaps and redundancy within the literature by identifying commonalities across levels. We integrate these insights into a framework based on three key dimensions—the sources of stigma (i.e., what creates or causes stigma), the characteristics of stigma (i.e., features or properties of a particular stigma), and stigma management strategies (i.e., approaches to respond to stigma). Tables 2 and 3 define each source and characteristic and the various terms previously used to describe these dimensions. Table 4 provides definitions, empirical examples, and the effects of management strategies. In Section III, we will see how this framework allows us to better examine processes of stigmatization.

Insert Tables 2–4 about here

Sources of stigma

If stigma is a “deeply discrediting” (Goffman, 1963: 3) mark that subjects a social actor to

devaluation (Pescosolido & Martin, 2015: 91), the *source* of a stigma is that which creates or causes the discrediting “mark” that classifies the social actor as “different ... of a less desirable kind” (Goffman, 1963: 3). From the literature, we identified six sources of stigma—physical, tribal, moral, servile, emotional, and associational.

Physical stigma refers to a defiling mark that is “physically disgusting” (Hughes, 1958: 49), such as “abominations of the body” (Goffman, 1963: 4), physical waste, and effluents (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Whereas physical stigma is often related to an individual’s physical appearance, such as facial deformities (Madera & Hebl, 2012), pregnancy (Hebl, King, Glick, Singletary, & Kazama, 2007; Jones, King, Gilrane, McCausland, Cortina, & Grimm, 2016), obesity (Shapiro, King, & Quinones, 2007; Tomiyama, 2019), and disability (Dirth & Branscombe, 2018; Gonzalez, Tillman, & Holmes, 2019; Taub, Blinde, & Greer, 1999), it can also refer to associations with garbage, death, human orifices, or effluents (Grandey, Gabriel & King, 2019; Hughes, 1958; Levine & Schweitzer, 2015). Therefore, many scholars have studied physical stigma at the occupational as well as the individual level in contexts involving janitors (Soni-Sinha & Yates, 2013), slaughterhouse workers (Baran, Rogelberg & Clausen, 2016), funeral directors (Ashforth, 1999), and exterminators (Ashforth et al., 2007).

Given that organizations and industries do not have “true physical bodies” (Devers et al., 2009: 158), it is not surprising that physical stigma is less studied at these levels. Nevertheless, exceptions do exist. Helms and Patterson’s (2014) study of mixed martial arts (MMA) is an example of organizations contaminated by physical stigma (i.e., MMA fighters’ appearances, and the physical harm and blood caused during the fights). Physical stigma is also attached to strip clubs (Grandy & Mavin, 2012; Mavin & Grandy, 2013), brothels (Blithe & Wolfe, 2017; Wolfe & Blithe, 2015), and other sex-orientated organizations and industries (Coslor, Crawford, & Brents,

2018; Tyler, 2011; Voss, 2015). It is also linked to the niche market that sells cadavers and body parts (Anteby, 2010). Thus, organizations and industries dealing with garbage, death, orifices of the human body, and effluents can be stigmatized. At all levels, physical stigma generates negative affective responses such as disgust, and negative behavioral responses such as social exclusion and discrimination (Johnson, Sitzmann, & Nguyen, 2014; Li, Kokkoris, & Savanic, 2020; Madera & Hebl, 2012).

Tribal stigma reflects membership in a group or category that is deemed inferior and discredited (Slutskaya et al., 2016). It tends to be genetically and culturally attached to individual traits, arising from one’s race or ethnicity (Deros, Ryan, & Nguyen, 2012; Stewart & Shapiro, 2000), gender (Byun & Won, 2020; Martell & DeSmet, 2001), class (Brand & Thomas, 2014; Gray et al., 2018), and sexual orientation (Mize & Manago, 2018; Tilcsik, Anteby, & Knight, 2015). But tribal stigma can also impact occupations by association, wherein groups that are deemed “inferior” taint the entire occupation (Slay & Smith, 2011: 211). It also can be more fundamental, such as when caste membership determines the types of work an individual is allowed to perform; in such cases, stigma is linked both to the individual for being a member of the caste, and to the occupation/work opportunities available to that individual (Chrispal, Bapuji, & Zietsma, 2020; McDowell, Rootham, & Hardgrove, 2016; Zulfiqar, 2019). Tribal stigma also can be attached to a particular geographic market, such as that associated with the “made in China” label (Devers et al., 2009: 158). For example, local Italian grappa was stigmatized as compared to spirits produced by foreign competitors (Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016).

The implications of tribal stigma can be devastating and long lasting, and contribute to systemic inequality, racism, and even mass genocide (Harris, Evans, & Beckett, 2011; Lamont, 2018). During the Holocaust, approximately six million Jewish people were murdered, and

1
2
3 genocides of other tribal groups have been documented and continue to take place. In 2020, racism
4 and inequality persist for people of color and for other racial minorities. The Black Lives Matter
5 movement in the United States has sought to make the discrimination experienced by Black
6 Americans visible. Indeed as the *Washington Post's* (September 17, 2020) real-time shooting
7 database indicates, African Americans are disproportionately killed by police officers. This
8 evidence resonates with the stigma literature, showing that racial stigma negatively affects
9 culturally or historically underrepresented groups (Deitch, Barsky, Butz, Chan, Brief, & Bradley,
10 2003; Harris et al., 2011).

11
12 ***Moral stigma*** refers to “blemishes” of character (Goffman, 1963: 4) based on engagement
13 in activities perceived as immoral or sinful. A moral source of stigma for individuals is engagement
14 in activities that are seen as violating moral standards, such as cheating (Leavitt & Sluss, 2015;
15 Premeaux, 2005), criminal activities (Toubiana, 2020), insider trading (Beams, Browns, &
16 Killough, 2003), and acts of violence towards the self or others (Stuart & Moore, 2017;
17 Timmermans, 2005). Similarly, at an occupational level, moral stigmatization occurs when “an
18 occupation is generally regarded as somewhat sinful or of dubious virtue” (Ashforth & Kreiner,
19 1999: 415)—for example, work involving the sale of sex (Blithe & Wolfe, 2017; Mavin & Grandy,
20 2013; Meis, 2002), torture (Chwastiak, 2015), and euthanasia (Baran et al., 2012).

21
22 Studies of organizational stigma highlight that stigma often derives from perceptions of
23 immorality. Hampel and Tracey (2019: 14) conceptualized stigmatization as situated at the
24 “extreme negative end” of a moral evaluation continuum. Similarly, Pollock and colleagues (2019)
25 regarded “the moral” as the primary element of organizational stigma. Perceptions of
26 organizational immorality may arise from conduct such as being implicated in financial fraud or
27 scandals (Piazza & Jourdan, 2018; Roulet, 2019), or adopting controversial practices (Chuang,
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Church, & Ophir, 2011). Moral stigma can also be attached to industries that use toxic chemicals (Diestre & Santaló, 2020), sell weapons (Durand & Vergne, 2015; Vergne, 2012), generate nuclear power (Piazza & Perretti, 2015), produce and sell medical cannabis (Lashley & Pollock, 2020), or engage in the slave trade (Ingram & Silverman, 2016).

Regardless of level, moral sources of stigma have often been found to trigger emotions such as anger and outrage, and have been associated with ostracization, social sanctions, and a host of negative outcomes (Ashforth, 2019; Toubiana & Zietsma, 2017). For example, practitioners in the sex industry suffer from constraints such as undesirable market exchanges, identity devaluation, and shaming because of the immorality and riskiness of the business (Ruebottom & Toubiana, 2020).

Servile stigma results from involvement in activities that are “degrading” through subservience (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Hughes, 1958: 319). In the dirty work literature, servile stigma and tribal stigma have been subsumed into the “social” stigma category (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). We differentiate the two because tribal stigma is about belonging to a group, whereas servile stigma is related to one’s position and role relative to others. They can overlap, of course, as one’s gender or class can increase the likelihood of being in a servile position relative to others (Hanna & Gough, 2019; Larsen, 2017). However, servile stigma can also stand on its own: taxi drivers are stigmatized for their servile relationship to clients (Phung, Buchanan, Toubiana, Ruebottom, & Turchick-Hakak, 2020; Turchick-Hakak, 2014), as are domestic workers and cleaners (Lucas, Kang, & Li, 2013; Orupabo & Nadim, 2020).

Although scholars most frequently have studied servile stigma at an occupational level, organizations or industries that are subservient to others can also be tainted in this way. For example, sex shops are “ancillary” within the sex industry, such that workers in these shops tend

1
2
3 to be ignored (Tyler, 2011: 1479); the hospitality industry likewise was stigmatized for its servility
4
5 at one point (Dyer, McDowell, & Batnitzky, 2010; Guerrier & Adib, 2003; Hampel & Tracey,
6
7 2017). Servile sources of stigma can lead to social exclusion and identity devaluation, and “wound
8
9 one’s dignity” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Fisher, 2003; Hughes, 1958: 49). Scholars have
10
11 documented how service workers receive lower wages, face demeaning treatment and are
12
13 perceived as less eligible (Dyer et al., 2010; McDowell et al., 2016).
14
15
16

17 *Emotional stigma* arises from engagement with burdensome and threatening emotions.
18
19 Interestingly, although stigma scholars have long noticed that emotion reflects responses towards
20
21 the stigmatized (Pescosolido & Martin, 2015), framing emotion as a source of stigma is a much
22
23 more recent development. Moreover, even though it has been introduced at the occupational and
24
25 organizational levels (Rivera, 2015; Rivera & Tracy, 2014; Tyler, 2011), it has not yet been studied
26
27 at the individual level.
28
29
30

31 Emotional stigma has been defined as “performances of emotion (or lack of emotion)” that
32
33 are perceived as negative, inappropriate for a certain situation, excessive, and showing
34
35 vulnerability (Rivera, 2015: 218). McMurray and Ward (2014), for example, studied Samaritans,
36
37 a UK organization which provides support for people who experience emotional stress. Whereas
38
39 janitors are classified as “dirty workers” because of their proximity to physical dirt, McMurray
40
41 and Ward proposed that distress line workers are classified as “dirty” because of their proximity
42
43 to toxic or negative emotions (i.e., “emotional dirt”) when working with people who are suicidal,
44
45 upset, or abusive. Other examples include workers in rape crisis centers (Zilber, 2002) and
46
47 slaughterhouses (McLoughlin, 2019), and border control agents (Rivera, 2015). Scholars have
48
49 shown that bearing an emotional stigma can negatively affects people’s wellbeing (e.g., workers
50
51 in slaughterhouses, see McLoughlin, 2019). In addition, while there is only limited research on
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how emotional stigma impacts organizations or industries, it is reasonable to anticipate that
4 organizations with an emotional stigma (e.g., toxic emotional culture, see Frost, 2007) would have
5
6 lowered employee engagement, reduced productivity, or high levels of turnover.
7
8

9
10 *Associational stigma* arises from proximity, association, or contact with those who are
11 stigmatized. Goffman (1963: 30) used the term “courtesy stigma” to describe people who do not
12 possess stigmatizing attributes, but are stigmatized by their relationships with stigmatized others.
13 They “are all obliged to share some of the discredit of the stigmatized person to whom they are
14 related” (Goffman, 1963: 30). Social settings where people frequently and publicly interact and
15 form relationships with others can be especially likely to facilitate this “stigma-by-association”
16 (Kulik, Bainbridge, & Cregan, 2008). For example, employees have been stigmatized for working
17 with blacklisted coworkers, and have lost job opportunities as a result (Pontikes, Negro, & Rao,
18 2010). Members of teams with a high proportion of racialized members receive lower
19 compensation than those who are not members of such teams (Hall, Avery, McKay, Blot, &
20 Edwards, 2019). Even being proximate to someone who is obese has been shown to adversely
21 affect the chances of being hired (Ruggs, Hebl, & Williams, 2015). Associational stigma can
22 similarly impact occupations, organizations, and industries: Tracey and Phillips (2016) discussed
23 how a social enterprise was stigmatized for working for refugees; Barlow, Verhaal, and Hoskins
24 (2018) found that firms in the craft beer industry were stigmatized because of their association
25 with mass-production breweries; and Slade Shantz et al. (2019) showed how clothing companies
26 catering to plus-sized customers were stigmatized for their involvement with these customers.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Associational stigma is distinct for two reasons. First, it can originate from the other
50 sources of stigma. Studies have shown how physical (Ruggs et al., 2015), tribal (Hernandez et al.,
51 2016), or moral (Pontikes et al., 2010) sources of stigma can all cause associational stigma. Second,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 it illuminates how stigma can be linked to non-stigmatized actors, even if such actors are at
4 different levels. For example, customers or suppliers can become stigmatized for their involvement
5 or interaction with stigmatized organizations (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009). This reveals the
6 importance of a multi-level perspective.
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Summary.** We have outlined six sources of stigma, each of which applies at the different
13 levels of analysis. Importantly, the six sources are not mutually exclusive and are often combined.
14 For example, the pornography industry's stigma is derived from physical, moral, and servile
15 sources (Voss, 2015), and the stigma of MMA arises from a combination of physical and moral
16 sources (Helms & Patterson, 2014). Most significantly, these sources provide us with a framework
17 to consider the causes of stigma.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Characteristics of stigma**

27
28 Characteristics of stigma are the features or properties of a given "mark." Whether the
29 source of a stigma is physical, tribal, moral, servile, emotional, or associational, all stigmas
30 "involve a range of characteristics that evoke different reactions in different social settings" (Jones
31 et al., 1984; Ragins, 2008: 206). Because certain characteristics shape and influence people's
32 perceptions of, and responses to, stigmatization (Jones et al., 1984) and because not all stigma is
33 equally contagious or contaminating (Summers et al., 2018), such characteristics need to be
34 systematically considered.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 During our review, we identified five characteristics relevant to all levels. The first of these,
45 **concealability**, refers to the extent to which a stigma can be hidden or disguised (Clair et al., 2005;
46 Jones et al., 1984; Newheiser & Barreto, 2014; Ragins, 2008). Individual level stigmas range from
47 being very observable (e.g., race, gender, or physical disability) to being easily hidden (e.g., sexual
48 orientation, religion, or mental illness). When a stigma can be hidden, actors may be able to avoid
49 stigmatization. However, research suggests that concealing can result in a host of negative
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

consequences (Barclay & Markel, 2007; Mohr, Markell, King, Jones, Peddie, & Kendra, 2019). For example, Ragins, Singh, and Cornwell (2007) found that, compared with those who had disclosed their sexual orientation to everyone at work, those who had not done so were more likely to experience negative attitudes, gain fewer promotions, and suffer more stress because of the discrepancy between their “virtual” and “actual” social identities (Goffman, 1963: 41). Concealing also results in “disclosure disconnects” when actors reveal in some settings and not in others (Ragins, 2008).

The stigma of occupations, organizations, and industries can also be concealable (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009; Voronov et al., 2013). For example, gynecological nurses can simply refer to their work as “nursing,” thereby avoiding the stigma associated with their specialty (Bolton, 2005: 173). Hudson and Okhuysen (2009) noted that men’s bathhouses disguise themselves, and Vergne (2012) likewise revealed how firms in the global arms industry conceal their activities. Relative to individuals, organizations and industries that conceal stigma incur lower psychological costs from doing so, but, if discovered, face greater stigmatization and social sanctions (Zhang, Jiang, Magnan, & Su, 2019).

The second characteristic, *controllability*, refers to the extent to which a stigmatized individual, organization, occupation, or industry is perceived as responsible for causing, having, or maintaining the stigma (Bruyaka, Philippe, & Castañer, 2018; Crocker et al., 1998; Gomulya & Boeker, 2016; Jones et al., 1984; Ragins, 2008). Across all levels, research indicates that when stigma is perceived as controllable, the resultant stigmatization is harsher, meaning that the stigmatized face greater social sanctions and negative evaluations (Boyce, Ryan, Imus, & Morgeson, 2007; Kibler, Mandl, Farny, & Salmivaara, 2020; Shepherd & Patzelt, 2015). A more controllable stigma (e.g., dishonesty, organizational wrongdoings) usually generates blame and

1
2
3 anger (Rodell & Lynch, 2016; Sutton & Callahan, 1987), whereas an uncontrollable stigma (e.g.,
4 disability, organizational accidents) is more likely to generate pity (Lyons, Volpone, Wessel, &
5 Alonso, 2017; Weiner, Perry, & Magnusson, 1988). Such different emotional responses can
6 influence attitudes and behaviors towards the stigmatized (Roulin & Bhatnagar, 2018, 2020;
7 Schepker & Barker, 2018).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Devers and colleagues (2009) proposed that organizational stigma is often perceived as
16 controllable because it typically follows from organizational actors actively choosing to be
17 involved in that which is stigmatized. One consequence, highlighted by Reuber and Fischer (2010),
18 is that controllable event-based acts of misconduct are particularly stigmatizing for organizations
19 (Devers et al., 2009; Harris et al., 2011). This observation also applies to industries (Desai, 2018;
20 Roulet, 2015). In general, controllability is a characteristic that impacts the perceived culpability
21 and responsibility for involvement with a particular source of stigma, and the greater the perceived
22 controllability, the greater the stigmatization.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The third characteristic, *centrality*, refers to the relative proximity of the stigmatized
34 attributes or practices to the core identity of the actor(s) (Hudson, 2008; Law, Martinez, Ruggs,
35 Hebl, & Akers, 2011; Ragins, 2008). Centrality can influence both the extent to which individuals
36 are stigmatized and the extent to which such stigmatization is internalized and triggers feelings of
37 shame (Helgeson & Zajdel, 2017; Ragins, 2008). For example, individuals with a physical
38 disability or chronic illness can reject these attributes as core to who they are, and may be able to
39 refute and negate the stigmatization directed at them (Goffman, 1963; Lyons et al., 2018). This
40 also applies across levels. When a stigma is central to an occupation, it is an “enduring
41 characteristic that typif[ies] the line of work” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999: 417; Van Maanen &
42 Barley, 1984). A physician, for example, may only occasionally deal with dead bodies, whereas a
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

coroner must continually do so. In this case, the coroner is attributed with physical stigma, because dead bodies are central to the occupation, whereas this is not the case for the physician. At an organizational level, Hudson (2008: 253) attributed “core” stigma “to the nature of an organization’s core attributes—who it is, what it does, and whom it serves.” It also applies to industries, such as abortion centers (Augustine & Piazza, forthcoming; Hudson, Wong-Mingji, & Loree, 2000), tattoo parlors (Velliquette, 2000), and the gambling and tobacco industries (Galvin, Ventresca, & Hudson, 2004). Regardless of level, the more central the source of stigma to an actor’s identity, the greater the resultant stigmatization.

Disruptiveness, the fourth characteristic, is the degree to which stigma disrupts social interaction and/or is perceived as a threat to others in society (Jones et al., 1984; Liu, Campbell, Fitzsimons, Fitzsimons, 2013; Stone et al., 1992). Stigma can introduce uncertainty into social relationships (Kleck, 1968, 1969; Ragins, 2008) because the stigmatized are perceived as representing a form of disorder in, and danger to society (Douglas, 1966; Link, Andrews, & Cullen, 1992), and thus can generate fear of contaminating others (Jones et al., 1984; Sitkin & Roth, 1993). Some stigmas, therefore, are seen as more disruptive than others. For example, mental patients (Caponecchia, Sun, & Wyatt, 2012; Hunter & Schmidt, 2010; Rosenfield, 1997), homeless people (Lee, Farrell, & Link, 2004; Lee, Tyler, & Wright, 2010), and people with criminal records (Ali et al., 2017; Pager & Quillian, 2005) have been associated with perceptions of risk, which intensify negative reactions (Juvonen & Graham, 2014; Pescosolido, Martin, Olafsdottir, Long, Kafadar, & Medina, 2015).

Disruptiveness likewise applies to organizations and occupations. Ragpickers in urban slums are avoided due to fear of contamination from disease and dirt (Bayly, 2001). Similarly, the police and the criminal system are feared due to the threat of violence (Loyd & Bonds, 2018;

1
2
3 Mobasseri, 2019), as are organizations that use torture (e.g., the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency,
4 see Chwastiak, 2015). Cannabis was once labeled the “killer weed,” thus the industry is perceived
5
6 as a “danger” to society (Lashley & Pollock, 2020: 440). Regardless of the source of stigma, the
7
8 greater the perceived disruptiveness, the greater the risk in interactions, and “the greater its
9
10 tendency to evoke strong, negative reactions in others” (Stone et al., 1992: 390).
11
12
13

14
15 *Malleability* refers to the extent to which the nature of the stigma changes over time (Jones
16
17 et al., 2016; Stone et al., 1992). Although stigma at an individual level has been conceptualized as
18
19 a “persistent predicament” (Link & Phelan, 2001: 379), not all stigmas are similarly stable, and
20
21 some stigmatizing conditions might change over time (Jones et al., 1984; Paetzold, Dipboye, &
22
23 Elsbach, 2008). Even physical stigma, such as visible burn scars (Goffman, 1963), obesity (Levine
24
25 & Schweitzer, 2015), or pregnancy (King, Mohr, Peddie, Jones, & Kendra, 2017) may not be
26
27 permanent. Malleability matters, because, as Stone and colleagues (1992: 390) elaborated,
28
29 “individuals who have stigmas that are viewed as irreversible (e.g., amputated limbs) or
30
31 degenerative (e.g., multiple sclerosis) will typically engender more negative reactions from
32
33 normals than individuals having stigmas that are considered alterable (e.g., acne-related skin
34
35 problems, facial moles or warts, deficient social skills).”
36
37
38
39

40 Occupations, organizations, and industries may also have more or less malleable stigmas.
41
42 For example, an organizational stigma stemming from the gender composition of its board of
43
44 directors is malleable (Perrault, 2015), whereas the occupational stigma associated with the sale
45
46 of sex is less so (Blithe & Wolfe, 2017). Accordingly, the relative malleability of a stigma
47
48 determines the experiences and responses of stigmatized actors. Because actors with more
49
50 malleable stigmas experience different degrees of stigmatization at different stages, they need to
51
52 select different stigma management strategies over time (Johnson & Joshi, 2016; Jones et al., 2016).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Summary. We have presented five characteristics of stigma that, we suggest, are relevant for individuals, occupations, organizations, and industries. Such characteristics may vary, and are not mutually exclusive. For example, having chronic illness is a stigma that is concealable and uncontrollable, and may be central to one’s identity, moderately disruptive, and malleable over time (Helgeson & Zajdel, 2017). These characteristics shape the experiences of stigmatized actors and thus are important to understand.

Stigma management strategies

Our literature review surfaced six overarching stigma management strategies—boundary management, dilution, information management, reconstruction, cooptation, and emotion work—by which individuals, occupations, organizations, and industries seek to manage or cope with the attributions and consequences of being stigmatized.

Boundary management is an attempt by stigmatized actors to influence the boundary between insiders (those who are stigmatized) and outsiders (those who are not). Using this strategy, actors differentiate and determine who belongs to the stigmatized group and who does not (Khazzoom, 2003). Individuals might craft narratives or outline differences in order to draw a boundary between “us” and “them” (Link & Phelan, 2001: 370; Schwarz, 2015). The goal is to provide a “safe haven and self-defense” from the threat of stigmatization (Moon, 2012: 1350). For example, Moon (2012) found that stigmatized American Jewish groups adopted a narrative of “we” as the virtuous oppressed, and “they” as evil oppressors.

Similarly, at the occupational level, scholars have found that occupational members create “social buffers” to define a distinctive in-group that provides a “bulwark” against the threat of stigma (Ashforth et al., 2007: 160). For example, Soni-Sinha and Yates (2013: 737) found that supportive in-groups provide “a space of resistance to the perception of their work as ‘dirty’ and a means by which to reclaim pride in their work.” Within the group, those stigmatized are able to

1
2
3 protect themselves from stigmatization by outsiders (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Ashforth et al.,
4
5 2017).
6

7
8 At the organizational level, Hudson and Okhuysen (2009: 143) showed how men's
9
10 bathhouses use a set of boundary management tactics, including "integration," whereby
11
12 organizations seek to make supportive suppliers "insiders." Similarly, Cook's Travel Agency
13
14 showed respectability towards users but attacked stigmatizers as a misguided minority who lacked
15
16 moral rectitude, honesty, and decency (Hampel & Tracey, 2017). At the industry level, such
17
18 boundaries can be protected by finding a "direct digital pathway to customers" (Slade Shantz et
19
20 al., 2019: 1269), and by avoiding outsiders or those who might be likely to stigmatize them (Sutton
21
22 & Callahan, 1987).
23
24
25

26 This strategy of boundary management has been shown to reduce exposure to stigmatizing
27
28 audiences, protect key stakeholders, and enable social support (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009; Tilcsik
29
30 et al., 2015). Ashforth and colleagues (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Ashforth et al., 2007) suggested
31
32 that social buffers are particularly important for workers who are morally tainted, because moral
33
34 stigma may carry some of the strongest reactions from outsiders. Social buffers may also be
35
36 particularly applicable and useful for tribal stigma, given its group-bound nature (Benjamin,
37
38 Bernstein, & Motzafi-Haller, 2011; Bolton, 2005). In general, boundary management may be most
39
40 relevant for stigma that is more central and more disruptive, but less malleable, because these
41
42 characteristics make the stigmatized more vulnerable to being excluded and thus more likely to
43
44 use boundary management to create a sense of "groupness" (Clair, Daniel, & Lamont, 2016).
45
46
47
48

49 ***Dilution*** involves severing, reducing, or altering ties to a source of stigma. Individuals with
50
51 physical stigma might alter their physical bodies through, for example, weight loss, skin lightening,
52
53 or cosmetic surgery (Goffman, 1963; Levine & Schweitzer, 2015). Individuals might also reduce
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

their association with, or even distance themselves from a stigmatized group (Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Snow & Anderson, 1987). For example, after an event that triggers stigmatization, members of an organization might “jump ship” by voluntarily leaving the firm in order to avoid the risk of stigmatization (Jiang et al., 2017: 2601; Semadeni, Cannella, Fraser, & Lee, 2008).

Similarly, occupational members might withdraw from a stigmatized occupation through absenteeism or resignation (Gonzalez & Pérez-Floriano, 2015). They may also engage in efforts to detach themselves from dirtier objects, tasks, or contexts associated with their work (Baran et al., 2016; Courpasson & Monties, 2017). In occupations stigmatized because of contact with stigmatized others, those in the occupation can alter or minimize those contacts (e.g., police officers or correctional officers can minimize interactions with criminals; see Courpasson & Monties, 2017; Tracy & Scott, 2006).

At the organizational level, firms have been found to decouple their stigmatized activities from their legitimate structures in order to minimize the appearance of belonging to a stigmatized category (Devers et al., 2009). This can mean isolating or censoring particular guilty parties to disassociate an organization from them (Elsbach & Sutton, 1992; Lamin & Zaheer, 2012). It can also involve straddling, whereby organizations and/or industries engage in non-stigmatized activities to distract attention from more stigmatized lines of business (Lynch & Rodell, 2018; Vergne, 2012).

Overall, dilution can enable actors to avoid shame and/or social sanctions, and become accepted by their audiences (Stein, 2019; Vergne, 2012). It is a strategy frequently adopted by those facing associational stigma in order to avoid potential contamination from those who are stigmatized (Gomulya & Boeker, 2016; Xia, Dawley, Jiang, Ma, & Boal, 2016; Zhang, George, & Tan, 2006). Given that the essence of dilution is to weaken perceptions of stigma by distancing

1
2
3 from that which is “marked” and/or by attaching to something clean, this strategy is likely most
4
5 effective when the stigma is less central, less disruptive, and more malleable.
6

7
8 ***Information management*** involves actors actively managing the information shared or
9
10 disclosed about their stigmatized attributes. Key to this strategy is the ability to conceal stigma.
11
12 Like the other strategies, it can be used across levels. It can take many different forms, including
13
14 “hiding” by consciously and actively attempting to conceal and “pass as a member of the non-
15
16 stigmatized majority” (Clair et al., 2005: 90; Kang, DeCelles, Tilcsik, & Jun, 2016). For example,
17
18 LGBT individuals may hide their sexual orientation at work (Herek & McLemore, 2013),
19
20 prostitutes may lie about their occupation to others (Kong, 2006), and organizations, such as men’s
21
22 bathhouses, may pretend to be something else, such as gyms (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009).
23
24
25

26
27 Alternatively, actors can “signal” by providing hints, clues, and implicit messages that
28
29 point to their stigma (Clair et al., 2005; Jones & King, 2014: 1471). Individuals with a concealable
30
31 stigma (e.g., sexual orientation), for example, have been observed “testing the waters” or “seeking
32
33 information about likely acceptance” (Clair et al., 2005; Jones & King, 2014: 1471; King et al.,
34
35 2017: 496). Actors can also “reveal” by purposefully disclosing their stigmatizing attributes to
36
37 others (Doldor & Atewologun, 2020; Elraz, 2018; Jones et al., 2016: 1532), including, for example,
38
39 accepting responsibility for organizational wrongdoing (Elsbach, 1994; Sutton & Callahan, 1987).
40
41

42
43 Scholars have proposed different, but overlapping conceptual models to explain when and
44
45 why certain information management strategies are chosen by employees (Chaudoir & Fisher,
46
47 2010; Clair et al., 2005; Jones & King, 2014; Ragins, 2008). One commonality across these models
48
49 is that they reveal the complexity of the information management process (Follmer et al., 2020),
50
51 which can be influenced by multiple individual, organizational, and situational factors (Clair et al.,
52
53 2005; Ragins, 2008). For example, employees who are more sensitive to potential rejection tend
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to conceal their stigmatized identities, whereas those who have more social supports are more
4 likely to reveal them (Grattet, 2011; Meyer, 2003; Pachankis, 2007). Similarly, Hudson and
5
6 Okhuysen (2009) highlighted that an organization’s choice of whether to hide stigmatizing
7
8 attributes or not partly depends upon the level of hostility of the institutional environment.
9
10

11
12 Information management strategies may affect the extent to which actors are accepted in
13
14 social settings, as well as personal outcomes (e.g., increased psychological distress when hiding
15
16 and signaling, and decreased distress when revealing) (Hudson, 2008; Martinez, White, Shapiro,
17
18 & Hebl, 2016; Toyoki & Brown, 2014; Vijayasingham, Jogulu, & Allotey, 2018). Such strategies
19
20 can work effectively for many sources of stigma that are concealable. Moreover, the centrality of
21
22 the stigma to an actor can influence decisions about whether to disclose or not: a stigma that is
23
24 more central to an actor’s identity may increase the likelihood of disclosure—especially if
25
26 authenticity is rewarded by certain audiences (Lyons, Wessel, Ghumman, Ryan & Kim, 2014;
27
28 Mohr et al., 2019). LGBT workers, for example, are more likely to express their sexual orientations
29
30 at work if their sexual identities are central to them (Jones & King, 2014; Peplau & Fingerhut,
31
32 2007), and organizations appear motivated to reveal their stigma to clients when it is “core” and
33
34 central to who they are (Wolfe & Blithe, 2015).
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Reconstruction** is used to reshape values, meanings, and/or interpretations of stigma. This
41
42 strategy involves attempting to normalize stigma (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Kreiner et al., 2006)
43
44 by reframing stigma in a more positive light, or by negating the stigma (Browning & McNamee,
45
46 2012; Caza, Vough, & Puranik, 2018; Lucas, 2015). Chwastiak (2015: 495) found that agents of
47
48 the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency reframed torture as clean work by “attributing benign intent
49
50 to the procedure,” “designating torture as legal,” and “embedding torture in mundane
51
52 organizational practices.” Although Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) highlighted “reframing” as a key
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to managing occupational stigma, it is also used by individuals, organizations, and industries to
4 manage their stigma. King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, and Turner (2006) found that individuals
5 manage the physical stigma of obesity by wearing professional attire that demonstrates their ability
6 to control their appearance, thereby challenging beliefs that the stigmatized lack self-control.
7
8 Tracey and Phillips (2016) found that Keystone, a social enterprise stigmatized for supporting
9 migrants, reframed migration as good for the economy and essential for public service.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 An alternative reconstruction tactic is “recalibrating,” or adjusting implicit standards of
18 assessing stigmatized attributes (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Hamilton et al., 2019; Johnston &
19 Hodge, 2014). For example, organic farming was stigmatized when it was first introduced in
20 Finland in the late 1970s and early 1980s; in response, organic farmers and journalists adjusted the
21 standards for evaluating modern farming to include environmental benefits so that organic farming
22 became understood as “a profitable and beneficial market category that served everyone’s interests”
23 (Siltaoja et al., 2020: 16).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Stigmatized actors can also shift attention to non-stigmatized aspects of their identities,
34 work, or organizations, sometimes referred to as “refocusing” (Ashforth et al., 2007: 150; Grandy
35 & Mavin, 2012; Mavin & Grandy, 2013). For example, Tyler (2011) found that employees
36 working in sex shops in London highlight the advice and guidance they provide to customers,
37 rather than the morally tainted aspects of their work. Walsh, Pazzaglia, and Ergene (2019) describe
38 how former members of a defunct technology company shared stories about the positive aspects
39 of their former organizational identity in order to verify their own worth, regardless of the
40 company’s failure.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Stigma management through reconstruction often results in improved identity outcomes—
52 such as an improved sense of self (Levine & Schweitzer, 2015), a stronger organizational identity
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Tracey & Phillips, 2016), and enhanced occupational pride (Just & Muhr, 2020). Hence, it is more likely to be deployed when stigma is central to an actor’s identity. Interestingly, unlike other strategies, this strategy enables actors to try to alter perceptions regarding the characteristics of stigma. For example, stigmatized actors can propose that a given stigma is not controllable or disruptive (Lamont, 2018; Lee et al., 2010; Spencer, Logel, & Davies, 2016), thereby potentially influencing reactions to the stigma.

Cooptation is a strategy whereby the stigmatized actor uses or manipulates stigma strategically. The underlying idea is that actors at all levels can “own” their stigma and benefit from it (Goffman, 1963; Tyler, 2011). For example, at the individual level, people can use stigma to differentiate themselves from others (Cha & Roberts, 2019; Clair et al., 2005; Steyrer, 1998) and to garner emotional, instrumental, and informational support from those who are similarly stigmatized (Norton, Dunn, Carney, & Ariely, 2012; Santuzzi & Waltz, 2016; Singletary & Hebl, 2009). At the occupational level, dirty workers, such as gynecology nurses, exotic dancers, or police officers, have been found “doing gender” by exhibiting exaggerated forms of expected gendered behaviors—in effect, embracing stigma (Bolton, 2005: 171; Mavin & Grandy, 2013; Perrott, 2019). This strategy, in other words, points to the fact that workers can accept “dirtiness” as is, and celebrate the distinctiveness that it provides (Barros, 2018; Dick, 2005; Huising, 2015). Organizations and industries have also been found to create controversy around their stigma in order to appeal to, and attract, certain audiences (Helms & Patterson, 2014; Roulet, 2020). Compared to boundary management, which builds upon the separation of the stigmatized from the stigmatizer, cooptation places greater emphasis on the deliberate mobilization of neutral and potentially supportive audiences by highlighting the merit and distinctiveness of the stigma.

Outcomes associated with cooptation include increased attention and social validation from

1
2
3 preferred audiences, and the potential for increased disapproval and hostility from others (Helms
4 & Patterson, 2014; Mavin & Grandy, 2011; Tracey & Phillips, 2016). Given that the strategy of
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
cooptation highlights the positive implications of stigma, it is particularly relevant for managing
stigmas that are moral, tribal, and physical, and that are less malleable but more central. The stigma
associated with sex workers, for example, is central to their identity but hard to change; thus, they
are more likely to use cooptation to solicit more supportive audiences.

Emotion work involves actors using or manipulating emotions to resist the negative influence
of stigmatization (Hochschild, 1979; McMurray & Ward, 2014; Tyler, 2011). It generally helps
actors cope by shifting the emotions associated with stigmatization from negative to positive (e.g.,
shame to pride) (Benjamin et al., 2011; Hamilton & McCabe, 2016; Levine & Schweitzer, 2015).
Emotion work can be applied to one's own emotions (Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Toubiana, 2020), or
may involve attempts to manipulate others' emotions (McMurray & Ward, 2014). For example,
individuals with physical stigma associated with obesity may exhibit friendliness and warmth in
an effort to reduce others' disgust, and by doing so, increase others' sympathy and intentions to
help them (Levine & Schweitzer, 2015). Hamilton and McCabe (2016) found that meat inspectors
expressed indifference, boredom, and sometimes pride rather than love, compassion, or upset in
order to resist their negative feelings about the mass-killing of chickens. At the organization and
industry levels, actors can work to activate certain emotions in order to garner appeal or acceptance,
and even to enhance emotional investment and ties with stakeholders (Lashley & Pollock, 2020;
Pontikes et al., 2010). For example, firms in medical cannabis industry used patients' testimonials
in marketing to build "emotional connections" with key audiences (Lashley & Pollock, 2020: 452).

Not surprisingly, emotion work is often used to address emotional sources of stigma, but
has relevance for all sources of stigma because stigmatization typically triggers feelings of shame

(Pescosolido & Martin, 2015). It appears to be more relevant when the stigma is less malleable and more controllable, as these characteristics are the most likely to trigger shaming efforts by external audiences. The fact that occupational stigma is often perceived as less malleable but more controllable (Kreiner et al., 2006) may explain why this strategy seems to be common at the occupational level (Benjamin et al., 2011; Hunter & Kivinen, 2016).

Summary. The six strategies we have outlined can be combined and are not mutually exclusive. Multiple strategies may be used, and certain strategies may be more relevant for certain sources and characteristics. Importantly, these strategies provide us with a common language to examine stigma management strategies.

III. PROCESSES OF STIGMATIZATION

In summary, our integrative framework pulls together insights from diverse streams of the management literature on stigma, and provides a unifying language that can enable scholars to better understand and build on these insights. Our framework, however, does more than reduce conceptual clutter. In this section, we show how it contributes to an enhanced understanding of processes of stigmatization. Our framework is important, in other words, because it renders the sources, characteristics, and strategic management of stigma comparable across different levels, thereby laying the foundation for investigating stigmatization as a complex process of emergence, transfer, maintenance, and removal that can occur horizontally *within* a certain level and vertically *between* and *across* levels. Thus, it sets the stage for a new trajectory of research that shifts the focus from responses and impacts of stigma to stigmatization processes that transcend levels. Figure 2 outlines how our framework contributes to future research on stigmatization processes.

Insert Figure 2 about Here

At the center of our framework sits a troika of the sources, characteristics, and management

1
2
3 strategies described in the previous section. Our goal in this section is to understand how this
4
5 framework opens up new opportunities for studying four specific aspects of stigmatization: its
6
7 emergence, transfer, maintenance, and removal within, between, and across levels. By emergence,
8
9 we mean how stigmatization begins. By transfer, we refer to the process by which stigmatization
10
11 that occurs at one level spills over to other levels. Maintenance speaks to how through both
12
13 purposeful and inadvertent actions, stigmatization persists, and even become taken-for-granted or
14
15 institutionalized. Lastly, removal refers to how stigmatization can be reduced or even eliminated.
16
17

18
19 While the immense and valuable body of work on stigma has revealed much about the
20
21 sources and characteristics of stigma (135 papers in our sample) and how actors respond to stigma
22
23 and the impact it has on their lives (111 papers in our sample), surprisingly, we found that
24
25 significantly less attention has been paid to these four elements of stigmatization as a process (only
26
27 22 papers in our sample)⁵. We argue that having a common language for the sources,
28
29 characteristics, and stigma management strategies places us in a better position to study
30
31 stigmatization processes. To illustrate potential theoretical questions to be tackled, we not only
32
33 engage several pioneering studies, but also use the COVID-19 pandemic that was unfolding as we
34
35 wrote this paper as an empirical example.
36
37
38

39 40 **Emergence**

41
42 In much of the literature, the question of where stigma comes from and how stigmatization
43
44 emerges remains unexplored. This is likely due to the fact that in many cases, stigma is already
45
46 institutionalized and systemically embedded in social structures (e.g., institutionalized racism)
47
48 (Lempert & Monsma, 1994; Loyd & Bonds, 2018). Yet, “stigmas reflect the fault lines in a society
49
50 at any one point and are as artificial and subject to change as national boundaries on a world map”
51
52
53

54
55 ⁵ These numbers do not perfectly add up to the number of studies included as some studies focus on more than one of
56
57 these elements.
58
59
60

(Pescosolido & Martin, 2015: 91). Indeed, stigmatization emerges more frequently than we expect, such as the recent stigmatization of the Catholic Church in the wake of sex scandals (Piazza & Jourdan, 2018) and of organic farming in Finland (Siltaoja et al., 2020).

We suggest that the ways in which the sources and characteristics of stigma interact can shape the potential trajectory of the emergence of stigmatization. First, there may be different baseline models of stigmatization—physical, tribal, moral, servile, associational, and emotional—each of which may have its own distinct trajectory, pace, and momentum depending on how the characteristics of stigma interact with these sources. Arguably, taking care of a family member with mental illness (i.e., a case of an emotional and associational stigma that is concealable and disruptive, but not controllable) may lead to slower and/or less intense stigmatization than that faced by individuals of certain races (i.e., a case of tribal stigma that is not concealable nor controllable, but is disruptive). We know, in general, that the more disruptive and controllable a stigma is perceived to be, the worse the potential stigmatization. We also know that concealability can shield actors from stigmatization. How might the source of stigma influence the impact of these characteristics on emergence? Thus, an interesting line of work for future research would be to compare the emergence of stigmatization from different combinations of sources and characteristics. For example, does the stigmatization of MMA (Helms & Patterson, 2014) more closely resemble that of nuclear power (Piazza & Perretti, 2015) than of men’s bathhouses (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009), given that the former stigmas originate from physical sources (i.e., violence and death) as opposed to the moral source associated with bathhouses (i.e., sexual preference)? How might the respective characteristics of each stigma influence the emergence process?

Our aspiration is also to expand the current scope of stigma research by exploring how the emergence of stigmatization at one level shapes or is shaped by the dynamics of stigmatization at

1
2
3 other levels. This raises another line of important research questions that attempt to trace and
4 follow stigmatization across levels. If stigmatization emerges at the individual level or the
5 organizational level, for example, how long might it take to trickle up or down? Are there specific
6 management strategies that will accelerate or slow this process? An excellent example of the type
7 of work we imagine is a paper by Wang and colleagues (2020). In the paper they discovered that
8 in China while the government attempted to publically shame individual physicians for profit-
9 seeking behaviors, it unintentionally catalyzed stigmatization at the profession level as a whole
10 leading to occupational and categorical stigma (Wang et al., 2020).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 To further illuminate our framework, and the type of research it encourages, we reflect on
22 the global COVID-19 pandemic as an example. During the first few months of the outbreak,
23 individuals of Chinese descent were stigmatized as were those wearing masks (McCullough, 2020),
24 particularly in North America. If scholars were to adopt the lenses of past research, they likely
25 would focus on the implications of stigmatization for the actors involved, or how these actors
26 coped with this stigmatization, which are indeed important. However, we call attention to the
27 emergence of stigmatization itself. For example, with COVID-19 the source of the stigma was
28 physical—a contagious virus—that was highly disruptive yet concealable. However, this physical
29 source of stigma became associated with a tribal source. Specifically, because the first known cases
30 were reported in China, “race” became tied to COVID-19, as it made the stigma visible. Similarly,
31 wearing a mask became stigmatized, as it too made the stigma visible. Several months after the
32 virus’s global spread, individuals who contracted the virus were pitied, while those of Asian
33 descent without the virus were vilified in many settings, and even attacked, as were businesses
34 such as Chinese restaurants. Our framework helps illuminate that the “disruptiveness” of the
35 stigma (i.e., virus contagiousness and dangerousness) as well as its “concealability” may be core
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

elements contributing to the tribal stigmatization of people of Asian descent because of their “association” with the location where the outbreak was first identified. It is likely that the existing stigmatization of visible minorities (tribal source) accelerated and contributed to the stigmatization surrounding COVID-19. It also seems possible that as countries later attempted to contain the spread of virus by lockdowns and physical distancing (i.e., dilution strategy) and/or blame or associate the virus with regions where the first outbreaks occurred (i.e., boundary management), they may have unintentionally fueled the stigmatization of people of Asian descent. That is, sigma management strategies can shape the emergence of stigmatization. However, as we explore below, the emergence of stigmatization can transfer, be maintained or removed, which happened as COVID-19 unfolded.

Understanding the ways in which stigmatization emerges as a social process is crucial for understanding its implications and management. As such, we encourage scholars to begin to examine nascent and emergent stigmatization, and how sources, characteristics, and management strategies influence this emergence, as well as how emergence at one level may influence other levels. The result, we believe, will be a more complete understanding of stigmatization, and of opportunities to trace the trajectory of stigmatization processes.

Transfer

Stigmatization can transfer across levels (Avery, McKay, & Volpone, 2016; Pozner, 2008; Wiesenfeld, Wurthmann, & Hambrick, 2008; Wurthmann, 2014). As Thomson and Grandy (2018: 235) put it: “stigma at the organizational level can ‘move’ from the organizational level to the occupational level and to the individual level.” Beyond acknowledging that this can happen, however, we have not extensively theorized or studied the process by which stigmatization transfers. While it is possible that stigma can transfer as a result of association (e.g., an accounting firm may be stigmatized for working with individual sex workers), the transfer of stigmatization

1
2
3 is more than a contamination process from a stigmatized actor to a non-stigmatized actor within a
4
5 certain level. The transfer of stigmatization speaks more generally to how a given stigma at a
6
7 certain level can be generalized and diffused by certain audiences to another entity at a different
8
9 level (Hsu & Grodal, 2020; Vergne, 2012). Understanding the ways in which stigmatization moves
10
11 is thus crucial for understanding the implications of stigmatization and how to manage them. Again,
12
13 our framework points to important, yet underexplored directions.
14
15

16
17 We propose that the source of stigma can impact whether and how stigmatization transfers
18
19 across levels. For example, previous studies suggest that moral stigmas (e.g., financial fraud) may
20
21 transfer from an organization to its leadership (Cowen & Marcel, 2011; Gomulya & Boeker, 2016;
22
23 Wiesenfeld et al., 2008) or to the entire industry (Roulet, 2015). Tribal stigma (e.g., racial minority)
24
25 may also transfer from a corporate leader to the entire company (Mikolon, Kreiner, & Wieseke,
26
27 2016; Rider & Negro, 2015) or spill over to a category of organizations whose leaders share the
28
29 same ethnicity (Yenkey, 2018). Will physical and/or emotional stigma transfer as easily?
30
31 Moreover, can the characteristics of a given stigma also exert an effect on the transfer of
32
33 stigmatization? For example, previous studies have implicitly suggested that controllable stigmas
34
35 (e.g., corporate failures caused by ethical transgressions) may be more likely to transfer across
36
37 levels than uncontrollable stigmas (Lee, Peng, & Barney, 2007; Wiesenfeld et al., 2008). Highly
38
39 disruptive stigmas may also be more likely to lead to transfer as people closely scrutinize any
40
41 potential relationship with stigmatized individuals when they are driven by fear (Granter, McCann,
42
43 & Boyle, 2015; Pontikes et al., 2010). Importantly, characteristics may interact with the sources
44
45 of stigma in ways that can shape its transference. Might moral stigmas that are disruptive, as in the
46
47 case of financial fraud (Marcel & Cowen, 2014), transfer more quickly across levels than
48
49 disruptive physical stigma, as in case of contagious disease or facial markings (cf. Ruggs et al.,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2015)? In sum, we still know very little about the effects of such interactions on the transfer of stigmatization.

Furthermore, stigma management strategies may render the transfer across levels even more complex. Arguably, information management (e.g., concealing) may prevent the transfer of stigmatization across levels, whereas cooptation of stigma at one level may encourage or expedite its transfer to other levels (e.g., celebrating the transgressive nature of sex shops may more readily stigmatize the industry or workers; Tyler, 2011).

Because our framework enables comparisons across levels, it provides an opportunity to observe and compare how the transfer of stigmatization between certain levels might vary. For example, is the transfer of stigmatization between individuals and organizations the same or different from that between industries and occupations? Recent work provides some hints. Mikolon et al. (2016) examined how stigmatization initially transferred from homeless employees to organizations, and then contaminated non-homeless employees, which decreased customers' willingness to reward the non-homeless employees. Similarly, Yenkey (2018) depicted a dynamic process of how leaders' involvement in misconduct interacted with their racial stigma, and transferred first to their organization, and then to an entire market category, which discouraged customers from future transactions within that market category. The transfer of stigmatization in these cases followed different trajectories: in the former study, stigmatization negatively implicated individuals inside an organization, whereas in the latter study, stigmatization extended beyond the boundary of the organization and contaminated the entire market category. Did the trajectories differ because the two stigmas originated from different sources? And/or, did the trajectories differ because the stigma associated with homelessness was perceived as uncontrollable, whereas that associated with misconduct was perceived as more controllable,

thereby compounding the stigmatization trajectory? By examining how stigmatization transfers, we can begin to identify what may aid or abet stigmatization processes.

Again, we reflect on the global COVID-19 pandemic as an example. As the stigmatization emerged in response to COVID-19, it transferred from patients in China to Chinese restaurants in North America (McCullough, 2020). While the lens of past work helps us understand how Chinese restaurants might strive to avoid associational stigma, perhaps through dilution (e.g., changing the type of cuisine) or boundary management (e.g., only serving Chinese customers), our framework surfaces other underexplored questions. Why and how did the original stigma spill over from a particular group of people to a category of organizations? Is it due to the concealability and disruptiveness of the highly contagious virus, as well as the low concealability of Chinese restaurants? What factors or characteristics might be buffers against the transfer of stigmatization? Expanding on existing work, how might different management strategies by government officials and regulators (e.g., Trump calling COVID-19 the “China Virus”) facilitate or stall the transfer? Moreover, was the process of transfer from patients to Chinese restaurants the same as that from patients to people who wear masks?

Maintenance

Stigma is often “persistent” (Link & Phelan, 2001: 379), yet stigmatization is not an automatic process. Stigmatization is maintained through both purposeful and inadvertent actions and inaction, which contribute to a stigma’s persistence, taken-for-grantedness and institutionalization. While much work has implicitly uncovered factors that might contribute to maintenance, less has been done to understand the actual mechanisms underlying it.

We know from existing insights that actors can cope with stigmatization by employing various strategies. Recent work has begun to suggest that these strategic responses can actually contribute to the persistence of the stigma and reinforce stigmatization in a broader environment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For example, Mikolon et al. (2020) showed that frontline workers’ stigma management tactics inadvertently reinforce the occupational moral stigma perceived by customers. Notably, five of the six management strategies in our framework (i.e., boundary management, dilution, information management, cooptation, and emotion work) could potentially contribute to the maintenance of stigmatization. When is this likely to happen? Furthermore, how is the maintenance of stigmatization influenced by distinct sources and characteristics? For example, is maintenance more likely to occur when a moral stigma is concealable and malleable (e.g., investing in or working behind the scenes of the adult film industry as actors are able to conceal) than if a moral stigma is characterized by high disruptiveness and centrality, but low concealability (e.g., using medical marijuana or injection sites)? Furthermore, given the sources and characteristics of stigma, are certain types of coping strategies more likely to maintain stigmatization across levels? While information management allows actors to avoid disclosure this strategy may contribute to maintenance, but reconstruction may not (Lashley & Pollock, 2020; Lawrence, 2017). Few scholars have systematically examined the dynamic relationships between the sources and characteristics of stigma and management strategy decisions, and how these relationships contribute to the maintenance of stigmatization. Detailing specific sources, characteristics, and management strategies will enable a better understanding of maintenance processes.

While recent contributions point toward ways that stigmatization might persist, we have a much less developed understanding of how the maintenance of stigmatization at one level might influence maintenance at other levels, even though the maintenance and persistence of stigmatization at a given level is often influenced by the coping and management strategies used at other level(s), both *intentionally* and *unintentionally*. For example, researchers have shown that when occupational workers use “gender” as a mechanism to cope with stigma at the individual

level, doing so reinforces gender stereotypes that contribute to the maintenance of gender as a higher-level tribal stigma (Bolton, 2005; Mavin & Grandy, 2013). Similarly, whereas the goal of affirmative action has been to reduce discrimination against individuals of certain groups, pursuing that goal has been found to inadvertently perpetuate tribal stigma by reinforcing perceptions of the inferiority of the entire group (Evans, 2003; Heilman, Block, & Stathatos, 1997; Heilman, Lucas, & Block, 1992; Unzueta, Lowery, & Knowles, 2008). Phung et al. (2020) discovered that although Uber as an organization attempted to avoid stigma transfer when it entered the taxi-driving industry, its stigma deflection strategy in fact worsened the stigmatization of taxi drivers. In contrast, some studies have shown that actors may intentionally maintain and coopt high-level stigmatization to achieve advantages at a lower level. In such cases, actors use and embrace stigmatization to garner attention and/or establish distinctiveness and appeal to particular audiences (Barros, 2018; Bolton, 2005; Helms & Patterson, 2014; McElroy et al., 2014; Roulet, 2019; Slade Shantz et al., 2019; Tyler, 2011), and, in so doing, capitalize and reinforce existing perceptions of stigmatization at a higher level.

To reflect again on the COVID-19 pandemic, the stigmatization of people of Chinese descent has been maintained to varying extents across communities in North America since the pandemic's inception (at the time of writing this was around 6 months). Tribal stigma is highly visible and particularly disruptive, given the current political tensions between the United States and China, and these two characteristics seem to be contributing to the maintenance of stigmatization. Likewise, stigma management strategies adopted at different levels might also be playing a role. For example, it is possible that Chinese immigrants are using boundary management to cope with the stigma (e.g., by restricting their social lives to Chinatowns or ethnic enclaves). This form of boundary management is more likely to be "competitive" rather than "collaborative,"

meaning that actors try to “protect territory and exclude others” by highlighting the distinction between “us” and “them” (Langley, Lindberg, Mørk, Nicolini, Raviola, & Walter, 2019: 707). As a result, geographic and social segregation may be contributing to stigma maintenance. In contrast, if governmental officials exhibit less hostility towards or even explicitly emphasize the positive value of Chinese immigrants, stigmatization in that region may be less persistent. Overall, there are many questions yet to be explored regarding the maintenance of stigmatization.

Removal

At the individual and occupational levels, destigmatization is often explained as “the process by which low-status individuals or groups gain recognition and worth in society” (Lamont, 2018: 420). Such a process is not easy, and typically involves the mobilization of different social actors (e.g., regulators, professionals, media, firms, and activists) who draw on cultural resources (e.g., existing ideologies) and engage in purposeful destigmatizing actions (Chwastiak, 2015; Just & Muhr, 2020; Lamont, 2018; Mavin & Grandy, 2013). As Hampel and Tracey (2017: 2175) put it, destigmatization occurs when organizations or industries become “normal” and “legitimate in the eyes of those who originally stigmatized them.”

We anticipate that the source of stigma may impact the trajectory of destigmatization. In much of the existing literature, scholars have examined how moral stigma may be removed. For example, researchers have investigated how priests who initially stigmatized life insurers for challenging the sanctity of life later endorsed them for their role in securing the financial survival of vulnerable families (Zelizer, 1978), and how the mainstream media, which originally tainted online dating companies for promoting promiscuity, subsequently accepted such providers for enabling social relationships (Hampel & Tracey, 2017). Perceptions of other sources, such as what is considered servile or what is physically abhorrent and dangerous, also can change.

Although eliminating stigmatization is difficult and sometimes unsuccessful (Lamont,

2018; Tracy & Scott, 2006), it is reasonable to anticipate that some sources of stigma are harder to remove than others. Tribal stigmas appear to be particularly challenging to remove, as indicated by ongoing racism, sexism, and other tribal stigmatization in society, despite efforts to reduce them. Associational stigma, in contrast, appears to be much easier to remove (Siltaoja et al., 2020). Indeed, certain alcohol categories have been successfully destigmatized by distancing themselves from “lower class” customers and associating themselves with higher status practices (Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016; Pedeliento, Andreini, & Dalli, 2019).

In addition to the sources of stigma, our framework suggests that paying attention to the characteristics of stigma may be helpful in understanding removal. For example, the destigmatization of people with HIV/AIDS was achieved by manipulating perceptions of controllability via education on the mechanism of contagion, thereby removing perceptions of people who catch the disease as blameworthy (Lamont, 2018). Yet, while we can speculate on how certain combinations of characteristics, sources, and stigma management strategies may influence the process and effectiveness of destigmatization, these are empirical questions ripe for exploration. For instance, is it easier to reduce stigmatization of employees working in a rape crisis center (an uncontrollable, emotional stigma; see Zilber, 2002) than that of individuals working in slaughterhouses or brothels (a controllable, moral stigma; see Baran et al., 2016; Voss, 2015)? And, if so, why?

Furthermore, the process of destigmatization often involves the use of particular strategies (Hampel & Tracey, 2017; Lamont, 2018). Compared to the strategies of dilution, information, and boundary management, each of which focuses on coping with the existing stigma, the reconstruction, cooptation, and emotion work strategies appear more relevant for removal (Levine & Schweitzer, 2015; Lyons et al., 2018). For example, Slay and Smith (2011) found that African

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

American journalists sought to destigmatize themselves via reconstruction (by generating new rhetoric and reframing their work as providing a distinctive perspective compared to that of white journalists). However, we still lack a comprehensive understanding of when and how reconstruction or cooptation may work, and how their successful implementation may depend upon the sources and characteristics of stigma.

Importantly, our framework also encourages consideration of how the removal of stigmatization at one level might shape or influence the removal of stigmatization at other levels. While some efforts and strategies at a given level might support destigmatization at other levels, others may worsen or enhance it (Helms & Patterson, 2014). For example, to destigmatize cannabis, stigmatized organizations emphasized the medical benefits of consuming marijuana (Lashley & Pollock, 2020). But what impact does this have on perceptions of recreational marijuana users? In a separate study, Aranda et al. (2020) showed that the legalization of medical marijuana shaped the destigmatization of alcohol, which shares the same health safety attribute as marijuana (e.g., safe consumption), but not of tobacco, for which producers have failed to present evidence of similar potential health benefits. In this case, stigmatization removal in the medical marijuana industry, spilled over to the alcohol industry, but failed to curtail stigmatization in the tobacco industry. In the future, researchers can investigate whether tobacco consumers (i.e., smokers) became more stigmatized following the success of medical marijuana because smoking violates the “health safety” attribute disseminated by the medical marijuana industry.

In the case of COVID-19, we have seen that, although the stigmatization of individuals of Chinese descent still persists at the time of this writing in the United States, the stigma of mask wearing has been removed, if not reversed. Indeed those not wearing masks are now more stigmatized than those who do, as many governments have made masks mandatory in all indoor

1
2
3 public spaces. Our framework enables us to unpack the process of destigmatization in instructive
4 ways. We can examine whether the source of the stigma—*tribal* versus *associational*—and its
5 characteristics—i.e., mask wearing being more *malleable* and highly *visible*—may have affected
6 the process. We can also investigate why and how the adoption of certain strategies might interact
7 with sources and characteristics and lead to different outcomes. Mass media *reconstructed* the
8 meaning of mask wearing from a signal of infection to one of protection. Further, we can explore
9 how the dynamics of destigmatization at other levels may have shaped the process. Has the
10 removal of stigma around the practice of mask wearing, which has been shaped largely by health
11 professionals and regulators, reduced racial stigma, as face masks were encouraged in Asia but
12 stigmatized in North America in the beginning of the pandemic (Leung, 2020)?

13
14 The research agenda we have outlined points to potential new avenues of research focused
15 on stigmatization processes, an agenda enabled by a common language for stigma scholarship.
16 Studying processes has become one of the central features of organizational theorists (Langley,
17 1999). More recently, scholars have suggested that there is room for further development and
18 application of new methods (Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013). Our agenda also
19 invites innovation and changes to extant methodologies within current silos. As we mentioned
20 earlier, the methodologies deployed in stigma research have tended to be similar within a particular
21 level of analysis. This is likely because a particular methodology was well suited for the types of
22 questions they focused on—such as experiments for demonstrating the implications of stigma on
23 individuals, or interviews for determining how dirty workers cope. When we push for research
24 beyond particular levels and focus on stigmatization processes more broadly, we will inherently
25 require more methodological diversity. Research designs will likely need to be more longitudinal
26 and process oriented, but can combine a variety of methods that range from qualitative to

1
2
3 quantitative. Perhaps novel methods like topic modelling (Hannigan et al., 2019) can be used to
4 collect more data and track patterns of stigmatization overtime? Or “netnography” (Kozinets, 2020)
5
6 to track emergent stigmatization processes in online enclaves and more hidden communities? We,
7
8 thus, encourage research to go beyond both the level and methodological silos as we develop this
9
10 new trajectory of research.
11
12
13

14 **Conclusion**

15
16 Stigma matters, and is becoming ever more important as it increasingly threatens to
17
18 fragment our society (Lamont, 2018; Loyd & Bonds, 2018). The importance of understanding
19
20 stigma is reflected in the awarding by the OMT Division of Academy of Management of the 2020
21
22 OMT Joanne Martin Trailblazer Award to Doug Creed, Bryant Hudson, Gerardo Okhuysen, and
23
24 Maureen Scully for “starting and shaping our conversation about LGBT issues, stigma, shame,
25
26 taboo, and power in organizational settings.” Our aspiration in this Annals paper is to advance that
27
28 conversation. Our thesis is, that to address challenges wrought by stigma, we need to develop a
29
30 better understanding of how stigmatization emerges, transfers, is maintained, or removed. Our
31
32 review shows that the conceptual clutter in prior stigma research has provided important insights,
33
34 but has restricted us from examining stigmatization processes. To address this problem, we have
35
36 outlined an integrative framework that conceptualizes six sources, five characteristics, and six
37
38 management strategies, thereby paving the way for scholars to integrate insights from different
39
40 streams of literature across different levels. We have shown how this framework facilitates a shift
41
42 in our research agenda from how a particular actor copes with a particular stigma at a particular
43
44 level, to how individuals, organizations, occupations, and industries become stigmatized and how
45
46 their stigmatization emerges, transfers, is maintained, or removed. Using this framework, we, as
47
48 social scientists, can contribute to promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion across society.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: Number of Articles by Level of Analysis Studied

* We used a three-year moving average to show a clearer trend.

Figure 2. Integrative Framework of Stigmatization

Table 1: Summary of Articles

Journal	Number of articles
Management	
Academy of Management Annals	2
Academy of Management Journal	19
Academy of Management Review	11
Administrative Science Quarterly	9
Gender, Work & Organization	19
Human Relations	26
Journal of Business Ethics	14
Journal of Management	11
Journal of Management Studies	9
Journal of Organizational Behavior	9
Organization	11
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	5
Organization Science	11
Organization Studies	6
Strategic Management Journal	7
Others	4
Sociology	
American Journal of Sociology	8
Annual Review of Sociology	5
American Sociological Review	14
Psychology	
Annual Review of Psychology	7
Journal of Applied Psychology	22
Psychological Bulletin	7
Others	3
Total	239

Table 2: Sources of Stigma

Source	Definition	Previous terms used to describe these sources
Physical	Stigma caused by a blemish of the body such as appearance and disability, and/or that which is associated with dirt, the effluent, physically disgusting, or dangerous environments.	Body, physical attractiveness
Tribal	Stigma caused by membership in a certain group, clan or category.	Cultural roots, group membership, social
Moral	Stigma caused by an attribute or behavior considered to be sinful or morally inappropriate.	Character, conduct, coalitional exploitation, criminal, lack of virtue, norm violations, sinful
Servile	Stigma caused by one's involvement in that which is perceived as degrading through subservience.	Social
Emotional	Stigma caused by involvement and need to engage with the burdensome and threatening emotions.	Affective stigma, emotional dirt, emotional taint
Associational	Stigma caused by proximity, association, or contact with actors who are stigmatized.	Communicability, courtesy, mere association, proximity

Table 3: Characteristics of Stigma

Characteristic	Definition	Previous terms used to describe these characteristics
Concealability	The extent to which a stigma can be hidden or disguised from others.	Discredited/discreditable, observable, salience, visibility
Controllability	The extent to which a stigmatized actor is perceived to be responsible for causing, having, or maintaining the stigma.	Attribution of blame, origin, responsibility
Centrality	The relative proximity of stigmatized attributes or practices to the core identity of the actor(s).	A matter of degree, breadth, core
Disruptiveness	The degree to which the stigma disrupts social interaction and/or is perceived as a threat to others in society.	Dangerousness, harm, peril, precarious, threat
Malleability	The extent to which the stigmatizing condition changes over time.	Course, stages, fluctuations, malleable, (non)recoverable, unstable

Table 4: Stigma Management Strategies

Strategy	Definitions	Levels	Empirical examples	General consequences
Boundary management	Actors attempt to construct boundaries between insiders (those who are stigmatized) and outsiders (those who are not).	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forming “peer support networks” (Gray et al., 2018: 1239) • Crafting narratives or outlining differences to draw boundary between “us” and “them” (e.g., Khazzoom, 2003; Moon, 2012: 1350) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and shield stigmatized actors from negative social evaluations • Enhanced group identity outcomes (sense of entitativity)
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social weighting: Selective social comparisons and differential weighting of outsiders’ views (e.g., Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Mavin & Grandy, 2013; Slutskaya et al., 2016) • Social buffers: Building distinctive in-group(s) to build a “bulwark” against identity threats (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2007: 160; Baran et al., 2012; Soni-Sinha & Yates, 2013) • Occupational concentration (Tilcsik et al., 2015) 	
		Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawing: Avoiding interaction with audiences who know the firm’s predicament (Sutton & Callahan, 1987) • Using isolation, integration, dramaturgy, associational, and conventional strategies to shield stakeholders (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009) • Highlighting the respectability of the users and attacking the stigmatizers (Hampel & Tracey, 2017) 	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital disintermediating by find a “direct digital pathway to customers” (Slade Shantz et al., 2019: 1269) 	
Dilution	Actors sever, reduce, or alter their ties to a source of stigma.	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Assimilating” (projecting favorable characteristics of another group) and “decategorizing” (removing references to the stigmatized group) (e.g., Fernando et al., 2020; Lynch & Rodell, 2018: 1311; Lyons et al., 2017) • Surgical or physical alteration of stigma (e.g., Goffman, 1963; Levay, 2014; Levine & Schweitzer, 2015) • “Jumping ship:” Voluntarily leaving the firm to avoid the risk of stigmatization (e.g., Jiang et al., 2017: 2601; Semadeni et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce or alter stigma • Distance actor from stigma and improve social validation
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distancing or withdrawing from stigmatized work (e.g., Baran et al., 2016; Courpasson & Monties, 2017; Gonzalez & Pérez-Floriano, 2015) • Distancing from clients (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2007; Hancock, 2016; Hansen & Kamp, 2018) 	
		Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Cleaning house:” Encouraging directors to leave (e.g., Cowen & Marcel, 2011; Gomulya & Boeker, 2016; Marcel & Cowen, 2014: 927) • Physical or symbolic decoupling (e.g., Devers et al., 2009; Elsbach, 1994; Elsbach & Sutton, 1992) • Partner defection (Bruyaka et al., 2018) 	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straddling by operating in multiple categories to dilute the stigma (e.g., Alexy & George, 2013; Vergne, 2012) • Asset divestments (e.g., Durand & Vergne, 2015; Piazza & Perretti, 2015) • Being “discrete with signage and other tangible markers” (Slade Shantz et al., 2019: 1269) • Category contraction by diverting stigma as a feature of a subgroup (Siltaoja et al., 2020: 19) • Category detachment and category disidentification by distancing from the stigmatized category (Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016; Lashley & Pollock, 2020: 453) 	
Information management	Actors manage the information they share or disclose about their stigmatized attribute.	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concealing: Attempting to “pass” by consciously and actively hiding stigma (e.g., Jones et al., 2016; Leavitt & Sluss, 2015; Ragins, 2008) • Signaling: “Testing the waters” by providing hints, clues and implicit messages (e.g., Clair et al., 2005; Jones & King, 2014: 1471; King et al., 2017) • Revealing: Actively and purposefully disclosing one’s stigmatized identity to others (e.g., Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Doldor & Atewologun, 2020; Follmer et al., 2020) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect stigmatized actors from negative social evaluations (passing) • Improved identity outcomes (i.e., enhanced sense of self and strengthened identification) • Negative social evaluations and sanctions when disclosing
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing, hiding, or concealing: Withholding information about one’s occupation (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2007; Brewis & Godfrey, 2018; Reid, 2015) • “Closeting:” Lying about one’s occupation (Kong, 2006) 	
		Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding acknowledgement of a scandal (Sutton & Callahan, 1987) • Mimicry of non-stigmatized organizations (e.g., men’s bathhouses advertising themselves as gyms rather than sex venues) (Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009: 114) • Acknowledging the organizational predicament and accepting responsibility (Elsbach, 1994; Sutton & Callahan, 1987) 	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using a “corporate disguise” by creating a new business entity with a different name (Slade Shantz et al., 2019: 1269) • Repressing a stigmatized history (Voronov et al., 2013) • “Covering” by directing attention away from the stigmatizing past (Rivera, 2008: 614) 	

Table 4 (cont’d): Stigma Management Strategies

Strategies	Definitions	Levels	Empirical examples	General consequences
Reconstruction	Actors attempt to reshape values, meanings, and/or interpretations of stigma to repair stigmatized identities and/or construct new identities.	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reframing: Infusing identity with positive value (e.g., Lucas, 2015; Petriglieri, 2011; Slay & Smith, 2011)• Explaining, negating, or justifying negative attributions, i.e., pointing to discrimination (e.g., Ali et al., 2017; Crocker et al., 1998; Major & O’Brien, 2005)• Challenging the belief of stigmatized identity (e.g., Cha & Roberts, 2019; King et al., 2006; Link & Phelan, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved identity outcomes (i.e., enhanced sense of self and strengthened social and group identification)• Emergence of normalizing ideologies that reduce stigma• Reduction of stigma and increased social validation by some audiences
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reframing: Infusing the work with positive value and/or rejecting its negative value (e.g., Chwastiak, 2015; Dick, 2005; Jensen, 2017)• Recalibrating: Changing the implicit standards used to assess the work (e.g., Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Hamilton et al., 2019; Johnston & Hodge, 2014)• Refocusing: Shifting attention towards non-stigmatized aspects of work (Ashforth et al., 2007: 150; Grandy & Mavin, 2012; Mavin & Grandy, 2013)	
		Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cultivating an anti-stigma culture (e.g., Follmer & Jones, 2018; Kulik et al., 2008; Leslie et al., 2014)• Identity reframing by clarifying an organization’s purpose and building solidarity (Tracey & Phillips, 2016)• Constructing practices to change people’s perceptions (e.g., Helms & Patterson, 2014; Zilber, 2002)• “Destigmatization” reframing the focal organization as “beneficial” and not harmful to society (Hampel & Tracey, 2017: 2199)	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Normalizing” by reframing the stigma as acceptable, and “moralizing” by explaining why serving the stigmatized market is moral (Slade Shantz et al., 2019: 1273)• Category assimilation by extending boundaries to legitimate categories, and category differentiation by constructing a distinctive identity from conventional categories (Siltaoja et al., 2020: 13)• Category emulation by linking a stigmatized category to one of high status via objects (Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016)• “Cultural reframing” by repositioning a stigmatized entity as identical to non-stigmatized neighbors (Rivera, 2008: 614)	
Cooptation	Actors use stigma strategically for specific purposes.	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Using stigma to gain identification with one’s stigmatized group to garner emotional, instrumental, and informational support (e.g., Major & O’Brien, 2005; Santuzzi & Waltz, 2016; Singletary & Hebl, 2009)• Intentionally acknowledging stigma via claiming or downplaying to manage others’ impressions (e.g., Kang et al., 2016; Lyons et al., 2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved identity outcomes (i.e., enhanced sense of self and strengthened social and group identification)• Improved validation from some audiences and reduced validation from others
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Doing gender:” Exhibiting exaggerated forms of expected gendered behaviors to embrace stigma and/or distinguish a type of worker (Bolton, 2005: 171; Rivera, 2015; Tracy & Scott, 2006)• “Embracing” stigma by accepting dirtiness and celebrating distinctiveness (e.g., Barros, 2018: 764; Reid, 2015)• Appropriation of the stigmatized label (e.g., Tibbals, 2013; Toyoki & Brown, 2014)	
		Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Using stigma to attract attention and resources from supportive audiences and create controversy with others (Helms & Patterson, 2014; Tracey & Phillips, 2016)	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Exploiting:” Embracing negative judgments and using them to the firm’s advantage when entering a stigmatized market (Slade Shantz et al., 2019: 1269)	
Emotion work	Actors use or manipulate emotions to resist the negative influence of stigmatization.	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exhibiting warmth to change negative feelings such as disgust and sympathy (Levine & Schweitzer, 2015)• Emotional regulation (e.g., Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Kessler et al., 2012)• Rejecting the “emotional politics” by negotiating sense of inclusion and belonging (Benjamin et al., 2011: 340).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved identity outcomes (i.e., enhanced sense of self and strengthened social and group identifications)• Improved emotional outcomes (i.e., pride instead of shame)• Altered perceptions of stigma
		Occupational	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Performing “abject labor:” Work that is “simultaneously attractive and repellent” (e.g., Hunter & Kivinen, 2016; Tyler, 2011: 1479)• Rationalizing and organizing emotion by reframing challenging and difficult work as a source of satisfaction (e.g., Hamilton & McCabe, 2016; McLoughlin, 2019; McMurray & Ward, 2014)• “Emotional politics:” Using emotion to exert control (Benjamin et al., 2011: 340)	
		Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Moral panic:” Fostering public fear (Pontikes et al., 2010: 457)• Developing “emotional connections” with certain stakeholders (Lashley & Pollock, 2020: 452)	

REFERENCES

- Alexy, O., & George, G. 2013. Category divergence, straddling, and currency: Open innovation and the legitimation of illegitimate categories. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(2): 173–203.
- Ali, A. A., Lyons, B. J., & Ryan, A. M. 2017. Managing a perilous stigma: Ex-offenders' use of reparative impression management tactics in hiring contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9): 1271–1285.
- Anteby, M. 2010. Markets, morals, and practices of trade: Jurisdictional disputes in the U.S. commerce in cadavers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4): 606–638.
- Aranda, A. M., Conti, R., & Wezel, F. C. 2020. Distinct but not apart? Stigma reduction and cross-industry evaluative spillovers: The case of medical marijuana legalization. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Ashforth, B. E. 2019. Stigma and legitimacy: Two ends of a single continuum or different continua altogether? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 28(1): 22–30.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. 1999. "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3): 413–434.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., Clark, M. A., & Fugate, M. 2007. Normalizing dirty work: Managerial tactics for countering occupational taint. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 149–174.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., Clark, M. A., & Fugate, M. 2017. Congruence work in stigmatized occupations: A managerial lens on employee fit with dirty work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(8): 1260–1279.
- Augustine, G., & Piazza, A. (forthcoming) Stigmatized category evolution: The organization of abortion services in the United States. *Organization Science*
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Volpone, S. D. 2016. Blaming the building: How venue quality influences consumer bias against stigmatized leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(8): 1111–1121.
- Baran, B. E., Rogelberg, S. G., Carello Lopina, E., Allen, J. A., Spitzmüller, C., & Bergman, M. 2012. Shouldering a silent burden: The toll of dirty tasks. *Human Relations*, 65(5): 597–626.
- Baran, B. E., Rogelberg, S. G., & Clausen, T. 2016. Routinized killing of animals: Going beyond dirty work and prestige to understand the well-being of slaughterhouse workers. *Organization*, 23(3): 351–369.
- Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. 2007. Discrimination and stigmatization in work organizations: A multiple level framework for research on genetic testing. *Human Relations*, 60(6): 953–980.
- Barlow, M. A., Verhaal, J. C., & Hoskins, J. D. 2018. Guilty by association: Product-level category stigma and audience expectations in the U.S. craft beer industry. *Journal of Management*, 44(7): 2934–2960.
- Barros, M. 2018. Digitally crafting a resistant professional identity: The case of Brazilian 'dirty' bloggers. *Organization*, 25(6): 755–783.
- Bayly, S. 2001. *Caste, society and politics in India from the eighteenth century to the modern age* (vol. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beams, J. D., Brown, R. M., & Killough, L. N. 2003. An experiment testing the determinants of non-compliance with insider trading laws. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(4): 309–323.
- Benjamin, O., Bernstein, D., & Motzafi-Haller, P. 2011. Emotional politics in cleaning work: The

- case of Israel. *Human Relations*, 64(3): 337–357.
- Blithe, S. J., & Wolfe, A. W. 2017. Work-life management in legal prostitution: Stigma and lockdown in Nevada's brothels. *Human Relations*, 70(6): 725–750.
- Bolton, S., C. 2005. Women's work, dirty work: The gynaecology nurse as 'other'. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(2): 169–186.
- Boyce, A. S., Ryan, A. M., Imus, A. L., & Morgeson, F. P. 2007. "Temporary worker, permanent loser?" A model of the stigmatization of temporary workers. *Journal of Management*, 33(1): 5–29.
- Brand, J. E., & Thomas, J. S. 2014. Job displacement among single mothers: Effects on children's outcomes in young adulthood. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(4): 955–1001.
- Brewis, J., & Godfrey, R. 2018. 'Never call me a mercenary': Identity work, stigma management and the private security contractor. *Organization*, 25(3): 335–353.
- Browning, B. W., & McNamee, L. G. 2012. Considering the temporary leader in temporary work arrangements: Sensemaking processes of internal interim leaders. *Human Relations*, 65(6): 729–752.
- Bruyaka, O., Philippe, D., & Castañer, X. 2018. Run away or stick together? The impact of organization-specific adverse events on alliance partner defection. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(3): 445–469.
- Byun, S. Y., & Won, S. Y. 2020. Are they ideological renegades? Fathers' experiences on taking parental leave and gender dynamics in Korea: A qualitative study. *Gender Work and Organization*. doi:10.1111/gwao.12410
- Caponecchia, C., Sun, A. Y. Z., & Wyatt, A. 2012. 'Psychopaths' at work? Implications of lay persons' use of labels and behavioural criteria for psychopathy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(4): 399–408.
- Carberry, E. J., & King, B. G. 2012. Defensive practice adoption in the face of organizational stigma: Impression management and the diffusion of stock option expensing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7): 1137–1167.
- Caza, B. B., Vough, H., & Puranik, H. 2018. Identity work in organizations and occupations: Definitions, theories, and pathways forward. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7): 889–910.
- Cha, S. E., & Roberts, L. M. 2019. Leveraging minority identities at work: An individual-level framework of the identity mobilization process. *Organization Science*, 30(4): 735–760.
- Chaudoir, S. R., & Fisher, J. D. 2010. The disclosure processes model: Understanding disclosure decision making and postdisclosure outcomes among people living with a concealable stigmatized identity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(2): 236–256.
- Chrispal, S., Bapuji, H., & Zietsma, C. 2020. Caste and organization studies: Our silence makes us complicit. *Organization Studies*, 0170840620964038.
- Chuang, Y. T., Church, R., & Ophir, R. 2011. Taking sides: The interactive influences of institutional mechanisms on the adoption of same-sex partner health benefits by fortune 500 corporations, 1990-2003. *Organization Science*, 22(1): 190–209.
- Chwastiak, M. 2015. Torture as normal work: The Bush administration, the Central Intelligence Agency and 'enhanced interrogation techniques'. *Organization*, 22(4): 493–511.
- Clair, J. A., Beatty, J. E., & Maclean, T. L. 2005. Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1): 78–95.
- Clair, M., Daniel, C., & Lamont, M. 2016. Destigmatization and health: Cultural constructions and

- the long-term reduction of stigma. *Social Science & Medicine*, 165: 223–232.
- Coslor, E. H., Crawford, B., & Brents, B. G. 2020. Whips, chains, and books on campus: How emergent organizations with core stigma gain official recognition. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 29(3), 299–316.
- Courpasson, D., & Monties, V. 2017. “I am my body.” Physical selves of police officers in a changing institution. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(1): 32–57.
- Cowen, A. P., & Marcel, J. J. 2011. Damaged goods: Board decisions to dismiss reputationally compromised directors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 509–527.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. 1998. Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (vol. 2, 4th ed.): 504–553. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. 2003. Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 56(11): 1299–1324.
- Delmestri, G., & Greenwood, R. 2016. How Cinderella became a queen: Theorizing radical status change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(4): 507–550.
- Derous, E., Ryan, A. M., & Nguyen, H. H. D. 2012. Multiple categorization in resume screening: Examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field and lab settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(4): 544–570.
- Desai, V. M. 2018. Third-party certifications as an organizational performance liability. *Journal of Management*, 44(8): 3096–3123.
- Devers, C. E., Dewett, T., Mishina, Y., & Belsito, C. A. 2009. A general theory of organizational stigma. *Organization Science*, 20(1): 154–171.
- Dick, P. 2005. Dirty work designations: How police officers account for their use of coercive force. *Human Relations*, 58(11): 1363–1390.
- Diestre, L., & Santaló, J. 2020. Why do firms suffer differently from input stigmatization? The costs of removing stigmatized inputs. *Organization Science*, 31(1): 47–66.
- Dirth, T. P., & Branscombe, N. R. 2018. The social identity approach to disability: Bridging disability studies and psychological science. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(12): 1300–1324.
- Doldor, E., & Atewologun, D. 2020. Why work it when you can dodge it? Identity responses to ethnic stigma among professionals. *Human Relations*. doi:10.1177/0018726719895552
- Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Durand, R., & Vergne, J.-P. 2015. Asset divestment as a response to media attacks in stigmatized industries. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(8): 1205–1223.
- Dyer, S., McDowell, L., & Batnitzky, A. 2010. The impact of migration on the gendering of service work: The case of a West London hotel. *Gender Work and Organization*, 17(6): 635–657.
- Elraz, H. 2018. Identity, mental health and work: How employees with mental health conditions recount stigma and the pejorative discourse of mental illness. *Human Relations*, 71(5): 722–741.
- Elsbach, K. D. 1994. Managing organizational legitimacy in the California cattle industry: The construction and effectiveness of verbal accounts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1): 57–88.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Sutton, R. I. 1992. Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(4): 699–738.
- Evans, D. C. 2003. A comparison of the other-directed stigmatization produced by legal and illegal

- forms of affirmative action. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1): 121–130.
- Fernando, M., Reveley, J., & Learmonth, M. 2020. Identity work by a non-white immigrant business scholar: Autoethnographic vignettes of covering and accenting. *Human Relations*, 73(6): 765–788.
- Fisher, A. P. 2003. Still “not quite as good as having your own”? Toward a sociology of adoption. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 335–361.
- Follmer, K. B., & Jones, K. S. 2018. Mental illness in the workplace: An interdisciplinary review and organizational research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 44(1): 325–351.
- Follmer, K. B., Sabat, I. E., & Siuta, R. L. 2020. Disclosure of stigmatized identities at work: An interdisciplinary review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(2): 169–184.
- Frost, P.J., 2007. *Toxic emotions at work and what you can do about them*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Galvin, T. L., Ventresca, M. J., & Hudson, B. A. 2004. Contested industry dynamics: New directions in the study of legitimacy. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 34(4): 56–82.
- Goffman, E. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gomulya, D., & Boeker, W. 2016. Reassessing board member allegiance: CEO replacement following financial misconduct. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(9): 1898–1918.
- Gonzalez, J. A., & Pérez-Floriano, L. R. 2015. If you can’t take the heat: Cultural beliefs about questionable conduct, stigma, punishment, and withdrawal among Mexican police officers. *Organization Studies*, 36(5): 665–687.
- Gonzalez, K., Tillman, C. J., & Holmes, J. J. 2019. Coming home: Why veterans with disabilities withhold workplace accommodation requests. *Human Relations*.
- Grandey, A. A., Gabriel, A. S., & King, E. B. 2019. Tackling taboo topics: A review of the three ms in working women’s lives. *Journal of Management*.
- Grandy, G., & Mavin, S. 2012. Occupational image, organizational image and identity in dirty work: Intersections of organizational efforts and media accounts. *Organization*, 19(6): 765–786.
- Granter, E., McCann, L., & Boyle, M. 2015. Extreme work/normal work: Intensification, storytelling and hypermediation in the (re)construction of ‘the new normal’. *Organization*, 22(4): 443–456.
- Grattet, R. 2011. Societal reactions to deviance. In K. S. Cook & D. S. Massey (Eds.), *Annual review of sociology*, vol. 37: 185–204. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Gray, B., Johnson, T., Kish-Gephart, J., & Tilton, J. 2018. Identity work by first-generation college students to counteract class-based microaggressions. *Organization Studies*, 39(9): 1227–1250.
- Guerrier, Y., & Adib, A. 2003. Work at leisure and leisure at work: A study of the emotional labour of tour reps. *Human Relations*, 56(11): 1399–1417.
- Hall, E. V., Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Blot, J. F., & Edwards, M. 2019. Composition and compensation: The moderating effect of individual and team performance on the relationship between Black team member representation and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(3): 448–463.
- Hamilton, L., & McCabe, D. 2016. ‘It’s just a job’: Understanding emotion work, de-animalization and the compartmentalization of organized animal slaughter. *Organization*, 23(3): 330–

- 350.
- Hamilton, P., Redman, T., & McMurray, R. 2019. "Lower than a snake's belly": Discursive constructions of dignity and heroism in low-status garbage work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4): 889–901.
- Hampel, C. E., & Tracey, P. 2017. How organizations move from stigma to legitimacy: The case of Cook's Travel Agency in Victorian Britain. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(6): 2175–2207.
- Hampel, C., & Tracey, P. 2019. Introducing a spectrum of moral evaluation: Integrating organizational stigmatization and moral legitimacy. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 28(1): 11–15.
- Hancock, P. 2016. Recognition and the moral taint of sexuality: Threat, masculinity and Santa Claus. *Human Relations*, 69(2): 461–481.
- Hanna, E., & Gough, B. 2019. The impact of infertility on men's work and finances: Findings from a qualitative questionnaire study. *Gender Work and Organization*. doi:10.1111/gwao.12414
- Hannigan, T. R., Haans, R. F. J., Vakili, K., Tchalian, H., Glaser, V. L., Wang, M. S., Kaplan, S., & Jennings, P. D. 2019. Topic modeling in management research: Rendering new theory from textual data. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2), 586–632.
- Hansen, A. M., & Kamp, A. 2018. From carers to trainers: Professional identity and body work in rehabilitative eldercare. *Gender Work and Organization*, 25(1): 63–76.
- Harding, D. J., Morenoff, J. D., Nguyen, A. P., & Bushway, S. D. 2018. Imprisonment and labor market outcomes: Evidence from a natural experiment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 124(1), 49–110.
- Harris, A., Evans, H., & Beckett, K. 2011. Courtesy stigma and monetary sanctions: Toward a socio-cultural theory of punishment. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2): 234–264.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L. 2009. How does sexual minority stigma "get under the skin"? A psychological mediation framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(5): 707–730.
- Haveman, H. A., & Gualtieri, G. 2017. Institutional logics. In R. Aldag (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.137
- Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. 2007. Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: Complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6): 1499–1511.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Stathatos, P. 1997. The affirmative action stigma of incompetence: Effects of performance information ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3): 603–625.
- Heilman, M. E., Lucas, J. A., & Block, C. J. 1992. Presumed incompetent—stigmatization and affirmative-action efforts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(4): 536–544.
- Helgeson, V. S., & Zajdel, M. 2017. Adjusting to chronic health conditions. In S. T. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 68: 545–571. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Helms, W. S., & Patterson, K. D. 2014. Eliciting acceptance for "illicit" organizations: The positive implications of stigma for MMA organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5): 1453–1484.
- Herek, G. M., & McLemore, K. A. 2013. Sexual prejudice. In S. T. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 64: 309–333. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews
- Hernandez, M., Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Hebl, M. R., Smith, A. N., & McKay, P. F. 2016.

- The role of proximal social contexts: Assessing stigma-by-association effects on leader appraisals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(1): 68–85.
- Heslin, P. A., Bell, M. P., & Fletcher, P. O. 2012. The devil without and within: A conceptual model of social cognitive processes whereby discrimination leads stigmatized minorities to become discouraged workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(6): 840–862.
- Hochschild, A. R. 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3): 551–575.
- Hsu, G. T., & Grodal, S. 2020. The double-edged sword of oppositional category positioning: A study of the US e-cigarette category, 2007–2017. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. doi:10.1177/0001839220914855
- Hudson, B., Wong-Mingji, D., & Loree, D. 2000. *Changing the field: The effect of illegitimacy on competing organizational forms*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto.
- Hudson, B. A. 2008. Against all odds: A consideration of core-stigmatized organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 252–266.
- Hudson, B. A., & Okhuysen, G. A. 2009. Not with a ten-foot pole: Core stigma, stigma transfer, and improbable persistence of men's bathhouses. *Organization Science*, 20(1): 134–153.
- Hughes, E. C. 1951. Studying the nurse's work. *American Journal of Nursing*, 51(5): 294–295.
- Hughes, E. C. 1958. *Men and their work*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Huising, R. 2015. To hive or to hold? Producing professional authority through scut work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(2): 263–299.
- Hunter, C., & Kivinen, N. 2016. Constructing girlhood: Abject labour in magazine offices. *Gender Work and Organization*, 23(6): 551–565.
- Hunter, L. R., & Schmidt, N. B. 2010. Anxiety psychopathology in African American adults: Literature review and development of an empirically informed sociocultural model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(2): 211–235.
- Ingram, P., & Silverman, B. S. 2016. The cultural contingency of structure: Evidence from entry to the slave trade in and around the abolition movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(3): 755–797.
- Jensen, M. C. F. 2017. Gender stereotypes and the reshaping of stigma in rehabilitative eldercare. *Gender Work and Organization*, 24(6): 656–674.
- Jiang, H., Cannella, A. A., Xia, J., & Semadeni, M. 2017. Choose to fight or choose to flee? A network embeddedness perspective of executive ship jumping in declining firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(10): 2061–2079.
- Johnson, S. K., Sitzmann, T., & Nguyen, A. T. 2014. Don't hate me because I'm beautiful: Acknowledging appearance mitigates the "beauty is beastly" effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 125(2): 184–192.
- Johnson, T. D., & Joshi, A. 2016. Dark clouds or silver linings? A stigma threat perspective on the implications of an autism diagnosis for workplace well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(3): 430–449.
- Johnston, M., S., & Hodge, E. 2014. 'Dirt, death and danger? I don't recall any adverse reaction ...': Masculinity and the taint management of hospital private security work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(6): 546–558.
- Johnstone, M. L., & Tan, L. P. 2015. Exploring the gap between consumers' green rhetoric and purchasing behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132(2): 311–328.
- Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A. H., Scott, R. A., Markus, H., Miller, D., Scott, R.A., French,

- R. d. S. 1984. *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Jones, K. P., & King, E. B. 2014. Managing concealable stigmas at work: A review and multilevel model. *Journal of Management*, 40(5): 1466–1494.
- Jones, K. P., King, E. B., Gilrane, V. L., McCausland, T. C., Cortina, J. M., & Grimm, K. J. 2016. The baby bump: Managing a dynamic stigma over time. *Journal of Management*, 42(6), 1530–1556.
- Just, S. N., & Muhr, S. L. 2020. Holding on to both ends of a pole: Empowering feminine sexuality and reclaiming feminist emancipation. *Gender Work and Organization*, 27(1): 6–23.
- Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. 2014. Bullying in schools: The power of bullies and the plight of victims. In S. T. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 65: 159–185. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K. A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. 2016. Whitened resumes: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(3): 469–502.
- Kessler, I., Heron, P., & Dopson, S. 2012. Opening the window: Managing death in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 65(3): 291–312.
- Khazzoom, A. 2003. The great chain of orientalism: Jewish identity, stigma management, and ethnic exclusion in Israel. *American Sociological Review*, 68(4): 481–510.
- Kibler, E., Mandl, C., Farny, S., & Salmivaara, V. 2020. Post-failure impression management: A typology of entrepreneurs' public narratives after business closure. *Human Relations*. doi:10.1177/0018726719899465
- King, E. B., Mohr, J. J., Peddie, C. I., Jones, K. P., & Kendra, M. 2017. Predictors of identity management: An exploratory experience-sampling study of lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers. *Journal of Management*, 43(2): 476–502.
- King, E. B., Shapiro, J. R., Hebl, M. R., Singletary, S. L., & Turner, S. 2006. The stigma of obesity in customer service: A mechanism for remediation and bottom-line consequences of interpersonal discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3): 579–593.
- Kleck, R. 1968. Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face-to-face interaction. *Human Relations*, 21(1): 19–28.
- Kleck, R. 1969. Physical stigma and task oriented interaction. *Human Relations*, 22(1): 53–60.
- Kong, T. S. K. 2006. What it feels like for a whore: The body politics of women performing erotic labour in Hong Kong. *Gender Work and Organization*, 13(5): 409–434.
- Konrad, A. M., & Yang, Y. 2012. Is using work-life interface benefits a career-limiting move? An examination of women, men, lone parents, and parents with partners. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8): 1095–1119.
- Kozinets, R. V. 2020. *Netnography: The essential guide to qualitative social media research*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Kreiner, G. E., Ashforth, B. E., & Sluss, D. M. 2006. Identity dynamics in occupational dirty work: Integrating social identity and system justification perspectives. *Organization Science*, 17(5): 619–636.
- Kulik, C. T., Bainbridge, H. T. J., & Cregan, C. 2008. Known by the company we keep: Stigma-by-association effects in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 216–230.
- Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. 2001. Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: The functions of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2): 187–208.
- Lamin, A., & Zaheer, S. 2012. Wall Street vs. Main Street: Firm strategies for defending legitimacy and their impact on different stakeholders. *Organization Science*, 23(1): 47–66.

Lamont, M. 2018. Addressing recognition gaps: Destigmatization and the reduction of inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 83(3): 419–444.

Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 691–710.

Langley, A., Lindberg, K., Mørk, B. E., Nicolini, D., Raviola, E., & Walter, L. 2019. Boundary work among groups, occupations, and organizations: From cartography to process. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2): 704–736.

Langley, A. N. N., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. 2013. Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 1–13.

Lara-Millán, A. 2014. Public emergency room overcrowding in the era of mass imprisonment. *American Sociological Review*, 79(5): 866–887.

Larsen, G. 2017. ‘It’s a man’s man’s man’s world’: Music groupies and the othering of women in the world of rock. *Organization*, 24(3): 397–417.

Lashley, K., & Pollock, T. G. 2020. Waiting to inhale: Reducing stigma in the medical cannabis industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(2): 434–482.

Law, C. L., Martinez, L. R., Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., & Akers, E. 2011. Trans-parency in the workplace: How the experiences of transsexual employees can be improved. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(3): 710–723.

Lawrence, T. B. 2017. High-stakes institutional translation: Establishing North America’s first government-sanctioned supervised injection site. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1771–1800.

Leavitt, K., & Sluss, D. M. 2015. Lying for who we are: An identity-based model of workplace dishonesty. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(4): 587–610.

Lee, B. A., Farrell, C. R., & Link, B. G. 2004. Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The case of public exposure to homelessness. *American Sociological Review*, 69(1): 40–63.

Lee, B. A., Tyler, K. A., & Wright, J. D. 2010. The new homelessness revisited. In K. S. Cook & D. S. Massey (Eds.), *Annual review of sociology*, vol. 36: 501–521. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews

Lee, S. H., Peng, M. W., & Barney, J. B. 2007. Bankruptcy law and entrepreneurship development: A real options perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1): 257–272.

Lempert, R., & Monsma, K. 1994. Cultural-differences and discrimination: Samoans before a public-housing eviction board. *American Sociological Review*, 59(6): 890–910.

Leslie, L. M., Mayer, D. M., & Kravitz, D. A. 2014. The stigma of affirmative action: A stereotyping-based theory and meta-analytic test of the consequences for performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4): 964–989.

Leung, H., 2020. March 12. Why wearing a face mask is encouraged in Asia, but shunned in the U.S. *Time*, Retrieved from <https://time.com/5799964/coronavirus-face-mask-asia-us/>. Accessed on October 3, 2020

Levay, C. 2014. Obesity in organizational context. *Human Relations*, 67(5): 565–585.

Levine, E. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. 2015. The affective and interpersonal consequences of obesity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 127: 66–84.

Li, S. B., Kokkoris, M. D., & Savanic, K. 2020. Does everyone have the potential to achieve their ideal body weight? Lay theories about body weight and support for price discrimination policies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 157: 129–142.

Link, B. G., Andrews, H., & Cullen, F. T. 1992. The violent and illegal behavior of mental-patients

- reconsidered. *American Sociological Review*, 57(3): 275–292.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. 2001. Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1): 363–385.
- Liu, P. J., Campbell, T. H., Fitzsimons, G. J., & Fitzsimons, G. M. 2013. Matching choices to avoid offending stigmatized group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122(2): 291–304.
- Lloyd, J. M., & Bonds, A. 2018. Where do Black lives matter? Race, stigma, and place in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *Sociological Review*, 66(4): 898–918.
- Lucas, K. 2015. Workplace dignity: Communicating inherent, earned, and remediated dignity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(5): 621–646.
- Lucas, K., Kang, D. J., & Li, Z. 2013. Workplace dignity in a total institution: Examining the experiences of Foxconn's migrant workforce. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(1): 91–106.
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P. 2008. Intensive remedial identity work: Responses to workplace bullying trauma and stigmatization. *Organization*, 15(1): 97–119.
- Lynch, J. W., & Rodell, J. B. 2018. Blend in or stand out? Interpersonal outcomes of managing concealable stigmas at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(12): 1307–1323.
- Lyons, B. J., Martinez, L. R., Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., Ryan, A. M., O'Brien, K. R., & Roebuck, A. 2018. To say or not to say: Different strategies of acknowledging a visible disability. *Journal of Management*, 44(5): 1980–2007.
- Lyons, B. J., Pek, S., & Wessel, J. L. 2017. Toward a “sunlit path”: Stigma identity management as a source of localized social change through interaction. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(4): 618–636.
- Lyons, B. J., Volpone, S. D., Wessel, J. L., & Alonso, N. M. 2017. Disclosing a disability: Do strategy type and onset controllability make a difference? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1375–1383.
- Lyons, B. J., Wessel, J., Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., & Kim, S. 2014. Applying models of employee identity management across cultures: Christianity in the USA and South Korea. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(5): 678–704.
- Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. 2012. Discrimination against facially stigmatized applicants in interviews: An eye-tracking and face-to-face investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2): 317–330.
- Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. 2005. The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56(1): 393–421.
- Marcel, J. J., & Cowen, A. P. 2014. Cleaning house or jumping ship? Understanding board upheaval following financial fraud. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(6): 926–937.
- Martell, R. F., & DeSmet, A. L. 2001. A diagnostic-ratio approach to measuring beliefs about the leadership abilities of male and female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6): 1223–1231.
- Martinez, L. R., White, C. D., Shapiro, J. R., & Hebl, M. R. 2016. Selection bias: Stereotypes and discrimination related to having a history of cancer. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(1): 122–128.
- Mavin, S., & Grandy, G. 2012. Doing gender well and differently in management. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 27 (4): 218–231.
- Mavin, S., & Grandy, G. 2013. Doing gender well and differently in dirty work: The case of exotic dancing. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 20(3): 232–251.
- McCullough, K. 2020, February 11. Chinese restaurants in gta see large drop in sales in weeks after coronavirus outbreak, *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/toronto/article-chinese-restaurants-in-gta-see-large-drop-in-sales-in-weeks-after/>. Accessed on June 7, 2020.

McDowell, L., Rootham, E., & Hardgrove, A. 2016. The production of difference and maintenance of inequality: The place of young Goan men in a post-crisis UK labour market. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(2): 108–124.

McElroy, J. C., Summers, J. K., & Moore, K. 2014. The effect of facial piercing on perceptions of job applicants. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 125(1): 26–38.

McLoughlin, E. 2019. Knowing cows: Transformative mobilizations of human and non-human bodies in an emotionography of the slaughterhouse. *Gender Work and Organization*, 26(3): 322–342.

McMurray, R., & Ward, J. 2014. ‘Why would you want to do that?’: Defining emotional dirty work. *Human Relations*, 67(9): 1123–1143.

Meis, C. 2002. House and street: Narratives of identity in a liminal space among prostitutes in Brazil. *Ethos*, 30(1–2): 3–24.

Meyer, I. H. 2003. Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5): 674–697.

Mikolon, S., Alavi, S., & Reynders, A. 2020. The Catch-22 of countering a moral occupational stigma in employee-customer interactions. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Mikolon, S., Kreiner, G. E., & Wieseke, J. 2016. Seeing you seeing me: Stereotypes and the stigma magnification effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(5): 639–656.

Mize, T. D., & Manago, B. 2018. Precarious sexuality: How men and women are differentially categorized for similar sexual behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 83(2): 305–330.

Mobasser, S. 2019. Race, place, and crime: How violent crime events affect employment discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology*, 125(1): 63–104.

Mohr, J. J., Markell, H. M., King, E. B., Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., & Kendra, M. S. 2019. Affective antecedents and consequences of revealing and concealing a lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(10): 1266–1282.

Moon, D. 2012. Who am I and who are we? Conflicting narratives of collective selfhood in stigmatized groups. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5): 1336–1379.

Mueller, A. S., & Abrutyn, S. 2016. Adolescents under pressure: A new Durkheimian framework for understanding adolescent suicide in a cohesive community. *American Sociological Review*, 81(5): 877–899.

Nature. 2020, April 7. Stop the coronavirus stigma now. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01009-0

Newheiser, A.-K., & Barreto, M. 2014. Hidden costs of hiding stigma: Ironic interpersonal consequences of concealing a stigmatized identity in social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 52: 58–70.

Norton, M. I., Dunn, E. W., Carney, D. R., & Ariely, D. 2012. The persuasive “power” of stigma? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(2): 261–268.

Orupabo, J., & Nadim, M. 2020. Men doing women’s dirty work: Desegregation, immigrants and employer preferences in the cleaning industry in Norway. *Gender Work and Organization*, 27(3): 347–361.

Pachankis, J. E. 2007. The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(2): 328–345.

Pager, D., & Quillian, L. 2005. Walking the talk? What employers say versus what they do. *American Sociological Review*, 70(3): 355–380.

Paetzold, R. L., Dipboye, R. L., & Elsbach, K. D. 2008. A new look at stigmatization in and of

- organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 186–193.
- Pedeliento, G., Andreini, D., & Dalli, D. 2019. From mother's ruin to ginaissance: Emergence, settlement and resettlement of the gin category. *Organization Studies*.
- Peplau, L. A., & Fingerhut, A. W. 2007. The close relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58: 405–424.
- Perrault, E. 2015. Why does board gender diversity matter and how do we get there? The role of shareholder activism in deinstitutionalizing old boys' networks. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1): 149–165.
- Perrigino, M. B., Dunford, B. B., & Wilson, K. S. 2018. Work-family backlash: The “dark side” of work-life balance (WLB) policies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2): 600–630.
- Perrott, T. A. 2019. Doing hot and ‘dirty’ work: Masculinities and occupational identity in firefighting. *Gender Work and Organization*, 26(10): 1398–1412.
- Pescosolido, B. A., & Martin, J. K. 2015. The stigma complex. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1): 87–116.
- Pescosolido, B. A., Martin, J. K., Olafsdottir, S., Long, J. S., Kafadar, K., & Medina, T. R. 2015. The theory of industrial society and cultural schemata: Does the “cultural myth of stigma” underlie the WHO schizophrenia paradox? *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(3): 783–825.
- Petriglieri, J. L. 2011. Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4): 641–662.
- Phung, K., Buchanan, S., Toubiana, M., Ruebottom, T., & Turchick-Hakak, L. 2020. When stigma doesn't transfer: Stigma deflection and occupational stratification in the sharing economy. *Journal of Management Studies*. doi:10.1111/joms.12574
- Piazza, A., & Jourdan, J. 2018. When the dust settles: The consequences of scandals for organizational competition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1): 165–190.
- Piazza, A., & Perretti, F. 2015. Categorical stigma and firm disengagement: Nuclear power generation in the United States, 1970–2000. *Organization Science*, 26(3): 724–742.
- Pollock, T. G., Lashley, K., Rindova, V. P., & Han, J. H. 2019. Which of these things are not like the others? Comparing the rational, emotional, and moral aspects of reputation, status, celebrity, and stigma. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2) 444–478.
- Pontikes, E., Negro, G., & Rao, H. 2010. Stained red: A study of stigma by association to blacklisted artists during the “red scare” in Hollywood, 1945 to 1960. *American Sociological Review*, 75(3): 456–478.
- Pozner, J. E. 2008. Stigma and settling up: An integrated approach to the consequences of organizational misconduct for organizational elites. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1): 141–150.
- Premeaux, S. R. 2005. Undergraduate student perceptions regarding cheating: Tier 1 versus tier 2 AACSB accredited business schools. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(4): 407–418.
- Ragins, B. R. 2008. Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life domains. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 194–215.
- Ragins, B. R., Singh, R., & Cornwell, J. M. 2007. Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4): 1103–1118.
- Reid, E. 2015. Embracing, passing, revealing, and the ideal worker image: How people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organization Science*, 26(4): 997–1017.
- Reuber, A. R., & Fischer, E. 2010. Organizations behaving badly: When are discreditable actions likely to damage organizational reputation? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(1): 39–50.

Rider, C. I., & Negro, G. 2015. Organizational failure and intraprofessional status loss. *Organization Science*, 26(3): 633–649.

Rivera, K. D. 2015. Emotional taint: Making sense of emotional dirty work at the U.S. Border patrol. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 29(2): 198–228.

Rivera, K. D., & Tracy, S., J. 2014. Embodying emotional dirty work: A messy text of patrolling the border. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 9(3), 201–222.

Rivera, L. A. 2008. Managing “spoiled” national identity: War, tourism, and memory in Croatia. *American Sociological Review*, 73(4): 613–634.

Roca, E. 2010. The exercise of moral imagination in stigmatized work groups. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(1): 135–147.

Rodell, J. B., & Lynch, J. W. 2016. Perceptions of employee volunteering: Is it “credited” or “stigmatized” by colleagues? *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2): 611–635.

Rosenfield, S. 1997. Labeling mental illness: The effects of received services and perceived stigma on life satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 62(4): 660–672.

Roulet, T. 2015. “What good is Wall Street?” Institutional contradiction and the diffusion of the stigma over the finance industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(2): 389–402.

Roulet, T. J. 2019. Sins for some, virtues for others: Media coverage of investment banks’ misconduct and adherence to professional norms during the financial crisis. *Human Relations*, 72(9): 1436–1463.

Roulet, T. 2020. *The power of being divisive: Understanding negative social evaluations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Roulin, N., & Bhatnagar, N. 2018. Smoking as a job killer: Reactions to smokers in personnel selection. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 149(4): 959–972.

Ruebottom, T., & Toubiana, M. 2020. Constraints and opportunities of stigma: Entrepreneurial emancipation in the sex industry. *Academy of Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.1166>

Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., & Williams, A. 2015. Weight isn’t selling: The insidious effects of weight stigmatization in retail settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(5): 1483–1496.

Santuzzi, A. M., & Waltz, P. R. 2016. Disability in the workplace: A unique and variable identity. *Journal of Management*, 42(5): 1111–1135.

Schepker, D. J., & Barker, V. L. 2018. How stigmatized are dismissed chief executives? The role of character questioning causal accounts and executive capital in dismissed CEO reemployment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(9): 2566–2586.

Schwarz, O. 2015. The sound of stigmatization: Sonic habitus, sonic styles, and boundary work in an urban slum. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(1): 205–242.

Semadeni, M., Cannella Jr, A. A., Fraser, D. R., & Lee, D. S. 2008. Fight or flight: Managing stigma in executive careers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(5): 557–567.

Shantz, A., & Booth, J. E. 2014. Service employees and self-verification: The roles of occupational stigma consciousness and core self-evaluations. *Human Relations*, 67(12): 1439–1465.

Shapiro, J. R., King, E. B., & Quinones, M. A. 2007. Expectations of obese trainees: How stigmatized trainee characteristics influence training effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1): 239–249.

Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. 2015. Harsh evaluations of entrepreneurs who fail: The role of sexual orientation, use of environmentally friendly technologies, and observers’ perspective taking. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(2): 253–284.

Siltaoja, M., Lahdesmaki, M., Granqvist, N., Kurki, S., Puska, P., & Luomala, H. 2020. The

- dynamics of (de)stigmatization: Boundary construction in the nascent category of organic farming. *Organization Studies*. doi:10.1177/0170840620905167
- Simpson, R., Slutskaia, N., Lewis, P., & Höpfl, H. (Eds.). 2012. *Dirty work: Concepts and identities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Singletary, S. L., & Hebl, M. R. 2009. Compensatory strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination: The effectiveness of acknowledgments, increased positivity, and individuating information. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3): 797–805.
- Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. 1993. Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic remedies for trust distrust. *Organization Science*, 4(3): 367–392.
- Slade Shantz, A., Fischer, E., Liu, A., & Lévesque, M. 2019. Spoils from the spoiled: Strategies for entering stigmatized markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(7): 1260–1286.
- Slay, H. S., & Smith, D. A. 2011. Professional identity construction: Using narrative to understand the negotiation of professional and stigmatized cultural identities. *Human Relations*, 64(1): 85–107.
- Slutskaia, N., Simpson, R., Hughes, J., Simpson, A., & Uygur, S. 2016. Masculinity and class in the context of dirty work. *Gender Work and Organization*, 23(2): 165–182.
- Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. 1987. Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(6): 1336–1371.
- Soni-Sinha, U., & Yates, C., A. B. 2013. ‘Dirty work?’ gender, race and the union in industrial cleaning. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 20(6): 737–751.
- Spencer, S. J., Logel, C., & Davies, P. G. 2016. Stereotype threat. In S. T. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 67: 415–437. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Stein, M. 2019. The lost good self: Why the whistleblower is hated and stigmatized. *Organization Studies*. doi:10.1177/0170840619880565
- Stewart, M. M., & Shapiro, D. L. 2000. Selection based on merit versus demography: Implications across race and gender lines. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2): 219–231.
- Steyrer, J. 1998. Charisma and the archetypes of leadership. *Organization Studies*, 19(5): 807–828.
- Stone, E. F., Stone, D. L., & Dipboye, R. L. 1992. Stigmas in organizations: Race, handicaps, and physical unattractiveness. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Advances in psychology*, vol. 82: 385–457. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Stuart, H. C., & Moore, C. 2017. Shady characters: The implications of illicit organizational roles for resilient team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5): 1963–1985.
- Summers, J. K., Howe, M., McElroy, J. C., Ronald, B. M., Pahng, P., & Cortes-Mejia, S. 2018. A typology of stigma within organizations: Access and treatment effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7): 853–868.
- Sutton, R. I., & Callahan, A. L. 1987. The stigma of bankruptcy: Spoiled organizational image and its management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(3): 405–436.
- Taub, D. E., Blinde, E. M., & Greer, K. R. 1999. Stigma management through participation in sport and physical activity: Experiences of male college students with physical disabilities. *Human Relations*, 52(11): 1469–1484.
- Thanem, T., & Wallenberg, L. 2016. Just doing gender? Transvestism and the power of underdoing gender in everyday life and work. *Organization*, 23(2): 250–271.
- Thomson, S. B., & Grandy, G. 2018. *Stigmas, work and organizations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tibbals, C. A. 2013. Sex work, office work: Women working behind the scenes in the US adult

- film industry. *Gender Work and Organization*, 20(1): 20–35.
- Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. R. 2015. Concealable stigma and occupational segregation: Toward a theory of gay and lesbian occupations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(3): 446–481.
- Timmermans, S. 2005. Suicide determination and the professional authority of medical examiners. *American Sociological Review*, 70(2): 311–333.
- Tomiyama, A. J. 2019. Stress and obesity. In S. T. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 70: 703–718.
- Toubiana, M. 2020. Once in orange always in orange? Identity paralysis and the enduring influence of institutions on identity. *Academy of Management Journal*. doi:10.5465/amj.2017.0826
- Toubiana, M., & Zietsma, C. 2017. The message is on the wall? Emotions, social media and the dynamics of institutional complexity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3): 922–953.
- Toyoki, S., & Brown, A. D. 2014. Stigma, identity and power: Managing stigmatized identities through discourse. *Human Relations*, 67(6): 715–737.
- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. 2016. Managing the consequences of organizational stigmatization: Identity work in a social enterprise. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(3): 740–765.
- Tracy, S. J., & Scott, C. 2006. Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers: Getting down and dirty with “America’s heroes” and the “scum of law enforcement”. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20(1): 6–38.
- Turchick-Hakak, L. 2014. Professionals in disguise: Identity work in situations of downward occupational transition. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2014(1): 17144.
- Tyler, M. 2011. Tainted love: From dirty work to abject labour in Soho’s sex shops. *Human Relations*, 64(11): 1477–1500.
- Unzueta, M. M., Lowery, B. S., & Knowles, E. D. 2008. How believing in affirmative action quotas protects White men’s self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 105(1): 1–13.
- Van Maanen, J., & Barley, S. R. 1984. Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6: 287–365.
- Velliquette, A. M. 2000. *Modern primitives: The role of product symbolism in lifestyle cultures and identity*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR.
- Vergne, J.-P. 2012. Stigmatized categories and public disapproval of organizations: A mixed-methods study of the global arms industry, 1996–2007. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5): 1027–1052.
- Vijayasingham, L., Jogulu, U., & Allotey, P. 2018. Enriching the organizational context of chronic illness experience through an ethics of care perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1): 29–40.
- Voronov, M., De Clercq, D., & Hinings, C. R. 2013. Conformity and distinctiveness in a global institutional framework: The legitimation of Ontario fine wine. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(4): 607–645.
- Voss, G. 2015. *Stigma and the shaping of the pornography industry*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, I. J., Pazzaglia, F., & Ergene, E. 2019. Loyal after the end: Understanding organizational identification in the wake of failure. *Human Relations*, 72(2): 163–187.
- Wang, M. S., Raynard, M., & Greenwood, R. 2020. From grace to violence: Stigmatizing the medical profession in China. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Weiner, B., Perry, R. P., & Magnusson, J. 1988. An attributional analysis of reactions to stigmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(5): 738–748.

- 1
2
3 Wiesenfeld, B. M., Wurthmann, K. A., & Hambrick, D. C. 2008. The stigmatization and
4 devaluation of elites associated with corporate failures: A process model. *Academy of*
5 *Management Review*, 33(1): 231–251.
- 6
7 Wolfe, A. W., & Blithe, S. J. 2015. Managing image in a core-stigmatized organization:
8 Concealment and revelation in Nevada's legal brothels. *Management Communication*
9 *Quarterly*, 29(4), 539–563.
- 10
11 Wurthmann, K. A. 2014. Service on a stigmatized board, social capital, and change in number of
12 directorships. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(5): 814–841.
- 13
14 Xia, J., Dawley, D. D., Jiang, H., Ma, R., & Boal, K. B. 2016. Resolving a dilemma of signaling
15 bankrupt-firm emergence: A dynamic integrative view. *Strategic Management Journal*,
16 37(8): 1754–1764.
- 17
18 Yenkey, C. B. 2018. Fraud and market participation: Social relations as a moderator of
19 organizational misconduct. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63(1): 43–84.
- 20
21 Zelizer, V. A. 1978. Human values and the market: The case of life insurance and death in 19th-
22 century America. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(3): 591–610.
- 23
24 Zhang, S. F., Jiang, L. K., Magnan, M., & Su, L. N. 2019. Dealing with ethical dilemmas: A look
25 at financial reporting by firms facing product harm crises. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
26 doi:10.1007/s10551-019-04375-6
- 27
28 Zhang, Y., George, J. A., & Chan, T. S. 2006. The paradox of dueling identities: The case of local
29 senior executives in MNC subsidiaries. *Journal of Management*, 32(3): 400–425.
- 30
31 Zilber, T. B. 2002. Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The
32 case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 234–254.
- 33
34 Zulfiqar, G. M. 2019. Dirt, foreignness, and surveillance: The shifting relations of domestic work
35 in Pakistan. *Organization*, 26(3): 321–336.
- 36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Rongrong Zhang (rz5@ualberta.ca) is a doctoral candidate at the University of Alberta. Her research broadly addresses social evaluations of firms (e.g., reputation, legitimacy, and stigma). She is also interested in how social evaluations interact with emotions to effectuate social changes.

Milo Shaoqing Wang (swang7@ualberta.ca) is a doctoral candidate at the University of Alberta. His current research examines how institutional change impacts the social evaluations of organizations by different stakeholders, and how organizations strategically respond to changes in those evaluations. He is interested in the intersection of social evaluation, strategic management, and institutional theory.

Madeline Toubiana (toubiana@ualberta.ca) is an assistant professor of strategic management and organization at the University of Alberta. Her research focuses on what supports or stalls social change. She is interested specifically in the role emotions, institutional dynamics and stigmatization play in influencing such processes of social change.

Royston Greenwood (rgreenwo@ualberta.ca) graduated from the University of Birmingham in the UK. He is a Professor Emeritus at the University of Alberta, Canada; and Professorial Fellow at the University of Edinburgh, UK. He is a Fellow of the Academy of Management, and Honorary Member of the European Group for Organization Studies.