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Overview of the symposium

This symposium invites consideration of the ways in which organizations interact with marginalized groups and to what effect. While such groups are, by definition, shunned by parts of society, there is growing recognition that organizations can play a transformative role in reintegrating them into communities. While there are strong moral and often commercial reasons for organizations engaging in such activities, there are also potential threats to the organizations involved. Our objective with this symposium is to open up discussion about the potential impact that organizations can have on those who are disadvantaged, and in so doing also uncover some of the organization processes, practices and outcomes that may be influenced through the engagement in such activities.

To date, organizational and institutional arrangements that can reduce social exclusion have been under-investigated by management theorists. This is unfortunate because organizations and institutions are heavily implicated in the marginalization of individuals and groups (e.g., Amis, Munir, Lawrence, Hirsch & McGahan, 2018; Tharchen & Garud, 2017). We explore ways in which organizations not only contribute to such mechanisms of exclusion but also how they may be able to erode them through the challenging of widely held beliefs and rules that help shape social life.

At an individual level, we are interested in the processes through which individuals that engage with organizations can develop in ways that allow them to overcome their social exclusion, for example through triggered identity work that changes self-perceptions (Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark & Fugate, 2007; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Such organizations can help individuals to revisit and reconstruct a positive sense of self that is re-aligned with audience expectations through the (re)association with mainstream morals and values (Stenger & Roulet,
This in turn can lead to broader community support and subsequent reintegration of previously excluded individuals.

At an organizational level, we explore the ways in which organizations manage their interactions and associations with marginalized groups. In addition to looking at the structures and systems that are developed, it is also necessary to consider organizational outcomes. In this respect, it is important to recognize that organizations that work with marginalized groups and address socially sensitive issues can be marginalized themselves (Tracey & Phillips, 2016; Hampel & Tracey, 2015). The association with marginalized groups can result in a threat to legitimacy that can generate stakeholder disapproval often leading to greater scrutiny and diminished financial performance (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Jeong and Kim, 2018). We thus also examine the ways in which organizations defend themselves and regain social approval among relevant audiences in order to sustain legitimacy, a problem that has recently been raised in the institutional literature (Hampel & Tracey, 2015; Jeong and Kim, 2018).

In the first paper, Hudson creates a framework for the symposium by reflecting on the ways in which organizational scholars can utilize a “lens of organizations that serve the marginalized” to better understand both the processes of marginalization and the management of stigma directed at the organization itself. Hudson argues that overcoming marginalization constitutes what has variously been termed a grand challenge (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi & Tihanyi, 2016) or wicked problem (Camillus, 2008) because its underlying conditions are characterized by very high levels of complexity and uncertainty.

As such, overcoming marginalization can appear impossible to address by standard governmental policy interventions (Head & Alford, 2015) or existing market mechanisms (Mair, Martí, & Ventresca, 2012), and therefore other forms of organization are pivotal in providing
solutions to the harmful effects of these problems. In addition to direct action, organizations can take on the challenge of advocating on behalf of affected marginalized groups through for example governmental lobbying, promotion, activism or attempt to lessen the negative effects.

An organizational lens in addressing these challenges allows us to focus attention differently, allowing discovery and knowledge creation across a wide range of organizational features, domains, settings and levels of analysis. This will reveal strategies and processes that allow organizations to successfully engage with marginalized groups. Subsequent papers in the symposium show varying ways in which this can take place.

**In the second paper**, Klinghardt and Amis study social exclusion in its extreme form of homelessness. They study Sport Great Britain (SGB), a social enterprise, that uses sport as a context in which homeless people – termed as players within the organization – can positively influence their self-perception, something that often proves to be a key step in their societal reintegration. Specifically, they investigate how particular places can trigger positive identity work among marginalized individuals. Drawing on the stigmatization, place, emotions and identity work literatures, Klinghardt and Amis engage in a longitudinal qualitative study that involves interviews, observations and documentary data. Early findings point to the ways in which sport and three emergent characteristics of place – security, relationships and purpose – interacted at multiple levels to trigger an emotional response that in turn helped to reduce the self-perception of stigmatization among SGB’s players. While the data analyses remain ongoing, theoretical contributions pertaining to the ways in which place precipitates emotional responses that in turn lead to positive identity work are offered.

**In paper three**, Claus and Block study the social movement “Stop Child Marriage” in Indonesia that failed to realize its primary objective to change the marriage law. However, the
actors behind the movement used the refusal of the Constitutional Court to change the law as a
discursive opportunity to frame the issue as a national concern to drive action.

The case study contributes to undertheorized social movement failures and their aftermaths
(Giugni, McAdam, & Tilly, 1999). The study illuminates processes by which activists can
continue to drive activism after they have ‘failed’ in the public’s eye. This furthers understanding
of how movements turn public failure into local success.

The preliminary findings show how social movements can continue to drive change even
after they have all but disappeared from the public sphere. The discursive strategies utilized
varied along three dimensions according to: 1) the type of issue coupling, 2) the nature of actor’s
public and private activities, and 3) the distance of actors from the effected communities. Post-
mortem, these strategic approaches allowed actors to legitimate opposition to child marriage
through their organizational expertise and to motivate local activism.

In the fourth paper, Patterson and Pozner study what accounts for the denigration of
identities to address the question why some actors are stigmatized by negative behaviours while
others are not. Goffman’s (1963) original distinction between the discredited and the
discreditable does not fully address this and neither does more recent research that differentiates
event stigma from core stigma. Patterson and Pozner develop a model that describes external and
audience factors that can interrupt the stigmatization process. Primarily this research identifies
cognitive, emotional and institutional mechanisms that lead audiences to turn away their attention
from the discreditable. This advances understandings of how to limit, impede or negate the
stigmatization process.
Relevance to divisions

This symposium application is being submitted to the Organization and Management Theory (OMT), Organization Development and Change (ODC) and Social Issues in Management (SIM) divisions. Here we explain the relevance of the symposium to each division.

The issues addressed in this symposium are at the very core of the OMT content domain. We are focused on the building and testing of theories about organizations that serve society. We are also very overtly engaged with a reemerging interest in how organizations contribute to society, in our case through the social reintegration of marginalized groups. In so doing, we address current OMT division topics including identity work, emotions, social movements and social change. OMT’s preferred multi-dimensional focus is met in our research through theory building at individual, organizational and societal levels.

The symposium will be of interest to ODC members because we examine ways in which change can be realized at multiple levels using a variety of methods. For example, we examine how innovative change agents develop practices that reimagines how individuals that engage with organizations alter their self-perceptions and enter a process of social reintegration. In addition, we show why some actors that engage in negative behaviours are marginalized while others are not. This exposes the mechanisms that impact the stigmatization process and how actors may be able to strategically change their behaviour to avoid marginalization. At an organizational level we illustrate how collective failures can be turned into opportunities potentially resulting in institutional and societal changes.

The theoretical issues addressed in this symposium also will be directly relevant to the interests of the SIM division. Our symposium discusses burning social issues related to poverty, deprivation, marginalization and exclusion. We show how organizations can offer approaches to
help address these grand social challenges. In so doing, we examine organizational practices that are designed to help overcome marginalization and, in so doing, establish more ethical norms, values and moral principles. Such actions can change institutional arrangements that are responsible for the social exclusion of particular groups. In so doing, we address the overall question of how organizational arrangements can have meaningful impacts on society, while advancing knowledge about practices and methods that establish sustainable social change.

Proposed format of symposium

Length: 90 minutes

Minutes 0 – 5: Welcome and introduction to the symposium

• Paul Tracey

Minutes 5 – 65: Paper presentations (15 minutes each)

• Serving the marginalized: Studying organizations aiding the most vulnerable.
  Bryant Hudson
• Socially reintegrating the homeless: Identity work, place and overcoming stigma.
  Chris Klinghardt & John Amis
• What happens when social movements fail? The case of stop child marriage in Indonesia.
  Laura Claus & Emily Block
• The discredited and the discredi-able: Why stigmatizing behaviour does not always result in stigmatization. Karen Patterson & Jo-Ellen Pozner

Minutes 65 – 90: Comments and facilitated discussion

• Paul Tracey
Organizational scholars have begun to examine those social conditions labelled as grand challenges (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi & Tihanyi, 2016) and wicked problems (Camillus, 2008; Head & Alford, 2015) and the ways that organizations can at least begin to address them. These social conditions, characterized by very high levels of complexity and uncertainty, include environmental pollution and resource scarcity, global diseases and pandemics, displaced people and migration, and social and economic inequalities, among others. Clearly, these conditions can and do lead to serious negative consequences for all those affected by them. As these problems and challenges often appear un-addressable by standard governmental policy and intervention (Head & Alford, 2015) or existing market mechanisms (Mair, Martí & Ventresca, 2012), other forms of organizing and organizations have been and continue to be important mediators to seek and provide at least partial solutions and amelioration of the harmful effects these problems cause.

One category of grand challenges, wicked problems, and social inequalities is that of socio-economic marginalized peoples and communities. The marginalized are those people and communities that are pushed to the edges of society, denigrated, and shunned by powerful social actors, with limited access to physical and social resources necessary for individual and community well-being. Such marginalization creates economic and social disadvantages that often lead to illness, lack of education and job skills, and a lack of social cohesion and validation at the community level, including the threat of violence and social dysfunction within that
community, and are recognized as those most vulnerable to grand challenges and wicked problems. These expressions of marginalization are the result of multiple, entwined complex social processes, including dynamics of power, identity, economics, religious, sexual, and racial prejudices, gendered dynamics, and culture, and are not easily understood or remedied.

In response to the plight of the marginalized, organizations have often taken on the challenge of ameliorating, diminishing, or otherwise offsetting the negative consequences of marginalization. Religious and other social service organizations have long taken on the burden of serving the marginalized, even incorporating that service into or as the sole focus of their mission. Non-profit organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), mutual aid societies, and organizational cooperatives are but a few of the types of organizations that have taken on the challenges and burdens of serving the marginalized. Governmental sponsored organizations and governmental agencies are often given that task as well.

More recently, for-profit commercial enterprises and so-called social enterprises have also begun to find ways to serve the marginalized in a variety of organizational forms and in a variety of ways. These organizations often seek to provide goods and services to marginalized community members, and sometimes provide employment opportunities, as ways of serving the marginalized. Often organizations will take on the challenge of advocating on behalf of the marginalized through governmental and public lobbying, promotion, and activism to attempt to lessen or ameliorate the negative effects of marginalization, or to remove the marginalization and attempt to integrate the formerly marginalized into the broader social community.

As organizations and organizing continue to address the grand challenges and wicked problems associated with the overcoming of marginalized people and communities, it is imperative for organizational scholars to study these organizations, and to learn what various
inputs, outcomes, and processes allow them to begin to or continue to serve the marginalized. Gauging various indicators of effectiveness, success, durability, and continued access to important resources are but a few of the ways organization scholars can understand and even promote beneficial organizational responses to such an important social challenge. Further, using the lens of serving the marginalized allows organization scholars to examine organizations across multiple domains - traditional commercial firms, social enterprises, nonprofit and NGOs, and governmental agencies – allowing the continued development of management and organizational knowledge across a variety of settings. The use of the lens of serving the marginalized would also cross a variety of processes such as survival, failure, and strategies, and contexts such as entrepreneurial ventures, organizational demographics, organizational networks, and organizational fields.

Problem of stigma management. One of the greatest challenges of organizations that serve the marginalized is the management of social stigma (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Devers, Dewett, Mishina & Belsito, 2009; Goffman, 1963; Hudson, 2008; Link & Phelan, 2001). Organizations serving the marginalized must both find ways to manage and ameliorate the stigmatization of their clients or employees, but to also manage the stigma directed at the organization itself (Hampel & Tracey, 2016; Tracey & Phillips, 2016). Research on organizational stigma has begun to show how it is managed, ranging from hiding (e.g. Hudson & Okhuysen, 2009), removing (e.g. Piazza & Perretti, 2015) to even embracing (e.g. Helms & Patterson, 2014) it. Yet more work is needed to understand not only how stigma is managed at the individual and organizational levels, but to also understand the cross-level and stigma transfer processes, and the interactions of stigma with other organization processes both negative and positive. Using a lens of organizations that serve the marginalized would allow important and timely research that is
focused on a particular type or source of stigmatization, providing for a more fine-grained analysis as well as informing the field of stigma research and organization studies more broadly. While the problem of stigma transfer from stigmatized constituencies to organizations has begun to be addressed, the important question of possible amplification of stigma back to those already marginalized constituencies needs study. Further, how stigma is transferred from one or more organizations serving the marginalized to entire industries or fields whose members may or may not be serving the marginalized is also an important question.

*Other important problems.* Of course, other questions also deserve attention. For example, management of mission-value congruence within the organizations and various stakeholder groups (Suar & Khuntia, 2010; Wright & Pandey, 2008), and mission creep (Jonker & Meehan, 2008) for organizations serving the marginalized are important issues. Also, while access to, management of, and the strategic leveraging of resources are well known problems for organizations in general, particular strategies of resource management for organizations serving the marginalized likely face additional complexity. Lastly, issues of personnel and organizational burnout prevention and management in such organizations also deserve attention.

*Conclusion.* Clearly, research that focuses on organizations serving the marginalized will yield important academic, practitioner, and social benefits. Using such a lens focuses attention differently, allowing discovery and knowledge creation across a wide range of organizational features and processes, research domains, and levels of analysis. Using such a lens for the benefit of the marginalized themselves and to address the grand challenges and wicked problems of which the marginalized and society more broadly suffer also allows organization scholars to build and maintain relevance in an often troubled world.
Socially reintegrating the homeless: Identity work, place and overcoming stigma

Chris Klinghardt & John Amis

In Scotland, one of the wealthiest nations on earth, social exclusion in its extreme form of homelessness remains a significant problem (The Guardian, 2018). Despite efforts by various agencies, strategies to overcome homelessness remain elusive, often hindered by a lack of funding in a public sector depleted of resources by government spending policies. In this context, several social enterprises and charities have emerged to try to help homeless people. One of these, the focus of our study, is Sport Great Britain (SGB). Attracted by its apparent success at rehabilitating homeless people, we are engaged in a longitudinal study to examine why its strategies have proved effective. Our early findings have pointed to the ways in which sport and place have interacted at multiple levels to trigger an emotional response that has in turn helped to reduce the self-perceived stigmatization that often proves to be a considerable barrier to the reintegration of the homeless into society. This has allowed us to address the broader question of how place can trigger emotions within stigmatized individuals leading to positive identity work.

Our work has allowed us to develop some emergent theoretical contributions to the identity work literature. First, we show how SGB’s sport sessions have created a sense of psychological security for the players through the provision of support, encouragement and development of self-belief. This has precipitated changes in self-perception by enhancing self-worth among the players. Second, the players build relationships with each other and the coaches. This has created support networks that have been missing for many years among players who have suffered from trauma, addictions and/or mental illness. Third, sport participation creates a positive purpose and structure through the provision of regular practices and games that can be crucial in overcoming self-destructive behaviours.
We theoretically framed our research by drawing on the identity work, emotions, place and stigmatization literatures. The concept of identity work is based on the provisional, temporary, negotiated and contested character of identities (Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas, 2008). Identity work can deeply influence our understanding of self and others’ identities (Ybema, Keenoy, Oswick, Beverungen, Ellis & Sabelis, 2009). Fundamentally, identity work can determine the confirmation and transformation of self-concepts (Beech, 2011; Thomas & Davies, 2005). Identity work is closely related to emotions, because emotions constitute an important element of self-definition (Fineman, 2003). Fredrickson and Branigan (2005: 313) define emotions as “short-lived experiences that produce coordinated changes in people’s thoughts, actions and physiological responses.” Emotions signal the presence of stimuli that demand attention. When emotions are stimulated they can disrupt current cognitions and behaviours (Forgas, 1992).

One way in which emotions might be triggered is by individuals’ interactions with particular places. Places that have meanings for individuals often precipitate an emotional reaction (Tuan, 1977). Our approach to place is rooted in social geography (Tuan, 1977). However, we see places as more than geographic locations. Places are meaningful locations, an intersection between location, material form, sets of meanings and values (Cresswell, 2004; Lawrence & Dover, 2015). As such, interactions with particular locations and the associated emotional response can, we contend, positively influence feelings of self-worth that in turn are important when considering individuals who have been stigmatized.

Goffman (1963: 3) defined stigma as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting”, an extreme kind of social disapproval by diverse audiences that reduces the individual “from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one.” Social discreditation almost inevitably leads to a
reduction in feelings of self-worth and diminishes social ties as a consequence of external status loss and negative perceptions. Thus, stigma reduction is important to increase the chances of marginalized individuals becoming socially reintegrated.

We adopted a qualitative single case study methodology (Yin, 2003) in which data were collected from interviews, observations and documents. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with SGB staff, volunteers, players and partners, while observations captured their interactions with the football pitches. An abductive theory building approach was used in which we continually worked back and forth between emergent empirical understandings and existing theory.

Our findings make it apparent that a key component of the success of SGB has been the creation of a set of unique places, the sporting arenas, that have become clearly differentiated for the players from their external environments. These have become sanctuaries for the players that, in conjunction with the people that they interact with at SGB, create first, a sense of security, second, a set of meaningful relationships, and third, a discovered purpose. Importantly, these factors are not experienced individually but rather are shared with other players. These factors trigger strong emotions among the players leading to positive identity work, which in turn substantially changes their self-perception and allows them to begin the process of social reintegration.

“Like so many addicts, I was leading a double life I was constantly lying to my mum and dad, but I was also lying to myself” (Player)

**Security** is provided in SGB’s sport sessions through the creation of a positive environment that is stigma-free. Heavy emphasis is placed on putting the individual’s needs ahead of any institutional or funding requirement allowing players to develop at their own pace.
The sport sessions repeatedly trigger feelings of support, encouragement and self-belief. This in turn appears to change self-perceptions by (re)awakening a sense of self-worth.

Further, SGB’s does not categorize people, only situations in which they find themselves. This creates places that are truly inclusive safety zones. No questions are asked and no judgment applied. Often, this is the first time in years that players can open up, show their real self and identity. Being honest is a new feeling for many of these players who have found themselves constantly marginalized by society. SGB has created an environment in which the players feel able to open-up, share problems and fears, and get feedback. Sharing problems, while still being accepted, creates trust. Trust in others fundamentally erodes negative worldviews and helps to prepare the players to form the relationships required to socially re-integrate.

“At SGB, I’m surrounded by positive people all the time. The staff and coaches at the drop in sessions are always available to help.” (Player)

*Relationships* are provided in SGB’s sport sessions through close interactions with other players and coaches. The idea is to build a support network that has, in many cases, been missing for many years among players who have suffered trauma, neglect and/or mental illness. Tackling challenges like addictions is easier when shared among peer groups, something that has been traditionally lacking for many players who have lost touch with family and friends. Feeling a sense of belonging and that somebody cares clearly makes a significant difference for players who have frequently come to attribute their social-exclusion to their own inadequacies or mistakes.

A key role in this rehabilitation is played by SGB’s coaches who frequently become role models. The coaches are themselves former players who have become rehabilitated by SGB. The coaches are therefore living exemplars of change. The players clearly identify with and gravitate
to these coaches who are respected for their achievements. Coaches can build close relationships because they can empathise with the players and are credible. This is fundamental for the success of SGB. Coaches trigger positive emotions of belonging and hope with the players.

“Being the captain brings a responsibility which I’m well aware of. But I feel I can do my team justice. If my mother was alive she would be proud.” (Captain)

**Purpose** is given to the players through the provision of “a place to be” and a structure. It was apparent throughout our interviews that the discovering of a purpose was vital in helping them overcome isolation and in many cases addictions. The opportunity to play football in a structured environment was important in establishing self-worth. Further, becoming part of a team-environment fostered communication, something that was lacking in the lives of virtually all of the players that we interviewed. It also created an immediate sense of belonging, something that was predominantly lacking in the players lives.

The structure provided by scheduled football practices and games created a positive routine that appeared to be crucial in overcoming self-destructive behaviours. In wanting to attend sessions and then striving to play well initiated greater desire for players to take care of themselves by, for example, curtailing drug and alcohol use and eating more healthily. Further, getting fitter clearly had positive physical and mental health benefits. Players can take development courses, play in tournaments and ultimately become coaches. Feelings of excitement, joy and satisfaction were reported as important in helping to address the depression suffered by many players. Identities associated with destructive behaviors changed to those aligned with self-care and self-respect, which further prepares the players for social re-integration. In the presentation, we further develop our findings and outline their implications for
theorizing how place, emotions and identity work create processes that can enable individuals to overcome social exclusion.
What happens when social movements fail? The case of Stop Child Marriage in Indonesia

Laura Claus & Emily Block

When on June 18th, 2015, Stop Child Marriage\(^1\) failed to realize its primary objective – to change the marriage law that still prohibits children to be married before graduating primary school – the Indonesian public voiced their disappointment. The reasoning of the Constitutional Court judges was heavily anchored in Islamic texts, which many thought to be “unacceptably backwards” (PP, 2015); judges were even labelled “paedophiles” (SM, 2015). The actors behind Stop Child Marriage, however, were celebrating. While the movement dissolved, in our interviews, they articulated: “now we can finally start driving real action” (AA, 2015). In their minds, the Constitutional Court’s failure to amend the marriage law enabled the emergence of discursive opportunities through which they could begin to frame child marriage as a national concern and drive initiatives that would address the practice. However, with the public perceiving Stop Child Marriage as having failed, the question that emerged was how do social movement actors re-invent themselves to translate discursive spaces into local action?

Social movement theories demonstrate that one way to enable societal changes is by mobilizing people into an “organized collective effort” (Den Hond & De Bakker, 2007; see also, Diani & McAdam, 2003; McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Social activism has been shown to be an effective vehicle of change that particularly low power, marginalized, and persecuted actors may leverage to advance their own interests. Examples from the US include students organizing to register black voters in the 1960s (e.g., McAdam, 1988) and activists pursuing LGBT rights (e.g.,

\(^1\) Pseudonym for local social movement in Indonesia (2013-2015).
Taylor et al., 2009) accomplishing results such as the Supreme Court’s ruling for same-sex marriages.

Most of these studies examine cases of “success”, that is, how social movements emerge, mobilize, and translate into institutional change. Social movement failures, on the other hand are undertheorized (Giugni, McAdam & Tilly, 1999). More specifically, while we have considerable insight about the factors and processes that might lead to failure (e.g., Giugni, 1998; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Piven & Cloward, 1978; Tilly, 1978), we know much less about the aftermath of such failures.

In this study, we followed actors of a “failed” social movement as they took their second attempt to mobilize against child marriage. Comprising a total of 22 actors, the movement was orchestrated by different types of organizations “behind the scenes” and carried out by student groups as the “public face”. Please see Figure 1 for a visualization of the movement’s actors and their social positions within the movement against child marriage in Indonesia.

The arrangement outlined in figure 1 was for reasons of religious sensitivity. Child marriage is deeply anchored in Islamic texts and often justified by referring to Prophet Muhammad having married his wife Aisha when she was six years old. It is therefore a legally and culturally accepted practice. In the past, organizations that had campaigned against it were accused of blasphemy and international organizations were threatened with expulsion from the country. As an eclectic group composed of lawyers, psychologists, academics, students, and other organizations, the collective decided to unite on a common goal: to submit a judicial review to the Constitutional Court requesting to amend the marriage law. Despite staging protests and carefully generating public momentum leading up to the judges’ decision, the movement failed.
Citing the Qur’an and the Hadiths (sayings of the Prophet), the country’s highest judges defended the current marriage law.

**Figure 1. Public visibility and distance to affected communities of movement actors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors involved</th>
<th>Personal distance to issue [child marriage]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Right’s Organizations (2)</td>
<td>high transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights Organizations (8)</td>
<td>high distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights (2)</td>
<td>low transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &amp; Student Groups (2)</td>
<td>low distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Organizations (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Activists (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To explore how these actors re-invented themselves after they were deemed “dead” by the Indonesian public (PA, 2016), we conducted a single embedded case study (Yin, 2013) where the broad case is the movement and the embedded cases are the seven largest actors that composed the movement. Our study includes interview, observation, and archival data that span four years from the initiation of collective action in 2013 until 2017.

Our preliminary findings suggest that not all social movements are played out in the public discourse, and that movements, even after they disappear in the public sphere, can continue to drive change using a different set of strategies. We find that the Constitutional Court’s decision provided discursive opportunities for former actors of Stop Child Marriage to strategically situate the issue of child marriage in the public discourse. In so doing, the different actors varied on three dimensions: 1) the type of issue coupling, 2) the variation between their public and private activities and 3) their distance from the effected communities. Their strategic approaches post-mortem, in turn, allowed actors to legitimate the ‘issue’ of child marriage through their organizational expertise, and to motivate local activism. In the next iteration of this work, we will examine how these combinations led to local change. Please see Figure 2 for a preliminary model of how discursive opportunities enable local change.

We seek to contribute to existing social movement literature by shedding light onto the processes by which actors can continue to drive activism even after they have “failed” in the public’s eye. We hereby intend to build on research defining the “success” and “failure” of social movements as well as studies concerned with the outcomes and consequences of collective action (e.g., Guigni, 1998; Giugni, McAdam, & Tilly, 1999). Much research has focused on the impact of movements by relating their action to changes in legislation or some other indicator of policy change (e.g., Amenta, Carruthers, & Zylan, 1992; Tarrow, 1993). Our preliminary findings
suggest that this conceptualization might be misleading. We further outline strategies that ‘failed’ movement actors may use to turn public failure into local success.

**Figure 2. Preliminary model of how discursive opportunities enable local change**
The discredited and the discreditable: Why stigmatizing behavior does not always result in stigmatization

Karen Patterson & Jo-Ellen Pozner

Why are some actors stigmatized by negative behavior while others emerge from such events relatively unscathed? In his canonical work, Goffman (1963) argues that stigmatization – the denigration and discrediting of one’s social identity because of an undesirable attribute or behavior - varies based on the observability of the undesirable attribute. What accounts for the stigmatization of some discreditable actors and the relative security of others? We build on the insight that social evaluation is a function of the work of audiences who adjudicate the legitimate from the illegitimate (Greve, Palmer & Pozner, 2010) who link discrediting marks to negative stereotypes or professional norms, leading to a loss of status and discrimination (Link & Phelan, 2001). From this perspective, it becomes clear that audiences can minimize, denigrate, or turn their attention from the discreditable, avoiding stigmatization and maintaining or restoring the status of potentially stigmatized actors. We identify some of the mechanisms and processes that impede the process of stigmatization.

We address the role that audiences and other external factors play in determining how discreditable actors avoid stigmatization. Although much research has addressed what stigmatized actors might do to overcome or erode stigma, we address the environmental and psychological forces that might preclude audiences from bestowing negative evaluations on such actors in the first place. Neither episodic events nor core discreditable marks lead to stigmatization unless audiences identify the discrediting event or mark (Link & Phelan, 2001) and then stigmatize the actor. Not all discreditable events or marks are recognized by relevant
audiences (Hoffman & Ocasio, 2001; Stenger & Roulet, 2018), and even attention to them does not always result in the assignment of stigma.

Link and Phelan (2001) argue that the stigmatization process involves several steps prior to the assignment of stigma. First, the discrediting event or mark must exist. These can vary from a scandal, such as the financial fraud committed by Michael Milken, to a concealable mark, such as identifying as homosexual in a highly gendered profession, to repeated unethical organizational behaviors, such as the persistent concealment of domestic violence and traumatic brain injury research in the NFL. Next, the link between discrediting marks and negative stereotypes that already exist within the social system must be made. Third, audiences or social control agents must label the identity of those involved in or marked by the stigmatizing event the designation of “other” or “different.” The fourth step involves status loss and discrimination on the part of the stigmatized parties. Finally, this can only occur within a framework where social differences exist and the process can be enacted.

Building on Link and Phelan (2001), we focus on the role of audiences in social evaluation. When audiences do not recognize a discrediting event or mark, the stigmatization process may not take root or may be easily corrected or reversed. Because audiences play such an important role in social evaluations, it is necessary to consider how the evaluative process might be influenced by internal audience factors, primary among them biased cognition (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Bazerman and Moore, 2008), and external environmental constraints, including institutional norms (e.g., DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Berger and Luckman, 1966). Consequently, we develop a model describing the ways in which cognition and emotion, and institutional constraints interrupt the process through which audiences engage in the process of stigmatization.
Cognitive and emotional barriers to stigmatization

Cognitive dissonance reduction. Given the unclear, conflicting, and confusing circumstances and explanations that often accompany the revelation of discrediting marks – particularly for public figures, organizations, and institutions with which individuals have only arms-length (or weaker) relationships, it is likely that many engage in cognitive dissonance reduction when evaluating discredited others.

Nostalgia, attachment, and loyalty. In some instances, audiences may have formative, positive associations with a discreditable actor based on early experiences that shaped their tastes. Nostalgia triggered by negative information and associated moods might increase audiences’ affect, induce recognition of positive self-attributes, and generate feelings of social connectedness (Sedikides, Whildschut, Arndt & Routledge, 2008) and therefore color sensemaking process. This is particularly likely to be true in settings where attachment to the discredited actor was formed early in one’s life (e.g., Simpson & Rholes, 1998). Nostalgia and attachment might also engender feelings of loyalty to the discredited actor, preventing observers from assigning negative evaluations.

Collective effervescence. Discrediting marks that might attach to events enjoyed in a community might also go unnoticed because audiences are caught up in the collective effervescence, or sense of unity of thought, action, and excitement that accompanies the experience. Like those who experience nostalgia for their childhood football heroes, those who have witnessed or participated in a championship game may rely on that experience to guide their evaluations of team members, preventing them from associating misbehaving players with discrediting criminal activity.
Trust. Trust and distrust have been demonstrated to play a role in attribution of blame, a critical aspect of the negative evaluative process that leads to stigmatization. The trust inherent in social relationships insulates wrongdoers from blame, while victims are more likely to attribute blame to those with whom they do not have trusting relationships (e.g., Yenkey, 2018), although that trust often leads people to open themselves up to victimization (e.g., Baker & Faulkner, 2004). Trust may prevent individuals from making connections between the discredited and negative stereotypes.

Institutional and pragmatic barriers to stigmatization

Institutional complexity. Significant research examines how organizations operating in institutionally complex environment may reconcile competing standards and expectations (Kraatz & Block, 2008). Actors that face competing expectations about their behaviors may address one logic over another (Toubiana & Zietsma, 2017) or engage in strategic silence with some audiences, while publicizing the same information to other audiences or at other times (Stenger & Roulet, 2018).

Decoupling. Organizations can engage in a number of activities that might distance them from being assigned stigma. Elsbach and Sutton (1992) provide a well-known example of organizations engaging in decoupling activities in order to avoid being stigmatized for questionable, even illegal, behaviors. Audiences may be well aware of the discreditable activities but due to actors’ impression management, such as decoupling or silence (Carlos & Lewis, 2018), may not assign a discrediting mark.

Positive social evaluations. Much research has addressed the outcomes that result from positive social evaluations including celebrity (Rindova, Pollock & Hayward, 2006), legitimacy (Suddaby, Bitektine & Haack, 2017), reputation (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990) and status
Positive social evaluations may be modified by a number of internal and external factors, but research on positive social evaluations has generally shown that they can protect actors from a variety of negative outcomes that may result from discreditable behaviors (although findings on the longevity of the effect vary and in fact, negative outcomes can occur as well).

*Violation of expectations.* Certain fields carry expectations about actors’ knowledge, expertise, morality, or other salient characteristics that the audiences are unable or unwilling to take upon themselves. In such fields, audiences may be less likely to assign stigma or even recognize the discreditable behaviors due to the inherent violation of institutional expectations or the audiences’ inability or unwillingness engage in the behavior on their own. Conversely, audiences may give undo emphasis to the behaviors because due to the intense emotional investments often present in such institutions (Toubiana & Zietsma, 2017; Gutierrez, Howard-Grenville & Scully, 2010).

We explore the cognitive, emotional and institutional characteristics of marginalizing audiences and their environments that influence the stigmatization process. We believe that by identifying the mechanisms that impact the stigmatization process, researchers can better understand how external factors influence the treatment of and consequences for the stigmatized.
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