

WORKING LIFE STRESS, REHABILITATION COUNSELLING AND INCLUSION

“To tell or not to tell?” Managing a concealable identity in the workplace

Ross Flett*

School of Psychology, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Abstract

The management of identities, particularly stigmatized identities, represents considerable challenge. This article considers some of the issues around the decision to conceal or reveal a stigmatized or potentially stigmatizing identity. The potential consequences of “telling or not telling” are examined. There is a need for all individuals to monitor behaviours, attitudes, systems and structures that convey disrespect, discrimination, and derogation towards those with a stigmatized identity (concealed or otherwise).

Keywords: *identity; stigma; workplace; disclosure; theory*

The warp and weft of everyday working life involves the management of multiple identities and for the most part these are seamlessly intertwined. We can at the same time be friend, acquaintance, colleague, worker, and boss. The notion of social identity and the management of multiple identities are well canvassed in the psychological literature (e.g. Brook, Garcia, & Fleming, 2008; Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010; Gregg, 1995; Settles, 2004). But at the same time there may be other identities that we wish to conceal (often because of

their potentially stigmatizing nature). Goffman (1963) defines a stigma as an attribute that prevents an individual from being fully accepted in or connected to the social world. Goffman makes the distinction between stigmas that are “discredited” versus those that are “discreditable”. The discredited are those that are more obvious such as race, physical disability while the discreditable are those that can be hidden such as sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS, mental illness and so on. A non-exhaustive list of stigmatised identities might include

*Correspondence to: Ross Flett, Senior Lecturer, School of Psychology, Massey University, Palmerston North 4410, New Zealand. Email R.A.Flett@massey.ac.nz

©2012 R. Flett. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Vulnerable Groups & Inclusion. DOI: 10.3402/vgi.v3i0.16145

mental illness, HIV/AIDS, sexual orientation, race, chronic illness (e.g. epilepsy, arthritis), sexual assault, childhood sexual abuse, and abortion (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010).

A central issue facing an individual with these invisible, discreditable identities is “Do I tell or do I keep it to myself?” The potential negative consequences of revealing such an identity are well documented (e.g. Pachankis, 2007; Rose Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell, 2007). The protection of vulnerable groups in the workplace has received much legislative and research attention in past decades but as Bell (2007) notes, “After more than two decades of diversity research, four decades of antidiscrimination legislation, and extraordinary media attention to diversity, discrimination and exclusion in organizations persist” (p. 3).

The present article seeks firstly to briefly review some research on examples of concealable stigmatizing identities. The aim is to bring to the foreground the potential vulnerability of those groups such that those who are concerned with wellbeing in the workplace might gain some additional insights and understandings. Secondly, I review, from a psychological perspective, research concerned with documenting some of the antecedents, contextual factors, and consequences of the decision to disclose a stigmatised concealable identity. Then it considers a number of theoretical models that have been advanced as frameworks for organising and understanding this research, and highlight some of the commonalities across these models. Finally, drawing on some of the research on the psychology of secrecy, the current article makes a case that

sometimes it may in fact be “better” to simply keep the identity secret.

As noted earlier, Goffman (1963) defined stigma as some type of devalued or unacceptable negative characteristic that sets an individual apart from others, creating what he referred to as a spoiled identity. The stigmatising effects of mental illness are extensive. Individuals are disliked, feared, avoided, excluded and seen as fundamentally “different” from the wider society (e.g. Crabtree, Haslam, Postmes, & Haslam, 2010). Workers with mental illnesses worry about their illnesses being “discovered”. The direct stigmatization effects of mental illness are profound (Jones, 2011) and indirect effects (stigma by association, or courtesy stigma) have also been noted (Parfene, Stewart, & King, 2009). Simply being a parent, sibling, caregiver, or friend of a person with mental illness may result in the same kinds of discrimination, exclusion, and avoidance experiences that are the reality for members of the stigmatized group.

Sexual orientation has carried with it a significant stigma (e.g. Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 2009). Whilst there has been a considerable shift in societal attitudes toward sexual orientation (Herek, 2010), hate crimes and other crimes of violence are not uncommon experiences for sexual minority adults (Herek, 2009). Rose Ragins et al. (2007) emphasise the ongoing importance of understanding the fear of disclosure of a gay identity in the workplace.

Among physical illnesses much has been written about HIV/AIDS as a widely recognised stigmatising physical health condition (e.g. Munir, Leka, & Griffiths, 2005; Neal, Lichtenstein, & Brodsky, 2010; Phillips, Moneyham, &

Tavakoli, 2011; Rutledge, Whyte, Abell, Brown, & Cesnales, 2011; Sengupta, Banks, Jonas, Miles, & Smith, 2011; Sowell & Phillips, 2010). Perhaps one of the less high profile but equally profound examples of a chronic physical illness that is a stigmatized identity is epilepsy (Munir et al., 2005). A study by Smith et al. (2009) provides extensive discussion of psychosocial factors associated with stigma in adults with epilepsy and noted that epilepsy and HIV/AIDS have similar stigma levels. Bishop, Stenhoff, Bradley, and Allen (2007) showed that individuals with cancer in remission, depression, history of heart problems, mild mental retardation, or spinal cord injury were seen by a sample of employers and HR professionals as more likely to get hired than a person with epilepsy.

The overarching picture that emerges here is of identities that individuals are highly motivated to conceal for good reasons—the psychological, social, emotional and practical costs of such identities being revealed or discovered is potentially very high. What then do we know about the psychology behind the management of such identities? How do I decide when to tell? Who to tell? How to tell? What are the consequences of telling (or not telling)?

A number of models have been proposed as a means of understanding the dynamics of concealed identities. The process model of the psychological implications of concealing a stigma (Pachankis, 2007) outlines some of the cognitive, affective and behavioural implications driving the disclosure decision. He notes some important aspects of the situation (salience of the stigma, the threat/consequences of discovery) and

some of the self evaluative implications such as identity ambivalence, reduced self-efficacy and negative views of self that underlie the decision to disclose, and the consequences of the feedback elicited by that disclosure decision. Chaudoir and Fisher (2010) outline a “Disclosure Processes Model (DPM)” which is aimed at providing a framework for understanding when and how disclosure might be a positive experience that is beneficial in terms of subsequent wellbeing. They argue that there are approach and avoidance motivations that impact on the decision to disclose (e.g. wanting more understanding, intimacy, greater acceptance versus trying to avoid conflict, rejection, distancing and so on). The model outlined by Ragins (2008) emphasises the influence of the extent of a disclosure decision on what she calls “disclosure disconnects” (p. 194). She suggests the fact that there can be a continuum of disclosure in both work and non-work domains can lead to “disclosure disconnects”. If I tell everyone in my non-work environment about my heretofore concealed identity but decide to continue to keep it secret at work then this “... disclosure disconnect[s] may result in psychological stress and conflict as individuals attempt to manage an identity that is concealed to various degrees across life settings” (p. 2008). Other models from the research literature on secrecy provide some additional insights into the kinds of strategies people might use to reveal a secret identity (e.g. The Revelation Risk Model), (Afifi & Steuber, 2009), or why such an identity might continue to remain hidden (e.g. The Cycle of Concealment Model), (Afifi & Steuber, 2010). It is beyond the scope of this

article to provide a detailed critical analysis of these and other relevant models reported in the literature. At the risk of stating the obvious, it is clear that there is substantial psychological “work” involved in the maintenance of a concealable stigmatized identity.

A useful distinction proposed by Goffman and others is between “passing” and “revealing”. Revealing is the disclosure of the previously invisible identity (often referred to in the sexual orientation literature, as well as in popular parlance, as “coming out”). The emphasis in the literature is on revealing as being “good” for an individual in a normative sense. Everyday language reflects this view. People claim that it is important for an individual “to get it off your chest”, “to clear the air”, “to be true to yourself”. The notion of self-verification suggests that individuals find it important for others to see them as they see themselves (Chen, English, & Peng, 2006; Gómez, Morales, Huici, Gavia, & Jiménez, 2007; Swann, Polzer, Seyle, & Ko, 2004). The positive benefits of revealing suggest that “... considered together, disclosure is a powerful behaviour that can shape nearly every domain of people’s lives” (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010, p. 3). On the other hand, “revealing” may be something of a two-edged sword. Potential negative consequences might include; increases in discrimination, prejudice and stigmatization experiences (Clair, Beatty, & Maclean, 2005), increasingly strained relationships with co-workers (Jones, 2011), rejection, social avoidance and disapproval (Mak, Ng, Mo, & Chong, 2010), and more generally experiences ranging from “... social isolation ... to verbal harassment, job

discrimination, job loss, and even physical assault ...” (Ragins, 2008, p. 201). Clearly “revealing” must be a carefully considered decision.

“Passing” is, in simple terms, keeping the identity hidden—“passing” on any opportunities that may arise to reveal the identity. Goffman (1963, p. 74) notes that “... because of the great rewards in being considered normal, almost all persons who are in a position to pass will do so on some occasion by intent”. There is evidence that management of a concealed identity or multiple concealed identities is both effortful and stressful in terms of the need for emotion regulation and suppression (to avoid intrusive thoughts associated with the concealed identity), creates a sense of cognitive dissonance, and generally reduces well-being and increases stress (Beals, Peplau, & Gable, 2009; Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Dovidio, 2009). There is some evidence, deriving from the pre-occupation model of secrecy (Afifi & Caughlin, 2006), that the process of thought suppression—attempting to suppress any thoughts about one’s concealed identity in order to avoid any inadvertent “slips of the tongue” that may result in the identity being revealed, may in fact increase the frequency of those thoughts, a supposed “rebound effect” (Afifi & Caughlin, 2006). In broad brush stroke terms, the implicit message in the research literature seems to be that, all things considered, “revealing” may be a “better” strategy for the individual to consider, depending on the target audience (Chaudoir & Quinn, 2010).

So, what to do? How does an individual resolve what seems to be an intractable dilemma—“do I tell” or, “do I not tell?” There are no clear advantages to

either strategy. Perhaps the fundamental question to ask oneself is “Does it bother me?” If the answer to that question is “no” then don’t tell (Kelly & McKillop, 1996). If the answer is “yes” then the decision making process becomes more complex. Most of the models emphasise some form of risk assessment process (Afifi & Steuber, 2009; Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Omarzu, 2000; Pachankis, 2007; Ragins, 2008). A pivotal factor here is the assessment of the availability of social support from the target for the disclosure, and the general likelihood that there will be a positive reaction to the disclosure from that target. Afifi and Steuber (2009) argue that feelings of closeness to the target of disclosure might reduce perceptions of risk. Other writers emphasise the importance of supportive relationships in general and having a supportive confidant in particular (Beals et al., 2009; Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Gignac & Cao, 2009; Ragins, 2008). The expectation of a hostile, angry, or aggressive reaction from a potential disclosure target is likely to perpetuate an ongoing “cycle of concealment” (Afifi & Steuber, 2010). If a potential confidant is assessed as being discreet, non-judgemental, and able to help (Kelly & McKillop, 1996) then disclosure becomes more likely. The stress buffering effects of such social support are well documented (e.g. Cohen & Wills, 1985) and may be an important resource with which an individual might confront any of the post-disclosure turbulence that occurs. Evidence suggests that workplace managers have an important role to play here in providing emotional and practical support particularly for those disclosing and coping with a chronic health condi-

tion in the workplace (Munir, Pryce, Haslam, Leka, & Griffiths, 2006; Munir, Randall, Yarker, & Nielsen, 2009).

On the other hand, keeping a concealable identity concealed may simply be the best decision. One must ask the question “do other people really need to know?” Kelly and McKillop (1996) suggest that “... Although confessions may be ‘good for the soul’, given that they can wreak havoc with one’s network of friends and supporters, some things truly are better left unsaid ...” (p. 461). Maintaining that boundary between work and non-work through a lack of disclosure may be important for the equilibrium of the workplace (Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009). Significant asymmetries in disclosure levels can exacerbate status differences, cause discomfort and embarrassment, and leave individuals vulnerable to exploitation. Having a “private sense of self” containing information, thoughts, feelings, desires that are known only to the individual is arguably a positive aspect of ego development (Kelly & McKillop, 1996). It is important to try and untangle these notions of “public” and “private”, “individual” and “collective” when trying to understand identity. What one thinks about oneself as a member of a stigmatised group may be quite different (and potentially much more favourable) from one’s ratings of how other people see that same group (Ashburn-Nardo, 2010).

In summary, the decision to disclose a concealable and stigmatized identity is an important one that cannot be taken lightly. At the same time one must be careful to avoid gloomy and pessimistic assumptions about a potential post-disclosure life inevitably fraught with

danger and difficulty. Quinn and Chaudoir (2009) note that "... some people exhibit distress; others do not. Some situations result in negative outcomes; some do not ... many people, despite living in a culture that often devalues them, can be happy, resilient, and well adjusted" (p. 649). Stigmatized individuals may indeed "... flourish despite others' negative perceptions ..." (Shelton, Alegre, & Son, 2010, p. 621). The challenge for researchers involves one of specificity; what kinds of disclosures?, what types of people?, what types of identities?, what kinds of circumstances?, lead to the most adaptive outcomes. The theoretical models and associated empirical research reviewed here provides the roadmap for further elaboration of the question "to tell or not to tell?"

To conclude, individuals are able to manage multiple identities without major dissonance (DeJordy, 2008) and can successfully maintain a distinction between one's working and non working life without living in a constant state of anxiety that their secret identity will be discovered. There is not an inevitable long term health cost associated with concealing a private identity (even though it may be a stigmatized one). A study by Kelly and Yip (2006) concluded that: "By demonstrating that keeping a major secret is not linked to greater symptomatology down the road, perhaps the results from this study will provide some comfort to those who feel that they cannot reveal a personal secret" (p. 1366). The literature on resilience and psychological flexibility (Kashdan & Rottenberg, 2010; Newman, 2005; Windle, 2011) indicates that people do have, or with appropriate supports can

develop, the resources to "bounce back" from adversity. However one must be cautious about sending a mixed message here. All individuals in the workplace and the wider community have the fundamental and inalienable right to be treated with dignity and respect. We must be ever vigilant in monitoring behaviours, attitudes, systems and structures that convey disrespect, discrimination, and derogation towards those with a stigmatized identity (concealed or otherwise). The research is clear about the potential destructiveness of those experiences in the lives of people living with stigma and the research agenda must be vigorous in the pursuit of understandings and insights into how prejudice and discrimination might best be dismantled and overcome. These things will take time. But, as noted above, as well as elsewhere in the literature (Shih, 2004; Thoits, 2011), individuals with concealed stigmatised identities can reveal them, can overcome the consequences of that revelation, and lead positive and optimistic lives. The research agenda needs to be equally vigorous in developing understandings of that process of empowerment.

REFERENCES

- Affi, T., & Steuber, K. (2009). The revelation risk model (RRM): Factors that predict the revelation of secrets and the strategies used to reveal them. *Communication Monographs*, 76(2), 144–176.
- Affi, T.D., & Steuber, K. (2010). The cycle of concealment model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27(8), 1019–1034.
- Affi, W.A., & Caughlin, J.P. (2006). A close look at revealing secrets and some consequences that follow. *Communication Research*, 33(6), 467–488.

- Ashburn-Nardo, L. (2010). The importance of implicit and explicit measures for understanding social stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(3), 508–520.
- Beals, K.P., Peplau, L.A., & Gable, S.L. (2009). Stigma management and well-being: The role of perceived social support, emotional processing, and suppression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(7), 867–879.
- Bell, M.P. (2007). *Diversity in organizations*. Mason, OH: South-Western.
- Bishop, M., Stenhoff, D.M., Bradley, K.D., & Allen, C.A. (2007). The differential effect of epilepsy labels on employer perceptions: Report of a pilot study. *Epilepsy and Behavior, 11*(3), 351–356.
- Brook, A.T., Garcia, J., & Fleming, M. (2008). The effects of multiple identities on psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(12), 1588–1600.
- Chaudoir, S.R., & Fisher, J.D. (2010). The disclosure processes model: Understanding disclosure decision making and post-disclosure outcomes among people living with a concealable stigmatized identity. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(2), 236–256. doi: 10.1037/a0018193
- Chaudoir, S.R., & Quinn, D.M. (2010). Revealing concealable stigmatized identities: The impact of disclosure motivations and positive first-disclosure experiences on fear of disclosure and well-being. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(3), 570–584.
- Chen, S., English, T., & Peng, K. (2006). Self-verification and contextualized self-views. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(7), 930–942.
- 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.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310–357.
- Crabtree, J.W., Haslam, S.A., Postmes, T., & Haslam, C. (2010). Mental health support groups, stigma, and self-esteem: positive and negative implications of group identification. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(3), 553–569.
- DeJordy, R. (2008). Just passing through: Stigma, passing, and identity decoupling in the work place. *Group and Organization Management, 33*(5), 504–531. doi: 10.1177/1059601108324879
- Dutton, J.E., Roberts, L.M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity construction at work: four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(2), 265–293.
- Gignac, M.A.M., & Cao, X. (2009). “Should I tell my employer and coworkers I have arthritis?” A longitudinal examination of self-disclosure in the work place. *Arthritis Care and Research, 61*(12), 1753–1761.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Gómez, A., Morales, J.F., Huici, C., Gaviria, E., & Jiménez, J. (2007). When the world understands me ... and my alignment with the group. From self-verification to verification of one’s group identity. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 7*(2), 213–236.
- Gregg, G.S. (1995). Multiple identities and the integration of personality. *Journal of Personality, 63*(3), 617–641.
- Hatzenbuehler, M.L., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Dovidio, J. (2009). How does stigma “get under the skin”? The mediating role of emotion regulation: Research article. *Psychological Science, 20*(10), 1282–1289.
- Herek, G.M. (2009). Hate crimes and stigma-related experiences among sexual minority adults in the united states: Prevalence estimates from a national probability sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(1), 54–74.
- Herek, G.M. (2010). Sexual orientation differences as deficits: Science and stigma in the history of American psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(6), 693–699.
- Herek, G.M., Gillis, J.R., & Cogan, J.C. (2009). Internalized stigma among sexual minority adults: Insights from a social psychological perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(1), 32–43.
- Jones, A.M. (2011). Disclosure of mental illness in the workplace: A literature review.

- American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, 14(3), 212–229.
- Kashdan, T.B., & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Psychological flexibility as a fundamental aspect of health. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 865–878.
- Kelly, A.E., & McKillop, K.J. (1996). Consequences of revealing personal secrets. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(3), 450–465.
- Kelly, A.E., & Yip, J.J. (2006). Is keeping a secret or being a secretive person linked to psychological symptoms? *Journal of Personality*, 74(5), 1349–1369.
- Mak, W.W.S., Ng, A.C., Mo, P.K.H., & Chong, E.S.K. (2010). Coming out among lesbians, gays, and bisexual individuals in Hong Kong: Application of the theory of planned behavior and the moderating role of attitudinal ambivalence. *Sex Roles*, 63(3), 189–200.
- Munir, F., Leka, S., & Griffiths, A. (2005). Dealing with self-management of chronic illness at work: Predictors for self-disclosure. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60(6), 1397–1407. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.07.012
- Munir, F., Pryce, J., Haslam, C., Leka, S., & Griffiths, A. (2006). Gender differences in managing chronic illness at work: Exploring predictors for disclosure. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 25(3), 173–180.
- Munir, F., Randall, R., Yarker, J., & Nielsen, K. (2009). The influence of employer support on employee management of chronic health conditions at work. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 19(4), 333–344.
- Neal, T.M.S., Lichtenstein, B., & Brodsky, S.L. (2010). Clinical implications of stigma in HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections. *International Journal of STD and AIDS*, 21(3), 158–160.
- Newman, R. (2005). APA's resilience initiative. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(3), 227–229.
- Omarzu, J. (2000). A disclosure decision model: Determining how and when individuals will self-disclose. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(2), 174–185.
- Pachankis, J.E. (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(2), 328–345.
- Parfene, C., Stewart, T.L., & King, T.Z. (2009). Epilepsy stigma and stigma by association in the workplace. *Epilepsy and Behavior*, 15(4), 461–466. doi: 10.1016/j.yebeh.2009.05.011
- Phillips, K.D., Moneyham, L., & Tavakoli, A. (2011). Development of an instrument to measure internalized stigma in those with HIV/AIDS. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 32(6), 359–366.
- Phillips, K.W., Rothbard, N.P., & Dumas, T.L. (2009). To disclose or not to disclose? Status distance and self-disclosure in diverse environments. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(4), 710–732.
- Quinn, D.M., & Chaudoir, S.R. (2009). Living with a concealable stigmatized identity: The impact of anticipated stigma, centrality, salience, and cultural stigma on psychological distress and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(4), 634–651.
- Ragins, B.R. (2008). Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life domains. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 194–215.
- Rose Ragins, B., 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. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1103
- Rutledge, S.E., Whyte, J., Abell, N., Brown, K.M., & Cesnales, N.I. (2011). Measuring stigma among health care and social service providers: The HIV/AIDS provider stigma inventory. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 25(11), 673–682.
- Sengupta, S., Banks, B., Jonas, D., Miles, M.S., & Smith, G.C. (2011). HIV interventions to reduce HIV/AIDS stigma: A systematic review. *AIDS and Behavior*, 15(6), 1075–1087.
- Settles, I.H. (2004). When multiple identities interfere: The role of identity centrality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(4), 487–500.
- Shelton, J.N., Alegre, J.M., & Son, D. (2010). Social stigma and disadvantage: Current

- themes and future prospects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(3), 618–633.
- Shih, M. (2004). Positive stigma: Examining resilience and empowerment in overcoming stigma. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591, 175–185.
- Smith, G. Ferguson, P.L. Saunders, L.L. Wagner, J.L. Wannamaker, B.B. & Selassie, A.W. (2009). Psychosocial factors associated with stigma in adults with epilepsy. *Epilepsy and Behavior*, 16(3), 484–490. doi: 10.1016/j.yebeh.2009.08.028
- Sowell, R.L., & Phillips, K.D. (2010). Understanding and responding to HIV/AIDS stigma and disclosure: An international challenge for mental health nurses. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 31(6), 394–402.
- Swann Jr, W.B., Polzer, J.T., Seyle, D.C., & Ko, S.J. (2004). Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(1), 9–27.
- Thoits, P.A. (2011). Resisting the stigma of mental illness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74(1), 6–28.
- Windle, G. (2011). What is resilience? A review and concept analysis. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, 21(2), 152–169.