Organization Science

Social Movements, Collective Identity, and Workplace Allies: The Labeling of Gender Equity Policy Changes

Cynthia S. Wang, Jennifer A. Whitson, Brayden G King, Rachel L. Ramirez

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages

Social Movements, Collective Identity, and Workplace Allies: The Labeling of Gender Equity Policy Changes

Cynthia S. Wang,[a] Jennifer A. Whitson,[b] Brayden G King,[c] Rachel L. Ramirez[d]

[a] Dispute Resolution Research Center, Management & Organizations Department, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208; [b] Management & Organizations Area, UCLA Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095; [c] Management & Organizations Department, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208; [d] United Parent Leaders Action Network, Chicago, Ilinois 60616
Contact: scynthia.wang@kellogg.northwestern.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3880-8753 (CSW); jennifer.whitson@anderson.ucla.edu (JAW); b-king@kellogg.northwestern.edu (BGK); rachelramirez773@gmail.com (RLR)

Abstract. Social movements seek allies as they campaign for social, political, and organizational changes. How do activists gain allies in the targeted institutions they hope to change? Despite recognition of the importance of ally support in theories about institutional change and social movements, these theories are largely silent on the microdynamics of ally mobilization. We examine how the labeling of organizational policies that benefit women influences potential workplace allies' support for these policies. We theorize that one barrier to mobilizing workplace allies is a misalignment of the labels that activists use to promote new policies and employees' affiliation with collective identities. We conducted five experiments to test our hypotheses and 26 qualitative interviews to provide illustration of our core concepts. We demonstrate that employees high in feminist identification are more likely to support feminist-labeled (feminist and #MeToo) than unlabeled policies, whereas those low in feminist identification are less likely to support feminist-labeled than unlabeled policies (Studies 1–3). However, we find that participants for whom organizational identification was high (whether measured or manipulated) and feminist identification was low supported organizationally labeled policies more than feminist-labeled polices (Studies 4 and 5). This illustrates that policies whose aims may not align with one collective identity can still garner support by activating another relevant collective identity. Within our studies, we provide evidence that these effects are mediated via feelings of pride in the organization (and not fear or anger), suggesting that positive emotions are a central mechanism in mobilizing workplace allies.

History: This paper has been accepted for the *Organization Science* Special Issue on Experiments in Organizational Theory.
Supplemental Material: The online appendix is available at https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1492.

Activists frequently target organizations to promote a cause and campaign for social change (King and Pearce 2010, Briscoe and Gupta 2016). Research on social movements and institutional change has emphasized the role of activists in mobilizing others to take part in collective action in support of their cause (King 2008, Soule 2009). Mobilizing a broad base of support is a key mechanism of institutional entrepreneurship (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, Battilana et al. 2009). Much of what social movement activists do is intended to help them win the "hearts and minds" of prospective supporters, such as potential allies (King and Walker 2014, p. 134).

By allies, we do not refer to movement activists themselves but to potentially sympathetic employees affiliated with the target institution who might lend internal support to accomplishing movement goals (Oegema and Klandermans 1994). Thus, our definition of ally implies that the individual is part of the very institution the movement seeks to change, giving them a more privileged position than typical movement members have (Yukich et al. 2020). Potential allies may at times benefit from a movement's proposed changes; however, because of their status as institutional insiders, they occupy a "liminal position" that not only grants them opportunities for influence but challenges their credibility as movement members (Meyerson and Scully 1995; Russo 2014, p. 68; Briscoe and Gupta 2016).

Ally support is critical as social movements drive policy change inside organizations. Research shows that even after a movement-initiated policy is adopted, potential movement allies help ensure that the intended institutional and organizational changes

actually take place (Andrews 2001). Social movement theory and organizational research both emphasize the role of allies in supporting new policy implementation, especially when such change is viewed as radical or possibly disruptive of the organization (Kellogg 2009, Briscoe and Gupta 2016, DeJordy et al. 2020). Moreover, although having elite allies (i.e., high-level organizational actors with decision-making authority) is often seen as key to movement success (McAdam 1996), implementation of new policies also requires the support of allies at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, including nonelite employees (Huy 2002, Kellogg 2009).

Despite the importance of gaining allies, we know little about the microlevel processes by which nonelite employees are converted into movement allies and support the implementation efforts of new organizational policies (Kellogg 2009, Briscoe and Gupta 2016). It is this recruitment of nonelite employees into allies that concerns us in this paper. Much social movement research considers the presence of allies to be an exogenous condition of movement mobilization and part of the "political opportunity structure," whereas we argue that allies (and the support they provide for policy change) can be endogenous to movement efforts (McAdam 1996; Binder 2002; Raeburn 2004; McDonnell et al. 2015, p. 672; Milkis and Tichenor 2019).

However, workplaces are "organizational habitats" distinct from policy-making domains and are not ideal sites for political consciousness raising (Katzenstein 1998, p. 19). Because successful implementation of the policy will both alter the institutional structure and require effort and dedication from organizational members, resistance to movement-initiated change is a natural obstacle within organizations (Meyerson and Scully 1995, Kellogg 2009, Giorgi et al. 2017). Potential allies of a policy change may be wary of the reputational and social risks faced when providing internal support for potentially polarizing organizational policies (Meyerson and Scully 1995, DeCelles et al. 2019). By *internal support*, we mean taking visible action within the organization to further the implementation of policy, encourage others to support the policy, and increase the likelihood of success of the activists' goals.[1] Wilensky (1967, p. 3) notes that in organizations, control is "the problem of getting work done and securing compliance with organizational rules," making it clear that support of rules and policies from within the organization cannot be assumed. Indeed, individuals within organizations have discretion as to the extent they can support or apply both preexisting organizational policies (e.g., Lipsky 1980, Vinzant et al. 1998, Evans 2010) as well as policy decisions as they are transformed into operational terms to carry out an organization's stated objectives (Williams 1971).

Converting employees into allies and gaining their support go beyond issue selling or other means of persuasion (Dutton and Ashford 1993).

How, then, do employees become allies of a movement that seeks to implement a potentially controversial policy? This paper explores how discourse, or more specifically, the label, used to introduce new policies affects ally mobilization. Labels can be drawn from broader social contexts outside the organization, such as when a social movement uses a label to denote a particular ideology, as well as from within the organization itself. Specifically, we compare and contrast labels associated with the women's rights movement, such as "feminist" and "#MeToo," versus organizationally related labels to better understand this recruitment process.

Activists use policy labels as a type of discourse that energizes potential allies by associating their support with a particular ideology or categorical schema (Negro et al. 2010). Framing discourse in a way that resonates with employees is an important challenge (Snow et al. 1986). Collective identities are key drivers in people's willingness to mobilize on behalf of a movement (e.g., Polletta and Jasper 2001); although collective identity is a nuanced concept that has been treated in a number of ways in the literature (Luhtanen and Crocker 1992, Brewer and Gardner 1996), we treat *collective identity* in general as an identity shared with others who are believed to have characteristics in common (Ashmore et al. 2004). We discuss specific collective identities here.

Social movement scholars have argued that one of the main problems in mobilizing ally support is that individuals in privileged positions may not initially share the collective identity of the movement (e.g., feminist) and that this lack of a shared identity can be a roadblock to gaining their support for the movement's goals (Myers 2008, Russo 2014). Moreover, as Meyerson and Scully (1995) have noted, employees may embrace other collective identities (for example, by identifying as a member of the organization) that may be in tension with the collective identity of the movement.

We argue that the collective identity of employees and the policy label itself play a central role in whether the policy will resonate, increasing mobilization. The labels that activists use to mobilize people in the broader public to join their movement may not resonate inside the target institutions they seek to change and may even be highly contentious and polarizing (Feinberg and Willer 2011, Giorgi et al. 2017). We theorize that the extent to which a new policy uses labels that resonate with employees' relevant collective identities will be associated with ally mobilization. Although there are many forms of collective identity, we explore two forms in particular: feminist identification

and organizational identification. We focus on these two forms of collective identity because they provide a theoretically generative window into understanding ally mobilization within organizations. Employees highly identified as feminists ought to be more open to feminist-labeled policies, whereas those less identified as feminists ought to be more resistant to feminist-labeled policies. In addition, we believe that for those low in feminist identification, organizational identification can make individuals more open to organizationally labeled policies over feminist-labeled policies. Moreover, because social movement scholars have argued that emotions mediate mobilization into collective action (Goodwin et al. 2009, Jasper 2011, DeCelles et al. 2019), we contend that pride toward the organization is a motivating emotion, central in support for labeled policies.

We make two theoretical contributions. First, we begin to unpack the microfoundations of how social movement activism translates into internal organizational support for movement goals (Briscoe and Gupta 2016). Whereas past research on social movements and organizations has focused on external activist efforts to reform organizations (e.g., King 2008) or on efforts to lead change by convincing elite decision makers (e.g., Raeburn 2004), we theorize a crucial factor in ensuring mobilization efforts succeed depends on recruiting nonelite employees to become allies. Thus, our paper contributes to a growing body of research that examines how social movements play a role in policy implementation efforts (Kellogg 2009, 2011; DeJordy et al. 2020). Our work provides insight into the critical process of gaining the internal support of allies in advancing institutional changes (e.g., Rao and Giorgi 2006), with a particular focus on the crucial phase of implementing these new movement-driven policies. Moreover, our analyses demonstrate the alignment of collective identity and policy labels as key micromechanisms underlying internal support for movement-driven policies (Weber et al. 2008, Augustine and King 2019).

Second, our paper elaborates on emotional resonance, in the form of pride toward the organization, as a critical mechanism in building support for new policies. One potential barrier to mobilizing workplace allies is a misalignment of employees' identities and the labels used to promote new policies, which results in lowering the emotional resonance of those policies with employees. As a result, we argue that the labels activists use to mobilize participants in the external movement may have unintentional consequences by failing to resonate with the very employees who are needed as movement allies. Thus, our paper adds to an important conversation around identity and emotions as mechanisms of mobilizing stakeholders (e.g., Rowley and Moldoveanu 2003, Zavyalova et al. 2016).

We conducted five experiments to test our hypotheses. Studies 1–3 examined whether feminist identification moderates the effect of policy labeling (i.e., "feminist," "#MeToo," or unlabeled) on levels of support for policies that benefit women (Hypothesis 1a). Studies 4 and 5 examined whether organizational labels (i.e., the organization's name versus "feminist") can increase policy support by those who are low in feminist identification but high in organizational identification (Hypothesis 2a). In addition, Studies 3–5 tested whether our proposed moderated effect is mediated via feelings of pride in the organization (Hypotheses 1b and 2b).

Our experimental approach offers several benefits. First, this approach rules out a host of potential confounds one might otherwise encounter (Brewer 1985) and allows for replicability (Croson et al. 2007, Camerer et al. 2016). Furthermore, by randomly assigning participants to conditions of labeled or unlabeled policies and high or low organizational identification, we are able to establish evidence of direct causality (Merton 1949). Finally, although social movement scholars have long understood the importance of gaining allies as a macrophenomenon, the micromechanisms by which movements create allies are often obscured by approaches grounded in the institutional level of analysis (Felin et al. 2012, Bitektine and Miller 2015). By employing an experimental approach, we illuminate some of these micromechanisms, with implications that deepen understanding of the processes related to social movements within organizations. We also collected qualitative data involving interviews with 26 working professionals from a diverse range of organizational contexts. Our interviews provided depth and external validity with regard to our phenomena of interest and are useful in understanding the patterns identified in the experiments (see also Kim and Miner 2007 for a similar approach); we thus follow our findings in each study with illustrative quotes from the interviews (Kapoor and Klueter 2015).

Theoretical Development
How Labeling Organizational Policies Influences Employees' Support

Social movements are particularly adept at using labels in their discourse to push for particular reforms (Augustine and King 2019). Activists use labels to connote meaning in their efforts to mobilize people to participate in collective action and to win supporters for their cause, as illustrated by supporters of the women's movement using the feminist label to signify resistance to a patriarchal gender system (Taylor and Whittier 1995). Thus, meaning construction and the connotation of key words become ways activists can gain or lose support, especially among potential allies.

Importantly, connotations of labels vary by audience, and thus, the same label may not be equally effective in generating support among all potential allies (Galinsky et al. 2013, Wang et al. 2017, Whitson et al. 2017).

The connotations of labels are particularly relevant to activists in the gender equity effort (hooks 2000). Labels such as "feminist" and more recently, "#MeToo" have become popular terms that highlight the desire to address gendered inequalities in everyday life, politics, and the workplace (McVeigh 2013). Although labels related to gender equity have historically been used outside organizations, recently they have begun to spread from within (Pesce 2018). Efforts to address the sexual harassment and pay inequity that occur within organizational boundaries are often accompanied by the introduction of policies to support gender equity (Berg 2009, Abrahams 2017); these organizational policies are often discussed in relation to contemporary movements in hopes of inspiring allies within the organization (Higginbottom 2018, Pesce 2018). However, these labels used within organizations can ignite controversy because they can be imbued with both negative and positive connotations depending on the audience.

We posit that, beyond the reputational risks and potential harm to careers (e.g., Meyerson and Scully 1995, DeCelles et al. 2019), another barrier to mobilizing movement allies in the workplace is misalignment of employees' identities and the labels that social movements use as part of their discourse. Inasmuch as social movements use labels to describe policy changes that do not align with employees' own identities, those proposed policies will not create the desired emotional resonance (Schrock et al. 2004). The challenge that movements face is describing those policies in a way that resonates broadly with potential allies among employees, not just with those who already see themselves as participants in the movement. We maintain that labeling policies is one way in which a movement communicates its collective identity. These labels may convey collective identity, especially inasmuch as groups use them to signify membership in a community, which in turn, creates a sense of personal belonging (Glynn and Navis 2013). Although a policy with a movement label may resonate with some, it will likely have the opposite effect on others. We argue a key determinant is the collective identity of potential allies.

Collective Identities. Scholars have recognized the critical link between collective identity and emotional resonance (Weber et al. 2008, Howard-Grenville et al. 2013). Identities are used to make sense of the environment and prepare for action within it (Oyserman 2009). Individuals allocate attention to identity-relevant stimuli and cues (Oyserman et al. 2007, Oyserman 2009,

Reed et al. 2012) and regulate their emotions, attitudes, and behaviors to align with their activated identity (Mercurio and Forehand 2011, Reed et al. 2012). We focus on two types of collective identity: feminist and organizational.

Feminist Identification. We argue that the extent to which employees possess a feminist identity is a central factor driving whether they become allies for movement-labeled policies. As a collective identity, feminism is a complex web of political and personal ideologies (Zucker and Bay-Cheng 2010). However, regardless of their differences, people who identify as feminist share a bond that ties together those who see gender as a useful lens of analysis, argue against sexism, and seek in general to improve the standing of women in society (Rupp and Taylor 1999). Feminists see themselves as part of the same movement community and as possessing a common identity (Whittier 1997). Yet, not everyone identifies as feminist. Indeed, a YouGov poll indicates that the percentage of women who self-identify as feminists increased from 32% to 38% from 2016 to 2018 (Ballard 2018). At the same time, only 22% of men identify as feminist, and 48% of women still do not identify as feminists. Moreover, 48% of nonidentifying women believe that "feminists are too extreme."

This division between those who identify more as feminists and those who identify less produces challenges in mobilizing allies, especially in workplaces in which individuals may face sanctions for being seen as transgressive (Meyerson and Scully 1995). Collective identities lay at the crux of the transformation of the scattered experiences of individuals into unified and active collectives, and adopting the identity is often a central part of investing in activism (Duncan 1999, Polletta and Jasper 2001). In line with this argument, research suggests that possessing a feminist identity drives increased support for the movement's goals and an increased likelihood to act on behalf of those goals, with those who identify less as feminists being less likely to take part in activism on behalf of women's rights (Nelson et al. 2008). Thus, we suggest that labeling organizational policies as "feminist" or "#MeToo" results in higher support from those high in feminist identification but lower support from those low in feminist identification.

Hypothesis 1a. *Feminist identification will moderate the relationship between policy label* (*unlabeled versus movement labeled as "feminist" or "#MeToo"*) *and support of the policy. Movement-labeled policies will receive more support than unlabeled policies for employees high in feminist identification; in contrast, movement-labeled policies will receive less support than unlabeled policies for employees low in feminist identification.*

Organizational Identification. To further our study of collective identities, we also examine organizational identity as an additional lever that might trigger emotional resonance when certain organizational policies are introduced. Ashforth and Mael (1989, p. 21) conceptualized organizational identification as a perception of "oneness" with the organization, whereby an employee defines himself or herself in terms of organizational membership (Tyler and Blader 2000, Van Knippenberg 2000, Haslam 2001). Specifically, organizational identification is when "key aspects of the individual's self-definition are drawn from the organizations' perceived attributes" (Conroy et al. 2017, p. 185).

For example, employees who identify with their organization are more likely to endorse and incorporate the organization's norms and values into their self-concept and internalize organizational outcomes as their own (Ashforth and Mael 1989). Moreover, organizationally identified employees are more motivated to endorse and support goals geared toward benefiting the organization (Ashforth and Mael 1989, Dutton et al. 1994). In fact, individuals will adjust their cognitions and behaviors to align with what is contextually appropriate (Fiske 1992). Moreover, failing to meet organizational goals may threaten the identity of highly identified organizational members (Petriglieri 2011).

We draw from work suggesting that employees who feel that their organization shares their values exhibit more positive organizational attitudes (Kristof-Brown et al. 2002). Thus, organizations can influence one's sense of belonging, and certain actions become important to employees because they perceive that their identity is affected or at stake (Taylor 1985). Congruently, social identity theory suggests individuals will support institutions that embody those collective identities (Ashforth and Mael 1989), and we suggest that a strong confirmation of that embodiment can occur when the organizations' policy labels emphasize organizational membership.

Specifically, we propose that for those low in feminist identification, organizational identity may serve to promote support for the policy. That is, for employees high in organizational identification but low in feminist identification, a policy labeled with the organization's name will resonate more than one that is feminist labeled. Therefore, organizationally labeled policies (compared with feminist-labeled policies) may be met with more support.

Hypothesis 2a. *Organizational identification and feminist identification will moderate the relationship between policy label (movement labeled versus organizationally labeled) and support of the policy. Employees high in organizational identification and low in feminist identification will support organizationally labeled policies more than movement-labeled policies.*

Organizational Pride as the Key Mechanism

People are more likely to support social movement causes if they find the activists' discourse emotionally resonant. We argue that emotional resonance manifests, in this situation, in the form of organizational pride or "the pleasure taken in being associated with one's employer" (Helm 2013, p. 544). Emotions are central to the movement mobilization process (Goodwin et al. 2000, Jasper 2011). Emotions of various sorts—including joy and hope—can be the stimulus that provokes individuals to give their support to a movement and exert effort in helping to realize the movement's ideals (Van Zomeren et al. 2004, Van Stekelenburg et al. 2011). Similarly, scholars have argued that emotions undergird the functioning of organizations (e.g., Ashforth and Humphrey 1995) and are powerful motivators for individuals to assist in organizational change efforts (Huy 1999). Researchers have suggested that positive emotions may help individuals overcome barriers to participate in movements within organizations (DeCelles et al. 2019).

We argue that organizational pride is a key mechanism driving our hypotheses, such that labeled policies will differentially influence levels of pride in the organization, depending on the employees' collective identities, which then drive levels of internal support for the policies. An individual's appraisal of an event, and not the event's objective reality, is the true driver of their emotional experience (Frijda 1986, Lazarus 1991, Scherer et al. 2001), such that the same stimuli can motivate different reactions for different individuals. Thus, the appraisal of an event determines the emotions felt. Here, we focus on whether the label used for the policy serves as a cue that influences employees' emotional reactions.

For a self-conscious emotion such as pride to arise, the stimuli causing the emotional response must be seen as closely related to the self (Hume 1978). This link, or closeness to self, is tied to the idea of identity affirmation or the process of developing positive feelings for one's social group or organization (Phinney and Kohatsu 1997). We focus on pride because self-enhancement is a fundamental goal of human existence (Allport 1937), and individuals are highly sensitive to cues that induce positive emotion about the self or the groups to which they belong (Swann et al. 1989). This includes a sensitivity to positive information about the organizations to which they belong (Pfeffer and Fong 2005) and to cues that add to their organizational pride.

An organization that explicitly affirms the identities of nonelite employees within it should expect shifts in organizational pride. That is, for those high in feminist identification, seeing confirmation of their collective identity via feminist-labeled policies may instill a sense of organizational pride. However, for those low

in feminist identification, feminist-labeled policies may in fact result in lower pride in the organization because these policies affirm an identity these individuals do not hold.

In turn, employees' organizational pride may influence levels of support toward the organization's policies. Classic work on social identity suggests that pride, an important element of collective identity, contributes to group cohesion and cooperation (Turner 1984). In line with this work and work on social movements and emotion (e.g., Jasper 2011), we draw from reinforcement sensitivity theory (Carver and White 1994), which explores how arousal systems regulate individuals' motivation and behavior and in turn, may contribute to mobilization and internal support. Most relevant to our theorizing is the behavioral approach system (BAS), which regulates approach-oriented goals. For example, the BAS energizes those experiencing positive emotion (Watson et al. 1999), also increasing perseverance in pursuing goals (Williams and DeSteno 2008). For those presented with the policy, experiencing pride sends an emotional signal to the BAS, which in its activation spurs engagement and action (Lazarus 1991). The emotions resulting from particular appraisals inspire behaviors and attitudes in line with those feelings (Ballinger and Schoorman 2007). Positive emotions resulting from an organization's actions improve employees' attitudes toward their organization (Weiss and Cropanzano 1996), and organizational pride, specifically, motivates stronger bonds with the organization (Helm 2013). When organizational pride increases, membership in the organization becomes more important to individuals' self-concept (Rosso et al. 2010) and increases behaviors helpful to the organization (Brickson 2013).

Thus, for those high in feminist identification, we expect feminist-labeled policies to increase internal support because of increased feelings of pride in the organization; however, for those who are low in feminist identification, we expect feminist-labeled policies to result in lower internal support because of decreased feelings of pride in the organization.

Hypothesis 1b. *The mediated effect of policy label (unlabeled versus movement labeled) on support of the policy through organizational pride will be moderated by feminist identification. Movement-labeled policies will receive more support than unlabeled policies because of increased organizational pride by employees high in feminist identification; in contrast, movement-labeled policies will receive less support than unlabeled policies because of less organizational pride by employees low in feminist identification.*

Similarly, for those who are low in feminist identification but high in organizational identification, we expect organizationally labeled policies, as compared with feminist-labeled policies, to result in increased

support because of increased feelings of pride in the organization.

Hypothesis 2b. *The mediated effect of policy label (movement labeled versus organizationally labeled) on support of the policy through organizational pride will be moderated by organizational identification and feminist identification. For employees high in organizational identification and low in feminist identification, organizationally labeled policies will receive more support than feminist-labeled policies because of increased organizational pride.*

Research Overview

We tested Hypotheses 1a–2b in five studies run on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk)[2] and 26 qualitative interviews with working professionals. We obtained institutional review board approval before conducting our studies and interviews. The interviewed professionals came from a variety of backgrounds (finance, higher education, etc.) with experiences of organizational policy changes related to women's rights issues. We conducted semistructured interviews, lasting approximately 30 minutes (see Online Appendix B for the interview guide development, guide, and demographic information), designed to elicit real-world experiences to complement our experimental results. We also used these interviews to explore whether there was variation within organizations' policy labeling (i.e., policies discussed in conjunction with labels such as "feminist" and "#MeToo" or related to the organization's name); the professionals we interviewed affirmed this variation exists. For instance, Jane,[3] who works in the housing development industry, noted the usage of the label "feminist" when certain organizational events occurred, saying

> Sometimes it would be explicit, like this is an International Women's Day celebration event. So I was like, yeah, we're going to highlight a feminist lens here. You know, we wouldn't shy away from an event that called itself feminist.

The #MeToo label was also used. Samantha, who works in a law firm, said that

> Whenever there's communications that go out, like those hashtags are used … I know that we have a big screen in on our lobby that always has new things coming up on it. Like it continually rotates and then they will have like a page on the #MeToo movement and diversity and stuff.

Similarly, Isabella, who works in education, noted that the usage of #MeToo was prevalent:

> Definitely #Me Too is used, even by the employees it's used. I've heard it a lot. I think at some of our meetings, I think between colleagues.

We also explored whether there was variation of policy labeling using the organization's name. For

instance, Noah, employed as a lawyer, discussed a policy his organization implemented, noting

> For a while now, the lawyers who graduate from law school, its' been pretty evenly split between men and women. But persistently, the lawyers who argue the case in court are disproportionally male and so our law firm wanted to do what it could to try to change that and boost the number who are actually getting to argue cases in court … This specific initiative was called "Women in the Courtroom," and it was a part of a broader ongoing subgroup called "Women's Initiative Network of [Organization's Name]."

These employees' experiences lend credence to the idea that the use of labels is a central part of organizational life used to shepherd policy changes related to gender equity.

Study 1

Study 1 tested Hypothesis 1a. We asked working adults to imagine a scenario in which their Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) announced they were seeking to implement a new gender equity policy and were forming a task force to determine the changes needed. Participants were 394[4] working adults[5] (see Online Appendix A for study materials and Online Appendix C for all participant demographics). They were randomly assigned to a policy label condition (feminist labeled, unlabeled), with feminist identification as a moderator.

Procedure

Participants consented, and then, they completed a survey that assessed their level of feminist identification, presented the labeling manipulation, measured their support for a policy change, and assessed their demographics.

Feminist Identification. Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with statements about identifying as a feminist (three items; e.g., "I identify as a feminist" from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly; adapted from Toller et al. 2004). We averaged the items (α = 0.98), with higher numbers indicating greater levels of feminist identification.

Policy Labeling Manipulation. In our labeled condition, we used the label "feminist," which is associated with the women's movement. Participants read a scenario that they received an email from their organization. In the *unlabeled* (*feminist-labeled*) condition, the email stated, "Your company has announced that your CEO will implement a new [feminist] policy to increase the gender equity of the workplace. Your CEO is forming a new task force to help determine what policy changes are needed."

Support for the Policy. We measured participants' likelihood to undertake actions in support of the policy (six items; e.g., "Try to recruit others to join the task force" from 1 = very unlikely to 6 = very likely). We averaged the items (α = 0.94), with higher numbers indicating greater support for the policy.

Results

See Online Appendix C for each study's variable means, standard deviations (SDs), and correlations.[6] We report our statistical analyses as two tailed throughout the paper.

Support for the Policy. We ran a linear regression with policy label as the independent variable, feminist identification as the moderator, and support for the policy as the dependent variable. In line with Hypothesis 1a, a policy label × feminist identification interaction emerged: b = 0.37, Standard Error *(SE)* = 0.09, $t(390)$ = 4.16, $p < 0.001$, 95% Confidence Interval (*CI 95%*) [0.20, 0.55]; see Figure 1 in Online Appendix C. Employees high in feminist identification (one standard deviation above the mean (+1 SD)) supported the feminist-labeled policy more than the unlabeled policy: b = 0.33, SE = 0.17, $t(390)$ = 1.99, $p = 0.047$, *CI 95%* [0.004, 0.66]. In contrast, employees low in feminist identification (–1 SD) supported the feminist-labeled policy less than the unlabeled policy: b = –0.64, SE = 0.17, $t(390)$ = –3.89, $p < 0.001$, *CI 95%* [–0.97, –0.32]. We also found support for Hypothesis 1a in our interviews. Frederick, a university administrator whose employer did not use feminist labels, said

> You know, I think there's a deliberate choice when talking about policy and talking about programs being implemented to stay away from language like feminist, because I think there would be a backlash in certain parts of the university around that. I think formal [administration] is trying to make it as neutral as possible so that it's not controversial and not seen as divisive.

This suggests an awareness that some employees may not support feminist-labeled policies. Interestingly, Frederick went on to say he personally identified as a feminist and thought

> It's okay to use these terms. I think people need to be made aware of certain things and it's okay if things are confrontational.

This drives home the point that those high in feminist identification likely see feminist-labeled policies as aligned with their beliefs and thus, are more likely to support those feminist-labeled policies. Finally, we also found support for this reasoning from Sue, a member of a domestic violence organization with a

preponderance of employees who were high in feminist identification. She said,

> Well, this was a feminist organization, so feminist language really under that was the sort of underpinning of conversations we would have at work … There was no one who worked in the agency, I don't think who wouldn't call themselves a feminist, cause that was just kind of implicit.

Sue went on to say,

> [Her supervisor] made those connections that she thought as "this is important, if we're going to be a feminist organization to see that our policies around mothering are connected to that" … So I think some of the work and advocacy that happened with helping, when using feminism, feminist language and things like that just sort of help make some of those connections.

In support of Hypothesis 1a, Study 1 demonstrated that feminist identification moderated the relationship between policy label and support for the policy. For employees high in feminist identification, a feminist-labeled gender equity policy received more support than an unlabeled policy; for those low in feminist identification, a feminist-labeled gender equity policy received less support than an unlabeled policy.

Study 2

The goal of Study 2 was to replicate Study 1 with a behavioral measure of policy support, again testing Hypothesis 1a. As with Study 1, participants in Study 2 read a scenario in which their company sought to implement either a feminist-labeled policy or an unlabeled policy. They then had the opportunity to support the task force's efforts by completing an email task (described in detail). Participants were 428 working adults. They were randomly assigned within a two-factor (policy label: feminist labeled, unlabeled) design, with feminist identification as a moderator.

Procedure

Participants consented, and then, they completed a survey that assessed their level of feminist identification, presented the labeling manipulation, asked them to act in support of the policy change, and assessed their demographics.

Feminist Identification. Participants responded to the same measure as in Study 1 ($\alpha = 0.98$).

Policy Labeling Manipulation. Participants read a scenario that they received an email from their organization. In the *unlabeled* (*feminist-labeled*) condition, the email informed them, "Your company has announced that it will implement a new [feminist] policy to increase the gender equity of the workplace. A new task

force is being formed to help determine what policy changes are needed."

Support for the Policy. Participants completed a behavioral task in which they helped the policy task force assemble email lists to communicate with each of the organization's departments. They were told, "Accurate email lists will help the task force communicate more effectively and increase the chance that the implementation of the [feminist] policy to increase gender equity will be successful." Participants were given the names and departments of 22 employees interested in receiving task force communications and asked to create an email list for each department (i.e., accounting, marketing, Research and Development (R&D), or finance). For example, 1 of the 22 employees was "Howard Worley—Accounting," and so, when assembling the accounting email list, participants looked through the company roster of 100 employees until they found "Worley, Howard <h.worley@corporate.com>." They selected him before moving on to the next employee in accounting. They did the same task for marketing, R&D, and finance.

Amount of support was coded as the number of employees selected to be on the correct list (i.e., if Howard Worley was put on the accounting mailing list, this would be coded as one correct inclusion; if Howard Worley was put on the marketing list, this would not be counted as a correct inclusion), with higher numbers meaning more correct answers and thus, greater support for the policy.

Results
Support for the Policy. A policy label × feminist identification interaction emerged: $b = 0.68$, $SE = 0.25$, $t(424) = 2.69$, $p = 0.008$, $CI\ 95\%$ [0.18, 1.17]; see Figure 2 in Online Appendix C. For those high in feminist identification (+1 SD), policy labeling (unlabeled versus feminist labeled) was positively associated with support: $b = 0.89$, $SE = 0.46$, $t(424) = 1.95$, $p = 0.052$, $CI\ 95\%$ [–0.009, 1.78]. In contrast, for those low in feminist identification (–1 SD), policy labeling (unlabeled versus feminist labeled) was negatively associated with support ($b = -0.85$, $SE = 0.46$, $t(424) = -1.86$, $p = 0.064$, $CI\ 95\%$ [–1.74, 0.05]), generally supporting Hypothesis 1a.

Study 3
Study 3 also tested Hypothesis 1a, and participants read a scenario in which their company sought to implement either a feminist-labeled or unlabeled policy. To test whether our findings are robust to different types of policies and labels, we included a similar scenario in which the organization sought to implement a new sexual harassment policy, labeled with

"#MeToo." This study also tested Hypothesis 1b, which proposes that organizational pride mediates the hypothesized moderated effects in Hypothesis 1a. Participants were 724 working adults randomly assigned within a 2 (policy label: movement labeled, unlabeled) × 2 (policy type: gender equity, antisexual harassment) factor between-participants design. The dependent variable was the amount of policy support.

Procedure

Participants consented; reported their level of feminist identification; and were presented the labeling manipulation, mediating and dependent variables, and demographic questions.

Feminist Identification. Participants responded to the same measure as in Studies 1 and 2 ($\alpha = 0.97$).

Policy Type and Label Manipulation. For the *gender equity policy* conditions (*unlabeled* and *labeled as "feminist"*), participants saw Study 2's scenario. For the *sexual harassment policy* conditions, in the *unlabeled* (*labeled*) condition, the email informed them that their company announced it would implement a new sexual harassment policy (based on the principles of the #MeToo movement).

Mediating Emotions. Our proposed mediating variable was organizational pride. We also collected anger and fear measures to rule out explanations that negative emotions drive our proposed effects (adapted from Shaver et al. 1987). Participants were asked, when thinking about the attempt to implement the policy at their organization, the extent to which they felt each of the following emotions. All were measured from 1 = not at all to 7 = very much, with each measure including three items.

Organizational Pride. Participants rated how proud, eager, and enthusiastic they felt ($\alpha = 0.94$).

Anger. Participants rated the extent to which they felt anger, hatred, and frustration ($\alpha = 0.94$)

Fear. Participants rated the extent to which they felt fear, alarm, and distress ($\alpha = 0.94$).

Support for the Policy. Participants responded to the same measure as in Study 1 ($\alpha = 0.94$).

Results

Support for the Policy. We tested whether the type of policy (gender equity versus sexual harassment) influenced the interaction between policy labeling and feminist identification—no interactions emerged; we report the tests without policy type as a moderator. In line with Hypothesis 1a, a policy label × feminist identification interaction emerged ($b = 0.23$, $SE = 0.06$, $t(720) = 3.52$, $p = 0.0005$, *CI 95%* [0.10, 0.36]); see Figure 3 in Online Appendix C. Those high in feminist identification exhibited greater support for the movement-labeled policies than for the unlabeled policies: $b = 0.24$, $SE = 0.12$, $t(720) = 1.96$, $p = 0.050$, *CI 95%* [0.0004, 0.48]. Those low in feminist identification exhibited weaker support for the movement-labeled policies than the unlabeled policies: $b = -0.37$, $SE = 0.12$, $t(720) = -3.01$, $p = 0.003$, *CI 95%* [-0.61, -0.13].

Organizational Pride Moderated Mediation. We tested Hypothesis 1b. Following Preacher et al. (2007), we conducted a first-stage moderated path analysis and tested for mediation (see Table 1 in Online Appendix C). The conditional indirect effect of the policy label on employees' policy support via organizational pride was examined at high and low levels of feminist identification using 5,000 bootstrapped samples (Shrout and Bolger 2002). For those high in feminist identification, the movement-labeled policies produced greater support than the unlabeled policies via stronger feelings of organizational pride: *CI 95%* [0.07, 0.31]. For those low in feminist identification, the movement-labeled policies produced less support than the unlabeled policies via weakened feelings of organizational pride: *CI 95%* [-0.45, -0.10].[7] The interaction between policy label and feminist identification did not influence feelings of anger ($p = 0.186$) or fear ($p = 0.429$).

The experiences of individuals in our qualitative interviews are relevant to these findings. Jane, who had noted that the label "feminist" had been used in her organization and who identified as a feminist herself, expressed feelings of organizational pride around the feminist-labeled policy.

> So I think there was a lot of pride about [the organization] being identified that way. Being a part of that community. There's also a part of the pride comes from that recognition and just like doing well. And, if that is part of your own values that you feel like your business is living up to those personal values … especially in newer places where, for example, the idea of being first I think helps, or being like an early adopter. So there's this part of the pride that comes from that.

Conversely, Brenda, a director, felt that labeling the sexual harassment training policy implemented at her institution would result in those low in feminist identification feeling lower pride.

> I think it would be undermining to the policy [if they labeled] … positioning it that way would lead to more people dismissing it as a fad rather than it being a necessary intervention, given that many people are unaware of behaviors that are harassing … I think if we associated a training with a movement that some

subscribe to and some don't subscribe to, I think they would say, well, that's not my kind of thing and so I don't care.

Study 3 supported Hypothesis 1a. Hypothesis 1b was also supported; for employees high in feminist identification, the movement-labeled policies produced greater support than the unlabeled policies via stronger feelings of organizational pride. In contrast, for those low in feminist identification, the movement-labeled policies produced less support than the unlabeled policies via weakened feelings of organizational pride.

Study 4

Studies 1–3 established that our findings were robust to different types of movement labels. Study 4 tests Hypothesis 2a: that organizational and feminist identification will moderate the relationship between policy label (organization versus feminist) and policy support. We expect that organizationally labeled policies will receive more support than feminist-labeled policies for those high in organizational identification and low in feminist identification. It also tests Hypothesis 2b, which proposes that the mediated effect of policy label on policy support through organizational pride will be moderated by organizational identification and feminist identification. We expect organizationally labeled policies to receive more support than feminist-labeled policies because of increased organizational pride by those high in organizational identification and low in feminist identification, with no other mediations emerging. Participants were 383 working adults and worked in a variety of industries, ranging from healthcare to information technology services. They were randomly assigned to a policy label condition: feminist labeled or organizationally labeled. Policy label was the independent variable, and feminist and organizational identity were moderators. The mediator was organizational pride, and the dependent variable was policy support.

Procedure

Participants consented, and they completed a survey that assessed levels of identification, presented the policy label manipulation, and assessed the key variables and demographic questions.

Feminist Identification. Participants responded to the same measure as in Studies 1–3 ($\alpha = 0.95$).

Organizational Identification. Participants responded to six items (e.g., "This organization's successes are my successes") from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly (Ashforth and Mael 1989). The items were averaged ($\alpha = 0.87$); higher numbers indicated greater organizational identification.

Policy Labeling Manipulation. In the *feminist-labeled policy* condition, participants saw the same scenario as in Study 2. In the *organizationally labeled policy* condition, participants named the organization they were currently employed at and then read the following email: "Your company has announced that it is planning to implement a new [provided organization's name] gender equity policy at your workplace. A new task force is being formed to help determine what policy changes are needed." We included a manipulation check question, which asked participants to confirm what their organization was planning to implement. They could select "A new feminist gender equity policy," "A new [provided organization's name] gender equity policy," or two other policy options.

Mediating Emotions. Our proposed mediating variable was organizational pride, and we collected anger and fear measures to rule out explanations that negative emotions drive our proposed effects.

Organizational Pride. Participants were asked, when thinking about the attempt to implement the policy at their organization, to what extent they felt proud of their organization (e.g., "I am proud of what the company has achieved," 1 = not at all to 7 = very much, four items) (Gouthier and Rhein 2011). We averaged the items ($\alpha = 0.95$), with higher numbers indicating greater levels of organizational pride.

Anger. Participants responded to the same measure as in Study 3 ($\alpha = 0.95$).

Fear. Participants responded to the same measure as in Study 3 ($\alpha = 0.94$),

Support for the Policy. Participants responded to the same measure as in Studies 1 and 3 ($\alpha = 0.95$).

Results

Manipulation Check. Those in the feminist-labeled condition were more likely to report seeing a feminist-labeled policy than other choices; those in the organizationally labeled condition were more likely to report seeing an organizationally labeled policy than other choices ($\chi^2 = 187.406$, degrees of freedom (df) = 1, $p < 0.001$).

Support for the Policy. We ran a linear regression, with organizational identification and feminist identification as moderators and policy label (0 = organization; 1 = feminist) as the independent variable (see Figure 4 in Online Appendix C). In line with Hypothesis 2a, an organization identification × feminist identification × policy label interaction emerged ($b = 0.21$, $SE = 0.10$, $t(375) = 2.08$, $p = 0.038$, $CI\ 95\%$ [0.01, 0.40]).

As expected, when organizational identification was high (+1 SD) and feminist identification was low (−1 SD), participants supported the organizationally labeled policy more than the feminist-labeled policy: $b = -0.70$, $SE = 0.23$, $t(375) = -3.04$, $p = 0.003$, CI 95% [−1.16, −0.25]. The interaction between feminist identification, organizational identification, and the policy label condition did not influence feelings of anger ($p = 0.728$) or fear ($p = 0.496$).

Organizational Pride Moderated Mediation. We tested whether organizational pride mediated the effects of policy label on policy support, moderated by feminist identification and organizational identification. Following Preacher et al. (2007), we conducted a first-stage double-moderated path analysis and tested for mediation. The organization identification × feminist identification × policy label interaction did not influence organizational pride ($b = -0.02$, $SE = 0.11$, $t(375) = -0.16$, $p = 0.870$, CI 95% [−0.24, 0.20]), and the index of moderated mediation overlapped with 0 (CI 95% [−0.18, 0.15]).

Study 4, in support of Hypothesis 2a, found that feminist identification and organizational identification moderated the relationship between policy labeling and support for the policy when organizational identification was high and feminist identification was low, such that participants supported the organizationally labeled policy more than the feminist-labeled policy. However, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

Experiences described in our interviews resonate with these findings. When asked how she might react should her organization's name be used to describe a policy change, Isabella, a woman strongly organizationally identified but less strongly identified as a feminist, noted that this would be

> a positive thing. I think the giving a name to something personalizes it more … it's something, almost tangible … this is something that we are doing for a good cause … Taking ownership and saying this is, you know, this is something important. We're looking at this as something that we know is important to you and it is important to us too.

Study 5

As in Study 4, Study 5 also tests Hypotheses 2a and 2b. In this study, instead of a measure of organizational identity, we directly manipulated organizational identity to establish causality. Participants were 519 working adults, working in a variety of industries. They were randomly assigned within a 2 (policy label: feminist labeled, organizationally labeled) × 2 (organizational identity: high, low) factor between-participants design, with policy label as the independent variable and measured feminist identification and manipulated organizational identity as moderators. The mediator was organizational pride, and the dependent variable was the amount of support for the policy.

Procedure
Participants consented, and they completed a survey that assessed their level of feminist identification and presented the organizational identification and labeling manipulations, mediating and dependent variables, and demographic questions.

Feminist Identification. Participants responded to the same measure as in Studies 1–4 ($\alpha = 0.97$).

Manipulation of Organizational Identification. We used a modified form of the manipulation used by Chen et al. (2016), in which participants were asked to imagine they were a marketing director at UMRO Inc. and had worked at the company for three years. In the *high (low) organizational identification* condition, they were told it was clear UMRO was *a good (not a good fit)*, that their coworkers held very *similar attitudes (different attitudes)*, and that if a more promising job presented itself they may *well pass it by (almost certainly jump at it)*. Participants were then asked to write one to two sentences about what it was like to work at UMRO.

As a manipulation check, participants responded to a modified three-item measure of organizational identification (e.g., "When talking about UMRO, I would usually say 'we' rather than 'they,'" 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly) (Ashforth and Mael 1989). We averaged the items ($\alpha = 0.91$), with higher numbers indicating greater organizational identification.

Policy Label Manipulation. In the *feminist-labeled policy* condition, participants saw the same scenario as in Study 2. In the *organizationally labeled policy* condition, the email said, "Your company has announced that it is planning to implement a new UMRO gender equity policy at your workplace. A new task force is being formed to help determine what policy changes are needed." Participants also responded to a policy label manipulation check that asked them what their organization was planning on implementing and could select "A new feminist gender equity policy" or "A new UMRO gender equity policy."

Mediating Emotions. We collect the same organizational pride ($\alpha = 0.96$), anger ($\alpha = 0.94$), and fear ($\alpha = 0.95$) measures as in Study 4.

Support for the Policy. Participants responded to the same measure as in Studies 1, 3, and 4 ($\alpha = 0.95$).

Results

Manipulation Checks. Participants in the high-organizational identification condition ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.643$) identified more with their organization than those in the low-organizational identification condition ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.05$; $t(517) = -21.01$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 1.84$, $CI\ 95\%$ [-1.75, -1.45]). In addition, those in the feminist-labeled condition were more likely than those in the organizationally labeled condition to report seeing a feminist policy ($\chi^2 = 241.29$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$).

Support for the Policy. We ran a linear regression, with policy label (0 = organization; 1 = feminist) as the independent variable and organizational identification (0 = low; 1 = high) and feminist identification as moderators (see Figure 5 in Online Appendix C). In line with Hypothesis 2a, a marginal three-way (organizational identification × feminist identification × policy label) interaction emerged ($b = 0.28$, $SE = 0.16$, $t(511) = 1.77$, $p = 0.077$, $CI\ 95\%$ [-0.03, 0.60]). As expected, in the high-organizational identification condition when feminist identification was low (-1 SD), participants supported the organizationally labeled policy more than the feminist-labeled policy: $b = -0.80$, $SE = 0.22$, $t(511) = -3.72$, $p < 0.001$, $CI\ 95\%$ [-1.22, -0.38]. The interaction between policy label, feminist identification, and organizational identification did not influence feelings of anger ($p = 0.223$) or fear ($p = 0.436$).

Organizational Pride Moderated Mediation. Following Preacher et al. (2007), we conducted a first-stage double-moderated path analysis and tested for mediation using a series of linear regressions (see Table 2 in Online Appendix C). The conditional indirect effects of policy label on policy support via organizational pride were examined at high and low levels of feminist identification and organizational identification using 5,000 bootstrapped samples (Shrout and Bolger 2002). As theorized in Hypothesis 2b, the mediation occurred for participants in the high-organizational identification condition when feminist identification was low (-1 SD), such that participants supported the organizationally labeled policy more than the feminist-labeled policy: $CI\ 95\%$ [-1.31, -0.62].

Study 5, in support of Hypothesis 2a, found that feminist identification and organizational identification moderated the relationship between policy labeling and support for the policy when organizational identification was high and feminist identification was low. We also found support that organizational pride mediated the moderated effects (Hypothesis 2b), such that mediation occurred for participants in the high-organizational identification condition and whose feminist identification was low. The qualitative

interviews are also relevant here, with Noah, a strongly organizationally identified person quoted with regard to the women's initiative his company labeled with the organization's name, saying

> I feel proud, I am glad that they do it, and I think it is important, and don't have any mixed feelings about this.

Discussion

Gaining employees' support for movement-led policies within organizations is instrumental to movement success (Binder 2002, Raeburn 2004, Briscoe and Safford 2008, Milkis and Tichenor 2019), yet it is often difficult to convert these employees into allies (DeCelles et al. 2019). Moreover, workplaces provide unique challenges in that the labels that activists usefully employ in other social contexts may be less effective in workplaces. Across five studies and 26 qualitative interviews, we find evidence that a misalignment of the collective identity of employees with the labels used to promote new organizational policies is one potential barrier to mobilizing workplace allies. Because employees vary in their levels of feminist identification, their reactions to organizational policies labeled "feminist" and "#MeToo" varied as well. We go on to show that organizationally labeled policies can also generate support, such that employees who are low in feminist identification but high in organizational identification will support organizationally labeled policies more so than feminist-labeled policies. Importantly, these effects were not mediated by fear or anger but organizational pride, suggesting that positive emotions are crucial for turning employees into allies.

Our work contributes to organizational theory and to work on social movements by increasing our understanding of why movement-driven policies can fail to be implemented in organizations (e.g., Kellogg 2009), opening the door to strategies that may help them surmount these barriers. Past research on social movements and organizational change has found that organizations are not ideal habitats for employees fighting for women's rights and point to the difficulty that social movements face when translating discourse and labels used in the broader movement to workplace politics (Katzenstein 1998). Our work contributes to this exploration in three key ways.

First, it underlines the importance of going beyond research on elite allies (e.g., how elite allies legitimatize social movements and the policies derived from them) (Raeburn 2004, Briscoe and Safford 2008) and research on how leaders of organizations create social change within them (e.g., Christensen et al. 2014). However, despite the recognition that nonelite employees are also vital to the successful implementation of new policies (Huy 2002, Kellogg 2011), little is

known about how or why employees are successfully transformed into movement allies. After an organization adopts a movement-driven policy, nonelite allies must work to ensure that the intended institutional and organizational changes take place (Andrews 2001). By examining the microdynamics of ally mobilization, we provide evidence that the labels used by organizations may help promote or hinder change via nonelite employees.

Second, our findings underline the importance of considering discourse within organizations. The paper highlights how translation from one institutional setting to another (in this case, from a social movement to a workplace) leads to dissonance among the people who are best positioned to carry out policy implementation (Boxenbaum 2006, Pedersen and Dobbin 2006). Movement discourse has the potential to create roadblocks for mobilizing allies, especially in contexts where such mobilization is precarious given the potentially polarizing status of the movement. Given the importance of allies for successful implementation, using labels that resonate with employees based on collective identities is likely to increase support. Thus, the context in which the policy is being applied should be taken into consideration. To be clear, the takeaway should not be that movement labels are inappropriate for the workplace but rather, should be that if one is trying to create allies within an organization, the movement should carefully consider the labels employed to ensure they resonate with the targeted population. If an organization has many employees high in feminist identification, then a feminist label may be used as a strategy to mobilize allies and to produce effective policy implementation (consider the comments by Sue, which are included in the results of Study 1). However, our work suggests that when employees are diverse in collective identities, it may be more effective to use an organizational label.

Finally, our work points to a critical micromechanism in garnering support from potential allies. Typically, organizational theorists highlight the cognitive effects of labels (e.g., Negro et al. 2010), but our study points to the importance of labels in creating or hampering emotional reactions as well. Labels do more than draw attention to particular aspects of a policy; rather, they create an emotional connection between the person and the labeled policy. This emotional resonance is part of what drives institutional change inasmuch as it creates energy for the change among those who must carry out the implementation (Huy 2002). Our work complements past work on how emotions (e.g., fear) result in collective inaction by suggesting that positive emotions—in particular, pride in the organization's actions—are central in engendering collective action (DeCelles et al. 2019). Our work also aligns with research showing that for

stigmatized group members, pride in one's group is central to mobilizing (Stein 1975, Thoits 1990). For example, an important goal of the civil and gay rights movements involved transforming membership in stigmatized groups from sources of shame into badges of pride (Britt and Heise 2000). Our work broadens these findings in suggesting that organizational pride is a mobilizing force within organizations, whether sparked by a label drawn from movement discourse or from the organization itself.

Future Directions

Our findings open the door for a number of potentially fruitful future directions. One possibility is that employees who are not high in feminist identification can gain more positive associations with feminist terms when they are convinced to publicly support a feminist-labeled policy. For example, social movement theorists have suggested that when people publicly associate themselves with a feature or action that others feel pride in (i.e., in our case, support for a feminist-labeled policy), it produces feelings of pride, even if none were felt initially (Britt and Heise 2000). This proposition also falls in line with cognitive dissonance theory, which suggests that people attempt to seek consistency between their behaviors and attitudes (Festinger 1957). Thus, when employees not high in feminist identification publicly affirm their support for feminist-labeled policies, the negative connotations they hold for the labels may be ameliorated or even superseded by the more positive associations they have just gained. This might be particularly important over time, as expressing support for feminist-labeled policies may eventually diminish the negative connotations of labels such as "feminist" and "#MeToo" more broadly.

Another route of potential exploration focuses on how emotional ambivalence affects decisions regarding social movements. Ambivalence around identifying as a feminist arose in the interviews; for example, Brett, who worked in the service industry, noted,

> I don't know what I identify as, myself a feminist. My definition of a feminist is well, equal rights for women. If that's the definition then I'm a feminist, but I believe in women's rights. I don't know if I will say I'm a feminist. No, I don't know. I don't know all that that entails. But if it mostly means women should be treated equally as me as far as pay and all that kind of stuff, yes. But if there's more than that, I don't know what that is though. I think so. I don't know. Let's say no, that's a no cause I don't know everything. I don't want to claim something to not know fully what it is … so not fully.

In this statement, the ambivalence is not subtext but text, as the participant swings back and forth between identifying and not. Although many people instinctively dislike feelings of ambivalence (van Harreveld

et al. 2009), recent work suggests that ambivalence can, under certain conditions, lead to more flexible thinking (Rothman et al. 2017). It is possible that allowing people to share their ambivalence and concerns about the policy labels might open the door to more creative forms of engagement or the discovery of new paths via which they might strengthen their identity with the collective.

Although this paper focused on support for policies, future work can also help understand how employees who are low in feminist identification might actively oppose feminist-labeled policies. We know that employees who might otherwise support a new policy or an activist effort sometimes withdraw from mobilization out of fear of negative consequences within the workplace (DeCelles et al. 2019). Similarly, institutional actors who do not identify with the movement, or feel active antipathy toward it, may elect not to engage in active opposition for the same reasons, namely fear of negative consequences in the workplace. However, this does not close off options for more surreptitious methods of expressing their opposition (e.g., counterproductive work behaviors) (see Greco et al. 2019 for a review).

Furthermore, although our paper explored how collective identity and labels could promote the desirable goal of gender equity, it should be noted that the same factors could promote more socially undesirable conduct, such as unethical behavior. Past work has demonstrated that when employees are highly identified with their organization, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit it but also breach core ethical values (Umphress and Bingham 2011). For example, employees at a pharmaceutical company may hide evidence that a new drug has severe side effects to make their organization look better. Future work can look at how forms of collective identity may interact with labels to promote support for dangerous movement goals (i.e., misrepresentations, threats, or acts of violence).

Although this paper focuses on the intersection between discourse and collective identity in organizations as it relates to the women's rights movement, a future direction is to see how generalizable these effects are beyond this particular social movement and the specific collective identities examined in our studies. It is likely that these findings are relevant to a variety of labels used to describe attempts to effect change. For example, in response to social movements focused on ending sweatshops, Nordstrom adopted the "Nordstrom Human Rights Commitment" (Nordstrom 2018). It would be interesting to examine whether allies within Nordstrom seeking to implement this policy elected to use the organizational label out of concerns that a movement label would not engender sufficient support for the policy within the organization.

Finally, it would be useful to consider the influence of demographic characteristics like race, gender, and age. For example, generational differences may influence the connotations that key labels hold for different individuals. Here, Tanya highlights the different expectations individuals of different generations hold for their workplace, noting that

> Especially when you consider talking to 20 somethings about what they want out of an organization to go work for, you just can't ignore some of their needs and goals are and what the cultures like in the kind of organization they go to work for. So meeting more progressive policies, just like the maternity leave policy, also extrapolate into just commitment to the community.

It is likely that these differing expectations also hold implications for how organizational efforts, which are outgrowths of particular activist movements, are received and interpreted.

Limitations

The current studies also have a number of methodological limitations that would benefit from future research. First, although Study 2 employed a behavioral measure, the majority of studies involved self-reported dependent variables. Research that explores whether effects vary across different behavioral measures would broaden the generalizability of the research.

Second, examining policy implementation within an organization would address the studies' weaknesses: the use of vignettes, the use of MTurk as a convenience sample, and the cross-sectional nature of the data. Moreover, although these studies' experimental nature allowed us to control for a number of serious confounds and the evidence collected in our qualitative quotes provides some insight into the organizational reality of the phenomena, we acknowledge that a field study with behavioral outcomes would bolster external validity. In particular, field studies in organizational contexts may reveal tangible behavioral outcomes (e.g., a longitudinal data set within an organization would be ideal for examining how policy support by allies is related to potential successful implementation throughout an organization).

Finally, is worth pointing out that in Study 4, organizational pride did not mediate the effects in our proposed hypothesis (Hypothesis 2b). This may be because organizational identification was measured rather than manipulated, such that participants' naturally occurring organizational identification overwhelmed the moderated effects. This suggests that organizational identification may be a strong lever to drive policy support, regardless of the label.

Conclusion

Our work illuminates the importance of the intersection between policy labels (i.e., feminist labeled and

organizationally labeled) and collective identities for policy implementation in organizations. We find that it is the resonance that lies at this intersection that in turn influences potential allies' support in implementing movement-driven organizational policies. We demonstrate that one barrier to mobilizing allies is a misalignment of the labels used for movement-driven policies and employees' collective identities, and we find that organizational pride is a potential central mechanism in mobilizing workplace allies. This work has implications for social movements, as these movements increasingly target organizational contexts and the employees within them to pursue their goals.

Acknowledgments

Endnotes

[1] We note that there is a strong difference between the actions that external activists take to pressure organizations and institutions to change, including engaging in protests and boycotts, pushing for legislation, etc., and the type of internal support that allies do to assist activists in accomplishing their goals, including efforts to mobilize other employees to offer their support as well. In general, public actions taken by movement activists are provocative and aimed at grabbing attention, whereas allies provide internal support that is largely invisible to the public.

[2] Studies 1 and 3 were the initial studies run, without preregistration, and included some exploratory variables (detailed in Online Appendix A). All subsequent studies were preregistered. The collection and analysis plans for Study 2 (https://aspredicted.org/ta3c9 .pdf), Study 4 (https://aspredicted.org/jf29m.pdf), and Study 5 (https://aspredicted.org/fa86t.pdf) were preregistered. Our data and syntax are available at https://osf.io/qa8f3/?view_only=fbf591ab 49db4b00ad000c82bb57d97d.

[3] To preserve anonymity while easing reading comprehension, researchers assigned all participants in the qualitative interviews aliases.

[4] Power analyses demonstrated that the power in each study exceeded 0.95 (α = 0.05, sample size range = 383–724, range of predictors = 3–7). Monte Carlo simulations also demonstrate sufficient power to detect the predicted moderated mediation effects (Muthén and Muthén 2002, Thoemmes et al. 2010).

[5] For each study, we consistently excluded participants who spent less than or greater than 2.5 SDs from the mean of the overall completion time, in line with past research (Wagenmakers and Brown 2007, Whitson et al. 2019). This allows us to eliminate responses from outlier participants who spent too much or too little time in our studies. As a robustness test for our findings with regard to the timing filter, we ran the same analysis with timing filters at 1 SD, 3 SD, and with no filters. The results remain consistent throughout

with what is reported in the paper for Studies 1, 2, 3, and 4, with the exception of the three-way interaction reported in Study 5 only when using a filter at 3 SD from the mean (b = 0.25, SE = 0.16, $t(390)$ = 1.56, p = 0.119, CI 95% [−0.06, 0.56].

In addition, we excluded participants from Studies 3 and 4 who responded inadequately (e.g., blank answers, one-word answers, etc.). As a result, we excluded 207 participants from the studies.

[6] We also ran our analyses controlling for gender. The results remain consistent. Therefore, we report all tests without gender.

[7] In Studies 4 and 5, we also included the same measure of pride used in Study 3, and an attitudinal measure of organizational pride drawn from Gouthier and Rhein (2011) and the pattern of data were consistent for both.

References

Abrahams J (2017) Everything you wanted to know about fourth wave feminism—but were afraid to ask. *Prospect* (August 14), https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/everything-wanted-know-fourth-wave-feminism.

Allport GW (1937) *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (Henry Holt, New York).

Andrews K (2001) Social movements and policy implementation: The Mississippi civil rights movement and the war on poverty, 1965–1971. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 66(1):71–95.

Ashforth BE, Humphrey RH (1995) Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations* 48(2):97–125.

Ashforth BE, Mael F (1989) Social identity theory and the organization. *Acad. Management Rev.* 14(1):20–39.

Ashmore RD, Deaux K, McLaughlin-Volpe T (2004) An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psych. Bull.* 130(1):80–114.

Augustine G, King BG (2019) Worthy of debate: Discursive coherence and agreement in the formation of the field of sustainability in higher education. *Socio-Economic Rev.* 17(1):135–165.

Ballard J (2018) How many Americans call themselves feminists? *YouGovAmerica* (August 9), https://today.yougov.com/topics/lifestyle/articles-reports/2018/08/09/feminism-american-women-2018.

Ballinger GA, Schoorman FD (2007) Individual reactions to leadership succession in workgroups. *Acad. Management Rev.* 32(1):118–136.

Battilana J, Leca B, Boxenbaum E (2009) How actors change institutions: Toward a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Acad. Management Ann.* 3(1):65–107.

Berg BJ (2009) *Sexism in America: Alive, Well, and Ruining Our Future* (Chicago Review Press, Chicago).

Binder AJ (2002) *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).

Bitektine A, Miller D (2015) Methods, theories, data, and the social dynamics of organizational research. *J. Management Inquiry* 24(2):115–130.

Boxenbaum E (2006) Lost in translation: The making of Danish diversity management. *Amer. Behav. Sci.* 49(7):939–948.

Brewer MB (1985) Experimental research and social policy: Must it be rigor vs. relevance? *J. Soc. Issues* 41(4):159–176.

Brewer MB, Gardner W (1996) Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 71(1):83–93.

Brickson SL (2013) Athletes, best friends, and social activists: An integrative model accounting for the role of identity in organizational identification. *Organ. Sci.* 24(1):226–245.

Briscoe F, Gupta A (2016) Social activism in and around organizations. *Acad. Management Ann.* 10(1):671–727.

Briscoe F, Safford S (2008) The Nixon-in-China effect: Activism, imitation, and the institutionalization of contentious practices. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 53(3):460–491.

Britt L, Heise D (2000) From shame to pride in identity politics. Stryker S, Owens TJ, White RW, eds. *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, vol. 5 (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis), 252–268.

Camerer CF, Dreber A, Forsell E, Ho T-H, Huber J, Johannesson M, Kirchler M, Almenberg J, Altmejd A, Chan T (2016) Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Sci.* 351(6280):1433–1436.

Carver CS, White TL (1994) Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 67(2): 319–333.

Chen M, Chen C, Sheldon OJ (2016) Relaxing moral reasoning to win: How organizational identification relates to unethical pro-organizational behavior. *J. Appl. Psych.* 101(8):1082–1096.

Christensen LJ, Mackey A, Whetten D (2014) Taking responsibility for corporate social responsibility: The role of leaders in creating, implementing, sustaining, or avoiding socially responsible firm behaviors. *Acad. Management Perspect.* 28(2):164–178.

Conroy S, Henle CA, Shore L, Stelman S (2017) Where there is light, there is dark: A review of the detrimental outcomes of high organizational identification. *J. Organ. Behav.* 38(2):184–203.

Croson R, Anand J, Agarwal R (2007) Using experiments in corporate strategy research. *Eur. Management Rev.* 4(3):173–181.

DeCelles KA, Sonenshein S, King BG (2019) Examining anger's immobilizing effect on institutional insiders' action intentions in social movements. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 65(4):847–886.

DeJordy R, Scully M, Ventresca MJ, Creed WED (2020) Inhabited ecosystems: Propelling transformative social change between and through organizations. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 65(4):931–971.

Duncan LE (1999) Motivation for collective action: Group consciousness as mediator of personality, life experiences, and women's rights activism. *Political Psych.* 20(3):611–635.

Dutton JE, Ashford SJ (1993) Selling issues to top management. *Acad. Management Rev.* 18(3):397–428.

Dutton JE, Dukerich JM, Harquail CV (1994) Organizational images and member identification. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 39(2):239–263.

Evans T (2010) *Professional Discretion in Welfare Services: Beyond Street-Level Bureaucracy* (Ashgate, London).

Feinberg M, Willer R (2011) Apocalypse soon?: Dire messages reduce belief in global warming by contradicting just-world beliefs. *Psych. Sci.* 22(1):34–38.

Felin T, Foss NJ, Heimeriks KH, Madsen TL (2012) Microfoundations of routines and capabilities: Individuals, processes, and structure. *J. Management Stud.* 49(8):1351–1374.

Festinger L (1957) *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA).

Fiske AP (1992) The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psych. Rev.* 99(4):689–723.

Frijda NH (1986) *The Emotions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).

Galinsky AD, Wang CS, Whitson JA, Anicich EM, Hugenberg K, Bodenhausen G (2013) The reappropriation of stigmatizing labels: The reciprocal relationship between power and self-labeling. *Psych. Sci.* 24(10):2020–2029.

Giorgi S, Bartunek JM, King BG (2017) A Saul Alinsky primer for the 21st century: The roles of cultural competence and cultural brokerage in fostering mobilization in support of change. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 37:125–142.

Glynn MA, Navis C (2013) Categories, identities, and cultural classification: Moving beyond a model of categorical constraint. *J. Management Stud.* 50(6):1124–1137.

Goodwin J, Jasper J, Polletta F (2000) The return of the repressed: The fall and rise of emotions in social movement theory. *Mobilization* 5(1):65–83.

Goodwin J, Jasper JM, Polletta F (2009) *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago).

Gouthier MHJ, Rhein M (2011) Organizational pride and its positive effects on employee behavior. *J. Service Management* 22(5): 633–649.

Greco LM, Whitson JA, O'Boyle EH, Wang CS, Kim J (2019) An eye for an eye? A meta-analysis of negative reciprocity in organizations. *J. Appl. Psych.* 104(9):1117–1143.

Haslam SA (2001) Your wish is our command: The role of shared social identity. Hogg MA, Terry DI, eds. *Social Identity Processes in Organizational Contexts* (Psychology Press, Philadelphia), 213–228.

Helm S (2013) A matter of reputation and pride: Associations between perceived external reputation, pride in membership, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *British J. Management* 24(2): 542–556.

Higginbottom K (2018) #MeToo movement has put organizations on alert. *Forbes* (December 20), https://www.inkl.com/news/metoo-movement-has-put-organizations-on-alert.

hooks b (2000) *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Pluto Press, Chicago).

Howard-Grenville J, Metzger ML, Meyer AD (2013) Rekindling the flame: Processes of identity resurrection. *Acad. Management J.* 56(1):113–136.

Hume D (1978) *A Treatise of Human Nature* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK).

Huy QN (1999) Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Acad. Management Rev.* 24(2):325–345.

Huy QN (2002) Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 47(1):31–69.

Jasper JM (2011) Emotions and social movements: Twenty years of theory and research. *Annual Rev. Sociol.* 37:285–303.

Kapoor R, Klueter T (2015) Decoding the adaptability–rigidity puzzle: Evidence from pharmaceutical incumbents' pursuit of gene therapy and monoclonal antibodies. *Acad. Management J.* 58(4): 1180–1207.

Katzenstein MF (1998) *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest Inside the Church and Military* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).

Kellogg KC (2009) Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in surgery. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 115(3):657–711.

Kellogg KC (2011) *Challenging Operations: Medical Reform and Resistance in Surgery* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago).

Kim J-Y, Miner AS (2007) Vicarious learning from the failures and near-failures of others: Evidence from the US commercial banking industry. *Acad. Management J.* 50(3):687–714.

King BG (2008) A political mediation model of corporate response to social movement activism. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 53(3):395–421.

King BG, Pearce KA (2010) The contentiousness of markets: Politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets. *Annual Rev. Sociol.* 36(1):249–267.

King BG, Walker ET (2014) Winning hearts and minds: Field theory and the three dimensions of strategy. *Strategic Organ.* 12(2): 134–141.

Kristof-Brown AL, Jansen KJ, Colbert AE (2002) A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *J. Appl. Psych.* 87(5):985–993.

Lazarus RS (1991) Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *Amer. Psych.* 46(8):819–834.

Lipsky M (1980) *Street-Level Bureaucracy* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York).

Luhtanen R, Crocker J (1992) A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality Soc. Psych. Bull.* 18(3):302–318.

McAdam D (1996) Conceptual origins, current problems, future directions. McAdam D, McCarthy J, Zald M, eds. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK), 23–40.

McDonnell MH, King BG, Soule SA (2015) A dynamic process model of private politics: Activist targeting and corporate receptivity to social challenges. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 80(3):654–678.

McVeigh T (2013) Meet the new wave of activists making feminism thrive in a digital age. *The Guardian* (June 1), https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/01/activists-feminism-digital.

Mercurio KR, Forehand MR (2011) An interpretive frame model of identity-dependent learning: The moderating role of content-state association. *J. Consumer Res.* 38(3):555–577.

Merton RK (1949) On sociological theories of the middle range. Merton RK, ed. *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Free Press, Glencoe, IL), 39–53.

Meyerson DE, Scully MA (1995) Crossroads tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organ. Sci.* 6(5):585–600.

Milkis SM, Tichenor DJ (2019) *Rivalry and Reform: Presidents, Social Movements, and the Transformation of American Politics* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago).

Muthén LK, Muthén BO (2002) How to use a Monte Carlo study to decide on sample size and determine power. *Structural Equation Model.* 9(4):599–620.

Myers DJ (2008) Ally identity: The politically gay. Reger J, Myers DJ, Einwohner RL, eds. *Identity Work in Social Movements*, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis), 167–187.

Negro G, Koçak Ö, Hsu G (2010) Research on categories in the sociology of organizations. *Res. Sociol. Organ.* 31(3):3–35.

Nelson JA, Liss M, Erchull MJ, Hurt MM, Ramsey LR, Turner DL, Haines ME (2008) Identity in action: Predictors of feminist self-identification and collective action. *Sex Roles* 58(9-10):721–728.

Nordstrom (2018) Nordstrom Human Rights Commitment. Accessed June 4, 2020, https://n.nordstrommedia.com/id/9ddcdbff-4c69-4d5c-b9a8-7d0837f010b2.pdf.

Oegema D, Klandermans B (1994) Why social movement sympathizers don't participate: Erosion and nonconversion of support. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 59(5):703–722.

Oyserman D (2009) Identity-based motivation: Implications for action-readiness, procedural-readiness, and consumer behavior. *J. Consumer Psych.* 19(3):250–260.

Oyserman D, Fryberg SA, Yoder N (2007) Identity-based motivation and health. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 93(6):1011–1027.

Pedersen JS, Dobbin F (2006) In search of identity and legitimation: Bridging organizational culture and neoinstitutionalism. *Amer. Behav. Sci.* 49(7):897–907.

Pesce NL (2018) The #MeToo movement has changed policies across industries, but there's still work to be done. *MarketWatch* (October 4), https://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-metoo-movement-has-changed-policies-across-industries-but-theres-still-work-to-be-done-2018-10-04.

Petriglieri JL (2011) Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Acad. Management Rev.* 36(4):641–662.

Pfeffer J, Fong CT (2005) Building organization theory from first principles: The self-enhancement motive and understanding power and influence. *Organ. Sci.* 16(4):372–388.

Phinney JS, Kohatsu EL (1997) Ethnic and racial identity development and mental health. Schulenberg J, Maggs JL, Hurrelmann K, eds. *Health Risks and Developmental Transitions During Adolescence* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK), 420–443.

Polletta F, Jasper JM (2001) Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Rev. Sociol.* 27(1):283–305.

Preacher KJ, Rucker DD, Hayes AF (2007) Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behav. Res.* 42(1):185–227.

Raeburn NC (2004) *Changing Corporate America from Inside Out: Lesbian and Gay Workplace Rights* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis).

Rao H, Giorgi S (2006) Code breaking: How entrepreneurs exploit cultural logics to generate institutional change. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 27:269–304.

Reed A, Forehand MR, Puntoni S, Warlop L (2012) Identity-based consumer behavior. *Internat. J. Res. Marketing* 29(4):310–321.

Rosso BD, Dekas KH, Wrzesniewski A (2010) On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 30:91–127.

Rothman NB, Pratt MG, Rees L, Vogus TJ (2017) Understanding the dual nature of ambivalence: Why and when ambivalence leads to good and bad outcomes. *Acad. Management Ann.* 11(1):33–72.

Rowley TI, Moldoveanu M (2003) When will stakeholder groups act? An interest-and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization. *Acad. Management Rev.* 28(2):204–219.

Rupp LJ, Taylor V (1999) Forging feminist identity in an international movement: A collective identity approach to twentieth-century feminism. *Signs* 24(2):363–386.

Russo C (2014) Allies forging collective identity: Embodiment and emotions on the migrant trail. *Mobilization* 19(1):67–82.

Scherer KR, Schorr A, Johnstone T, eds. (2001) *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research* (Oxford University Press, New York).

Schrock D, Holden D, Reid L (2004) Creating emotional resonance: Interpersonal emotion work and motivational framing in a transgender community. *Soc. Problems* 51(1):61–81.

Shaver P, Schwartz J, Kirson D, O'Connor C (1987) Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 52(6):1061–1068.

Shrout PE, Bolger N (2002) Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psych. Methods* 7(4):422–445.

Snow DA, Rochford EB Jr, Worden SK, Benford RD (1986) Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 51(4):464–481.

Soule SA (2009) *Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).

Stein HF (1975) Ethnicity, identity, and ideology. *School Rev.* 83(2):273–300.

Swann WB, Pelham BW, Krull DS (1989) Agreeable fancy or disagreeable truth? Reconciling self-enhancement and self-verification. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 57(5):782–791.

Taylor G (1985) *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Clarendon Press of Oxford University Press, New York).

Taylor V, Whittier N (1995) Analytical approaches to social movement culture: The culture of the women's movement. Johnston H, Klandermans B, eds. *Social Movements and Culture*, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention, vol. 4 (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis), 163–187.

Thoemmes F, MacKinnon DP, Reiser MR (2010) Power analysis for complex mediational designs using Monte Carlo methods. *Structural Equation Model.* 17(3):510–534.

Thoits PA (1990) Emotional deviance: Research agendas. Kemper TD, ed. *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions* (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY), 180–203.

Toller PW, Suter EA, Trautman TC (2004) Gender role identity and attitudes toward feminism. *Sex Roles* 51(1-2):85–90.

Turner JC (1984) Social identification and psychological group formation. Tajfel H, ed. *The Social Dimension: European*

Developments in Social Psychology, vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK), 518–538.

Tyler TR, Blader SL (2000) *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement* (Taylor & Francis Group, Philadelphia).

Umphress EE, Bingham JB (2011) When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organ. Sci.* 22(3):621–640.

van Harreveld F, van der Pligt J, de Liver YN (2009) The agony of ambivalence and ways to resolve it: Introducing the maid model. *Personality Soc. Psych. Rev.* 13(1):45–61.

Van Knippenberg D (2000) Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. *Appl. Psych.* 49(3):357–371.

Van Meter DS, Van Horn CE (1975) The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Admin. Soc.* 6(4):445–488.

Van Stekelenburg J, Klandermans B, Van Dijk WW (2011) Combining motivations and emotion: The motivational dynamics of protest participation. *Internat. J. Soc. Psych.* 26(1):91–104.

Van Zomeren M, Spears R, Fischer AH, Leach CW (2004) Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 87(5):649–664.

Vinzant JC, Denhardt JV, Crothers L (1998) *Street-Level Leadership: Discretion and Legitimacy in Front-Line Public Service* (Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC).

Wagenmakers E-J, Brown S (2007) On the linear relation between the mean and the standard deviation of a response time distribution. *Psych. Rev.* 114(3):830–841.

Wang CS, Whitson JA, Anicich EM, Kray L, Galinsky AD (2017) Challenge your stigma: How to reframe and revalue negative stereotypes and slurs. *Current Directions Psych. Sci.* 26(1):75–80.

Watson D, Wiese D, Vaidya J, Tellegen A (1999) The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 76(5):820–838.

Weber K, Heinze KL, DeSoucey M (2008) Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 53(3):529–567.

Weiss HM, Cropanzano R (1996) Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 18:1–74.

Whitson JA, Anicich EM, Wang CS, Galinsky AD (2017) Navigating stigma and group conflict: Group identification as a cause and consequence of self-labeling. *Negotiation Conflict Management Res.* 10(2):88–106.

Whitson JA, Kim J, Wang CS, Menon T, Webster BD (2019) Regulatory focus and conspiratorial perceptions: The importance of personal control. *Personality Soc. Psych. Bull.* 45(1):3–15.

Whittier N (1997) Political generations, micro-cohorts, and the transformation of social movements. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 62(5):760–778.

Wilensky HL (1967) *Organizational Intelligence* (Basic Books, New York).

Williams W (1971) *Social Policy Research and Analysis: The Experience in the Federal Social Agencies* (American Elsevier, New York).

Williams L, DeSteno D (2008) Pride and perseverance: The motivational role of pride. *J. Personality Soc. Psych.* 94(6):1007–1017.

Yukich G, Fulton BR, Wood RL (2020) Representative group styles: How ally immigrant rights organizations promote immigrant involvement. *Soc. Problems* 67(3):488–506.

Zavyalova A, Pfarrer MD, Reger RK, Hubbard TD (2016) Reputation as a benefit and a burden? How stakeholders' organizational identification affects the role of reputation following a negative event. *Acad. Management J.* 59(1):253–276.

Zucker AN, Bay-Cheng LY (2010) Minding the gap between feminist identity and attitudes: The behavioral and ideological divide between feminists and non-labelers. *J. Personality* 78(6):1895–1924.

Cynthia S. Wang is the Executive Director of the Dispute Resolution and Research Center and a clinical professor of management & organizations at Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management. She received her PhD from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University. Her research interests fall in the areas of diversity, negotiations, decision making, and intergroup processes.

Jennifer A. Whitson is an associate professor at the University of California, Los Angeles Anderson School of Management. Her research explores two phenomena crucial to sensemaking and social regulation: control and power. She received her PhD from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University.

Brayden G King is a professor of management and organizations and the Max McGraw Chair of Management and the Environment at Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management. He received his PhD in sociology from the University of Arizona in 2005. His research examines the role of social movements in leading social, political, and organizational change.

Rachel L. Ramirez is a national organizer with United Parent Leaders Action Network. She received her MS in management and organizations & sociology from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University. Her research centers on intramovement dynamics related to power and politics among movement members.