

Towards a better understanding of the social stigma of facial difference

Citation for published version (APA):

Rasset, P., Mange, J., Montalan, B., & Stutterheim, S. E. (2022). Towards a better understanding of the social stigma of facial difference. *Body Image*, 43, 450-462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2022.10.011>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/12/2022

DOI:

[10.1016/j.bodyim.2022.10.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2022.10.011)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license:

Taverne

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:


www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.



Review article

Towards a better understanding of the social stigma of facial difference

Pauline Rasset ^{a,*}, Jessica Mange ^a, Benoît Montalan ^b, Sarah E. Stutterheim ^c^a Laboratoire de Psychologie de Caen Normandie (LPCN EA 7452), Université de Caen Normandie, France^b Centre de Recherche sur les Fonctionnements et Dysfonctionnements Psychologiques (CRFDP EA 7475), Université de Rouen Normandie, France^c Department of Health Promotion, Care and Public Health Research Institute, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 December 2021

Received in revised form 10 October 2022

Accepted 23 October 2022

Available online 4 November 2022

Keywords:

Facial difference

Facial disfigurement

Stigma

ABSTRACT

Facial difference (FD) is not only an individual experience; it is inherently social, reflecting interactions between social norms and individual attitudes. Often FD is stigmatized. In this paper, we employ a widely used stigma framework, namely the social stigma framework put forth by Pryor and Reeder (2011), to unpack the stigma of FD. This framework posits that there are four forms of stigma: public stigma, self-stigma, stigma by association, and structural stigma. We first discuss the social and psychological literature on FD as it pertains to these various forms of stigma. We then describe coping approaches for FD stigma. Lastly, we delineate evidence-based methods for addressing the various forms of FD stigma, such that future efforts can more effectively tackle the stigma of facial difference.

© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	451
2. Pryor and Reeder's social stigma framework	451
2.1. Public stigma	451
2.1.1. Cognitive reactions	451
2.1.2. Affective reactions	452
2.1.3. Behavioral reactions	452
2.1.4. Ambivalent reactions	453
2.1.5. Summary	453
2.2. Self-stigma	454
2.2.1. Summary	454
2.3. Stigma by association	454
2.3.1. Summary	455
2.4. Structural stigma	455
2.4.1. Summary	455
3. Coping with the social stigma of facial difference	456
3.1. Summary	456
4. Addressing the stigma of facial difference: How to intervene	456
4.1. Interventions for public stigma	456
4.2. Interventions for self-stigma	457
4.3. Interventions for stigma by association	457
4.4. Interventions for structural stigma	457
4.5. Summary	457

* Correspondence to: UFR de Psychologie, Laboratoire de Psychologie de Caen Normandie, Université de Caen Normandie, Esplanade de la Paix, 14032 Caen Cedex 5, France.
E-mail address: pauline.rasset@unicaen.fr (P. Rasset).

5. Conclusion.....	458
Funding.....	458
.....	458
References.....	458

1. Introduction

Researchers struggle to define Facial difference (FD). FD usually tends to be defined biomedically with emphasis placed on individual impairment (Katz et al., 2000; Krishna, 2009; Rakic et al., 2018). However, FD is not only an individual experience (Atkinson et al., 2020). Rather, how FD is viewed and perceived is inherently social, reflecting interactions between social norms and individual attitudes (Thompson & Kent, 2001). Therefore, we define FD as a face whose characteristics make it deviate significantly from what an individual who perceives it expects from a normal human face.

Often, but not always FD is stigmatized. Pescosolido and Martin (2015) define stigmatization as a socially and culturally constructed process where a person is labelled as different and then devalued, resulting in status loss and discrimination, and Phelan et al. (2008) claim that stigma serves three functions: 1) to keep people in via norm enforcement; 2) to keep people out through avoidance; and 3) to keep people down through domination and exploitation.

In this paper, we employ a widely used stigma framework, namely the social stigma framework put forth by Pryor and Reeder (2011; see Fig. 1; Bos et al., 2013), to unpack the stigma of FD. Pryor and Reeder’s (2011) framework is, in our opinion, the most comprehensive framework for understanding stigma. It brings together the broad range of stigma forms (e.g., public stigma, perceived stigma, enacted stigma, anticipated stigma, internalized stigma, structural stigma, stigma-by-association) in a cohesive and theoretically sound framework, which has demonstrated utility across a number of stigmatized identities, conditions, and behaviors, including sexual orientation (i.e., being lesbian; Leonard, 2021), race and ethnicity (i.e., being Black; Pryor et al., 2012), marital status (i.e., being single; Ochnik & Mandal, 2016), adolescent motherhood (Bermea et al., 2018), weight (Pryor et al., 2012), sex trafficking (i.e., being a victim of sex trafficking; Basu, 2022), criminal offenders (Moore et al., 2016), noncommunicable neurological disease (Elliot et al., 2019), Autism Spectrum Disorders (Mazumder & Thompson-Hodgetts, 2019), Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (Roosen et al., 2022), HIV (Pryor & Reeder, 2011; Stutterheim et al., 2022; Van Der Kooij et al., 2021), menstruation (Coleman & Sredl, 2022), and mental illness (Shu et al., 2022; van der Sanden et al., 2015) including depression (Aziz & Khan, 2021) and substance use dependence (Burgess et al., 2021). Our purpose is to discuss research on FD stigma in the context of Pryor and Reeder’s (2011) social stigma framework, thereby delineating how the social environment poses challenges for people with FD, how FD stigma is coped with, and, importantly, what can be done to reduce FD stigma.

We acknowledge that FD is not always stigmatized, and that people living with FD do not necessarily experience social difficulties. Nevertheless, given evidence that FD stigma does occur, and in light of the negative consequences of stigma for social and psychological well-being, we feel that an exploration of the FD literature using the social stigma framework is important as it allows us to effectively ascertain avenues for future research and, more importantly, it enables us identify important strategies for reducing FD stigma.

2. Pryor and Reeder’s social stigma framework

The social stigma framework put forth by Pryor and Reeder (2011) outlines four forms of stigma: Public stigma, self-stigma, stigma-by-association, and structural stigma (Fig. 1). *Public stigma* represents people’s cognitive, affective, and behavioral reactions to people with a stigmatized condition, and manifests on an interpersonal level. *Self-stigma* is the anticipation and internalization of society’s negative beliefs about the stigmatized condition, and occurs on an intrapersonal level. *Stigma-by-association* entails social and psychological reactions to people associated with a stigmatized person (e.g., family and friends) as well as the impact of being connected to a person with a stigmatized identity or condition, and can be considered analogous to Goffman’s (1963) courtesy stigma. Lastly, *structural stigma* is the legitimization and perpetuation of stigma by society’s institutions and ideological systems through, for example, policy and legislation. This form of stigma occurs on organizational, institutional, or societal levels. The four types of stigmas are interrelated with public stigma being at the core of the other forms of stigma.

In what follows, we discuss the literature on FD in the context of each of the four forms of stigma put forth by Pryor and Reeder (2011).

2.1. Public stigma

From a social psychological perspective, public stigma comprises cognitions, affects, and behaviors. Cognitive reactions often reflect stereotypes, affective responses demonstrate prejudice, and behavioral reactions to a stigmatized condition like FD manifests as discrimination (often also termed enacted stigma; Bos et al., 2013; Stutterheim & Ratcliffe, 2021). Because public stigma is the core form of stigma, this is where the majority of research on FD stigma occurs. Below, we outline the various cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses that occur in interactions with people with FD as reported in the literature. We then look specifically at ambivalent reactions and their implications.

2.1.1. Cognitive reactions

Research on cognitive reactions to people with FD has shown that people without FD hold stereotypical representations of people with FD, and that these manifest via attributions of less favorable characteristics to people with FD, resulting in an ‘anomalous-is-bad’ stereotype (Jamrozik et al., 2019; Stone & Wright, 2012; Workman et al., 2021). This bias is contrary to the ‘beauty is good’ bias (Dion et al., 1972), whereby attractive individuals are favored in terms of personality traits, as well as in life opportunities (Eagly et al., 1991; Klebl, Rhee, Greenaway, Luo, & Bastian, 2022). The ‘anomalous-is-




Fig. 1. Types of stigma adapted from Pryor and Reeder (2011).

bad' bias would therefore work in the same way as the 'ugly-is-bad' bias (Griffin & Langlois, 2006) but more dramatically.¹

Accordingly, people with FD have been rated as having significantly less positive personality traits (e.g., conscientiousness, emotional stability), less positive internal attributes (e.g., intelligence, honesty), less positive social attributes (e.g., likability, school success), and as less attractive (Bull, 1979; Collett et al., 2013; Jamrozik et al., 2019; Masnari, Schiestl, Weibel, et al., 2013; Rankin & Borah, 2003; Stone & Wright, 2012). These attributions have been made both on an individual level and in a group context (Workman et al., 2021).

As with other disabilities, there seems to be a "spread" of FD to people's identity (see Nario-Redmond, 2020) whereby FD is perceived as an essential element of the person explaining his or her other characteristics (e.g., "he/she is not self-confident probably because of her FD"; see also Rumsey & Harcourt, 2012). However, research has shown that people with FD are more negatively evaluated than other people with visible physical disabilities (Bogart et al., 2019; Stevenage & McKay, 1999; Stone & Wright, 2012).

In fact, some studies suggest that faces with FD are actually processed differently than faces without FD. For example, studies using eye-tracking have shown that visual attention is drawn to the part of the face where FD is apparent (for a review, see Asaad et al., 2020). At the same time, FD diverts attention away from internal facial features like the eyes, which plays an important role in social interactions (Rasset et al., 2022a). Clearly, FD affects the allocation of overt visual attention, and not only because of its saliency (Ackerman et al., 2009; Boutsen et al., 2018, 2021). In fact, research has shown that faces with FD are not better memorized; people tend to confuse different faces with FD with each other more than different faces without FD (Ackerman et al., 2009).

Differential attention to faces with FD has also been explored using neuroimaging techniques. In a study by Hartung et al. (2019), faces with FD evoked lower neural responses in the anterior cingulate and medio-prefrontal cortex. As these networks are important in social cognition, notably for inferring feelings and mental states, this particular way of processing faces with FD is likely to have implications for social interactions as well (e.g., dehumanization Harris & Fiske, 2006, 2007, 2009; Hartung et al., 2019; Workman et al., 2021). Additionally, research using event-related potentials (ERP) showed alterations in the configural processing of faces with FD (i.e., the default mode of processing for 'normal' faces) (Huffmeijer et al., 2018; Parsons et al., 2013).

2.1.2. Affective reactions

A general preference for people showing no FD appears to arise early in child development (Harper, 1999; Masnari, et al., 2013; Richardson, 1971; Sigelman et al., 1986). Even at an implicit level, research has shown that people are quicker to associate FD with negatively valenced words than with positively valenced ones (Grandfield et al., 2005 yet not replicated by Roberts et al., 2017; Hartung et al., 2019; Stone, 2022).

Beyond a global negativity towards people with FD (Madera, 2016), specific affective reactions to FD have also been documented, with the emotion of *disgust* drawing specific interest (e.g., Shanmugarajah et al., 2012). Indeed, research shows that FD elicits significant activations in the amygdala and anterior insula, both of which are regions that react to disgust-inducing stimuli (Krendl et al., 2006; Workman et al., 2021). Also, in a study by Ryan and

colleagues (2012), participants were asked to touch props that had been allegedly used by someone either with a birthmark or an infectious disease, and the results showed similar levels of behavioral avoidance and disgust for both conditions.

From an evolutionary perspective, disgust serves the function of avoiding disease (Kurzban & Leary, 2001; Oaten et al., 2009). However, disgust is especially prone to false alarms, and is frequently instinctively activated in perceivers when faced with a stigmatized condition (Oaten et al., 2009). This suggests that FD is misinterpreted as a disease (Ackerman et al., 2009; Kurzban & Leary, 2001; Ryan et al., 2012; Shanmugarajah et al., 2012). However, disgust reactions to FD are not universal. Recent research shows that biases towards faces with a scar vary based on exposure to Western culture (Workman et al., 2022).

In addition to disgust, research has demonstrated that FD also elicits *threat* reactions. In Blascovich et al. (2001) study, participants interacting with a made-up confederate exhibiting a port wine stain had increased cardiovascular activity, which is consistent with a feeling of threat. Also, in a study by Jones and Stone (1995), participants reported more discomfort towards people with FD than towards people living with other physical disabilities.

Additional affective reactions have been demonstrated by Stone and Potton (2014). In their study, participants were asked to report their subjective emotional experience when shown faces that were attractive, unattractive, or presenting a FD. The results showed that, when high anonymity was guaranteed, participants reported more *sorrow* and *curiosity*, less positive and more negative emotions. Based on this, a six-dimension typology describing a wide array of possible affective states experienced by perceivers of people with FD emerged (Rasset et al., 2022b). The dimensions are *surprise*, *anxiety* and *embarrassment*, *disgust*, *hostility*, *sympathy*, and *neutral* affective states.

2.1.3. Behavioral reactions

There is significant literature showing that people with FD experience enacted stigma or discrimination (for reviews, see Macgregor, 1990; Rumsey & Harcourt, 2004; Thompson & Kent, 2001; Wali & Regmi, 2017) across the life course (Feragen & Borge, 2010; Holland et al., 2019; Lawrence et al., 2011; Magin et al., 2008; Masnari et al., 2012; Strauss et al., 2007; Strobel & Renner, 2016) with the most detrimental impacts occurring in formative periods of life (e.g., adolescence; Bogart, 2015; Crerand et al., 2020).

Discriminatory responses tend to reflect a lack of social tolerance (Lawrence et al., 2011) and can manifest as *unfriendly behaviors*, *avoidance*, and *ostracism* (Bogart et al., 2012; Bonanno & Choi, 2010; Ryan et al., 2012). Additionally, people with FD have reported *staring* and *unsolicited attention* as behavioral responses (Bogart et al., 2012; Bonanno & Choi, 2010; Halioua et al., 2017; Lawrence et al., 2006; Rossi et al., 2009; Strauss et al., 2007; Strobel & Renner, 2016; Threader & McCormack, 2016). Research shows that people with FD may not experience the "civil inattention" that others commonly experience (Macgregor, 1990), particularly when they are singled out (Kornhaber et al., 2014). Visible difference may also elicit *questions*, *comments*, and *other privacy intrusions* (Bogart et al., 2012; Bonanno & Choi, 2010; Rossi et al., 2009; Strauss et al., 2007).

Furthermore, people with FD experience social *rejection*, which can be subtle or blatant (Ginsburg & Link, 1993). In terms of hostile behaviors, people with FD have reported *teasing* as a common experience, as well as *harassment* (Bogart, 2015; Bogart et al., 2012; Bonanno & Choi, 2010; Feragen & Borge, 2010; Griffiths et al., 2012; Halioua et al., 2017; Holland et al., 2019; Lawrence et al., 2011; Magin et al., 2008; Nishikura, 2009; Strauss et al., 2007; Turner et al., 1997; Visram et al., 2019). Teasing and, to a greater extent, *bullying* have a detrimental impact on psychological well-being, especially with regard to self-esteem, self-image, and self-consciousness, but also in terms of body image and satisfaction with facial appearance

¹ However, considering FD as an issue of unattractiveness is not always informative for considering the difficulties faced by people with FD (Roberts & Shute, 2011; Stone & Potton, 2014). Moreover, considering FD as intrinsically rather than culturally unattractive is problematic (e.g., see the career of Winnie Harlow as a model while living with a vitiligo).

(Crerand et al., 2020; Feragen & Borge, 2010; Magin et al., 2008). It is also important to note that social interactions are not always anti-social; *sympathetic reactions* have also been reported, but these are sometimes considered stigmatizing, particularly when expressed in public, manifested as unsolicited help, or when they show pity (Bonanno & Choi, 2010).

The various behavioral reactions to people with FD occur across a number of contexts, both private (e.g., at the swimming pool, at the hairdresser's, on the street; Ginsburg & Link, 1993; Koster & Bergsma, 1990) and professional (e.g., at work; Porter et al., 1986; Stevenage & McKay, 1999; Stone & Wright, 2012a, 2013; Stone et al., 1992).

It is noteworthy that most of the literature on behavioral responses to people with FD focus on the experiences of people with FD, rather than on the behavior of people interacting with people with FD (i.e., the perceiver). However, there are a few experimental studies that have shown that FD affects recruitment decisions (e.g., intention to hire, especially for jobs with high levels of customer contact; Stevenage & McKay, 1999; Stone & Wright, 2013), interpersonal distance (Albrecht et al., 1982; Pausch et al., 2016), and willingness to help (Knapp-Oliver & Moyer, 2009). Also, there are a few behavioral studies that have provided evidence that discrimination does occur (e.g., aversion to interaction, avoidance). Notably, Houston and Bull (1994) demonstrated that people avoided sitting next to a person with a FD, and Rumsey et al., (1982) showed that people stood significantly further away from people with FD on the streets of London. Both real-life and laboratory setting results consistently show that FD elicits avoidance behaviors (Miller & Maner, 2011).

In order to synthesize the stigma experiences of people with FD, Partridge (1998) developed, based on testimonies and his own experience of FD, the acronym "SCARED" (Fig. 2) which summarizes the various cognitive, affective, and behavioral reactions experienced by people with FD, and also refers to the uncertainty and fear felt in a social situation between two people where one has FD.

2.1.4. Ambivalent reactions

Stigmatized conditions like FD do not only evoke negative reactions. They also, like other stigmatized conditions, elicit ambivalent reactions (e.g., mixed affective reactions ranging from sympathy to hostility). This can be explained by the dual-process model of stigmatization (Pryor et al., 2004) which postulates that reactions to people with a stigmatized identity or condition rely on two

processes, namely a 'reflexive system' and a 'rule-based system'. The former engenders automatic and immediate responses which can then be counterbalanced by a more controlled and thoughtful reaction, which occurs slightly later. For this reason, reactions to people with FD often comprise a mixture of negative and positive feelings (Dovidio et al., 2000; Rasset et al., 2022a, 2022b).

Ambivalence can lead to nervousness caused by pressures to express kindness and compassion, while actually feeling anxious and uncomfortable (Dey et al., 2015). Further, with the knowledge that people should not judge based on appearance, people interacting with someone with FD may attempt to compensate by displaying more controlled sympathetic behaviors and willingness to help (Nario-Redmond et al., 2019) but not fully succeed leading to awkward interactions (Hebl et al., 2000). For example, Rumsey et al.'s (1982) on how FD impacts proxemic behavior in the street was not replicated twenty years later in Australia by Roberts and Gierasch (2013). This may be because stigma towards people with FD has evolved into something less overt.

This contention is further supported by Knapp-Oliver and Moyer's (2009) work showing that discrimination against people with FD may be stronger when the context allows the stigmatization to be subtle. Indeed, as normative pressures increasingly encourage people to be kind to people with disabilities (Nario-Redmond et al., 2019), self-presentation biases are likely to occur, and this is reinforced by research showing that negative emotions were only reported when anonymity was guaranteed (Stone & Potton, 2014; see also Jewett et al., 2018).

To further explore this ambivalence, researchers have ingeniously employed methodologies that reach beyond the explicit measurement of stigmatizing reactions (e.g., self-reported questionnaires such as the Measure of Disease-Related Stigma; Stump et al., 2016) to include more implicit measures (e.g., Implicit Association Test; Grandfield et al., 2005; Stone & Wright, 2012). Also, physiological measures have been helpful in establishing affective reactions (Blascovich et al., 2001) and circumventing social desirability bias. These include eye-tracking measures for gaze behavior (see Asaad et al., 2020; Rasset et al., 2022a, 2022b), and fMRI for cognitive processes and their neural correlates (e.g., Hartung et al., 2019; Krendl et al., 2013).

2.1.5. Summary

Evidently, there is abundant research showing that public stigma in the form of cognitive, affective, and behavioral reactions, occurs

	Affective reactions	Cognitive reactions	Behavioral reactions
Perceiver (enacted stigma)	S Sorry / Shocked	Stereotype	Staring / Speechless
	C Curious / Confused	« no Chance »	Clumsy
	A Anxious	Awesome	Asking / Awkward
	R Repelled	Retarded	Recoiling / Rude
	E Embarrassed	Exceptional	Evasive
	D Distressed	Discounting	Deferential
Person with FD (felt stigma)	S Self-conscious	Supine / Stupid	Shy
	C Conspicuous	« Can't »	Cowardly
	A Angry / Anxious	Asexual	Aggressive
	R Rejected	Resigned	Retreating
	E Embarrassed	Exaggerating	Evasive
	D « Different »	Discounting	Defensive

Fig. 2. Affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions of people with FD and their perceiver, adapted from Partridge (1998). Note: Although the subject is not discussed in Partridge's work, enacted stigma could be related to the perceiver's reactions and felt stigma to the reactions of people with FD.

and impacts the lives of people with FD. Some of this research, predominantly research on cognitive and affective responses, focuses on the perspectives of ‘perceivers’ thus those without FD that engage with some with FD. Other research, particularly research focusing on behavioral responses to FD, hones in on the lived experiences of people with FD across various contexts. Ambivalent reactions to people with FD are also present, demonstrating that stigma is often subtle. Also, it is interesting to note that, although researchers often focus on one type of FD (e.g., clefts), reactions of perceivers to different FD are often very similar. This suggests that we should be studying reactions to various FD in a unitary manner.

2.2. Self-stigma

Self-stigma entails the anticipation of stigma (i.e., anticipated stigma) and the internalization of the negative beliefs about people with FD reflected in public stigma, (i.e., internalized stigma; Pryor & Reeder, 2011; Bos et al., 2013). The experience of self-stigma is prevalent and widespread among people with FD (for reviews, see (Dimitrov & Szepietowski, 2017; Germain et al., 2021; Reynolds & Harris, 2021), as is also reflected in the development and validation of standardized scales for measuring self-stigma, such as the Feelings of Stigmatization Questionnaire (Ginsburg & Link, 1989), the Questionnaire on Experience with Skin Complaints (Schmid-Ott et al., 1996), and the Shame and Stigma Scale (Kissane et al., 2013).

Various manifestations of self-stigma have been reported, including the *anticipation of rejection, feelings of being flawed, sensitivity to the opinions of others, feelings of guilt and shame, and feeling the need to be discrete* about one’s FD (Ginsburg & Link, 1989). These manifestations of self-stigma lead to fear of negative evaluations, fear of intrusive behaviors and even fear of provoking disgust in others, which, in turn, can lead people to conceal their FD when possible (Clarke et al., 2014; Keys et al., 2021; Leary et al., 1998; Reynolds & Harris, 2021; Sharratt et al., 2020; Tiemens et al., 2013).

People with FD also internalize negativity and have reported considering themselves to be *dirty, ugly, or flawed* (Bradbury, 2012; Brown et al., 2008; Crerand et al., 2020; Halioua et al., 2017; Lanigan & Cotterill, 1989; Visram et al., 2019). Accordingly, there has been substantial research attention to the role of shame in appearance-related issues (for a review, see Halioua et al., 2017; Keys et al., 2021; Kissane et al., 2013; Rumsey & Harcourt, 2005). For some conditions, such as head and neck cancers that are related to lifestyle risk factors (e.g., tobacco use; Threader & McCormack, 2016), shame is amplified by perceptions that one may be responsible for one’s FD (Goyal et al., 2021; Kissane et al., 2013).

Research has consistently demonstrated that enacted stigma (e.g., bullying) can lead to felt stigma (e.g., fear of rejection) and internalized stigma (e.g., feeling unattractive; Griffiths et al., 2012). For instance, in a qualitative study conducted with adolescents with cutaneous leishmaniasis, the reactions of others were related to subsequent lower self-concept (Bennis et al., 2017). At the same time, anticipated stigma and internalized stigma can occur even in the absence of enacted stigma, and research has indeed shown discrepancies between the perception that stigma is present and actual discrimination, also for FD (Kleck & Strenta, 1980). This is termed stigma consciousness (Pinel, 1999). Although stigma consciousness has been studied among people with physical disabilities (Kowalski & Peipert, 2019), to our knowledge, to date, no studies have looked at stigma consciousness specifically among people with FD.

For FD, it is often difficult to disentangle the negative psychological and well-being impacts of stigma from the impact of impairment or trauma, which is notably present in individuals whose condition is acquired (Bogart, 2014). Nonetheless, self-stigma does

have detrimental effects for the psychological and social well-being of people with FD. Self-stigma in general is associated with decreased hope, lower self-esteem, poorer self-efficacy, and reduced quality of life (see Mittal et al., 2012). Accordingly, people with FD may have decreased self-confidence, increased self-consciousness, and they may be dissatisfied with their facial appearance (Hunt et al., 2005; Sharratt et al., 2020; Turner et al., 1997).

Additionally, research has demonstrated negative associations between self-stigma and both self-esteem and self-confidence (Griffiths et al., 2012; Kent, 1999; Porter & Beuf, 1991). In a qualitative study, adolescents with various visible FD reported experiencing fear of being negatively evaluated, which hampered confidence in initiating relationships and even fears of becoming intimate (Griffiths et al., 2012). Furthermore, research has shown that people with FD have higher rates of depression or anxiety than people without FD (Gibson et al., 2018; Halioua et al., 2017; Hunt et al., 2005), and depression and anxiety are related to self-stigma. For instance, in a study on rosacea, people who reported feelings of stigmatization also reported more depressive symptoms (Halioua et al., 2017).

More generally, self-stigma impacts quality of life (Germain et al., 2021; Jankowiak et al., 2020; Masnari, et al., 2013; Strobel & Renner, 2016; Topolski et al., 2005; Visram et al., 2019). In a study conducted among people with psoriasis, Jankowiak et al. (2020) showed that the more sensitive individuals were to the opinions of others and the worse their attitudes about their psoriasis, the worse their quality of life was.

2.2.1. Summary

Overall, there is some research on self-stigma and its effects, but little research has directly measured the consequences of self-stigma and even less has explored the mediating role of stigma on quality of life outcomes (see, e.g., Van Der Kooij et al., 2021, for an example of an application to HIV stigma).

2.3. Stigma by association

Stigma can also affect people who do not have FD themselves but are, in some way, associated with someone with FD through stigma by association (Pryor & Reeder, 2011). Indeed, stigma can spread to people (i.e., companions) that are arbitrarily and closely related to individuals with FD, and this is especially the case in highly intolerant individuals (Neuberg et al., 1994; Pryor et al., 2012; Sigelman et al., 1991). Having a family member with a stigmatized condition or identity can lead to feelings of shame regarding the relationship, blame regarding the onset of the stigma, and fear of being contaminated by the stigma (Corrigan & Miller, 2004; Roozen et al., 2020). This can have severe implications as people are apt to be reluctant to build relationships with people with FD for fear of stigma. This clearly jeopardizes social opportunities (Crocker & Garcia, 2006). In terms of research, stigma by association can be studied either from the perspective of the companions (e.g., family, relatives, and/or partner) or from the perspective of the person who stigmatizes someone associated with a person with FD (i.e. the perceiver).

In the FD literature, most studies exploring stigma by association focus on families with a specific attention to the perspective of parent(s) or sibling(s) of a child with FD (Lehna, 2013; Strauss et al., 2007). That research shows that parents may feel ‘different’ because of their child’s FD (Nelson et al., 2012) and that they experience discrimination in their social environment (for a review, see Nelson, et al., 2012). Similar to their child, they experience staring (Rossi et al., 2005), questions and comments (Kerr et al., 2020), and rejection (Nelson, et al., 2012). At the same time, family members may

also feel 'unseen' when relatives act with neutrality as this can be (mis)interpreted as a lack of interest (Johansson & Ringsberg, 2004).

Research on the perspectives of other associates such as friends or intimate partners has also been conducted. Although controversial, studies on dating people living with disabilities have shown that one reason why individuals prefer dating people without disability is because they fear the reactions of their friends (Fichten et al., 1991; for an alternative explanation in terms of relationship satisfaction and inequity, see Collisson et al., 2020).

Research has also shown that stigma by association is detrimental for companions (Dako-Gyeke, 2018). For example, in a qualitative study by Nelson et al., (2012) on parent's emotional and social experiences of caring for a child through cleft treatment, mothers reported worrying and feeling blamed for their child's condition, leading to feelings of guilt (Nelson et al., 2012). They also reported concerns about their child not being accepted or even bullied (Nelson et al., 2012). In another study, parents of children with vascular birthmarks reported having to deal with questions and comments that sought to ascertain the extent to which they may be responsible for their child's condition, which can be hurtful and upsetting (Kerr et al., 2020). Clearly, parents of children with FD have to navigate both stigmatizing reactions directed at themselves and stigmatizing reactions directed at their child with FD. Generally, these stigmatizing reactions emphasize abnormality and the undesirability of FD, or question the extent to which that child can meet beauty ideals (Kerr et al., 2020).

To our knowledge, there is no research conducted on stigma by association from the perceivers' perspective. However, given evidence that attitudes towards people with visible stigmas contaminate their companions (Pryor et al., 2012), and research showing that stereotypes towards people living with disabilities 'spread' to their partners (Goldstein & Johnson, 1997; Nieweglowski & Sheehan, 2017), it is likely that this phenomenon also occurs in interactions with associates of people with FD such as families, partners, and friends.

2.3.1. Summary

There is clear evidence that the stigma of FD can 'spread' to companions, and that companions grapple with both witnessing stigma towards their loved one and being stigmatized themselves because of their association with someone, often a child, with FD.

2.4. Structural stigma

Structural stigma encompasses the ways in which society perpetuates and legitimizes the stigmatization of FD, notably by promoting ideal (face) shape in general, and, more specifically, by neglecting FD. The predominant source of structural stigma for FD is media. Media representations are important because they contribute to the beliefs and stereotypes about people with FD held by consumers of media (Garrisi & Janciute, & Johanssen, 2018; Gunter, 2012).

It is well documented that media influences body image through, for example, the mere exposure to socially imposed standards of appearance, or by inviting individuals to evaluate self-images posted on social media (for a review, see Jarman et al., 2022). Media content overwhelmingly praises ideal bodies and faces (e.g., thinspiration and fitspiration social media content; Griffiths et al., 2018) and scrutinizes less ideal ones (Frith, 2012). This idealization is particularly detrimental for people with FD for several reasons. First, it can lead to substantial body dissatisfaction, particularly among vulnerable populations (Ferguson, 2013; Puhl, 2022; Rodgers et al., 2020). Second, by promoting ideal body shapes, media contributes to the denigration of visible differences, thus shaping how people think

about FD and framing visible difference as inherently negative and necessarily troubling (Rumsey & Harcourt, 2012).

On the whole, FD in the media is either not present or not well represented (Garrisi et al., 2018). There is a gross underrepresentation of visible differences, which contributes to a lack of public awareness, especially for rare conditions (see Riklin et al., 2019). When represented, the content tends to present a sensational or tragic depiction of FD (Garrisi et al., 2018). Indeed, most representations of FD in the media come either from reports on crimes or incidents that have led to FD through 'before and after' stories (Garrisi et al., 2018) or from entertainment (e.g., evil cinematic characters). Media attention to some rare diseases occurs occasionally but very little attention is paid to more frequent forms of FD (e.g., acne vulgaris; Gunter, 2012). Furthermore, visible difference is almost completely absent in advertising which can lead people with FD to feel ignored and underrepresented (Changing Faces, 2021).

With regard to entertainment, almost all representations of FD in entertainment media frame the person with FD as evil (Partridge, 2012; Reese, 1995). Croley et al., (2017) compared the dermatologic characteristics of heroes and villains in the top ten American films and found that, in six of ten movies, villains had one or more skin disease, but none of the heroes had FD. This highlights how FD is used to illustrate moral depravity.

Clearly, media has significant impact in perpetuating structural stigma but structural stigma is also reflected in policy and legislation. Discrimination against, and human rights violations towards, people with FD are still neglected (Swift & Bogart, 2021). In many contexts, the rights of people with FD are not sufficiently protected (Saunders, 2020). This lack of protection concerns financial, medical, educational and other societal domains (Swift & Bogart, 2021). This is often because FD is seen as an individual issue, and as an individual problem that needs to be fixed. In this context, the propagation of surgery as the only viable avenue for living with FD is another reflection of structural stigma.

Indeed, surgery is put forth as the ideal, and an almost mandatory obligation, for people with FD. There are several possible reasons for this. First, unrealistic beauty standards have led to the medicalization of beautification and popularization of cosmetic surgery (Bonell et al., 2021; Wu, Mulken, & Alleva, 2022), which offers the promise of an immediate and permanent solution to psychological distress. Second, reconstructive surgery has benefited from considerable technological progress offering an ever-expanding array of solutions. One example is the hope offered by the development of facial transplantation (Rifkin et al., 2018), alongside the fact that medical and surgical solutions often also provide a functional gain, thus lowering the stress elicited by disability and impairment (Bemmels et al., 2013; Roberts & Shute, 2011).

However, focusing 'only' on these solutions can lead individuals with FD to think that they must 'fix' the FD, and that the problem, and solution, lies with them. Beyond the significance of this therapeutic focus, people may also be dissatisfied with surgery, especially if the surgery has spillover effects (e.g., school absences), the social difficulties remain unchanged, or their post-operative look does not appear as "normal" as they had hoped (Bemmels et al., 2013; Myhre et al., 2021). Thus, the social pressure for people with FD to undergo surgery is problematic, especially for individuals for whom surgery is either not possible, not sufficient, or not wanted.

2.4.1. Summary

Society plays an important role in the perpetuation of FD stigma, by promoting what people with FD are not, by not adequately representing people with FD in media and advertising, by negatively representing FD in media, by inadequately addressing human rights

violations, and by perpetuating surgery as only viable avenue for dealing with FD.

3. Coping with the social stigma of facial difference

Evidently, in the context of facial difference, there is public stigma, self-stigma, stigma by association, and structural stigma, and each of these has detrimental social and psychological impacts. This necessitates coping on the part of people with FD and their associates like parents and siblings. People with FD may also benefit and improve coping with help of others (Griffiths et al., 2012; Habib et al., 2021). For instance, family members of people with FD can facilitate social participation (Bonanno & Esmaeli, 2012).

Link and colleagues (Link et al., 1989; see also Link & Phelan, 2013) identified three main coping orientations to face public stigma: secrecy, withdrawal, and education. Although FD is undoubtedly visible, many people with FD engage in measures to conceal their FD (e.g., cosmetic cream, prosthesis, surgery), often to ease outings in public places (Keys et al., 2021; Thompson et al., 2020) and in social interactions (Bemmels et al., 2013; Myhre et al., 2021). Their stigma is thus partially concealed, because it may not be readily apparent to others. However, the mere presence of a 'mask' provokes reactions on the part of the perceivers (Yaron et al., 2018). As such, disclosure is frequently challenging for people with FD (Sharratt et al., 2020).

In addition to concealment, people with FD may also adopt avoidant behaviors and social withdrawal, in order to prevent stigma. However, this reduces opportunities to socialize and access social support (Griffiths et al., 2012; Halioua et al., 2017; Lanigan & Cotterill, 1989; Magin et al., 2008; Thompson et al., 2020).

For some people with FD, coping takes the form of educating people about their condition in order to ease social interactions (Bogart et al., 2012). To do this, resilience in dealing with negative reactions and comments is necessary (Thompson & Kent, 2001). Some individuals develop a more positive perspective by focusing on positive aspects of their FD, giving less importance to appearance, or accepting their condition as part of themselves (Bogart, 2015; Cash et al., 2005; Clarke et al., 2014; Griffiths et al., 2012; Habib et al., 2021; Visram et al., 2019). These strategies can be particularly useful for reducing self-stigma. One channel through which education takes place is through blogs. Blogs (e.g., <https://katiemeehan.co.uk>; see Garrisi & Johanssen, 2018) offer opportunities to broadcast one's experience of living with FD, which both tackles negative representations of FD conveyed in the mainstream media, and replaces self-stigma with personal empowerment (Corrigan, 2019).

Indeed, there is research highlighting positive aspects of living with FD (Eiserman, 2001). Some of this work shows how FD makes its bearer unique, special, and recognized, which may be perceived as particularly positive in societies that value individuality (Kerr et al., 2020; Strauss, 2001). Other studies have shown that, despite stigma, a traumatic event – which may have led to an acquired FD – can bring about psychological growth and personal development, and actually increase well-being (Threader & McCormack, 2016). Accordingly, there is research showing that optimism is associated with reduced fear of negative appearance evaluation (Costa et al., 2021). A perspective whereby FD is studied and viewed as a strength rather than a weakness is clearly desirable, both because it fosters optimism in those affected and their relatives, and because it better enables us to develop innovative treatments, psychological interventions, and ways to promote well-being and healthy relationships (Broder, 2001; Kerr et al., 2020; Meyerson, 2001; Mouradian, 2001; Roberts & Shute, 2011).

Coping with FD stigma can also be leveraged through body positivity movements. Body positivity movements often use social media as a mass communication tool to share information and to elevate attention to rights activism (Puhl, 2022). Given that people

with FD use social media to find information and to access emotional and social support from others with FD (Stock et al., 2018), the body positivity movement is an integral part to coping with FD stigma and developing a positive social identity. Moreover, social media allows us to target structural stigma of FD by, for example, revaluing FD as an asset, reclaiming disability labels as positive subcultural signifiers, and establishing new norms, values, or dimensions of comparison (Nario-Redmond, 2020).

With respect to stigma by association, families may respond in ways similar to people with FD, such as withdrawal or concealment (Bonanno, 2012; Kerr et al., 2020; Nelson et al., 2012). Stigma is distressing and thus often a motivation for parents to seek medical or surgical advice (Williams et al., 2003). Research has shown that this differs for mothers and fathers. Fathers tend to be less concerned about being judged by others, while mothers tend to experience more social support (Nidey et al., 2016). It is also possible that parents acknowledge positive impacts of their child's condition (for a review, see Nelson et al., 2012). For example, the experience of being a parent of a child with FD can offer an opportunity to recognize one's own personal strengths and the strengths of one's child, which can lead to stronger relationships, or can increase a sense of community (Nelson et al., 2012).

3.1. Summary

People with FD cope with stigma using various approach and avoidance strategies including concealment, withdrawal, and education. Body positivity movements have also been leveraged to cope and empower people with FD. Associates of people with FD cope in similar ways as well.

4. Addressing the stigma of facial difference: How to intervene

There is a significant evidence base for stigma reduction interventions (Stutterheim et al., 2022; Stutterheim & Ratcliffe, 2021) that have been tested and demonstrated efficacy across various stigmatized identities and conditions including sexual orientation (Bartoş et al., 2014), mental illness in general (Corrigan et al., 2012), eating disorders more specifically (Doley et al., 2017), weight (Rubino et al., 2020), tuberculosis (Sommerland et al., 2017), HIV (Mak et al., 2017), and health-related stigma more generally (Stangl et al., 2019; for a review see Paluck et al., 2021). As such, the broader stigma literature can offer insight on how to best tackle stigma related to FD (for a review, see Stutterheim & Ratcliffe, 2021).

With regard to FD, much research focusing on the social difficulties encountered by people living with FD provide practical implications (for a review, see Rumsey & Harcourt, 2004). Yet, we believe that bridging together social stigma and the FD literatures can foster the development of innovative intervention strategies and/or the improvement of already existing ones. To this end, we detail, below, interventions addressing the different types of stigma in parallel to interventions targeting FD difficulties.

4.1. Interventions for public stigma

Interventions are needed in order to tackle the public stigma of FD and its accompanying cognitive (e.g., stereotypes; Jamrozik et al., 2019), affective (e.g., disgust; Shanmugarajah et al., 2012), and behavioral reactions (e.g., avoidance; Ryan et al., 2012). These interventions should aim to reduce automatic negative reactions, while promoting more deliberate and positive ones (Pryor et al., 2004), regardless of the context.

Strategies that have been developed to reduce and prevent the public stigma of FD have mostly focused on information provision and contact with affected groups (see Topp et al., 2019). The provision of information can be important (e.g. through education

campaigns, notably for rare diseases) (Bogart & Tickle-Degnen, 2015), but, generally, strategies promoting contact are more effective than information-based ones (Corrigan et al., 2018; Topp et al., 2019). Contact interventions lead to the disconfirmation of stereotypes and are particularly effective when the contact is between people of equal status, when the interactions are one-on-one, and when the interaction involves an activity that is rewarding or includes a shared goal (Corrigan & Shapiro, 2010). However, indirect contact through videos can also improve social judgments of individuals with FD (Edwards et al., 2011; Stone & Fisher, 2020).

Education-based strategies have also been developed in order to ease social interactions between people with FD and people without FD that they see on a regular basis (e.g., caregivers, professors, colleagues; Hlongwa & Rispel, 2018; Rumsey & Harcourt, 2004). For instance, reintegration programs for children with burns are improved when they also help teachers to manage the situation, including their own reactions (Pan et al., 2018).

Specifically with respect to cognitive reactions to people with FD, strategies enabling people to challenge their beliefs or biases towards FD are imperative. Bogart and Tickle-Degnen (2015) showed the beneficial impact of a training to 'look beyond' FD. In their study, participants who were informed, trained, and provided with feedback on cues for interacting with people with facial paralysis displayed better performances in impression formation (Bogart & Tickle-Degnen, 2015). Other strategies include cognitive training, which aims to alter particular cognitive associations (e.g., FD with villains; see Paluck et al., 2021). Cognitive training can be applied to emotional reactions, and lower associations between FD and negative attributes (Bilici et al., 2022). Furthermore, strategies fostering empathy, such as perspective-taking (Todd & Galinsky, 2014), have been found to be effective (Batson et al., 2002). Perspective taking also has beneficial behavioral outcomes, fostering approach-oriented action tendencies and smoother interactions.

4.2. Interventions for self-stigma

Strategies that can effectively address self-stigma include cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and skills building (Topp et al., 2019). Indeed, the provision of psychological services can be beneficial for the reduction of both anticipated and internalized stigma. By training individuals to identify and modify negative beliefs and interpretations, CBT addresses not only internalized negative beliefs about FD; it also helps people with FD deal with consequences of self-stigma and develop coping skills (e.g., behavioral therapy) (Heijnders & Van Der Meij, 2006; Mittal et al., 2012).

Strategies that seek to develop social skills or provide tools for social interactions can also serve to manage enacted stigma (e.g., training conversation skills, identifying others' reactions, using compensatory strategies; Clarke, 1999; Jenkinson et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 1996). Furthermore, self-help interventions that have been designed to lower appearance-related distress may also lower self-stigma (Muftin & Thompson, 2013). This includes interventions that target stress reduction with mindfulness, or resilience with self-compassion. Additionally, peer support can enable people with FD to find new ways to manage self-stigma by sharing experiences (Bogart et al., 2017; Bogart & Hemmesch, 2016).

Research on other stigmas can also provide insights for the development of new strategies and the refinement of existing strategies for addressing FD self-stigma (for a critical review on self-stigma reduction strategies, see Mittal et al., 2012). For example, there is substantial evidence showing that Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) can successfully reduce internalized stigma, both when employed in isolation (Luoma et al., 2008) and when combined with CBT (Pearl et al., 2020). More generally, ACT is a psychological flexibility-based intervention, which can lessen self-

stigma by increasing psychological acceptance and lowering self-conscious emotions (e.g., shame; Masuda et al., 2017).

4.3. Interventions for stigma by association

Strategies aimed at counselling families and helping them to deal with their family member's FD have proven to be valuable in reducing stigma by association (e.g., Positive Parenting Program, parental training; Costa et al., 2021). For instance, the Early Family Intervention Program was designed to support parents of a child with a disability and has demonstrated evidence for better adaptation, including reduced emotional distress (Pelchat et al., 1999). More generally, providing peer support to close relatives is advantageous, especially for mothers (Nidey et al., 2016).

To be effective, strategies targeting stigma by association should aim to help relatives build resilience and coping skills. As such, strategies for addressing public stigma or self-stigma can also be employed to reduce stigma by association. More broadly, there is a substantial need to support relatives of people with a stigmatized identity or condition, as demonstrated by a study conducted with family members of people with mental illness. This study showed that emotional support (e.g., discussing feelings), instrumental support (e.g., information, advice) and organizing support systems (e.g., networks) can be life-changing (van der Sanden et al., 2014).

4.4. Interventions for structural stigma

Several approaches can be used to prevent structural stigma and to protect people with FD against the impacts of structural stigma. Given the important work conducted by the charity Changing Faces, we draw heavily on their work in our recommendations for reducing structural stigma. First, we recommend changes to policy and laws, and the recognition of the rights of people with FD. Changing Faces has lobbied for 'disfigurement' to be covered by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the Equality Act 2010 (Changing Faces, 2017) and we support this. More generally, advocacy is needed in order to support the interests of people with FD.

Second, in order to improve knowledge and generate more positive attitudes towards FD in society, increased awareness and positive exposure to facial conditions is needed. This has, to some extent, been done. For example, in an effort to tackle the 'disfigured is bad' stereotype, there have been public awareness campaigns that focus on positive exposure (e.g., see Changing faces' campaign 'I am not your villain' in the UK, or Corasso's campaign 'Quoi ma gueule ?' in France). Increased awareness also requires educating and training the media on best practices for addressing FD (Garrisi et al., 2018). For instance, Face Equality International (2021) provides resources on how to present, interview, and talk about FD. Furthermore, we suggest explicitly calling on the media to produce and commit to non-stigmatizing portrayals of FD (see Rubino et al., 2020).

Third, because structural stigma causes social exclusion, we need inclusive efforts that remove the barriers that reduce people with FD's opportunities to participate in social life (e.g., discrimination at work, school). These efforts should also seek to increase the visibility of people with FD. For instance, the 'Changing Faces' (2021) campaign 'pledge to be seen' aims at representing more people with a visible difference in communication.

4.5. Summary

We have a broad toolbox for addressing public stigma, self-stigma, stigma by association, and structural stigma. These strategies can be derived from not only previous experience and efforts to reduce FD stigma, but also efforts to reduce stigmatization related to other identities and conditions.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we set out to employ the social stigma framework put forth by Pryor and Reeder (2011) to unpack the stigma of facial difference (FD). By describing relevant literature on public stigma including the cognitive, affective, and behavioral reactions to people with FD; self-stigma including anticipated and internalized stigma; stigma by association experienced predominantly by parents of children with FD, and structural stigma embedded in media and in legislation, we have shown the utility of Pryor and Reeder's (2011) framework for understanding FD stigma. We then followed up by discussing how people with FD cope with the various forms of stigma. Lastly, we outlined a number of evidence-based strategies for addressing FD stigma. In doing so, we hope to have shed light on future avenues for intervention and the improvement of well-being for people with FD.

Funding

This work was supported by the Normandy Region [grant RIN 100%, 2018; grant RIN tremplin 19E00851, 2019], the Foundation Gueules Cassées [72–2020, 2020].

Data Availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

- Ackerman, J. M., Becker, D. V., Mortensen, C. R., Sasaki, T., Neuberger, S. L., & Kenrick, D. T. (2009). A pox on the mind: Disjunction of attention and memory in the processing of physical disfigurement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(3), 478–485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.12.008>
- Albrecht, G. L., Walker, V. G., & Levy, J. A. (1982). Social distance from the stigmatized. *Social Science & Medicine*, 16(14), 1319–1327. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(82\)90027-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(82)90027-2)
- Asaad, M., Dey, J. K., Al-Mouakeh, A., Manjouna, M. B., Nashed, M. A., Rajesh, A., Boonipat, T., & Bite, U. (2020). Eye-tracking technology in plastic and reconstructive surgery: A systematic review. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, 40(9), 1022–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjz328>
- Atkinson, M. J., Stock, N. M., Alleva, J. M., Jankowski, G. S., Piran, N., Riley, S., Calogero, R., Clarke, A., Rumsey, N., Slater, A., Diedrichs, P. C., & Williamson, H. (2020). Looking to the future: Priorities for translating research to impact in the field of appearance and body image. *Body Image*, 32, 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2019.10.006>
- Aziz, A., & Khan, N. (2021). Perceptions pertaining to stigma and discrimination about depression: A focus group study of primary care staff. *Psychological Applications and Trends*, 2021(4), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.36315/2021inact013>
- Bartos, S. E., Berger, I., & Hegarty, P. (2014). Interventions to reduce sexual prejudice: A study-space analysis and meta-analytic review. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 51(4), 363–382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.871625>
- Basu, S. (2022). A study on the rehabilitation mechanisms of the victims of trafficking with special focus on commercial sexual exploitation of women in West Bengal. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 10(5), 849–856.
- Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(12), 1656–1666. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702237647>
- Bemmel, H., Biesecker, B., Schmidt, J. L., Krokosky, A., Guidotti, R., & Sutton, E. J. (2013). Psychological and social factors in undergoing reconstructive surgery among individuals with craniofacial conditions: An exploratory study. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 50(2), 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.1597/11-127>
- Bennis, I., Thys, S., Filali, H., De Brouwer, V., Sahibi, H., & Boelaert, M. (2017). Psychosocial impact of scars due to cutaneous leishmaniasis on high school students in Errachidia province, Morocco. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*, 6(1), 46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-017-0267-5>
- Bermea, A. M., Toews, M. L., & Wood, L. G. (2018). "Students getting pregnant are not gonna go nowhere": Manifestations of stigma in adolescent mothers' educational environment. *Youth & Society*, 50(3), 423–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X16661734>
- Bilic, N., Workman, C. I., Humphries, S., Hamilton, R., & Chatterjee, A. (2022). Normalizing Anomalies with Mobile Exposure (NAME): Reducing implicit biases against people with facial anomalies. *PsyArXiv Preprints*.
- Blascovich, J., Mendes, W. B., Hunter, S. B., Lickel, B., & Kowai-Bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(2), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.2.253>
- Bogart, K. R. (2014). The role of disability self-concept in adaptation to congenital or acquired disability. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 59(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035800>
- Bogart, K. R. (2015). "People are all about appearances": A focus group of teenagers with Moebius Syndrome. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 20(12), 1579–1588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105313517277>
- Bogart, K. R., Frandrup, E., Locke, T., Thompson, H., Weber, N., Yates, J., Zike, N., & Hemmesch, A. R. (2017). Rare place where I feel normal": Perceptions of a social support conference among parents of and people with Moebius syndrome. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 64(2016), 143–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2017.03.014>
- Bogart, K. R., & Hemmesch, A. R. (2016). Benefits of support conferences for parents of and people with Moebius syndrome. *Stigma and Health*, 1(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000018>
- Bogart, K. R., Rosa, N. M., & Slepian, M. L. (2019). Born that way or became that way: Stigma toward congenital versus acquired disability. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(4), 594–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218757897>
- Bogart, K. R., & Tickle-Degnen, L. (2015). Looking beyond the face: A training to improve perceivers' impressions of people with facial paralysis. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 98(2), 251–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.09.010>
- Bogart, K. R., Tickle-Degnen, L., & Joffe, M. S. (2012). Social interaction experiences of adults with Moebius Syndrome: A focus group. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 17(8), 1212–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105311432491>
- Bonanno, A. (2012). The social limits of reconstructive surgery: Stigma in facially disfigured cancer patients. In S. Danilla (Ed.), *InTech*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/28847>
- Bonanno, A., & Choi, J. Y. (2010). Mapping out the social experience of cancer patients with facial disfigurement. *Health*, 02(05), 418–428. <https://doi.org/10.4236/health.2010.25063>
- Bonanno, A., & Esmaeli, B. (2012). Cancer and facial disfigurement: Reducing survivors' stigma in social interaction. *Clinical Journal of Oncology Nursing*, 16(2), 153–159. <https://doi.org/10.1188/12.CJON.153-159>
- Bonell, S., Barlow, F. K., & Griffiths, S. (2021). The cosmetic surgery paradox: Toward a contemporary understanding of cosmetic surgery popularisation and attitudes. *Body Image*, 38, 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.04.010>
- Bos, A. E. R., Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., & Stutterheim, S. E. (2013). Stigma: Advances in theory and research. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 35(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2012.746147>
- Boutsen, L., Pearson, N. A., & Jüttner, M. (2018). Differential impact of disfiguring facial features on overt and covert attention. *Acta Psychologica*, 190, 122–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2018.08.003>
- Boutsen, L., Pearson, N. A., & Jüttner, M. (2021). Do facially disfiguring features influence attention and perception of faces? Evidence from an antisaccade task. 174702182110416 Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211041621>
- Bradbury, E. (2012). Meeting the psychological needs of patients with facial disfigurement. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 50(3), 193–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2010.11.022>
- Broder, H. L. (2001). Using psychological assessment and therapeutic strategies to enhance well-being. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 38(3), 248–254. [https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569\(2001\)038<0248:UPAATS>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569(2001)038<0248:UPAATS>2.0.CO;2)
- Brown, B. C., McKenna, S. P., Siddhi, K., McGrouther, D. A., & Bayat, A. (2008). The hidden cost of skin scars: Quality of life after skin scarring. *Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgery*, 61(9), 1049–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2008.03.020>
- Bull, R. (1979). The psychological significance of facial difformity. In M. Cook, & G. Wilson (Eds.), *Love and Attraction* (pp. 21–25). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-022234-9.50008-X>
- Burgess, A., Bauer, E., Gallagher, S., Karstens, B., Lavoie, L. A., Ahrens, K., & O'Connor, A. (2021). Experiences of stigma among individuals in recovery from opioid use disorder in a rural setting: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 130(May), Article 108488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108488>
- Cash, T. F., Santos, M. T., & Williams, E. F. (2005). Coping with body-image threats and challenges: Validation of the Body Image Coping Strategies Inventory. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 58(2), 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2004.07.008>
- Changing Faces. (2017). Disfigurement in the UK. www.changingfaces.org.uk/media-guidelines.
- Changing Faces. (2021). Changing faces. <https://www.ChangingFaces.Org.Uk>. <https://www.changingfaces.org.uk>
- Clarke, A. (1999). Psychosocial aspects of facial disfigurement: Problems, management and the role of a lay-led organization. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 4(2), 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135485099106270>
- Clarke, S. A., Newell, R., Thompson, A., Harcourt, D., & Lindenmeyer, A. (2014). Appearance concerns and psychosocial adjustment following head and neck cancer: A cross-sectional study and nine-month follow-up. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, 19(5), 505–518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2013.855319>
- Coleman, C. A., & Sredl, K. C. (2022). *Menstruation in marketing* (Issue January) *The routledge companion to marketing and feminism*. Routledge 102–119. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003042587-10> (Issue January).
- Collett, B. R., Gray, K. E., Kapp-Simon, K. A., Birgfeld, C., Cunningham, M., Rudo-Stern, J., Ung, D., Buono, L., & Speltz, M. L. (2013). Laypersons' ratings of appearance in children with and without single-suture craniosynostosis. *Journal of Craniofacial Surgery*, 24(4), 1331–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SCS.0b013e3182997885>
- Collison, B., Edwards, J. M., Chakraborty, L., Mendoza, J., Anduiza, A., & Corona, A. (2020). Perceived satisfaction and inequity: A survey of potential romantic partners of

- people with a disability. *Sexuality and Disability*, 38(3), 405–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11195-019-09601-7>
- Corrigan, P. W. (2019). *The stigma effect. In The stigma effect*. Columbia University Press <https://doi.org/10.7312/corr18356>
- Corrigan, P. W., Bink, A. B., & Schmidt, A. (2018). Reducing physical illness stigma: Insights from the mental illness arena. In B. Major, J. F. Dovidio, & B. G. Link (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of stigma, discrimination, and health* (pp. 413–427). Oxford University Press.
- Corrigan, P. W., & Miller, F. E. (2004). Shame, blame, and contamination: A review of the impact of mental illness stigma on family members. *Journal of Mental Health*, 13(6), 537–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638230400017004>
- Corrigan, P. W., Morris, S. B., Michaels, P. J., Rafacz, J. D., & Rüsch, N. (2012). Challenging the public stigma of mental illness: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Psychiatric Services*, 63(10), <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.005292011>
- Corrigan, P. W., & Shapiro, J. R. (2010). Measuring the impact of programs that challenge the public stigma of mental illness. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(8), 907–922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.06.004>
- Costa, B., Ardouin, K., & Stock, N. M. (2021). Factors associated with psychological adjustment in adults with cleft lip and/or palate: Findings from a national survey in the United Kingdom. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10556656211028494>
- Costa, B., Thornton, M., Guest, E., Meyrick, J., & Williamson, H. (2021). The effectiveness of interventions to improve psychosocial outcomes in parents of children with appearance-affecting health conditions: A systematic review. *Child: Care Health and Development*, 47(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12805>
- Crerand, C. E., Rumsey, N., Kazak, A., Clarke, A., Rausch, J., & Sarwer, D. B. (2020). Sex differences in perceived stigmatization, body image disturbance, and satisfaction with facial appearance and speech among adolescents with craniofacial conditions. *Body Image*, 32, 190–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2020.01.005>
- Crocker, J., & Garcia, J. A. (2006). *Stigma and the social basis of the self: A synthesis. In Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives*. Psychology Press, 287–308.
- Croley, J. A., Reese, V., & Wagner, R. F. (2017). Dermatologic features of classic movie villains. *JAMA Dermatology*, 153(6), 559. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2016.5979>
- Dako-Gyeke, M. (2018). Courtesy stigma: A concealed consternation among caregivers of people affected by leprosy. *Social Science & Medicine*, 196, 190–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.11.030>
- Dey, J. K., Ishii, L. E., Byrne, P. J., Boahene, K. D. O., & Ishii, M. (2015). The social penalty of facial lesions: New evidence supporting high-quality reconstruction. *JAMA Facial Plastic Surgery*, 17(2), 90–96. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamafacial.2014.1131>
- Dimitrov, D., & Szepletowski, J. C. (2017). Stigmatization in dermatology with a special focus on psoriatic patients. *0–0 Postępy Higieny i Medycyny Doświadczalnej*, 71(0), <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0010.6879>
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(3), 285–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033731>
- Doley, J. R., Hart, L. M., Stukas, A. A., Petrovic, K., Bouguettaya, A., & Paxton, S. J. (2017). Interventions to reduce the stigma of eating disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 50(3), 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22691>
- Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overview. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma* (pp. 1–28). Guilford Press.
- Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.109>
- Edwards, T. C., Topolski, T. D., Kapp-Simon, K. A., Aspinall, C. L., & Patrick, D. L. (2011). What difference can a minute make? Social skills and first impressions of youth with craniofacial differences. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 48(1), 91–97. <https://doi.org/10.1597/08-204>
- Eiserman, W. (2001). Unique outcomes and positive contributions associated with facial difference: Expanding research and practice. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 38(3), 236–244. [https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569\(2001\)038<0236:UOAPCA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569(2001)038<0236:UOAPCA>2.0.CO;2)
- Elliot, V. L., Morgan, D., Kosteniuk, J., Froehlich Chow, A., & Bayly, M. (2019). Health-related stigma of noncommunicable neurological disease in rural adult populations: A scoping review. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 27(4), e158–e188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12694>
- Face Equality International Resources 2021. <https://faceequalityinternational.org/resources/>
- Feragen, K. B., & Borge, A. I. H. (2010). Peer harassment and satisfaction with appearance in children with and without a facial difference. *Body Image*, 7(2), 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2009.12.001>
- Ferguson, C. J. (2013). In the eye of the beholder: Thin-ideal media affects some, but not most, viewers in a meta-analytic review of body dissatisfaction in women and men. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 2(1), 20–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030766>
- Fichten, C. S., Goodrick, G., Amsel, R., & McKenzie, S. W. (1991). Reactions toward dating peers with visual impairments. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 36(3), 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0079084>
- Frith, H. (2012). Appearance and society. In N. J. Rumsey, & D. Harcourt (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of the psychology of appearance*. Oxford: OUP.
- Garrisi, D., Janciuete, L., & Johanssen, J. (2018). Appearance, discrimination and the media. *University of Westminster Press*. <https://doi.org/10.16997/book31>
- Garrisi, D., & Johanssen, J. (2018). Competing narratives in framing disability in the UK media: A comparative analysis of journalistic representations of facial disfigurement versus practices of self-representations online. *JOMEC Journal*, 12, 128. <https://doi.org/10.18573/jomec.172>
- Germain, N., Augustin, M., François, C., Legau, K., Bogoeva, N., Desroches, M., Toumi, M., & Sommer, R. (2021). Stigma in visible skin diseases – a literature review and development of a conceptual model. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*, 35(7), 1493–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.17110>
- Gibson, J. A. G., Ackling, E., Bisson, J. I., Dobbs, T. D., & Whitaker, I. S. (2018). The association of affective disorders and facial scarring: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 239, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.06.013>
- Ginsburg, I. H., & Link, B. G. (1989). Feelings of stigmatization in patients with psoriasis. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 20(1), 53–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-9622\(89\)70007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-9622(89)70007-4)
- Ginsburg, I. H., & Link, B. G. (1993). Psychosocial consequences of rejection and stigma feelings in psoriasis patients. *International Journal of Dermatology*, 32(8), 587–591. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-4362.1993.tb05031.x>
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Penguin.
- Goldstein, S. B., & Johnson, V. A. (1997). Stigma by association: Perceptions of the dating partners of college students with physical disabilities. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(4), 495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324839715036931>
- Goyal, A. K., Bakshi, J., Panda, N. K., Kapoor, R., Vir, D., Kumar, K., & Aneja, P. (2021). Assessment of shame and stigma in head and neck cancer: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12663-021-01658-2>
- Grandfield, T. A., Thompson, A. R., & Turpin, G. (2005). An attitudinal study of responses to a range of dermatological conditions using the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 10(6), 821–829. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105305057316>
- Griffin, A. M., & Langlois, J. H. (2006). Stereotype directionality and attractiveness stereotyping: Is beauty good or is ugly bad? *Social Cognition*, 24(2), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2006.24.2.187>
- Griffiths, C., Williamson, H., & Rumsey, N. (2012). The romantic experiences of adolescents with a visible difference: Exploring concerns, protective factors and support needs. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 17(7), 1053–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105311433909>
- Griffiths, S., Castle, D., Cunningham, M., Murray, S. B., Bastian, B., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). How does exposure to thinpiration and fitspiration relate to symptom severity among individuals with eating disorders? Evaluation of a proposed model. *Body Image*, 27, 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2018.10.002>
- Gunter, B. (2012). The role of the media. In N. J. Rumsey, & D. Harcourt (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the psychology of appearance* (pp. 455–467). Oxford University Press.
- Habib, Z., Saddul, R., & Kamran, F. (2021). Perceptions and experiences of female burn survivors with facial disfigurement. *Chinese Journal of Traumatology*, 24(1), 53–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjtee.2020.11.007>
- Halioua, B., Cribrier, B., Frey, M., & Tan, J. (2017). Feelings of stigmatization in patients with rosacea. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*, 31(1), 163–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.13748>
- Harper, D. C. (1999). Social psychology of difference: Stigma, spread, and stereotypes in childhood. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 44(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0090-5550.44.2.131>
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the Lowest of the Low. *Psychological Science*, 17(10), 847–853. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01793.x>
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2007). Social groups that elicit disgust are differentially processed in mPFC. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 2(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsi037>
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2009). Social neuroscience evidence for dehumanised perception. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 20, 192–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280902954988>
- Hartung, F., Jamrozik, A., Rosen, M. E., Aguirre, G., Sarwer, D. B., & Chatterjee, A. (2019). Behavioural and neural responses to facial disfigurement. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 8021. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44408-8>
- Hebl, M. R., Tickle, J., & Heatherton, T. F. (2000). Awkward moments in interactions between nonstigmatized and stigmatized individuals. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma* (pp. 275–306). Guilford Press.
- Heijnders, M., & Van Der Meij, S. (2006). The fight against stigma: An overview of stigma-reduction strategies and interventions. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 11(3), 353–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548500600595327>
- Hlongwa, P., & Rispel, L. C. (2018). “People look and ask lots of questions”: Caregivers’ perceptions of healthcare provision and support for children born with cleft lip and palate. *BMC Public Health*, 18(1), 506. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5421-x>
- Holland, A. A., Stavinoha, P. L., Swearer, S. M., Solesbee, C., Patel, S., & Klesse, L. J. (2019). Rate and frequency of bullying victimization in school-age children with neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1). *School Psychology*, 34(6), 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000333>
- Houston, V., & Bull, R. (1994). Do people avoid sitting next to someone who is facially disfigured. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(2), 279–284. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420240205>
- Huffmeijer, R., Eilander, J., Mileva-Seitz, V. R., & Rippe, R. C. A. (2018). Changes in face-specific neural processing explain reduced cuteness and approachability of infants with cleft lip. *Social Neuroscience*, 13(4), 439–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2017.1340336>

- Hunt, O., Burden, D., Hepper, P., & Johnston, C. (2005). The psychosocial effects of cleft lip and palate: A systematic review. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 27(3), 274–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cj004>
- Jamrozik, A., Oraa Ali, M., Sarwer, D. B., & Chatterjee, A. (2019). More than skin deep: Judgments of individuals with facial disfigurement. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 13(1), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000147>
- Jankowiak, B., Kowalewska, B., Krajewska-Kulak, E., & Khvorik, D. F. (2020). Stigmatization and quality of life in patients with psoriasis. *Dermatology and Therapy*, 10(2), 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13555-020-00363-1>
- Jarman, H. K., McLean, S. A., Griffiths, S., Teague, S. J., Rodgers, R. F., Paxton, S. J., Austen, E., Harris, E., Steward, T., Shatte, A., Khanh-Dao Le, L., Anwar, T., Mihalopoulos, C., Parker, A. G., Yager, Z., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2022). Critical measurement issues in the assessment of social media influence on body image. *Body Image*, 40, 225–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.12.007>
- Jenkinson, E., Williamson, H., Byron-Daniel, J., & Moss, T. P. (2015). Systematic review: Psychosocial interventions for children and young people with visible differences resulting from appearance altering conditions, injury, or treatment Effects. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 40(10), 1017–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsv048>
- Jewett, L. R., Gumuchian, S. T., Pepin, M., Rice, D. B., Kolorz, F., Harrison, P., & Thombs, B. D. (2018). Factors associated with negative observer responses towards individuals with visible differences: A scoping review. *Body Image*, 25, 103–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2018.02.007>
- Johansson, B., & Ringsberg, K. C. (2004). Parents' experiences of having a child with cleft lip and palate. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 47(2), 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03075.x>
- Jones, G. E., & Stone, D. L. (1995). Perceived discomfort associated with working with persons with varying disabilities. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 81(3), 911–919. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1995.81.3.911>
- Katz, M. R., Irish, J. C., Devins, G. M., Rodin, G. M., & Gullane, P. J. (2000). Reliability and validity of an observer-rated disfigurement scale for head and neck cancer patients. *Head & Neck*, 22(2), 132–141. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0347\(200003\)22:2<132::AID-HED4>3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0347(200003)22:2<132::AID-HED4>3.0.CO;2-K)
- Kent, G. (1999). Correlates of perceived stigma in vitiligo. *Psychology & Health*, 14(2), 241–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870449908407325>
- Kerr, A. M., Thompson, C. M., & Rubinsky, V. (2020). Memorable messages parents of children with vascular birthmarks receive from others: Implications for stigma and identity. *Health Communication*, 35(6), 685–695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2019.1582314>
- Keys, J., Dempster, M., Jackson, J., Williams, M., & Coyle, S. (2021). The psychosocial impact of losing an eye through traumatic injury and living with prosthetic restoration: A thematic analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, 219(July), Article 103383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2021.103383>
- Kissane, D. W., Patel, S. G., Baser, R. E., Bell, R., Farberov, M., Ostroff, J. S., Li, Y., Singh, B., Kraus, D. H., & Shah, J. P. (2013). Preliminary evaluation of the reliability and validity of the Shame and Stigma Scale in head and neck cancer. *Head & Neck*, 35(2), 172–183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.22943>
- Klebl, C., Rhee, J. J., Greenaway, K. H., Luo, Y., & Bastian, B. (2022). Beauty Goes Down to the Core: Attractiveness Biases Moral Character Attributions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 46(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-021-00388-w>
- Kleck, R. E., & Strenta, A. (1980). Perceptions of the impact of negatively valued physical characteristics on social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(5), 861–873. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.5.861>
- Knapp-Oliver, S., & Moyer, A. (2009). Visibility and the stigmatization of cancer: Context matters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(12), 2798–2808. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00550.x>
- Kornhaber, R., Wilson, A., Abu-Qamar, M. Z., & McLean, L. (2014). Adult burn survivors' personal experiences of rehabilitation: An integrative review. *Burns*, 40(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2013.08.003>
- Koster, M. E. T. A., & Bergsma, J. (1990). Problems and coping behaviour of facial cancer patients. *Social Science & Medicine*, 30(5), 569–578. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(90\)90155-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(90)90155-L)
- Kowalski, R. M., & Peipert, A. (2019). Public- and self-stigma attached to physical versus psychological disabilities. *Stigma and Health*, 4(2), 136–142. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000123>
- Krendl, A. C., Macrae, C. N., Kelley, W. M., Fugelsang, J. A., & Heatherton, T. F. (2006). The good, the bad, and the ugly: An fMRI investigation of the functional anatomic correlates of stigma. *Social Neuroscience*, 1(1), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470910600670579>
- Krendl, A. C., Moran, J. M., & Ambady, N. (2013). Does context matter in evaluations of stigmatized individuals? An fMRI study. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 8(5), 602–608. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nns037>
- Krishna, S. (2009). Disfigurement: Psychosocial impact and coping. *The Open Dermatology Journal*, 3(1), 54–57. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874372200903010054>
- Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: The functions of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 187–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.187>
- Lanigan, S. W., & Cotterill, J. A. (1989). Psychological disabilities amongst patients with port wine stains. *British Journal of Dermatology*, 121(2), 209–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2133.1989.tb01800.x>
- Lawrence, J. W., Fauerbach, J. A., Heinberg, L. J., Doctor, M., & Thombs, B. D. (2006). The reliability and validity of the Perceived Stigmatization Questionnaire (PSQ) and the Social Comfort Questionnaire (SCQ) among an adult burn survivor sample. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(1), 106–111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.1.106>
- Lawrence, J. W., Rosenberg, L., Mason, S., & Fauerbach, J. A. (2011). Comparing parent and child perceptions of stigmatizing behavior experienced by children with burn scars. *Body Image*, 8(1), 70–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2010.09.004>
- Leary, M. R., Rapp, S. R., Herbst, K. C., Exum, M. L., & Feldman, S. R. (1998). Interpersonal concerns and psychological difficulties of psoriasis patients: Effects of disease severity and fear of negative evaluation. *Health Psychology*, 17(6), 530–536. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.17.6.530>
- Lehna, C. (2013). Stigma perspective of siblings of children with a major childhood burn injury (n/a-n/a) *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners*, 25(10), <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-7599.12007>
- Leonard, T. I. (2021). *Lesbian students' experiences of challenges faced at a south african university*. South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Link, B. G., Cullen, F. T., Struening, E., Shrout, P. E., & Dohrenwend, B. P. (1989). A modified labeling theory approach to mental disorders: An empirical assessment. *American Sociological Review*, 54(3), 400. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095613>
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2013). Labeling and Stigma. In T. L. SCHEID, & T. N. BROWN (Eds.). *Handbook of the sociology of mental health* (pp. 525–541). (Second edi.,). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4276-5_25
- Luoma, J. B., Kohlenberg, B. S., Hayes, S. C., Bunting, K., & Rye, A. K. (2008). Reducing self-stigma in substance abuse through acceptance and commitment therapy: Model, manual development, and pilot outcomes. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 16(2), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16066350701850295>
- Macgregor, F. (1990). Facial disfigurement: Problems and management of social interaction and implications for mental health. *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery*, 14(1), 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01578358>
- Madera, J. M. (2016). Facial stigmas in dyadic selection interviews. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(4), 456–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348013503996>
- Magin, P., Adams, J., Heading, G., Pond, D., & Smith, W. (2008). Experiences of appearance-related teasing and bullying in skin diseases and their psychological sequelae: Results of a qualitative study. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 22(3), 430–436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2007.00547.x>
- Mak, W. W. S., Mo, P. K. H., Ma, G. Y. K., & Lam, M. Y. Y. (2017). Meta-analysis and systematic review of studies on the effectiveness of HIV stigma reduction programs. *Social Science and Medicine*, 188, 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.06.045>
- Masnari, O., Landolt, M. A., Roessler, J., Weingaertner, S. K., Neuhaus, K., Meuli, M., & Schiestl, C. (2012). Self- and parent-perceived stigmatisation in children and adolescents with congenital or acquired facial differences. *Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery*, 65(12), 1664–1670. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2012.06.004>
- Masnari, O., Schiestl, C., Rossler, J., Gutlein, S. K., Neuhaus, K., Weibel, L., Meuli, M., & Landolt, M. A. (2013). Stigmatization predicts psychological adjustment and quality of life in children and adolescents with a facial difference. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 38(2), 162–172. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jss106>
- Masnari, O., Schiestl, C., Weibel, L., Wurtke, F., & Landolt, M. A. (2013). How children with facial differences are perceived by non-affected children and adolescents: Perceiver effects on stereotypical attitudes. *Body Image*, 10(4), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.05.007>
- Masuda, A., Hill, M. L., Morgan, J., & Cohen, L. L. (2017). A psychological flexibility-based intervention for modulating the impact of stigma and prejudice: a descriptive review of empirical evidence. *Psychology, Society, & Education*, 4(2), 211. <https://doi.org/10.25115/psye.v4i2.492>
- Mazumber, R., & Thompson-Hodgetts, S. (2019). Stigmatization of children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders and their families: A scoping study. *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 6(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-018-00156-5>
- Meyerson, M. D. (2001). Resiliency and success in adults with Moebius Syndrome. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 38(3), 231–235. [https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569\(2001\)038<0231:RASIAW>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569(2001)038<0231:RASIAW>2.0.CO;2)
- Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2011). Sick body, vigilant mind: The biological immune system activates the behavioral immune system. *Psychological Science*, 22(12), 1467–1471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611420166>
- Mittal, D., Sullivan, G., Chekuri, L., Allee, E., & Corrigan, P. W. (2012). Empirical studies of self-stigma reduction strategies: A critical review of the literature. *Psychiatric Services*, 63(10), 974–981. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100459>
- Moore, K. E., Stuewig, J. B., & Tangney, J. P. (2016). The effect of stigma on criminal offenders' functioning: A longitudinal mediational model. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(2), 196–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2014.1004035>
- Mouradian, W. E. (2001). Deficits versus strengths: Ethics and implications for clinical practice and research. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 38(3), 255–259. [https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569\(2001\)038<0255:DVSEAI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569(2001)038<0255:DVSEAI>2.0.CO;2)
- Muftin, Z., & Thompson, A. R. (2013). A systematic review of self-help for disfigurement: Effectiveness, usability, and acceptability. *Body Image*, 10(4), 442–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.07.005>
- Myhre, A., Råbu, M., & Feragen, K. J. B. (2021). The need to belong: Subjective experiences of living with craniofacial conditions and undergoing appearance-altering surgery. *Body Image*, 38, 334–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.05.008>
- Nario-Redmond, M. R. (2020). *Ableism*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Nario-Redmond, M. R., Kemerling, A. A., & Silverman, A. (2019). Hostile, benevolent, and ambivalent ableism: Contemporary manifestations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 75(3), 726–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12337>
- Nelson, P. A., Glenny, A.-M., Kirk, S., & Caress, A.-L. (2012). Parents' experiences of caring for a child with a cleft lip and/or palate: a review of the literature. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 38(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.2011.01244.x>
- Nelson, P. A., Kirk, S. A., Caress, A.-L., & Glenny, A.-M. (2012). Parents' emotional and social experiences of caring for a child through cleft treatment. *Qualitative Health Research*, 22(3), 346–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732311421178>

- Neuberg, S. L., Smith, D. M., Hoffman, J. C., & Russell, F. J. (1994). When we observe stigmatized and “normal” individuals interacting: Stigma by association. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(2), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294202007>
- Nidey, N., Moreno Uribe, L. M., Marazita, M. M., & Wehby, G. L. (2016). Psychosocial well-being of parents of children with oral clefts. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 42(1), 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12276>
- Nieweglowski, K., & Sheehan, L. (2017). Relationship depth and associative stigma of disability. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37(3), <https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v37i3.5527>
- Nishikura, M. (2009). Difficulties with employment: Understanding the experiences of people with visible differences. *READ Discussion Paper*.
- Oaten, M., Stevenson, R. J., & Case, T. I. (2009). Disgust as a disease-avoidance mechanism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(2), 303–321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014823>
- Ochnik, D., & Mandal, E. (2016). Do Polish never-married singles feel stigmatized? *In Singlehood from Individual and Social Perspective*, 163–191.
- Paluck, E. L., Porat, R., Clark, C. S., & Green, D. P. (2021). Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 533–560. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-071620-030619>
- Pan, R., dos Santos, B. D., Nascimento, L. C., Rossi, L. A., Geenen, R., & Van Loey, N. E. (2018). School reintegration of pediatric burn survivors: An integrative literature review. *Burns*, 44(3), 494–511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2017.05.005>
- Parsons, C. E., Young, K. S., Mohseni, H., Woolrich, M. W., Thomsen, K. R., Joensson, M., Murray, L., Goodacre, T., Steen, A., & Kringsbach, M. L. (2013). Minor structural abnormalities in the infant face disrupt neural processing: A unique window into early caregiving responses. *Social Neuroscience*, 8(4), 268–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2013.795189>
- Partridge, J. (1998). Changing faces. *Journal of Burn Care & Rehabilitation*, 19(2), 174–180. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004630-199803000-00017>
- Partridge, J. (2012). Changing faces: The challenge of facial disfigurement. *Changing Faces*.
- Pausch, N. C., Winter, K., Halama, D., Wirtz, C., Yildirim, V., & Nattapong, S. (2016). Psychosocial acceptance of cleft patients: Has something changed? *Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 20(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10006-015-0518-1>
- Pearl, R. L., Wadden, T. A., Bach, C., Gruber, K., Leonard, S., Walsh, O. A., Tronieri, J. S., & Berkowitz, R. I. (2020). Effects of a cognitive-behavioral intervention targeting weight stigma: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 88(5), 470–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000480>
- Pelchat, D., Bisson, J., Ricard, N., Perreault, M., & Bouchard, J. M. (1999). Longitudinal effects of an early family intervention programme on the adaptation of parents of children with a disability. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 36(6), 465–477. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489\(99\)00047-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489(99)00047-4)
- Pescosolido, B. A., & Martin, J. K. (2015). The stigma complex. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 87–116. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145702>
- Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Stigma and prejudice: One animal or two. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(3), 358–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.022>
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(1), 114–128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.114>
- Porter, J. R., & Beuf, A. H. (1991). Racial variation in reaction to physical stigma: A study of degree of disturbance by vitiligo among black and white patients. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 32(2), 192. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137152>
- Porter, J. R., Beuf, A. H., Lerner, A., & Nordlund, J. (1986). Psychosocial effect of vitiligo: A comparison of vitiligo patients with “normal” control subjects, with psoriasis patients, and with patients with other pigmentary disorders. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 15(2), 220–224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-9622\(86\)70160-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-9622(86)70160-6)
- Pryor, J. B., & Reeder, G. D. (2011). HIV-related stigma. In J. C. Hall, B. J. Hall, & C. J. Cokerell (Eds.), *HIV/AIDS in the Post-HAART Era: Manifestations, treatment, and epidemiology* (pp. 790–806).
- Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., & Monroe, A. E. (2012). The infection of bad company: Stigma by association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026270>
- Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., Yeadon, C., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (2004). A dual-process model of reactions to perceived stigma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(4), 436–452. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.4.436>
- Puhl, R. M. (2022). Weight stigma, policy initiatives, and harnessing social media to elevate activism. *Body Image*, 40, 131–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.12.008>
- Rakic, V., Djikanovic, B., Alempijevic, D., Simic, R., Bogdanovic, S., Janjic, Z., & Dejan, V. (2018). Development of a scale for evaluating the severity of disfigurements caused by injuries disease or surgery. *Vojnosanitetski Pregled*, 75(4), 381–389. <https://doi.org/10.2298/VSP160619287R>
- Rankin, M., & Borah, G. L. (2003). Perceived functional impact of abnormal facial appearance. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, 111(7), 2140–2146. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PRS.0000060105.63335.0C>
- Rasset, P., Mange, J., & Montalan, B. (2022a). Look me in the eyes! A pre-registered eye-tracking study investigating visual attention and affective reactions to faces with a visible difference. *Body Image*, 40, 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.10.010>
- Rasset, P., Mange, J., & Montalan, B. (2022b). (Un)veiling distinct feelings: A typology of affective reactions while meeting people with facial disfigurement for the first time. *Stigma and Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000364>
- Reese, V. (1995). Dermatology in the cinema. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 33(6), 1030–1035. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-9622\(95\)90297-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-9622(95)90297-X)
- Reynolds, L. M., & Harris, L. (2021). Stigma in the face of cancer disfigurement: A systematic review and research agenda. *European Journal of Cancer Care*, 30(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.13327>
- Richardson, S. A. (1971). Handicap, appearance and stigma. *Social Science & Medicine* (1967), 5(6), 621–628. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0037-7856\(71\)90011-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0037-7856(71)90011-4)
- Rifkin, W. J., Kantar, R. S., Ali-Khan, S., Plana, N. M., Diaz-Siso, J. R., Tsakiris, M., & Rodriguez, E. D. (2018). Facial disfigurement and identity: A review of the literature and implications for facial transplantation. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 20(4), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2018.20.4.peer1-1804>
- Riklin, E., Andover, M. S., & Annunziato, R. A. (2019). The effects of society on the psychosocial functioning of those with a facial difference. *Health Psychology Report*, 7(2), 87–102. <https://doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2019.85657>
- Roberts, R. M., & Gierasch, A. (2013). The effect of visible facial differences on personal space during encounters with the general public. *Plastic Surgical Nursing*, 33(2), 81–82. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSN.0b013e31829adddc>
- Roberts, R. M., Neate, G. M., & Gierasch, A. (2017). Implicit attitudes towards people with visible difference: findings from an Implicit Association Test. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22(3), 352–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2016.1163399>
- Roberts, R. M., & Shute, R. (2011). Children’s experience of living with a craniofacial condition: Perspectives of children and parents. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 16(3), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359104509355021>
- Robinson, E., Ramsey, N., & Partridge, J. (1996). An evaluation of the impact of social interaction skills training for facially disfigured people. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, 49(5), 281–289. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1226\(96\)90156-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1226(96)90156-3)
- Rodgers, R. F., Slater, A., Gordon, C. S., McLean, S. A., Jarman, H. K., & Paxton, S. J. (2020). A biopsychosocial model of social media use and body image concerns, disordered eating, and muscle-building behaviors among adolescent girls and boys. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 49(2), 399–409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01190-0>
- Roozen, S., Stutterheim, S. E., Bos, A. E. R., Kok, G., & Curfs, L. M. G. (2022). Understanding the social stigma of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders: From theory to interventions. *Foundations of Science*, 27(2), 753–771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-020-09676-y>
- Rossi, L. A., Costa, M. C. S., Dantas, R. S., Ciofi-Silva, C. L., & Lopes, L. M. (2009). Cultural meaning of quality of life: Perspectives of Brazilian burn patients. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31(9), 712–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280802306257>
- Rossi, L. A., Vila, V. D. S. C., Zago, M. M. F., & Ferreira, E. (2005). The stigma of burns. *Burns*, 31(1), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2004.07.006>
- Rubino, F., Puhl, R. M., Cummings, D. E., Eckel, R. H., Ryan, D. H., Mechanick, J. I., Nadglowski, J., Ramos Salas, X., Schauer, P. R., Twenefour, D., Apovian, C. M., Aronne, L. J., Batterham, R. L., Berthoud, H.-R., Boza, C., Busetto, L., Dicker, D., De Groot, M., Eisenberg, D., & Dixon, J. B. (2020). Joint international consensus statement for ending stigma of obesity. *Nature Medicine*, 26(4), 485–497. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0803-x>
- Rumsey, N. J., Bull, R., & Gahagan, D. (1982). The effect of facial disfigurement on the proxemic behavior of the general public. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 12(2), 137–150.
- Rumsey, N. J., & Harcourt, D. (2004). Body image and disfigurement: Issues and interventions. *Body Image*, 1(1), 83–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1740-1445\(03\)00005-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1740-1445(03)00005-6)
- Rumsey, N. J., & Harcourt, D. (2005). The psychology of appearance.
- Rumsey, N. J., & Harcourt, D. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of the psychology of appearance*. Oxford: OUP.
- Ryan, S., Oaten, M., Stevenson, R. J., & Case, T. I. (2012). Facial disfigurement is treated like an infectious disease. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33(6), 639–646. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.04.001>
- Saunders, H. (2020). Difficult distinctions in anti-discrimination law: Disfigurement, appearance and disability. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 20(1), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1358229120927917>
- Schmid-Ott, G., Jaeger, B., Kuensebeck, H. W., Ott, R., & Lamprecht, F. (1996). Dimensions of stigmatization in patients with psoriasis in a ‘questionnaire on experience with skin complaints. *Dermatology*, 193(4), 304–310. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000246275>
- Shanmugarajah, K., Gaiind, S., Clarke, A., & Butler, P. E. M. (2012). The role of disgust emotions in the observer response to facial disfigurement. *Body Image*, 9(4), 455–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2012.05.003>
- Sharratt, N. D., Williamson, H., Zucchelli, F., & Kiff, J. (2020). Becoming known: Disclosure and exposure of (in)visible difference. *Stigma and Health*, 5(4), 413–424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah00000212>
- Shu, J. L., Alleva, J. M., & Stutterheim, S. E. (2022). Perspectives on mental health difficulties amongst second-generation Chinese individuals in Germany: Stigma, acculturation, and <sc> help seeking </sc>. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, March, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2620>
- Sigelman, C. K., Howell, J. L., Cornell, D. P., Cutright, J. D., & Dewey, J. C. (1991). Courtesy stigma: The social implications of associating with a gay person. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 131(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1991.9713823>
- Sigelman, C. K., Miller, T. E., & Whitworth, L. A. (1986). The early development of stigmatizing reactions to physical differences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 7(1), 17–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973\(86\)90016-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(86)90016-X)
- Sommerland, N., Wouters, E., Mitchell, E. M. H., Ngicho, M., Redwood, L., Masquillier, C., Van Hoorn, R., Van Den Hof, S., & Van Rie, A. (2017). Evidence-based interventions to reduce tuberculosis stigma: A systematic review. *International Journal*

- of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 21(October 2016), S81–S86. <https://doi.org/10.5588/jitld.16.0788>
- Stangl, A. L., Earnshaw, V. A., Logie, C. H., van Brakel, W., Simbayi, C., Barré, I. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2019). The health stigma and discrimination framework: A global, crosscutting framework to inform research, intervention development, and policy on health-related stigmas. *BMC Medicine*, 17(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1271-3>
- Stevenage, S. V., & McKay, Y. (1999). Model applicants: The effect of facial appearance on recruitment decisions. *British Journal of Psychology*, 90(2), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712699161369>
- Stock, N. M., Martindale, A., & Cunliffe, C. (2018). #CleftProud: A content analysis and online survey of 2 cleft lip and palate facebook groups. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 55(10), 1339–1349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1055665618764737>
- Stone, A. (2022). Negative perceptions of people with facial disfigurement depend on a general attitude rather than on specific concerns. *Stigma and Health*, 7(3), 270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000396>
- Stone, A., & Fisher, V. (2020). Changing negative perceptions of individuals with facial disfigurement: The effectiveness of a brief intervention. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 42(5), 341–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2020.1768394>
- Stone, A., & Pottot, A. (2014). Emotional responses to disfigured faces: The influences of perceived anonymity, empathy, and disgust sensitivity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 36(6), 520–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2014.958491>
- Stone, A., & Wright, T. (2012). Evaluations of people depicted with facial disfigurement compared to those with mobility impairment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 34(3), 212–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2012.674420>
- Stone, A., & Wright, T. (2013). When your face doesn't fit: Employment discrimination against people with facial disfigurements. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(3), 515–526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2013.01032.x>
- Stone, E. F., Stone, D. L., & Dipboye, R. L. (1992). Stigmas in organizations: Race, handicaps, and physical unattractiveness. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial Organizational Psychology* (pp. 385–457). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62608-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62608-4)
- Strauss, R. P. (2001). "Only skin deep": Health, resilience, and craniofacial care. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 38(3), 226–230. [https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569\(2001\)038<0226:OSDHRA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569(2001)038<0226:OSDHRA>2.0.CO;2)
- Strauss, R. P., Ramsey, B., Edwards, T., Topolski, T., Kapp-Simon, K., Thomas, C., Fenson, C., & Patrick, D. (2007). Stigma experiences in youth with facial differences: A multi-site study of adolescents and their mothers. *Orthodontics & Craniofacial Research*, 10(2), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-6343.2007.00383.x>
- Strobel, L., & Renner, G. (2016). Quality of life and adjustment in children and adolescents with Moebius syndrome: Evidence for specific impairments in social functioning. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 53–54, 178–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.02.005>
- Stump, T. K., LaPergola, C. C., Cross, N. A., & Else-Quest, N. M. (2016). The Measure of Disease-related stigma: Construction, validation, and application across three disease contexts. *Stigma and Health*, 1(2), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000012>
- Stutterheim, S. E., Kuijpers, K. J. R., Waldén, M. I., Finkenflügel, R. N. N., Brokx, P. A. R., & Bos, A. E. R. (2022). Trends in hiv stigma experienced by people living with hiv in the Netherlands: A comparison of cross-sectional surveys over time. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 34(1), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.2022.34.1.33>
- Stutterheim, S. E., & Ratcliffe, S. E. (2021). Understanding and addressing stigma through qualitative research: Four reasons why we need qualitative studies. *Stigma and Health*, 6(1), 8–19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000283>
- Stutterheim, S. E., van der Kooij, Y. L., Crutzen, R., Rüter, R. A. C., Bos, A. E. R., & Kok, G. (2022). Applying principles of systematic behavior change for stigma reduction: A guide to develop, implement, and evaluate stigma reduction interventions. *Submitted*.
- Swift, P., & Bogart, K. (2021). A hidden community: Facial disfigurement as a globally neglected human rights issue. *Journal of Oral Biology and Craniofacial Research*, 11(4), 652–657. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobocr.2021.09.011>
- Thompson, A. R., & Kent, G. (2001). Adjusting to disfigurement: Processes involved in dealing with being visibly different. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21(5), 663–682. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(00\)00056-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(00)00056-8)
- Thompson, A. R., Seward, I., & Baker, S. R. (2020). Cancer and changes in facial appearance: A meta-ethnography of qualitative studies. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 25(1), 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12398>
- Threader, J., & McCormack, L. (2016). Cancer-related trauma, stigma and growth: the 'lived' experience of head and neck cancer. *European Journal of Cancer Care*, 25(1), 157–169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.12320>
- Tiemens, K., Nicholas, D., & Forrest, C. R. (2013). Living with difference: Experiences of adolescent girls with cleft lip and palate. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 50(2), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1597/10-278>
- Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Perspective-taking as a strategy for improving intergroup relations: Evidence, mechanisms, and qualifications. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(7), 374–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12116>
- Topolski, T. D., Edwards, T. C., & Patrick, D. L. (2005). Quality of life: How do adolescents with facial differences compare with other adolescents? *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 42(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1597/03-097.3.1>
- Topp, J., Andreas, V., Weinberger, N. A., Schäfer, I., Sommer, R., Mrowietz, U., Luck-Sikorski, C., & Augustin, M. (2019). Strategies to reduce stigma related to visible chronic skin diseases: A systematic review. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*, 33(11), 2029–2038. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.15734>
- Turner, S. R., Thomas, P. W. N., Dowell, T., Rumsey, N., & Sandy, J. R. (1997). Psychological outcomes amongst cleft patients and their families. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, 50(1), 1–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1226\(97\)91275-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1226(97)91275-3)
- Van Der Kooij, Y. L., Kupková, A., Den Daas, C., Van Den Berk, G. E. L., Kleene, M. J. T., Jansen, H. S. E., Elsenburg, L. J. M., Schenk, L. G., Verboon, P., Brinkman, K., Bos, A. E. R., & Stutterheim, S. E. (2021). Role of self-stigma in pathways from hiv-related stigma to quality of life among people living with HIV. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 35(6), 231–238. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2020.0236>
- van der Sanden, R. L. M., Bos, A. E. R., Stutterheim, S. E., Pryor, J. B., & Kok, G. (2015). Stigma by association among family members of people with a mental illness: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 25(5), 400–417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2221>
- van der Sanden, R. L. M., Stutterheim, S. E., Pryor, J. B., Kok, G., & Bos, A. E. R. (2014). Coping with stigma by association and family burden among family members of people with mental illness. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease*, 202(10), 710–717. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0000000000000189>
- Visram, S. M., Gill, D., Shute, J. T., & Cunningham, S. J. (2019). Qualitative study to identify issues affecting quality of life in adults with craniofacial anomalies. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 57(1), 47–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2018.06.011>
- Wali, I. M., & Regmi, K. (2017). People living with facial disfigurement after having had noma disease: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 22(10), 1243–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105315624751>
- Williams, E. F., Hochman, M., Rodgers, B. J., Brockbank, D., Shannon, L., & Lam, S. M. (2003). A psychological profile of children with hemangiomas and their families. *Archives of Facial Plastic Surgery*, 5(3), 229–234. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archfaci.5.3.229>
- Workman, C. I., Humphries, S., Hartung, F., Aguirre, G. K., Kable, J. W., & Chatterjee, A. (2021). Morality is in the eye of the beholder: The neurocognitive basis of the "anomalous-is-bad" stereotype. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1494(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14575>
- Workman, C. I., Smith, K. M., Apicella, C. L., & Chatterjee, A. (2022). Evidence against the "anomalous-is-bad" stereotype in Hadza hunter gatherers. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 8693. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-12440-w>
- Wu, Y., Mulkens, S., & Alleva, J. (2022). Body image and acceptance of cosmetic surgery in China and the Netherlands: A qualitative study on cultural differences and similarities. *Body Image*, 30–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.10.007>
- Yaron, G., Meershoek, A., Widdershoven, G., & Slatman, J. (2018). Recognizing difference: In/visibility in the everyday life of individuals with facial limb absence. *Disability & Society*, 33(5), 743–762. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1454300>