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Abstract

The focus of this qualitative study was to produce knowledge on what women leader’s in Christian higher education do when encountering gender-based stereotypes and experiencing a moment of shame. What was found was that while my participants were describing their experiences of shame in the interview they also described enacting resilience. In other words, resilience was present in moments in shame. The primary question that informed my analysis was: What are the moments of articulating shame and gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience? This question focused my thinking on how the participants deferred their understanding of shame and what they did when they experienced a moment of shame. What was produced in the analysis was ten aspects of resilience and shame in leadership (see p. 223). The methods used for this study were in-depth interviews. The research questions were designed to generate deep conversations that examined moments of shame in leadership. They included what do women do when a moment of shame is evoked by gender-based stereotypes? What resources did women leaders use to navigate moments of shame in leadership? How did a shame instance disrupt their effectiveness as a leader and the institution? How did participants understand/articulate moving through shame and into resilience? What had they learned about leadership, gender-based stereotypes and shame resilience in Christian higher education? The methodology was to think with deconstruction, feminist poststructural and shame resilience theories as the transcripts were analyzed.
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Chapter One Introduction

Sociologist Thomas Scheff (2003) found that shame is both sociological and psychological (p. 241) and locates shame in social discourse. Brown (2006) found that messages in social discourse formed a framework for constructing expectations for oneself and therefore, perception of oneself. Brown and Scheff (2014) agree that from a Western perspective, shame in social discourse is ubiquitous (Brown, 2007). Eagly (1970, 2007) found that gender-based stereotypes can be a challenge and a barrier when women operate outside of the traditional economic based social roles. Even more so in contexts that have ideals for leadership and structures rooted in gender roles that support those ideals. Although what causes shame is unique to each person what is common across cultures is the effect of shame (Fessler, 2007). If shame is evident in bodily sensations, postures, lack of mental clarity and coherency of speech (Hill, 2015; Siegel, 1999), it follows that moments of shame would impact leadership effectiveness (Eagly & Karau, 2002). The focus of this study is on women leaders in Christian higher education and what they do in moments of shame and how they have made sense of the experience. This study is designed to look for the trace (Derrida, 1967/1974) of resilience in shame (Brown, 2006) rather than explore why or what caused a moment of shame. In other words, in moments of articulating shame during the interview, I will look for elements of resilience that might be explicitly absent yet present in the process of talking about moments of shame (Derrida, 1967/1974). And according to Brown (2006) acknowledging shame is the first step to developing resilience to it. The approach is intended to resource educators and researchers in understanding how
women leaders move through moments of shame and what they do to develop resilience to it.

Without attention to a particular emotion like shame, to describe it distinctions and connections to affective states, the experience of shame remains elusive (Scheff, 2000, 2003, 2014). Generally speaking, there has been a lack of awareness when experiencing shame, thereby hindering the development of language and a conceptual framework for it (Block Lewis, 1971; Lynd, 1958; Scheff, 2014). It is accepted that Helen Block Lewis’ research in the early 1970’s was the beginning of a slow start for the research community to pay attention to shame. Prior to Helen Block Lewis shame had been considered a “primitive” (Kaufman, 1989, p. 6) emotion and subsumed under the concept of guilt.

I begin this chapter by describing that the significance of my study is a work towards making shame and self-conscious emotions less elusive in the social discourse of Christian leadership. I follow this description by defining shame and guilt within the wider body of self-conscious emotion research. The conceptual framework that I developed to guide this study is then presented followed by the problem statement and rationale, research questions, personal positioning and bracketing, overview of research methods and the study.

The Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is that shame impacts the perception of leadership effectiveness and there has been an inattention to researching shame across disciplines, including leadership studies. Leadership effectiveness is defined as the perception of effectiveness by the social group (Eagly & Karau, 2002) or institution. Whereas guilt
was the focus of psychological research in the twentieth century, guided by the influence of Freud’s writings (Block Lewis, 1971; Lynd, 1958; Nathanson, 1987; Piers & Singer, 1971; Scheff, 2006, 2014), until the last four decades of the twenty-first century the study of shame was preceded by years of inattention. It was not that shame as an emotion and/or affect was not identified, but that it was conceptualized as part of something else. Writers offer various reasons for this lack of attention. Early researchers like S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957a) and Benedict (1946/1989) identified shame in connection with guilt, which set the trajectory for research focused on guilt versus on shame as distinct from guilt (Lynd, 1958, pp. 20-23; see also Block Lewis, 1971; Scheff, 2006). Shame and guilt along with disgust and anxiety were listed as two of four main motives for defense (Fenichel, 1945/1972, pp. 138-140), without in depth understanding of shame. It was not until the research of psychoanalyst Helen Block Lewis (1971) that psychotherapist’s had cognitive tools to identify and address experiences of shame in therapy (p. 17). Additional speculations for the lack of research on shame are attributed to the individual affective experience of the researcher when studying shame or therapist when addressing shame (Scheff, 2003). “By its nature, [shame] is a state with which it is easy to identify, and at the same time it is painful, so that both the patient and the therapist turn away from it” (Block Lewis, 1971, pp. 16-17).

The dynamics of shame contributes to the relative lack of attention to shame in research. Examining shame can evoke one to experience shame; there is “shame about shame” (Kaufman, 1989, p. 4; Nathanson, 1987; Sedgwick & Frank, 1995). For example, when one listens to a person describe a shame experience it can evoke an
experience of shame in the listener, spreading feelings of shame to others. This is especially noted in comedy; an experience of shame is depicted by a comedian, resulting in a ripple of laughter from the observers. Laughter is evidence of identifying with the shame experience and is one way of diffusing shame (Nathanson, 1987). In this way, shame can be considered “contagious” (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 15).

Not only is shame evocative and contagious, but shame is also considered elusive. In 1958 Lynd wrote that the very nature of shame made finding the words for a shame experience difficult (pp. 64-71). Lynd drew from Piers and Singer’s (1971) description of shame as involving an “unconscious, irrational threat” (p. 24) of abandonment; as when a child senses that a parent turns away from her in disgust (Lynd, 1958, pp. 59-63). Piers and Singer wrote that the threat of isolation and abandonment (as anxiety) are the penalties of shame. Lynd (1958) took a different approach. Instead of isolation being a penalty, isolation is in the very experience of shame in that there are no words to describe the experience. The following excerpt from Lynd (1958) illustrates her point:

A small child allowed to play with the loom of an older girl cut all the strings of the loom to remove her weaving and, when questioned, lied about having done this. There was certainly guilt over having destroyed the loom by cutting the strings and over having lied about it; but deeper than this, I believe, there was shame over the fact that she had cut the strings trustingly, in good faith, thinking that that was the way to move the pattern, not knowing that it would damage the loom. The discovery left her alone and bewildered. The lie covered her
inability to communicate the trust that had been shattered and the confused doubt that replaced it. (p. 67)

Guilt and shame are both identified in this example. Generally speaking, after answering the question, the child would be isolated in her conflicted emotions. On the one hand, the child experiences guilt for the action of cutting the strings and lying about it. On the other hand, the child experiences shame in the self-revelation of the mistake and judging herself for not knowing that cutting the strings would ruin the loom. In this event it could be said that shame is evoked when the child discovers what she originally thought was the right thing to do was actually the wrong thing to do. Shame was experienced after she was confronted with cutting the strings thereby ruining the loom. The child was “exposed” to making a mistake, and in response to being exposed, she lied about it. Instead of feeling trust of others and trust in herself because she did the right thing, the child was confused by her own response. In this scenario there was no awareness of shame at play in the incident. The lack familiarity with an understanding of shame (and language for it), made the experience of shame elusive or difficult to grasp. Without having a general understanding of shame in therapeutic relationships the effects of instances of shame limit the relationship and therefore the therapeutic effectiveness.

**The elusiveness of shame limits effectiveness.** Following the work of Helen Block Lewis (1971), Nathanson (1987) wrote how a lack of understanding of shame limited the effectiveness of therapeutic conversations and relationships. In the wake of S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957), therapists have been trained to interpret emotions like anger and fear as indicators of guilt rather than a manifestation of a
moment of shame (experience of shame). The affect (Sedgwick & Frank, 1995) shame can influence one’s behavior and speech in such a way that has been characterized as childish or neurotic. Shame, therefore, was considered a “primitive” emotion (Kaufman, 1989) and dismissed or missed altogether (Nathanson, 1992, p. 21).

Reasons for the more recent increased interest in understanding shame are speculative. Kaufman (1989) speculated that the draw to study shame in psychoanalysis and psychology in the recent decades was due to inadequate treatment of addictions, eating disorders, and abuse that are related to shame. Helen Block Lewis (1971) was prompted to do her research on shame and guilt in neurosis because she suspected that shame played a part in therapeutic relationships that ended prematurely. Brown’s (2006) initial interest in shame was from her work with women in treatment centers.

Whereas Brown’s initial interest was on women and shame, she expanded her sociological research to understand components of resilience to shame for women and men in a variety of contexts. Brown first published her research in 2004 in *Women and Shame* followed by publishing the results of her grounded theory study of women and shame in a peer reviewed journal in 2006. Four years later Brown’s 2010 Tedx talk which introduced vulnerability and courage as elements of resilience to shame went viral and is listed as one of the top 10 TED talks on TED.com with millions of views. The spread of Brown’s material is indicative of a general curiosity or willingness of popular Western culture to think about shame. The first step in developing resilience to shame is acknowledging it. Over the last seven years of teaching courses on shame and leadership, I have noted an increase of familiarity with shame in my students at the start of my class; most cite Brown’s writings and videos. If this anecdotal trend continues I
suspect that Brown’s psycho-socio-cultural concept for shame will lead to lessening the elusiveness of shame (Lynd, 1958; Scheff, 2003). If shame is noted as having influenced the effectiveness of therapeutic relationships and if shame resilience in women is noted to increase when women acknowledge shame, how does the acknowledging shame influence the effectiveness of leadership in higher education?

**Emotions and leadership effectiveness.** Emotional intelligence (EI) research has made a way for emotion and resilience to it to be addressed in leadership. EI, however, addresses competencies for managing emotions in leadership rather than addressing the influence of specific emotions. EI was introduced by researchers Salovey and Mayer in 1990 and popularized by Goleman in 1995 as a framework for regulating emotions in leadership. Another framework for EI (or EQ) was developed by Bar-On and Handley (1999). There has been much skepticism on EI research (Antonakis, 2004; Doe, Ndinguri, & Phipps, 2015) and one example showed that increasing ones EI increases the perception of leadership effectiveness, especially when linked with behavior that demonstrates transformational leadership skills such as vision casting and ethical behavior; however the perceptions of effectiveness varied for subordinates and superiors (Dabke, 2016, p. 37). In 2010 Joseph and Newman’s meta-analysis of the effect of self-reported/mixed EI on the job performance showed that there were contexts where emotional intelligence (emotion regulation) was a liability to job performance if the regulation process “drained” resources needed for the job (like decision-making) (pp. 56-57). With the connection of emotions to stereotypes for leadership, it seems plausible that the research is impacted by lingering resistance due to
limited understanding of emotion and identifying with emotion or stereotype threat (Inzlicht & Schmader, 2012; Schmader & Hall, 2014).

In this study, leadership effectiveness is related to perceptions of effectiveness based on Eagly and Karau’s (2002) research on role congruity. Effectiveness is not conceptualized separate from what the participants perceived as they made sense of their experiences.

**Shame and Christian leadership.** Noddings (1984) wrote that women form ethics based on relationships. My supposition is that Christian women look to faith communities to find relationships. By Christian I mean those that identify within a broad range of religious traditions such as Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Anglican/Episcopalian, and Evangelical. My experience is primarily in the Evangelical (Bebbington, 1989; Gallagher, 2003; Smith, 2000) tradition that has many subgroups such as Pentecostal, Baptist, Nondenominational, and Evangelical Quakers/Friends. Often the ethics in conservative faith communities are modeled after literal interpretations of scripture (Ammerman, 1987). If this is the case, then conservative faith communities depict relationship as patriarchal, which is subversive to women (Tronto, 1995). Once the “nutshell” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997) of scripture as patriarchal is cracked open in a “deconstructive event” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 20), women are open to reimagine understandings of relationships with God, woman, and man. According to Derrida (1967/1972) a deconstructive event is when a new understanding of a concept or truth emerges from one that was once closed or fixed. I propose that this deconstructive event can occur while in Christian graduate education and that part of the event involves experiencing the feelings of shame associated with
the messages of patriarchy in scripture and related social discourse of faith communities.

Another deconstructive event is experiencing shame associated with competing expectations in culture messages aimed towards females (Brown, 2006, 2007, 2009). Women in Brown’s study saw themselves as needing to measure up to expectations communicated as from television, music, mentors, friends, faith communities, advertising, magazines, colleagues, educators, books, partners, etc. (Brown, 2006, p. 46). These expectations communicate conflicting discourses of who, what, and how women “should” be. Brown frames these competing messages as a web. The web traps women into believing they are unworthy of relationships because they cannot measure up to the competing messages (pp. 45-46). If women leaders in Christian graduate education are trapped in a web of shame, then how do they move through shame towards resilience? How do moments of shame impact their leadership effectiveness? I hope that the results of this study provide useful insights into developing a deeper awareness of how women in leadership develop resilience to shame so that leadership educators can address the interconnection between social interaction, emotion regulation and gender-based stereotypes in discourse to beginning leaders thereby increasing resilience in women who are preparing for senior leadership.

Background and Definitions

Definitions: Self in self-conscious emotion. What is self in self-conscious emotion or in shame and guilt? The answer to this question depends on the researcher or theorist and their paradigmatic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 12) or theoretical approach emotion. In this study, self does not involve a transcendent essence (St.
Pierre, 2013, pp. 461-462) that was created and “out there” to be uncovered (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, pp. 68-70) and lived into; self is a perception that is constructed in the context of relationship (Hill, 2015).

Starting with primary caregivers, the perception of self begins first as part of caregivers (infancy) then as separate from caregivers (late infancy and early childhood) and progressively moves outward from caregivers to family, friends (adolescence), community, country, and all living things (late stages in adult development) (Lewis, 2007). This conceptualization of self is not static or fixed but continues to form and develop as one interacts with external objects and other people and learns from those interactions (Hill, 2015).

Shame and other self-conscious emotions highlight the influence of social interaction in forming an idea of self as both separate and connected to other objects and living things (Scheff, 2000, 2015). Social interaction is communication in language that includes verbal and/or physical postures. Perceptions are created as one makes sense of experience. Experience is what one agrees to attend to. What I see, taste, smell, touch and feel inform what I perceive, and I build my perceptions from how I’ve made sense of these encounters. Self-conscious emotions signal when we perceive (through communication) a threat to being connected or belonging. In this way they are a significant component to regulating behavior (Nathanson, 1992, p. 42).

The cognitive aspect in making sense of moments differentiates self-conscious from basic emotions (see below). Self-perceptions (Cooley, 1922; Goffman, 1959; Scheff, 2003) are ideas of what one perceives of oneself—both separate and connected to all living things—and are formed by taking in information from one’s body
(embodied knowing) and making sense of it by learning from the interaction of behavior, sensations and feelings, thoughts (Kaufman, 1989; Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963). Emotion regulation or resilience is about learning that the image created of myself can change when thoughts and behaviors change (Gross, 2014; Gross & Thompson, 2007, pp. 548-567). Again, interaction with all living things is an essential component in this view of self and self-perception.

**Definitions: Self-conscious emotion.** Shame is conceptualized as a self-conscious emotion. Self-conscious emotions have to do with how one perceives how others evaluate oneself such as “imagining oneself through the eyes of other people” (Leary, 2007, p. 45). They play a role in self-evaluation of one’s own value and worth and appraising the self to “adapt patterns of behavior arising from a person’s appraised relation to ongoing events” (Mascolo & Fischer, 1995, p. 65). They are more “tied to what we think other people might think of us than to what we think of ourselves” (Leary, 2007, p. 46).

Self-conscious emotions “evolved” to gage behavior in social interactions (Keltner & Buswell, 1997). Goffman (1959) identified this when he wrote “it seems there is no interaction in which participants do not take an appreciable chance of being slightly embarrassed or a slight chance of being deeply humiliated” (p. 243).

Shame is described as a negative self-conscious emotion along with guilt and embarrassment while positive self-conscious emotions include pride, honor, respect, gratitude, and humility (Li & Fisher, 2007, p. 224). Self-conscious emotions are not the same as basic emotions because they depend on cognition (Izard, Ackerman, & Schultz, 1999, p. 84) to measure up to self-representations and behavior to avoid social
transgressions (Tracy & Robins, 2007, p. 5). Basic emotions such as fear, anger and sadness are biologically based and span across cultures (Ekman, 1992; Izard, 1977). Basic emotions have to do with fight or flight survival responses and self-conscious emotions have to do with social aspects of survival responses (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Each of these emotions work in response to social interaction and when one becomes aware and acknowledges when they arise, they become useful in guiding behavior and self-understanding.

Siegel’s (1999) interpersonal neurobiological approach to emotion differs from the approach described above. Basic and self-conscious “emotions represent dynamic process created within the socially influenced, value-appraising process of the brain” (p. 123, emphasis in the original). Siegel breaks the emotional response process into three phases: initial orientation, appraisal and arousal, and categorical emotions. This process is not necessarily a conscious process, but involves information and energy flow in the system that includes the brain and the body. Orientation is the body’s initial response to a stimulus such as “Pay attention!” The brain evaluates or appraises the meaning of the stimuli and the body is aroused by channeling the energy towards a response (p. 124) for example by moving towards when something is determined good or moving away when something is determined bad. The way the emotion is externally expressed in body posture, tone of voice, facial expressions is called “affect”. When asking someone how they feel, they may be respond by saying “good”, “bad”, or “okay” (primary emotion) or “mad”, “sad”, or “angry” (categorical emotion). The purpose of affect expression is social communication which is a significant yet often overlooked component in leadership training, education and research.
The history of emotion research and the various approaches to it in specific disciplines provide a necessary backdrop to understanding current research on shame. I have included other disciplines in my literature review including philosophical and theological, anthropological, literary and historical, psychoanalytic, and neurobiological. Each discipline approaches shame research from varying epistemological frameworks, which influence the interpretation and application of the research. Whether or not emotions are “things” in and of themselves “out there” to be discovered measured and contained, makes a difference to how one interprets the information. Noted in the review of literature, disciplines build on research outside their particular field. Sigmund Freud’s (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) conceptualization of guilt and shame, for example, is found across the disciplines I examined. Since this study is focused on shame in social discourse it is important to consider that shame research has influenced the general population’s understanding of shame and similar to Brown’s research, it will likely have informed how my participants talked about shame.

**Definitions: Shame and guilt.** Because talking about shame and using the word shame can cause a shame response, instances of shame are often articulated by using cognates of shame (Retzinger, 1991). Rather than say, “I feel shamed” a person my say “I feel rage” or “I feel like I want to disappear”. Additionally, shame is experienced with other emotions such as humiliation, embarrassment, and guilt (Scheff, 2003, p. 255) furthering the identification with the emotion shame. To present a background for understanding shame from a psychosocial approach, I will review the definitions of shame, guilt, humiliation and embarrassment as they relate to this study.
The participants in Brown’s (2006) research defined shame in relation to guilt, humiliation, and embarrassment. They described guilt as a feeling of not measuring up to a standard or principle. Humiliation is not measuring up to someone else’s standard or principle. Embarrassment is being made aware of something that is socially awkward. Each of these feelings results from actions and can be resolved by changing an action. For example, once a person realizes she or he has food on her or his face and removes it, the embarrassment is resolved. With shame, according to Brown, this is not the case; feelings of shame are not resolved by changing a situation. The definition of shame is an “intensely painful feeling or experience of believing we are flawed and therefore unworthy of belonging” (2007, p. 5).

Shame has to do with experiencing exposure that one’s core belief or identity is exposed and open/vulnerable to evaluation evoking a reactive desire to shrink, get small, cover-up and/or hide. It’s more painful than guilt because the vulnerability involves a sense that one’s entire belief of self, which is internal and personal, is publicly exposed and open for attack/evaluation. The reaction to feeling shame, therefore, is to hide or cover up. Shame motivates reactions that attempt to separate the pain from negative evaluation such as denial, hiding, or escape from the event of shame (Block Lewis, H. 1971; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007, p. 26).

Shame disrupts the ability to express empathy or “form empathetic connections” (Tangney & Dearing, 2002, p. 83). Shame is associated with anger and aggression (Retzinger, 1991) such as denying and blaming others to “regain some sense of control and superiority in their life” (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007, p. 27). Shame is not as adaptive as guilt, and the relational costs are greater.
The difference between shame and guilt are that shame involves the whole self (Brown, 2006; Lynd, 1958, pp. 49-56) while guilt involves specific behavior. Tangney and Dearing (2002) reviewed anthropological studies that distinguished between shame and guilt based on situations that included public and private exposure. With shame, one is exposed publicly and with guilt one is exposed privately (pp. 15-16), but found the evidence lacking. What was more convincing was the substantial evidence supporting Helen Block Lewis' (1971) contention that the fundamental difference between shame and guilt centers on the role of the self. Shame involves fairly global and negative evaluations of the self (i.e. “Who I am”). Guilt involves a more articulated condemnation of a specific behavior (i.e. “What I did”) (Tangney & Dearing, 2002, p. 24). 

With guilt the negative evaluation is focused on behavior. In an instance of guilt, one connects with others in “other-oriented empathy” (Tangney & Dearing, 2002, p. 82). Guilt is not associated with aggression or hostility, but a response that is constructive towards reparation (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007, p. 27). Guilt is adaptive and can benefit individuals and relationship through reparative actions (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). The motivation for behavior that follows the instance of shame or guilt shows other differences. For example with shame one would be motivated to cover up with avoidant or hostile behavior and with guilt one would be motivated to make reparation with behavior that works towards making amends.

**Conceptual Framework**

Theories of why shame develops and how it is sensed and expressed physically are important for understanding what shame looks like and how to empathize with a
person when experiencing a moment of shame. Shame is an inter and an intra personal emotion (Hill, 2015) with physical expressions (Ekman, 2003) and sensations (Nathanson, 1987) that are rooted in early childhood attachment (Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994). Attaching to a primary caregiver communicates belonging to a social group and is part of human survival. Shame is part of the human nonverbal and verbal repertoire that communicates what to do and what not to do to belong. It was once thought that the human brain could not change, but recent research in neuroscience has shown that there is potential for change because of neuroplasticity (Siegel, 1999). Emotion regulation theories like SRT (Brown, 2006) provide a way for persons/leaders to develop alternate neural pathways that can lead to different behavioral responses when experiencing emotions like shame.

My interest in this research is to focus on how shame is expressed in language by women leaders in Christian higher education. I am interested in naming shame messages embedded in social discourse that perpetuate gender-based prejudice by identifying and dismantling the binaries of shame/vulnerability, shame/women, shame/motherhood, shame/singleness, shame/non-maleness, shame/Christian in Christian higher education leadership discourse. Binaries in this study signify as structure of power in language noting a dominant and a subjugated (Weedon, 1997). For example, shame dominates over vulnerability such that the threat of experiencing shame regulates experiencing exposure in vulnerability. The conceptual framework for this study is constructed with three primary theories that deal with messages communicated in social discourse. The first is Scheff’s (2003) theory of shame as a “master” emotion in social interaction and addresses why shame is difficult to name and
acknowledge and how it is used for social control. The second is Brown’s (2006) theory of shame resilience in women and addresses how women experience shame and what they do to regulate the emotion. The third theory is Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) social theory and addresses why women experience prejudice/barriers in leadership contexts that privilege male leadership styles. In Brown’s (2006) SRT, she identified stereotypes as a category for experiencing shame and Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) social role theory articulates how stereotypes are used to enforce gendered social roles in female leadership. Scheff’s (2003) theory addresses how shame is used enforce the social roles such as those prescribed in stereotypes. Together the three theories form a container for tracing how shame is expressed in language and understanding how women regulated their shame, or developed resilience to it, in what they did when they were in a moment of shame.

**On shame and social interaction.** Scheff (2003) contends that shame is a master emotion because it is in the mix of all social interaction. He views shame, guilt, embarrassment and humiliation as part of a family of emotions (Tomkins, 1963) that indicate relational connectedness or disconnectedness. He bases this on Goffman’s (1959) identification of the significance of embarrassment and humiliation in managing impressions to avoid embarrassment: that in all interactions there is a chance of experiencing the pain of embarrassment and “being deeply humiliated” (p. 243). Since these emotions are indicative of evaluating self on the basis of what is perceived others think of oneself, they fall within the same purpose of shame; to interpret acceptable behavior for the social group and adjust accordingly. Shame takes it a step further in that the interpreted perception is measured up to the ego ideal and if it falls short, the
focus is not on acceptable behavior but being accepted by the social group. The ego ideal is constructed from depictions of what was valued as acceptable and/or desirable and communicated by primary caregivers, family members, social and religious institutions, and culture, and is communicated in social interaction. “Shame is crucial in social interaction because it ties together the individual and social aspects of human activity” (Scheff, 1997, p. 12). The interchange of messages of what is perceived by self as acceptable or not acceptable by the social group in verbal and nonverbal messages support Scheff’s assertion that shame is ubiquitous in social interaction.

Scheff (2003) looks to Cooley (1922) and a looking-glass self to further his assertion that shame is ubiquitous and signals a threat to a social bond. Cooley theorized that emotions involve social aspects of living in the “minds of others without knowing it” (p. 208) and the aspect of self in imagining one’s appearance in the eyes of the other and judging the perception of one’s appearance, followed by a “self-feeling” of pride or shame. Pride in this context is positive from having earned favor and a sense of being relationally connected (indicating a secure bond). Shame, on the other hand is being dissatisfied with self thereby socially disconnected (indicating a threatened bond). Shame and pride therefore, are signals of the state of a relationship. During a time when shame was associated with neurosis (Breuer & Freud, S., 1895/1957) Cooley (1922) firmly placed shame in the both the psychological (the self) and social aspects of interaction and in the looking-glass self, showed a social source to the emotion and an internal result.

If shame is ubiquitous in social interaction and as threat to losing a social bond, why is it elusive and not talked about? Scheff (2003) draws from Elias (1939/1994) and
his exploration of Von Raumer’s (in Elias, 1939/1994; 1857) nineteenth century etiquette manuals. Elias points to the use of shame in the text, to teach mothers how to talk to their daughters when asking about sex. Shame is not used explicitly but is implied as noted in the statements Von Raumer suggests mothers say to their daughters, ”It would not be good for you to know such a thing, and you should take care not to listen to anything said about it” (in Elias, 1939/1994, pp. 151-152). This implicit or hidden shame is used to instill modesty, a desirable quality in girls at that time, by shaming them into silence when curious about sex. Shame in this example is invisible and unspoken and used to enforce social rules. “A truly well brought-up girl will from then on feel shame at hearing things of this kind spoken of” (1978, p. 180).

Irons and Mock (2015) give several examples of how shame is used in conservative Christian culture to enforce social rules about women and men. In their book If Eve Only Knew, they examined how popular Christian culture uses Biblical text to enforce social rules that perpetuate patriarchy: male dominance and female subservience. They examined metanarratives drawn from Biblical characters and used in Evangelical subculture to support the continuation of patriarchy and the binaries within such as man/woman, husband/wife and male/female. Yet these metanarratives represent a non-contextualized hermeneutic or not considering the context of the original text and interpretive issues therein. Relevant to this study is Irons and Mock’s deconstruction of messages communicated to girls and women and how they are used for building self-representations and ideals of God’s will for women. The Genesis story of Eve and Adam and the Proverbs 31 woman are examples of Biblical characters that are used to perpetuate a sense that women are inferior to men (p. 17). For example,
since men (male) were depicted as the first created being in the Genesis story and women as the second, because they were created from Adam’s rib, a hierarchical structure or creation order was established such that men lead and women follow (p. 16). Shame is used therefore, if women do not align to these ideals. Irons and Mock wrote “In evangelicalism, those women who chafe at these prescriptions are often marginalized and shamed, their inability to comfortably fit within God’s design [is] a sign they identify with Eve and her sin, and also with feminists, who evangelicals revile” (p. 17). They assert that the conservative evangelical subculture opposes the foundations of feminism which involves coming to terms with patriarchy as a socially constructed hierarchy (Weedon, 1997) at work in the Church and the private lives of women and men (Mollenkott, 2007; Scanzoni, & Hardesty, 1992; Schussler Fiorenza, 1986).

Shame is used as a social control for aligning to biblical characters and similar to the etiquette manual noted in Elias’s (1939/1994) study, shame is silent. Irons and Mock’s (2015) look to products for young girls that teach the virtues of the Proverbs 31 woman. Citing what was once a thriving movement called Live 31 and other marketing efforts that produced videos, biographies, dolls, and books to enforce the ideals of the Proverbs 31 character: a woman tirelessly serves her husband, her family and community by working day and night. Noted in their discussion about this scripture passage is a lack of a critical hermeneutic approach (Schussler Fiorenza, 1986) that takes into account the literary purpose (wisdom literature) and tradition for which this scripture was written (Irons & Mock, 2015, pp. 51-52). The virtues espoused in this
character are not the issue for my study, it is how this ideal is supported and then perpetuated by shame in social discourse.

By the time a daughter in an evangelical family reaches maturity, she has heard countless times that there is one woman especially in the Bible upon whom she should focus her attention. Forget those women who served as prophets and disciples, leaders, ministers of the gospel; their stories are admirable, but they are not as the Proverbs 31 woman/wife, upon whom some evangelicals seem to place all their [idealistic] expectations about women. (Irons & Mock, 2015, p. 49)

This shows the silencing that occurs for girls who are pointed towards one ideal image from which to model their lives and discourages girls to ask questions about other models that may align with what they know of themselves. Women leaders in Christian higher education are likely to be familiar with the scenarios mentioned above but unaware of shame because it is not talked about rather it is an invisible emotional force that expressed in body language (Siegel, 1999) and felt as a biological affect (Hill, 2015; Nathanson, 1987). The problem is that identifying the emotion and energy flow that presses women and men to conform is not clear. Brown’s SRT draws attention to this lack of clarity or elusiveness around the experience of shame in that acknowledging shame - naming the moment of shame - is the first step in developing resilience to it.

This is significant for Christian women leaders to understand because they are leading women and teaching students who have also been exposed to the use of shame as a means for social control.
On shame and resilience. The second theory that I used to construct the conceptual framework for my study is Brown’s SRT. Brown’s initial research on shame in women was a grounded theory study that describes why and how women experience shame and how the women resolve their concerns about implications and impact of shame. In my literature review I connect SRT and other theories that identify emotion regulation as a process for developing resilience. Important to my study is how the women in Brown’s study described their experience of shame and then what they did to regulate shame.

Brown’s (2006) participants described shame as a painful feeling rooted in believing that they did not belong. They believed they were flawed because they could not measure up to expectations laden in social discourse. As noted in the Elias’ (1939/1994) study, expectations are communicated in social discourse and shame, although silent, is used to enforce the expectations. If one does not measure up to the expectations, for example if a young girl in the late nineteenth century verbalized her questions about sex, she would be shamed by her mother or other social group members as a means to conform to the social expectation of not verbalizing questions about sex. But what happens when the girl reaches the age of marriage? There was no age limit on this social rule. The soon to be married woman will be expected to engage in sex without having opportunity to ask about it. Brown’s participants named this predicament a “double bind” where managing impressions of self (Cooley, 1922) would prohibit her to risk the secure relational bond to cross social etiquette and ask questions about sex or not ask questions and be unprepared for sexual intercourse risking the impression that she wants to create for her new husband. The result is that she feels as
if she is flawed and experiences a threat to losing the secure relational bond with the mother, the new husband, the family, and the community.

Brown (2006) categorized the expectations her participants described that evoked shame. The most common category for shame and women was appearance and body language and for men the category was money and work. Other categories are motherhood and fatherhood, family, parenting, mental and physical health and addiction, sex, aging, religion, speaking out, surviving trauma, and being stereotyped or labeled. Not meeting expectations, for example, for leadership could evoke a moment of shame. What do women do when they run up against a leadership stereotype and experience a moment of shame? SRT suggests that women who acknowledged that they were experiencing shame and then deconstructed the message of shame practiced what Brown calls critical awareness to messages of shame embedded in the social discourse of structures, relationships and cultures.

SRT provides a cognitive framework for making sense of moments of shame and a process for regulating emotions rather than being regulated by emotions. Emotion regulation theories (Hill, 2015; Siegel, 1999) break down each component of an emotion moment to understand reactions that defend against painful feelings and responses that project emotions on others. These are nonconscious reactions and responses that can influence one’s social interactions, relationships, understanding of self and effectiveness in leadership. Recognizing that emotions are an “ordinary” part of being human and like thoughts, they do not define a person. As emotions are experienced in an event of reaching or not reaching a goal they are attended to. The emotion, thoughts, feelings, and bodily sensations that interrupt and “force themselves
on our awareness” (Gross & Thompson, 2007, p. 5) that go along with the emotion moment can be accepted rather than rejected or resisted and integrated into understanding self and others.

In her book *Here I Am: Faith stories of Korean American clergywomen*, Kim (2015) wrote of her experiences of engaging with gender and ethnic stereotypes in America. She used the example of having to be hospitalized repetitively for a short season in her life and recalled how many times she was asked “Do you speak English?” (p. 51). As a woman and a person of color, Kim compared her experience with white European Americans for whom will likely never be asked if they speak English. The bias that Kim experienced was twofold: gender and ethnic bias. She wrote that she was not viewed as only a woman but an Asian American woman. “My identity becomes tied to my physical body in ways that are never applied to those in power or those making rules” (p. 52). The differences in her appearance provoked nonconscious assumptions from the dominant white culture who treat her as an outsider or a foreigner that is assigned blame as a scapegoat” (p. 55).

I look Asian, and therefore to many in my community I will constantly be viewed as a foreigner who lives in their midst. The question of whether I speak English leads me to wonder if, in the eyes of members of the dominant culture, I will ever truly belong. Will I be accepted for who I am? Or will I be forever seen, and treated, as an outsider? (p. 53)

Although Kim (2015) does not use the word shame (Scheff, 2006, 2014), based on the participants in Brown’s (2006) research, the emotion she is addressing is shame. She runs up against the stereotype for persons who look like her and experience feelings
of not belonging (shame) in response to it. Expectations for Asian American women are that they are “quiet, subservient and subordinate” (Kim, 2015, pp. 55-56). She experiences a double bind in what is expected of her: if she talks to her friends about the discrimination she experiences, she is at times “labeled as a troublemaker” (p. 56) and if she keeps quiet about the experiences it is assumed that she is not discriminated against. According to Brown’s (2006) research, this no-win situation evokes shame.

Kim (2015) asserts that the racial stereotype for Asian Americans is what she engages with in social discourse and that gender stereotypes are secondary. “I am never viewed or understood as simply a ‘woman,’ but I am viewed and defined as an ‘Asian American woman. As a result, I am continually viewed as inferior to white women and understood as the other” (p. 52).

In publishing her book on Korean women who are clergy Kim (2015) is speaking out about her experiences of ethnic and gender prejudice in the Christian church by acknowledging the emotion moment although not recognizing it as shame and its effect. It is clear that Kim is aware of prejudice and bias (the moment of emotion) but what is not clear is if or how she moved through the emotion of shame which would indicate emotion regulation and/or resilience. This gap of naming shame in research is also evident in Eagly’s (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Koenig & Eagly, 2014) studies on female leadership and social role theory. What if Christian leaders and scholars like Kim (2015) were to address the shame they experience as part of engagement with race and gender stereotypes? How would this benefit leadership in congregational and institutional settings? As research continues to make connections
between shame, resilience, and leadership in Christian contexts it will disrupt the structures and systems that enforce inequity resulting from upholding stereotypes for women of different ethnicities, gender and sexual orientations.

**On shame and social role theory: Gender-based stereotypes.** The last theory that I used to construct the conceptual framework for my study is Eagly’s (1970) social role theory. Social role theory presents a framework for understanding why women experience prejudice in contexts for leadership. Social role theory asserts that traditional roles for men and women were socially constructed and based on economic and social needs. She asserts that because of the role of women in childbearing and rearing, expectations were formed that supported these roles. Eagly’s theory presents economic roles as generalizations and does not represent particularities for social class, ethnicity, or marital status. Social role theory is helpful to understand how the general population categorizes expectations for roles that form the basis for gender-based stereotypes in leadership and provides a useful framework for understanding specific populations like those in Christian higher education.

Eagly and Karau (1991, 2002) explained that personality traits were formed that resembled the skills necessary to provide for material and physical needs. In agrarian communities, women and men supported the social structure by working in and near the family dwelling. Industrialization caused the center of social structure to shift away from a common working and dwelling place; men traveled to the city work and women stayed with the children. Women who stayed near the family and worked with childrearing and raising children developed communal personality traits. These roles required women to have social behavior necessary that was more relational, while
men’s roles required social behavior that was more task oriented. Although they are
generalizations, these gendered traits and behaviors form the basis of beliefs about
women and men and their roles in institutional settings and when upheld by social
groups they become stereotypes (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood & Diekman, 2000; Koenig
& Eagly, 2014).

Stereotypes are mental constructs that create attitudes to determine who is and
who is not suitable for particular roles (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). Conscious or
unconscious associations with a stereotype produce attitudes that, when enforced by a
social group, prejudice evaluations and discriminate against differences (Carli & Eagly,
2012). When expectations for roles integrate into institutional social discourse
stereotypes become prescriptions for what is effective and not effective leadership.

Carli and Eagly (2012) found that personality traits and social behaviors for
women spilled over into expectations for roles in organizational settings. The construct
of the “ideal employee” (p. 458; Acker, 1990) represents how institutions formed
expectations for leaders based on who was working in institutional leadership and the
responsibilities for home and family that they carried outside of work. When
expectations for work included after work socializing, men were able to work longer
hours to meet these demands because caring for the home and family was not shared,
but a role assigned to women as described above. Many changes have occurred with
the legalization and distribution of birth control which has given women more options
for participating in economic roles and men more options for participating in roles
related to family and home. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) showed that
although most women have opportunities to move out of the traditional economic social
roles and specifically, into mid-level organizational leadership roles, they do not meet the expectations for the ideal employee stereotype and are therefore disadvantaged for leadership. One reason is because women continue to be involved in meeting the relational and domestic needs of the household (Eagly, 1970, 1987, 2007) which does not allow for working after hours.

Acker’s (1990, 2012) theory of gendered organizations describes another perspective for how gender-based stereotypes prescribe expectations for male gendered leadership. The “universal worker” is a social construct embedded institutional discourse that resembles Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) traditional economic role for men but it supports a disembodied employee. It does not have characteristics that support female bodies or female social and behavioral traits therefore disadvantaging women when characteristics, traits, and behaviors do not align to what is prescribed as male. Acker’s (1988) theory shows how institutions operationalize and reproduce gendered processes (pp. 477-478). For example, the ideal of the family wage is that the man’s wages are distributed to the woman for her unpaid labor for the family. Although this is a twentieth century white Western ideal, it is the foundation of American family culture and law (p. 484).

Prejudice works to select and exclude leaders when leadership roles are congruent with gendered personality styles or gendered leadership styles (Carli & Eagly, 2012). When there is an incongruity between what gender and personality trait is prescribed for a leadership role then prejudice results. For example if leadership in an organization is described by what has been found to be male personality traits (agentic) or gender neutral, then men will likely be selected to fill the leadership positions (p.
This can be described as role congruency; gendered personality traits prescribe what is effective leadership (Carli & Eagly, 2011, 2012). Conversely, role incongruence is when prescribed gender and leadership roles are not aligned (Eagly & Karau, 2002). According to Brescoll, Dawson, and Uhlmann’s (2010) study, this is a precarious situation. If woman is in a leader position that has prescribed male personality traits or leadership styles and she makes a mistake, she will likely be discriminated against. This is called the “glass cliff effect” that results in the female leader being perceived as incompetent based on the one mistake.

Eagly and Karau (2002) showed that when stereotypes like the ideal employee or the universal worker are not examined, they are internalized as beliefs about what are acceptable (expectations) roles for leadership. Fraser (1998) wrote of the internal and external dynamics that she encountered while waking up to implications of gender in seminary and a doctoral program.

I thought I could become a theologian without undue reference to gender. I had experienced the unfairness and injustices of growing up female, but I didn’t see how that was directly connected to my identity as a theologian. I wanted to be a theologian the way men were theologians. I wanted to do what they were doing at least as well as they did, if not better. (p. 23)

Fraser described encountering gender-based stereotypes for evangelical theologians and for feminist theologians. As she reflected on the initial process she employed to regulate the conflicts she wrote of remaining silent to avoid being exposed for not knowing enough and forming her ideals for being theologian after white male role models. As a beginning theologian, she was not aware of the influence of gender and
how trying to fit into a male gender stereotype played a part in what she believed about herself. At various points in her story she referred to employing components of SRT to make sense of her experiences. For example, she mentioned the importance of talking about aspects of beliefs about herself that were in conflict with her public role as professor and seminary dean: “discovering in conversation with trusted friends how to begin breaking shame-filled silence about my life” (p. 10)

This relates to Brown’s (2006) SRT in that her participants described experiencing shame when they did not live up to a belief about oneself or to expectations in the categories for shame. If personality traits and styles for leadership are internalized as beliefs, then one either meets or does not meet the beliefs about what is expected for leadership. A moment of shame can be triggered when not living up to an expectation that is part of the leadership stereotype (Brown, 2006). Adding to this dynamic is the social group that enforces the stereotype (Eagly & Karau, 2002) and the potential for using shame to enforce the particular leadership trait (Scheff, 2014). The leader will likely be experiencing shame from within as an internal sense of not measuring up and from an external source for either changing her behavior or for judging her as incompetent. This is the point where each of the theories connect to form the conceptual container for this study.

To summarize, shame is involved in social interaction and is used to enforce social rules. Stereotypes are social rules that are social constructions embedded in institutional discourse and prescribe what is effective and competent leadership. Gender-based stereotypes in leadership exclude women because generally speaking, they are based on male based personality traits and leadership styles when the “ideal
employee” or “universal worker” stereotypes have not been dismantled. Shame is experienced when women do not meet expectations that are inherent in stereotypes; however, in a moment of shame the shame emotion is not named or acknowledged. Shame is an emotion that evokes pain from a sense of being flawed and therefore not belonging. The threat of losing a social bond and not belonging because of a sense that one is flawed is the pain associated with shame. By acknowledging shame and developing critical awareness of shame messages in social discourse one develops resilience to shame. The intermixture of shame in social interaction and discourse, pain of not belonging and the gender-based stereotypes in leadership create the conceptual framework for this study. This conceptual framework articulates the complexities of what happens when the gender binary male/female is disrupted in a moment of shame and the impact the disruption has on women and the Christian higher education institution.

**Problem Statement**

Because gender-based stereotypes (Eagly, 1970, 1987, 2007) evoke shame (Brown, 2006) and can be used for social control (Scheff, 2003, 2006) my study attempts to fill in the gap in leadership research by showing what female leaders in Christian higher education have done in moments of shame and how they made sense of their experience. Leadership literature, like other research disciplines, has been slow to recognize a need to develop a framework for self-conscious emotions like shame and what is looks like when women develop resilience to shame. Yet according to shame researchers it is part of leadership dynamics because it is ubiquitous in social
interaction. What makes it difficult is that shame is conceptualized as a hidden affect; it often goes unrecognized.

Since more women are moving through the leadership labyrinth (Eagly & Carli, 2007) and into senior leadership roles than ever before what lingers in stereotypes about women may pose a threat to conforming to the stereotype (Steele & Aronson, 2004). Adding to this complexity is that women are stereotyped as more emotional than men (Else-Quest, Higgins, Allison, & Morton, 2012 p. 950). When one notes that aligning with an undesired stereotype creates the perception of living up to the negative stereotype about one’s social group, she or he avoids meeting the expectations. For example, a female leader holds back her tears when she does not get a promotion so that she does not confirm the negative stereotype that women are more emotional than men. This is problematic for SRT (Brown, 2006) in that when women leaders are first learning about and acknowledging shame moments, the threat of confirming the stereotype that “women are more emotional” (Barrett, Bliss-Moreau, & Phelps, 2009; Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000, p. 81) may discourage any movement towards acknowledging shame. Additionally, the experience of shame may be perceived internally as a disqualifier because the expectations for leadership do not allow for expressions of emotion. Regulating emotions (Hill, 2015; Siegel, 1999) like in SRT is a process for developing resilience to shame that is ubiquitous in social discourse.

Moreover, leadership stereotypes assigned by particular social groups (Koenig & Eagly, 2014), may or may not discriminate against a display of emotions by leaders, or may distinguish between what emotions are acceptable or not. If a woman who is a beginning leader displays anger, and the social group has stereotyped leadership that
does not display anger, then the social group will judge the effectiveness of the leader negatively (Eagly, 1970, 1987, 2007). The effects of being judged negatively are discrimination and/or exclusion from leadership (Eagly & Karau, 1991, 2002). If a leader is not aware of the dynamics between stereotypes of emotions, leadership, and perceptions/judging effectiveness, how the leader internalizes the assessment of ineffectiveness by the social group may affect her or his capacity to lead (emotional capacity).

For instance, regarding shame and guilt, persons who are likely to have a shame response will apply the evaluation of effectiveness to her or his global evaluation of self (“I am a bad leader”) and a person that responds in guilt will interpret the evaluation on her or his behavior (“I led ineffectively”) (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). A person that has a shame response will judge herself or himself as disqualified from a combined effect of the interpretation of the discourse in the negative evaluation and the sensation of internalized shame (Hill, 2015). If the event is deconstructed and discourse analyzed (Brown, 2006) new understandings can be learned. Conversely, if a person has a guilt response to a negative evaluation from a display of a taboo (Kaufman, 1998) behavior like anger, the person will connect the evaluation to the behavior/anger, which can be modified and accounted for, unlike shame that when internalized results in a global judgment and possibly disqualifying self.

Understanding the effect of self-conscious emotions like guilt and shame, on the beginning leader may give leadership educators a framework for constructing curriculum that emphasizes awareness of emotions and resilience in leadership (Hannum, Muhly, Shockley-Zalabak, & White, 2015; Madsen, 2008; Sulpizio, 2014).
If leadership curriculum defines leaders based on prescribed traits, skills, or capacities that reinforce stereotypes related to gender and emotions, and does not give attention to shame in the implicit enforcement of these stereotypes, they are excluding leaders who may be disqualified by their social group and/or disqualifying themselves from leadership. The literature shows the importance of mentoring and sponsoring (Hannum, Muhly, Shockley-Zalabak, & White, 2015) beginning leaders, and if educators include this research in their curriculum, beginning leaders will have the chance to develop insights in emotion regulation and in turn, mentor other beginning leaders.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to produce knowledge of what women leaders in Christian higher education do when engaging with gender-based stereotypes that elicit a moment of shame and how in a deconstruction event they made sense of the experience.

**Research Questions**

Research questions for this study are: (1) What do women leaders do when a moment of shame is evoked by gender-based stereotypes? (2) What resources do female leaders use to navigate moments of shame in leadership? (3) How does a shame instance disrupt their effectiveness as a leader and the institution? (4) How do participants understand/articulate moving through shame and into resilience? (5) What have they learned about leadership, gender-based stereotypes and shame resilience in Christian higher education?

The research questions are based on the following assumptions: (1) Shame is contagious (Nathanson, 1987) therefore the participant and researcher may experience
shame during the interview and when recalling the interview. (2) Other words may be used when describing moments of shame instead of the word shame (code words, circumlocutions, self-conscious emotions in the “family” of shame) (Retzinger, 1991; Scheff, 2015). (3) Articulating a moment of shame is a movement towards developing resilience to shame (Brown, 2006).

**Theoretical Foundations**

The deconstruction and feminist poststructural perspectives focus attention to shame in discourse. Through language, gender is constituted and reconstituted. Through discourse messages of shame and gender are communicated, affect is triggered and understanding is made about the event. Discourse is the means of interaction and can be in text form, verbal and nonverbal forms. It is the means of communicating gender-based stereotypes that subjugate women in binaries. What women do in moments of shame and how they make sense of them will be a result of the discourse they engage with or are part of.

The deconstructive perspective allows for meanings that were thought to be fixed to become open for new understanding. Deconstruction “keeps the event of tradition going” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 37) in understanding shame in discourse, and it looks for tensions, contradictions, and heterogeneity in the text. It is not a tool, although researchers like Brown (2006) use the term deconstruction to describe a part of the process of developing resilience. Deconstruction is something that happens inside an event. It examines the words and spaces between the words used in a deconstructive event and looks for openings when new meanings are made. This stance is important to this research because it is open to the trace of historical approaches on shame research evident in language used to describe moments of shame. It does not fix itself in a
meaning but by examining for the process of understanding in the text, or for the
deconstructive event, meaning can shift and new knowledge about shame and resilience
can emerge from the event. This approach gives the space for various approaches of
shame and resilience and it aims at unfixing them.

Shame in the discourse of Christian higher education will be examined through
the lens of feminist poststructuralism. Shame can be viewed as fixed state, like a tattoo
or a birthmark. In approaching shame research from a deconstructive perspective there
is an alliance to newness that brings hope. For example deconstruction can bring hope
when new understandings of shame shift from being conceptualized as part of one’s
identity (beliefs about oneself) to a word that represents a physiological response
and/or sensation of that response, which can be expressed in body postures. These
approaches are useful but viewing shame as a message that is communicated or
embedded in social discourse and not part of an inherent, essential aspect of
personhood, can work to disrupt the hierarchies that are invested in essentialist (Crotty,
1998) interpretations of shame. It can dislodge the barriers that ideas of shame and
personhood bring to leadership and in particular to women and leadership in Christian
institutions. Although shame may evoke shame, there is a hope that the new
understandings that this study brings, provides a way forward for women to develop
resilience and move into senior leadership positions that can make an impact on
institution wide policy.

Another important aspect to this study is to make evident the binaries that evoke
shame in gender-based stereotypes (male/female) and the shame/woman binary.
Binaries are representations of how words are defined as opposed to the other; male is
defined over and against or compared to what is female and vice versa. Weedon (1997) proposes that binaries represent a power structure in language. In the male/female binary male is dominant and female is subjugated to male. Deconstruction unfixes the binaries and examines the limits of each word.

Weedon’s (1997) feminist poststructural approach also speaks into undoing the gender as fixed in biological differences such as described in Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) social role theory as a way to explain how gender roles are socially constructed. Instead Weedon’s (1997) approach views gender as “a social construction which encompasses desire, the unconscious and conscious emotional life” (p. 162) and socially constructed in discourse. Feminist criticism analyzes for how gender and race, gender and social class are constituted in the meanings of historical and current texts (p. 163). Although I am using Deconstruction and Feminist Poststructuralism in the plugging theory into data (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) methodology, they are also paradigms with belief systems that form a lens to form understandings and worldviews (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018, p. 12).

This study is designed to make apparent the process women go through to regulate the emotion shame when encountering a gender-based stereotype and disrupting the gender binary male/female and the impact of the disruption in women in Christian higher education leadership. Although the tradition of shame and emotion research works within other epistemological foundations and the conceptual framework primarily in a social constructivist framework, the lens I am using for this study is to examine for a deconstructive event in the interview that relates to untangling from the binaries and to look for the trace of resilience.
Personal Positioning and Bracketing

My research was rooted in my interest and experience with shame, resilience, and female leadership. My personal position was integrated into every aspect of this study. Often called reflexivity, this positioning is contested in qualitative research, which traditionally supports bracketing. Contrary to bracketing, my experiences, social class, gender, and politics (Creswell, 2007, p. 179) inform the lens from which I interpreted the data and wrote this study. In bracketing the researcher “sets aside, as far as humanly possible, all preconceived experiences to best understand the experiences of the participants” (Creswell, 2007, p. 235; Moustakas, 1994, pp. 58-62) which is a standard for phenomenological studies. Richardson (1994) argues that situating research and writing in a particular context and time works against supporting a “privileged status” (p. 518) as one with authority. Based on the postmodern and poststructuralist perspective, however, “texts are always partial, limited, and rooted within a particular viewpoint” (Esterberg, 2002, p. 21). Below I describe the position from which I approach this study.

My personal interest in this topic started when I took a graduate course on shame and grace. The content of the course touched on unexplored experiences and understandings that I made while being raised and working in fundamentalist evangelical denominations and ministries. Messages of shame jumped out at me as I became aware of my interest in leadership in congregational and higher education settings. As my awareness grew and I began to acknowledge shame, these messages became even more evident to me as others began noticing my leadership in institutional
contexts that trained women leaders but also reinforced and perpetuated gender-based stereotypes.

Soon after starting doctoral course work I began teaching courses on shame to graduate students. While teaching I remember feeling ashamed for not knowing the answers to the questions and being distracted by managing impressions of the students and what I perceived they were thinking of me. I had similar internal discourse in leadership situations as my role in higher education changed and my responsibilities increased. Having a cognitive understanding shame was not enough to continue to develop resilience when teaching and leading during a moment of shame. Part of Brown’s (2006) SRT is that empathy is the antidote to shame, or that one needs to dig deep into one’s own shame experiences to be able to be present to oneself and others in the midst of a shame moment. I learned that resilience actually started when I reflected on my life experiences, turned towards the shame moments, talked about them and reach out when the shame affect is triggered. Additionally, I learned that talking about shame as a leader is not welcome in groups that are not aware of shame or the effect that it can have on oneself and others. I found, however, that understanding shame and resilience was particularly useful in situations where I experimented with something new, when I made leadership mistakes and/or when I ran up against gender biases. Additionally, I noticed that institutions respond out of shame in situations that do not align with a desired perception/impression. Understanding shame and resilience to shame, therefore, is an important component in personal and organizational leadership education.

Overview of Research Methods
Like when explaining the difference between shame and guilt to my students and my students talk about how familiar they are with feelings of shame and guilt, deconstruction works with things that are familiar and after consideration of the literal meanings they are transformed into new understandings (St. Pierre, 1997, p. 180). It was in the deconstructive event during an interview, when a moment of shame was being described and its meaning was reflected on, that the transformation of what was once a painful moment had the potential to be transformed into something new (Derrida & Caputo, 1997). Mazzei (personal communication, January 10, 2018) described these moments as a rupture or resistance to naming shame that could be a marker of resilience. I conducted in-depth interviews of women in leadership in Christian higher education and collected institutional texts related to the context. I used thinking with theory and plugging in one text into another (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) as the methodology for this study. It involved thinking with Derrida’s (1967/1974) deconstruction theory while examining the interview data for elements of a deconstructive event. This data analysis process decentered the subject by putting the concept shame under erasure and showed how it was constituted in discourse. In the process of analysis I used questions from Derrida’s and Weedon’s (1997) analytical perspective and Brown’s SRT to plug into the analysis in the excess of the data and looked for the trace of gender bias, race, social class stereotypes, and shame as a threat to losing a social bond. I also looked for the trace of resilience as described in SRT. Since I worked in Christian higher education which is the context of my study I used a research journal for teasing out my biases and considering how my personal positioning affected the data collection and analysis.
Overview of the study

This chapter is followed by a review of literature and the presentation of the conceptual framework used for this study. I begin by reviewing the “tradition” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 79) of research on shame to provide a backdrop for the study and to provide a way to ease the reader into understanding shame. The conceptual framework for this study is shame and social interaction (Scheff, 2003), shame and resilience (Brown, 2006), and shame, social role theory and gender-based stereotypes in female leadership (Eagly, 1970, 1987, 2007). I close this chapter with two theorists, Derrida (1967/1974) and Weedon (1997), as the theoretical framework for the study.

Chapter Three describes the methodology and research methods used for this study, and why the qualitative approach is best suited for this study. Chapter Four includes the analysis of the interview data. Chapter Five presents a discussion of the analysis, conclusions and suggested research.
Chapter Two Literature Review

Sociologist Thomas Scheff (2003) found that shame is both sociological and psychological (p. 241) and locates shame in social discourse. Brown (2006) found that messages in social discourse formed a framework for constructing expectations for oneself and therefore, perception of oneself. Brown and Scheff agree that from a Western perspective, shame in social discourse is ubiquitous (Brown, 2007; Scheff, 2014). Eagly (1970, 1987, 2007; Koenig, & Eagly, 2014) found that gender-based stereotypes can be a challenge and a barrier when women operate outside of the traditional economic based social roles; even more so in contexts that have ideals for leadership and structures rooted in gender roles that support those ideals. The effect of shame is common across cultures, although the causes of it are particular to each individual (Fessler, 2007). Since the effect of shame is evident in bodily sensations and postures (Siegel, 1999; Hill, 2015) that can signal oneself or others of a shift in self-consciousness (Scheff, 1997) and ability to attune to others, it follows that shame can impact leadership effectiveness.

In my research I hope to produce knowledge of how women leaders in Christian higher education move through moments of shame and if/how they move into resilience to shame (Brown, 2006), so that leaders in all stages of their professional development can make sense of the impact of their emotional response to gendered stereotypes. I’ve organized this chapter to present the reader with the “tradition” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997) of the writings and research on shame, and then I move into the three theories that are the basis of the conceptual framework for this study: shame in social interaction; shame and resilience; and gender-based stereotypes in female leadership. I situated my theoretical
framework in a poststructural perspective, namely deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1974) and feminist poststructural perspective (Weedon, 1997). In order to understand how the theoretical frameworks influence my review of literature, I have included a condensed summary towards the end of this chapter.

**Approaches to Shame**

In the section below I present a brief review of literature in from various academic approaches (Pattison, 2000) that have historically been engaged with understanding shame and emotions. Shame is often understood when compared to other self-conscious emotions, but particularly guilt (Block Lewis, 1971; Lynd, 1958; Tangney & Dearing, 2002) therefore I include foundational theories and specific researchers that provide a historical and current perspective relevant for building the container of my conceptual framework. I looked for the “trace” (Derrida, 1967/1974) of early research on shame as it crosses disciplines such that S. Freud’s (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) perspective of guilt and shame are evident in psychoanalytic research, anthropological research, psychosocial research and neurobiological research. In each section I weave in leadership in Christian higher education in order to ground the research in the context of my study. Additionally, I narrow my selections down to those that relate to the elusiveness of shame (Scheff, 2003, 2014), two aspects of SRT (Brown, 2006): acknowledging shame and developing critical awareness of shame messages, and gender-based stereotypes (Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Koenig & Eagly, 2014). My intention is to ease the reader into the study of shame in order to grasp the breadth and therefore the “ordinariness” (Brown, 2007) of shame.
**Philosophical and Theological Approach.** For Christian women in higher education, elements of classical philosophy and theology are embedded in the social discourse related to leadership and women (Longman & Anderson, 2016). The influence of these ancient disciplines on Christian contexts contribute to the lack of understanding shame and the impact of shame on leadership. Therefore, it is important to consider the “trace” (Derrida, 1967/1974) of shame in the philosophical and theological approach so that the implicit and explicit use of shame can become more apparent in Christian leadership contexts.

Historically, the ancient philosophers approach to emotion was to situate emotion as separate from and a threat to reason. Solomon (2000) wrote that since Socrates, philosophers have wondered about emotions that have “lurked in the background---often as a threat to reason and a danger to philosophy and philosophers” (p 3). Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) describes the function of emotion (i.e. anger, fear, pity) as transforming one’s condition by affecting judgment (in *Rhetoric*) which was central to ethical analysis of the good life (McKeon, 2001). The Stoics viewed emotions as “misguided judgments about life and our place in the world” (Solomon, 2000, p. 5) that unlike the good life, generated misery. They did not address the biological component or affect. Emotions for these ancient philosophers, therefore, interfered with the pursuit of reason, which led to separating emotions from reason.

When working with specific emotions, some philosophers articulated that the emotion shame provided structure for human behavior. Immanuel Kant (1724/1804) viewed shame as the foundation of a moral system (Rawls, 1971, p. 256). Gabriele Taylor (1985) wrote that shame is beneficial for guiding behavior. Shame is a moral
emotion that judges how one is measuring up to ideals for living. It reveals values and morals and propels one to live up to them, therefore it is viewed a “positive, revelatory emotion” (Pattison, 2000, p. 56) that guard’s self-respect.

Sartre (1956) wrote of shame as a social emotion, one that has to do with image of self and the Other. “The Other is a thinking substance of the same essence as I am, a substance which will not disappear into primary and secondary qualities, and whose essential structure I find in myself” (p. 303). One experiences shame as perceiving self through the eyes of the Other, and that perception informs one’s ontological perception of self (aspect of being). Furthermore, shame is recognizing “that I am as the Other sees me.” (p.302). It involves comparison between what the self sees of self, and what the Other sees of self, and this comparison evokes an “immediate shudder which runs through me from head to foot without any discursive preparation” (p. 302). Shame is felt in the body first and without warning.

Theologian Bonhoeffer (1955) brought a relational component into his concept of shame. On the meaning of the scriptural account of shame in Genesis 3:7, he writes that shame ensued when Adam and Eve’s “eyes were opened” and they realized they were naked. Shame was not from being without clothes: it was that they realized they were separate from creator and therefore exposed to God. “Shame is man’s ineffaceable recollection of his estrangement from the origin; it is grief for the estrangement, and the powerless longing to return to unity with the origin” (p. 24). Additionally, he interpreted the act of covering of the genitals to serve as a reminder of estrangement from God, to conceal yet not withdraw from God; “shame seeks a covering as a means of overcoming the disunion” (p. 25).
Locke (2007) brought attention to why shame has been considered a “less valuable or morally significant emotion than guilt” (p. 148). Locke connected the embodied reactions to shame (like blushing or feelings in the gut) as a reason for the devaluing of shame. She points to Aristotle's association of shame with children and women and Freud's (1933/1964) description of shame that was, above all other emotions, a “feminine characteristic” (p. 132) as leading the way to Western philosophers “not tak[ing] shame seriously” (Locke, 2007, p. 148).

The implicit use of shame and explicit association with women and children describe a foundational conundrum for female leaders in Christian organizations. Though as women, female leaders are associated with shame they also may be using shame to promote particular behavior while feeling shame in their bodies as they experience desire for connection and leadership.

**Anthropological Approach.** The social-behavioral aspects of shame noted in the philosophical and theological approach are also evident in anthropological studies on shame. Although the two studies I present here were conducted over 70 years ago, the results have made their way into social discourse about cultures of shame and guilt. Significant in the results of these studies is that cultures differ on how shame is used but the effect of shame is similar.

Margaret Mead (1937) and Ruth Benedict (1946/1989) were pioneer anthropologists in the study of emotions and culture. Mead lived with tribal people groups such as the Arapesh of New Guinea, the Maus of the Admiralty Islands, and the Samoans of the Polynesian Islands and through her observations and relationships, conceptualized the difference between shame and guilt having to do with sanctions.
Sanctions were described as “mechanisms by which conformity is obtained, by which desired behavior is induced and undesired behavior prevented” (Mead, 1937, p. 493). In “shame cultures” external sanctions were applied to regulate social behavior, eliciting a sense of being watched by others, which created pressure to comply with social norms. In “guilt cultures” the pressure to comply came from internalized sanctions resulting from expectations from primary authority figures (Wallbott & Scherer, 1995, pp. 467-468).

Benedict (1946/1989), a cultural anthropologist, studied the rules and culture of the Japanese people living in America during World War II. Vogel (1989) wrote in the introduction to Benedict’s republished research that Benedict was curious about how she saw people from Japan “extremely sensitive to others’ opinions and less concerned with internalized, standardized rules about right and wrong” (p. xi) resembling collectivist versus individualist culture. Researchers after Benedict were more interested in her articulation of shame and guilt, and critiqued her interpretations as overly simplistic (Fessler, 2007, p. 186) leading to generalizing people from Japan in terms of extremes (Vogel, E., 1989, p. xi). Both Mead (1937) and Benedict’s (1946/1989) work were critiqued because of the implicit effect of ranking of one culture over another; guilt cultures were interpreted as “modern” and shame cultures as “primitive” (Wallbott & Scherer, 1995, p. 467).

Benedict’s (1946/1989) primary contribution was to understand that the function of shame in collectivist cultures was to bring appeasement or to be observed as fitting in and adhering to what pleased social hierarchy and avoiding events of shame (Fessler, 2007). This was interpreted in contrast with individualist cultures whose drive is for standing out as successful individual. For example, in Fessler’s research students would
not raise their hand in class because they did not want to be shamed by instructors if they were wrong, and did not want to be shamed by peers because of standing out from the group, if they are right (p. 188).

The benefits to shame in collectivist cultures (Fessler, 2007) is that shame motivates individuals to contribute to the group rather than pursue personal interests (p. 187). He found that the use of shame increases “civility, cooperation, and prosociality in the United States since these behaviors are linked with both attention to others and the desire to make a positive impression” (p. 188). At a “local level” shame motivates for acceptable social behavior. Fessler found that the use of clear recycling bags in Japan was so that others can see the accuracy of sorting items for recycling (p. 188). The cost of shame in collectivist cultures is that shame is viewed as an acceptable means for social control outside of judicial contexts. Fessler implies a negative effect if adopted in individualist cultures like the United States is that “[it] is more likely that people will view the application of shaming in non-judicial contexts as acceptable, and hence that the dunce cap and its ilk will return the U.S. culture” (p. 187).

In Western individualistic cultures, there is evidence of a use of shame in the criminal system as a means of provoking conformity to productive and civil standards (Fessler, 2007). These have been called scarlet-letter punishments named after Hawthorn’s (1850/2003) novel, and are designed to evoke a shaming instance as community members respond to the public exposure of the person announcing the crime they committed. For example, a judge in Florida sentenced persons convicted of stealing to stand outside the stores holding a sign announcing what they had done, and in January of 2017, US District Judge Thelton Henderson ordered Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
to pay for advertisements to admit that in they were found guilty of violating standards for natural pipeline safety in 2010, a violation which resulted in an explosion of natural gas that killed eight people and burned down thirty-eight homes in San Bruno, California.

In the anthropological approach the function of shame is for social control directed towards adhering to particular behavior. Norbert Elias (1939/1994) analyzed nineteenth century social etiquette instructional manuals and showed that shame was used as a means to control conversation about sex and that it was the act of shaming rather than use of the word shame that enforced proper etiquette. This connects to Mead’s (1937) findings that shame involved external sanctions and to Benedict’s (1946/1989) findings that the function of shame in collectivist cultures is to bring appeasement, which maintains a social bond (Scheff, 2000) and belonging (Brown, 2006). Fessler (2007), on the other hand, did not emphasize the use of shame to enforce social codes; rather, he emphasized the result of using shame to enforce behavior was to appease the social group and so the individual would not stand out, thereby avoid a shame instance (significant in collectivist cultures). The use of shame for imbuing what is and is not acceptable in cultures is an example of how shame functions, particularly in individualist cultures.

Christian women in higher education run up against cultural expectations for women in the Christian subculture (Longman, & Anderson, p. 2016). Similar to collectivist cultures, when expectations for Christian leaders compete with expectations for Christian women, shame is used to enforce behavioral alignment and resist shaming the group (Brown, 2007; Scheff, 2003, 2014). As I have talked about my research over the last four years, a question that continues to come up is why some women in the Christian subculture shame other women who are in leadership. How could exploring
this question contribute to understanding the lack of women in senior leadership positions? Although comparing the Christian subculture to collectivist cultures is not the point of my research, it is important to note that according to Fessler (2007), the effect of shame is similar across cultures and subcultures. If this is true, then training leaders to recognize and understand shame could disrupt social structures and systems that enforce shame and open a way for women in non-dominant and dominant cultures to develop resilience to shame. The effect of shame is central to psychoanalytic approach to shame.

**Psychoanalytic Approach.** The psychoanalytic approach shows how early research on shame lagged in developing momentum and show how the hidden qualities of shame (Block Lewis, 1971; Scheff, 2003, 2014) may have contributed to this lag. The intrinsic factors of shame (Block Lewis, 1971) make it difficult to identify shame and name it. This may also explain the lack of attention to shame and other self-conscious emotions (guilt, embarrassment, humiliation) in leadership education. If shame is difficult to name in a moment of shame (undifferentiated shame), and difficult to feel the sensations of the affect shame (bypassed shame) in clinical contexts, the same is likely true for leadership and education contexts. Additionally, as research on shame develops momentum, understanding shame in popular contexts is increasing. The information below gives a detailed look of the emergence of research on shame.

Sigmund Freud’s research laid the groundwork for emotion research in the twentieth century. Freud (1915/1957b) developed “drive theory” of emotions and posited that libido energy was the force for drive or emotion. “[E]motion itself occurred whenever libido energy was prevented from achieving its natural aim of sexual congress. What powered emotions was the same energy that drove every other mental function”
(Nathanson, 1992, p. 43). For S. Freud, the sexual drive was basic force of human activity. Anxiety was produced when drive was prevented from achieving a goal, and anxiety was determined to be the cause of sexual tension. Later, S. Freud added aggression to the energy of libido and related it to anger (pp. 44-45).

Sigmund Freud’s (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) research on shame is most evident in his early work with Breuer in Studies of Hysteria (Block Lewis, 1971; Lynd, 1958; Scheff, 2000), but S. Freud’s (1900/1990) research on drive theory in The Interpretation of Dreams moved guilt into the forefront (Nathanson, 1992). In this essay S. Freud describes shame as a hidden affect that is associated with repressing distressing ideations (Scheff, 2000). Shame is a reaction formation which is part of the super-ego that inhibits drive to be seen by others (exhibitionism) and to see others (scopophilia or voyeurism) (Pattison, 2000, p. 45). “Prohibitions against exhibitionism drive the ego to create a shame feeling that obliterates awareness of the forbidden wishes. Thus shame is a deputy of sexual morality (Miller, 1985, pp. 9-10).

Building on S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957), Piers and Singer (1971) theorized that shame is a product of unreached goals idealized as the ego-ideal and guilt results from internalized standards for behavior adopted from parental figures. The threat of shame is fear of abandonment and contempt (pp. 28-29) resulting from unrealized goals. Whereas shame is anxiety related to not living up to ideals (goals and standards) of parents “under the unconscious threat of abandonment,” guilt is crossing lines of what is deemed acceptable or unacceptable (rules and norms) by parents, “under the unconscious threat of mutilation” (p. 97). Shame involves tensions between the ego and
ego ideal; guilt involves tensions between the ego and superego (Wallbott & Scherer, 1995, p. 468)

Psychologist Helen Block Lewis (1971) studied shame and the relation to the symptoms of neurosis. She recorded therapeutic sessions with patients to understand why clients would leave therapy in anger, never to return. She used the Gottschalk-Gleser (1969) method for identifying and coding keywords with specific emotions. As a result, Helen Block Lewis theorized three intrinsic factors for explaining why shame is difficult to name and to feel. Her research was the first conceptualization of shame that has been widely accepted across disciplines (Scheff, 2003).

The first intrinsic difficulty of identifying shame is that moments of shame can be fused with guilt and reactions to shame can be confused with reactions to guilt (Block Lewis, 1971, pp. 35-36). When shame or guilt is evoked in the context of crossing a moral ideal, ideation is fused and labeled guilt. This makes it difficult to distinguish between guilt and shame. For example, one’s self talk in a state of guilt might resemble:

how could I have done that; what an injurious thing to have done; how I hurt so-and-so; what a moral lapse that act was; what will become of that or of him, now that I have neglected to do it, or injured him. How should I be punished or make amends? (p. 36)

On the other hand, in a state of shame one’s self talk might sound like: “how could I have done that; what an idiot I am—how humiliating; what a fool, what an uncontrolled person—how mortifying; how unlike so-and-so, who does not do such things; how awful and worthless I am. Shame!” (p. 36). Both the guilt and shame ideation involve self-
reproach and hostility towards self and the other. Helen Block Lewis calls this blending of guilt and shame “overt, undifferentiated” shame.

During moments of shame, focus turns inward (like tunnel vision; Brown, 2004, 2007, 2009) as the body responds and wordlessness ensues, making shame difficult to identify. Helen Block Lewis (1987) states that shame is experienced more in imagery (the mind’s eye) of looking at or being looked at and involving an internal “internal colloquy” (p. 19; 1971, p. 37) in which the whole self is condemned by the other. In this state, a rational solution is difficult to come by which is compounded by feelings of shame for feeling shame. Helen Block Lewis (1987) describes two types of shame with different reactions: moral and non-moral shame (pp. 17-18). Moral shame has to do with meeting up to the expectations of the ego-ideal and results in a narcissistic reaction that is centered on self-perception. Non-moral shame has to do with excitement that is thwarted or desire that is not reciprocated such as a sexual rebuff. Reactions to this shame involve a “implosion” (Laing, 1969, pp. 47-48) of self, evident in gestures of the body and attitudes: head is down, eyes are closed, and body curved inward to become small. Increased autonomic stimulation is also evidenced by sweating, heart pounding, and overwhelming senses. Accompanying this internal fury is a wordlessness that can be viewed as irrational. The participants in Helen Block Lewis’ study demonstrated these psychologically painful responses, but were not able to identify them as shame.

Furthermore, Helen Block Lewis’ (1971) research showed that it is how one responds to shame that elicits defense mechanisms to create a sense of protection from being perceived as acting irrationally. Helen Block Lewis drew from Anna Freud’s (1967) contrast of denial and repression: denial operates in response to an external threat;
repression operates in response to an internal threat. When shame is experienced as evaluation from “other” the response is to deny or hide from the shame. Sigmund Freud’s (1915/1957b) notion of repression is that it is a defense mechanism to ward off or escape from feeling the pain of shame. “Denial makes shame difficult for the person experiencing it to identify even though there is a strong affective reaction. The person often does not know what has hit him” (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 38) and repression is “forgetting what one has forgotten” (Goleman, 1985, p. 119). Both of these defense mechanisms keep awareness of moments of shame and guilt at bay.

“By-passing” feelings of shame is another defense mechanism Helen Block Lewis (1971) identified as occurring prior to denial or repression. In this defense mechanism, one recognizes that shame is being experienced but does not actually feel the bodily sensations of shame. This involves an internal posturing that separates emotion from perception of self. “The content of the ideation in question concerns shame events, but without shame affect. Shame affect is by-passed and replaced by watching the self from a variety of viewpoints” (p. 38).

The second intrinsic difficulty in identifying shame is the function of self when experiencing shame. In shame the self is divided in acute self-consciousness by condemnation from the other and condemnation from self. The self is split in a cognitive response and physical arousal or affective experience which can “linger behind cognitive” experience (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 40). After a shame instance one can look back and experience affect about the event, but in the moment, the self is fully engaged.

The third intrinsic difficulty in identifying shame is involvement of hostile feelings towards self and the other making it difficult to think through (Block Lewis,
Shame involves comparing self with an ego-ideal; failure to live up to this internalized admired imago stirs hostility (Pattison, 2000, p. 46). Furthermore, vulnerability to shame increases in significant relationships:

For shame to occur there must be an emotional relationship between the person and the ‘other’ such that the person cares what the other thinks or feels about the self. In this affective tie the self does not feel autonomous or independent, but dependent and vulnerable to rejection. Shame is a vicarious experience of the significant other’s scorn. (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 42)

Feeling small, helpless, or childish in how one responds to shame evokes hostility towards the other and self. Helen Block Lewis (1971) describes this in instances of unrequited love where the other is the source of hostility in the shame of being unloved (p. 41) and results in two types of hostility: humiliated-fury and shame-rage. Humiliated-fury is turning the tables to humiliate the other and vicariously experience their shame even though the other is admired (Block Lewis, p. 87; Scheff, 1987, pp. 111-112). Shame-rage is fury towards self because of being passive towards the other who is valued (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 42; Retzinger, 1987, pp. 156-158).

To summarize Helen Block Lewis’ (1971, 1987) research, the fusing of guilt and shame in overt, undifferentiated shame, the falling inward to a wordless state with irrational reactions and the activation of defense mechanisms all work to hide or distance from feeling shame (by-passed shame). The self is fully engaged in physical arousal, including a global hostility towards self and others, this makes awareness or acknowledging shame and guilt difficult. It is acknowledging vulnerability and shame;
however, that is the first step in Brown’s (2006) SRT. Without recognizing shame, it is impossible to develop resilience to it.

Although S. Freud’s (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) first writings addressed shame, the concept was subsumed by his focus on guilt in his subsequent work and set the trajectory for the majority psychoanalytic research in the early to mid-twentieth century. Few researchers built on S. Freud’s concept of shame until later in the twentieth century. Piers and Singer (1971) and Helen Block Lewis (1971) drew from S. Freud’s concept of ego, ego-ideal, and superego to describe the difference between guilt and shame, and for Helen Block Lewis, the reasons why it is difficult to identify guilt and shame. Scheff (2003) attributes the lack of attention to shame in research to hidden qualities of shame similar to Helen Block Lewis’ (1971) findings. Scheff (2007) wrote that “Although several psychoanalysts made crucially important contributions to shame knowledge, these contributions helped make them marginal to psychoanalysis. Shame also goes unnamed and/or undefined even in these marginal analysts.” (p. 258). If Helen Block Lewis’ (1971) findings apply to early psychoanalytic researchers, then shame would have been difficult to identify not only in therapeutic contexts but in research contexts. For example, Scheff (2007) notes that Adler (1917) developed inferiority complex theory and Horney (1950/1991) developed the pride system in personality development each implying what is now named shame, yet neither constructed a conceptual framework for shame. Conversely, Erikson (1950/1993) named shame as part human development and saw it as “rage turned against the self” (p. 244), but there were few scholarly responses to his work on shame (Scheff, 2007).
Since Helen Block Lewis’ (1971) research, the influence of Brown’s (2006) writings on shame on popular audiences have increased the likelihood of spreading a general understanding of shame, but the elusiveness of shame continues to be an issue for leaders today. In Christian contexts, the emphasis on guilt provides a gateway to understanding shame, but the hidden aspects of shame keep it uncovered and misunderstood. Although Helen Block Lewis’ research articulates the felt sense of shame, the neurobiological approach takes her research further and considers the embodied or physiological aspects of shame.

**Neurobiological Approach.** Whereas S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957), Piers and Singer (1971), and Helen Block Lewis (1971) described shame from a sense of self in relation to self and others, the neurobiological approach considers shame from evolutionary and human physiological perspective. Neurobiological researchers give evidence for how emotions in general and shame in particular are visible in bodily responses and something that humanity shares. Additionally, researchers have theorized what is involved in a moment of emotion or shame. By breaking down what comprises shame instances helps to disrupt the notion that emotions are irrational and shame is womanish, or childish. Lastly, interpersonal neurobiologists show how the brain can change to respond to emotions differently and growing resilience.

To begin to understand the neurobiological approach to emotions, I start with Darwin (1872/1965). In his book *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals* he showed that expressions of emotions in humans and animal are similar. Darwin’s research involved describing emotions of blushing, fear, crying and laughter and matching these descriptions with photographs of expressions. The 36 participants of his
study were missionaries located in different parts of the world. Based on their responses, Darwin asserted that facial expressions of emotions are universal and consistent through life. When describing “the Nature of the Mental States which induce blushing” (p. 325) Darwin listed shame, shyness, and modesty as what induces blushing and linked blushing to embarrassment. Embarrassment results from ideas about being the focus of attention of other (Keltner, 1995; Lewis, 2007, p. 135). “It is not the simple act of reflecting on our own appearance, but the thinking what others think of us, which excites a blush” (Darwin, 1872/1965, p. 325). Furthermore, Darwin noted that persons in a shame state “lose their presence of mind, and utter singularly inappropriate remarks. They are often much distressed, stammer, and make awkward movements or strange grimaces” (p. 332), similar to what Helen Block Lewis (1971) found in her psychoanalytic research.

Noticing the physical and verbal response to shame are clues for identifying moments of shame in self and others. Can one predict when emotions will arise? Does the physiological response come before the emotion? The James-Lange Hypothesis is based on combining the theories of William James and Carl Lange (Nathanson, 1992, p. 42). The theory, developed in the late nineteenth century, asserts that the circulatory system ("humoral substances") is the source of emotions and that a stimulus evokes a behavioral and physiological response from the autonomic nervous system which precedes emotion rather than emotion causing a behavioral and physical response (Tracy & Robins, 2007). In other words, events (stimuli) evoke a bodily response, and these responses produce an emotion. For example, watching my granddaughters smile at each other (event) makes me smile (behavioral) and I feel sensations (physiological response) of happiness (emotion). I have found that students in my courses often reverse this
process and think that emotions cause feelings, behavior and events, which contributes to repressing or denying emotion.

In 1960’s Sylvan Tomkins (1963) composed a tome that detailed a structure of emotions as part of the affect system. Similar to the James Lange Hypothesis, rather than pointing to emotions as a cause for behavior, he wrote that emotions are events in themselves. For example, memory holds a biographic event and an accompanying emotion. To understand the cause, one must separate the biographical from the biological and “determine the influence of memory on the perception of the emotion of the moment” (Nathanson, 1992, p. 48). Based on Tomkins (1963), Basch (1976) defined the affect system as comprised of three portions of emotion: affect, feeling, and emotion.

The affect portion of emotion is the biological portion (Nathanson, 1992). Affects are triggered by a stimulus that evokes a response from a pattern of biological events. The biological events involve the reptilian brain which houses vital functions such as breathing, heart rate, body temperature and balance. This reaction becomes a script or story that lasts but a few seconds. The feeling portion of emotion is the psychological portion. Feeling is when an organism is aware of or conscious of experiencing or having experienced an affect. Cultural acceptance of expressing feelings differs and may impact awareness of feelings. For example, women raised in a culture that expects anger to be repressed will likely not be aware of their anger. These feelings may last only long enough to have a flash of recognition. The last portion is the biography of emotion. Emotions are made of instances in life that are combined and categorized. Affect intertwines with memory and if a person has intact memory storage
system, she or he will be able to call upon the storehouse to retrieve memories of previous experiences of affect (pp. 50-51)

Tomkins (1963) theory of shame is that it is a biological response (affect) that impedes interest in something that may not be safe to continue to pursue. For example, when it is discovered that I am staring at a person across the room by the person I am staring at, my interest in the person is exposed and immediately my eyes are averted. The interest that evoked the staring is not gone, it has been reduced, impeded, constrained for a little while. Nathanson (1992) describes the shame affect occurring when exploration is compelled by desire “but at the cost of experiencing shame” (p. 140).

Emotion research has evolved since Darwin (1872/1965), S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) and Tomkins (1963). Russell and Lemay (2000) developed a framework for understanding how research on emotion was conceptualized and integrated into everyday living (p. 491). They described how one aspect of research sits within cognitive science and develops concepts for understanding emotion within the general population (like Brown, 2006). Another aspect sits within philosophy of science and focuses on the function of concepts for emotion in human development (Russell & Lemay, 2000, p. 491) which is a functionalist approach to emotion research (Gross & Thompson, 2007, pp. 3-24). They suggest that the tasks of conceptualizing emotion are descriptive and prescriptive. The first is to understand how emotions are described by the general population, how they develop from childhood and across languages and cultures. The other is to utilize validated conceptual frameworks for emotion events, such as an event of shame, guilt or embarrassment and assign an emotion to an event. They suggest that these two tasks are interrelated yet distinct and that together they represent a
developmental continuum of how a child pulls from cultural cues and scripts to understand and articulate an emotion event. Cultural scripts are categories of emotions that identify a cause followed by a sequence of sub events (Russell & Lemay, 2000, p. 496). This understanding is then integrated into the common understanding of ordinary thinking of emotion and into scientific models from which conceptual frameworks are constructed for understanding emotions (p. 492).

One such cognitive theory of emotion is appraisal theory (Frijda, 1986). In this theory, emotions are comprised of three temporal components: an antecedent or cause, a response or reaction, and realigning or coping. The interpretation of the cause of the emotion is dependent on what is initially appraised or perceived as the cause, which is influenced by cultural context (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994). “The mere fact that our emotions [in general] are a result of how we perceive events in our environments points to the indispensable role sociocultural context pays in our emotional experience” (Li & Fischer, p. 226). Similar to Tomkins (1963), appraisal theory looks to emotions as a signal rather than the cause of the affect.

The neurobiological approach to emotions also includes neuroscience research on mindfulness. Siegel (1999) and Davidson (Davidson & Begley, 2012) are producing evidenced based research that shows that the neuro pathways of the brain can change. The brain (biological structure) was once thought as fixed, is now known to have plasticity or can change. By examining the brain patterns of Buddhist monks who have rigorous meditation practices uncommon to Western Christian traditions, researchers have shown that consistent mindfulness meditations work to increase emotion regulation (Gross & Thompson, 2007, pp. 548-567). Siegel’s (1999) theory of the developing mind
proposes that by practicing the awareness wheel meditation parts of the brain that are either dominant or non-dominant integrate to utilize more of the brain. Davidson’s (Davidson & Begley, 2012) emotion styles theory also utilizes meditation for developing non-dominant aspects of the brain that work to influence emotion styles that, along with Siegel (1999), results in developing emotional resilience.

Conceptualizing shame as a biological affect with external signs that can be identified is helpful to navigating complex leadership situations that elicit emotion. If emotions like shame are a sign rather than a cause of physiological pain, and if shame is a shared part of humanity, it is important for leadership to consider how to respond to self and others when in moments of shame. Being able to acknowledge a moment of shame is developing awareness of it and according to Brown; awareness of shame is part of the process of increasing resilience to shame (Brown, 2006).

**Types of emotions.** The neurobiological approach gives a general framework for understanding emotions and according to Tomkins (1963), delineates shame as an affect (biological) that can be noticed, named, and made sense of. To further develop a general framework for understanding shame, I present theories that describe the different types of emotion, the function of emotions and two theories for the development of emotions.

In neurobiological research, emotions are categorized as either basic emotions or self-conscious emotions. The self in self-conscious emotions is a “mental apparatus that allows an organism to think consciously about itself” (Leary, 2007, p. 39) similar to self-concept and self-representation. Basic emotions are anger, fear, sadness, disgust, happiness and surprise (Tracy & Robins, 2007, p. 4) and self-conscious emotions are shame, embarrassment, guilt, hubris and pride (Lewis, 2000). From an evolutionary
approach, particular emotions are “basic” because “their biological basis, evolved origins, universality, and location (in most cases) [are] at the basic level in hierarchical classifications of emotion terms” (Tracy & Robins, 2007, p. 4). Basic emotions are evident in facial expressions across species and cultures (Izard, 1977).

As part of the system of affect, self-conscious emotions serve as regulators and motivators of thoughts, actions, and feelings. They regulate what is necessary to achieve particular social outcomes by attuning to dynamics in social norms. One thing that distinguishes self-conscious emotions from basic emotions is that they are “cognition-dependent” (Tracy & Robins, 2007, p. 5) emotions. Cognition is involved by evaluating how a potential behavior may or may not meet a representation they have of self so to avoid social incongruences/transgressions (p. 3).

Tracy & Robins (2007) differentiate self-conscious emotions from basic emotions in these five features. First, self-conscious emotions involve self-evaluative processes that include a “sense of self” (pp. 5-7), self-awareness and having complex representations of self. A person’s self, therefore, is conscious of herself or himself, located in particular and global social contexts. Early self-representations or identities are formed during early childhood. Second, the emergence of self-conscious emotions occurs later in childhood than basic emotions. Basic emotions are evident by nine months with the majority of self-conscious emotions emerging in the third year (Lagattuta & Thompson, 2007, pp. 92-96). Embarrassment is evident, however, just before and after the second year (Lewis, 2007). Third, self-conscious emotions have a social aspect of survival goals while basic emotions have to do with general fight and flight survival and reproductive goals. This was accounted for in complex social
hierarchies that require attaining social status for reproduction, navigating complex social situations, and avoiding exclusion or social rejection. Fourth, self-conscious emotions have a physical aspect but there are differences between what researchers describes as innate and universal and what is not. According to Ekman (2003), self-conscious emotions do not have innate, universal facial expressions although Izard (1977) and Keltner (1995) showed that shame, pride and embarrassment are expressed in body posture, head movement, and some facial expressions. Fifth, involved in self-conscious emotions are self-evaluation processes that elicit self-conscious emotions. These self-evaluation processes are more cognitively complex than basic emotions. They involve having stable representations of self that are evaluated upon in self-reflection (Tracy, & Robins, 2007, pp. 3-20).

Michael Lewis (2011) described the development of self-conscious emotions different from Tracy and Robbins (2007). He wrote that the first group of self-conscious emotions emerge when a toddler is aware of “me” in the presence of others moving into embarrassment when given attention. Empathy and jealousy emerge as the toddler differentiates self from others in identifying with the emotional response of the other, or identifies desire for what the other has.

A second group of self-conscious emotions emerges in the third year, when the standards, rules and goals (SRGs) of the child’s familial and social-cultural context are internalized. Michael Lewis (2011) calls these self-conscious evaluative emotions and this is where he locates shame but connects it with embarrassment. The first is shame-related embarrassment occurs when a child is in the company of the group that holds to the SRGs, becomes the object of attention while crossing the group’s SRGs. This is a
“less intense form of shame” than melding of self and object or fusing (p. 2). The second is guilt/regret, which is failure that is experienced and behavior that is evaluated in light of particular actions or components of self that contributed to the failure, which can be repaired thereby alleviating the sense of guilt. The cognitive attribution is on action and differentiated from the self, whereas in shame, the cognitive attribution is on the melded self and object. Guilt, therefore, is less painful than shame because it is differentiated from self and can be alleviated by reparative action. (pp. 2-3).

Michael Lewis (2011) wrote that shame is a product of multiple cognitive functions: first, one evaluates self in relation to measuring up to SRGs; second the evaluation does not distinguish behavior from self, but adheres the two into an evaluation of a “global self.” It is painful because of an all-inclusive negative evaluation of self that results in speech, cognitive and behavior disruptions/changes. Reactions to shame are predictable including “reinterpreting the causes of the shame, self-splitting (multiple personalities), or forgetting (repression). Shame is not produced by any specific situation but rather by the individual’s interpretation of the event” (p. 2).

Understanding the different types of emotions furthers developing awareness of when emotions emerge and how they can be identified in others. The framework for conceptualizing shame and emotions has been constructed through the philosophical and theological, anthropological, psychoanalytic, and neurobiological approach. To complete the process of laying the groundwork is the literary approach.

**Literary Approach.** In the literary approach I have included two writers who researched across disciplines, to look for how shame has been articulated and expressed in social, cultural, and political contexts. Shame messages are statements or accusations
that are embedded in social discourse. If leaders are to become aware of shame messages, then developing a critical eye to discourse in structures and systems of leadership, such as institutional policy manuals, can be helped by understanding how shame has been produced by historical penal practices and represented in classic fiction.

Sociologist Helen Lynd (1958) published *Shame and the Search for Identity* during a period when research on self-conscious experiences of shame and guilt were based primarily on S. Freud’s (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) research (p. 15). Lynd’s (1958) approach was interdisciplinary which she believed was a way to explore what was missing when taken out of modes for categorization and understanding. She reviewed the prominent psychological and anthropological research on shame and guilt and described that the idea of shame was “subsumed under guilt” (p. 19). She found that guilt and shame were either coupled as one description or contrasted with each other.

A significant aspect of Lynd’s (1958) contribution to understanding shame was an analysis of literature on the use of the word shame. She described her analysis as a history of the words in the “non-theoretical, literary record of human experience” (p. 23). She showed that the word shame had been part of the Western cultural expression for many centuries yet was not understood. Lynd drew from perspective of various writers who wrote of shame and identified six characteristics central in experiences of shame. She states that although circumstances for when shame arises might be different, feelings of shame may be the same.

The first characteristic of shame (Lynd, 1958) is a sense of exposure particularly when the exposure is sudden. In, *The Scarlet Letter* Hawthorne (1850/2009) described the public shame of Hester Prynne who wore a representation of her shame as a scarlet
letter on her breast as relief versus the private shame of Dimmesdale who fathered the child. Dimmesdale says, “Happy are you, Hester, that wear the scarlet letter openly upon your bosom! Mine burns in secret!” (p. 284).

The second characteristic of shame is that it occurs when the thing that is exposed is incongruent with a social situation or a discrepancy in the way one sees oneself in the situation. Lynd (1958) relates this with coming to recognize assumptions made about the world and how others respond (pp. 43-44), like when a person giving a gift believes a particular gift is desired by the other, but the gift is not well received. The third characteristic of shame is threat to trust when questions of personal adequacy or values conflict with expectations. The biblical story of the two sons of Noah covering his naked body by walking backwards (p. 54) is symbolic of shame experienced by children when trust in parents is shattered. The realization that “instead of our elders being our interpreters of the world, our protectors, we must, instead, protect them from their own fallibilities and shortcomings, and from the shameful knowledge that we are aware of them” (p. 40). Lynd asserts that the consistency of early forms of trust and the inevitable loss of trust and how the events are integrated is an important aspect in developing “a future sense of identity” (p. 49).

The fourth characteristic of shame is that it involves the whole self. Shame cannot be repaired by making amends, or by acts of penance or atonement.

It is not an isolated act that can be detached from the self. It carries the weight of ‘I cannot have done this. But I have done it and I cannot undo it, because this is…. I…. it is pervasive as anxiety is pervasive; its focus is not a separate act, but
revelation of the whole self. The thing that has been exposed is what I am. (Lynd, 1958, p. 50)

It is part of self, part of one’s belief of self.

The fifth characteristic of shame is that it is revelatory. It involves identifying with others in their shame that goes beyond individual shame and extends to confronting human limitations and questions the meaning of life (Lynd, 1958, p. 56). “If experiences of shame can be fully faced, if we allow ourselves to realize their import, they can inform the self, and become a revelation of oneself, of one’s society, and of the human situation” (p. 71).

The final characteristic of shame is that is it difficult to put into words because the immediate reaction to shame is to cover up what is exposed whether it has something to do with self, others, or society. Furthermore, shame is difficult to recognize because threats of exposure and loss of trust in self and others can be experienced as confusing, therefore difficult to put into words. Unlike guilt that at the time of Lynd’s (1958) research had well developed confession and reparation rituals, there were no rituals or accepted words for working through shame (pp. 64-65). She wrote that because shame is such an isolating experience, expressing it in the context of trusted relationships could relieve the feelings of isolation, and move towards closeness with others (p. 66).

In historian Stuart Walton’s (2004) account of the history of emotions he also analyzed classic literature to bring more understanding to how shame has been expressed. He divides his analysis into two categories: one is a personal yet passive form of shame, “I am ashamed” and the other is an active form of shame “I shame you”. Walton traced shame in the biblical account of creation (Genesis 1-3) from being without shame in
Adam and Eve’s “natural state” to awaken to their nakedness and compelled to cover themselves after eating the fruit. The sense of shame was attached to the exposure of sexual organs that he associated with desire for the forbidden. Just the woman and man were enticed to act on their desire to eat what was forbidden, so Walton interprets the creation story depicting woman and man covering themselves to distract from their desire for the forbidden represented in exposed nakedness. Shame in this account is associated with the exposure of desire for something forbidden.

Walton (2004) describes the sense of being ashamed as involving physicality and subjectivity. The way one feels shame is physical; “shame makes one want to want to step out of one’s own skin” to “dissociate ourselves from the being that has been convicted as guilty before the world” (p. 247). Furthermore, shame and guilt involve consciousness that arise when taboos are violated. Taboo is something that has been deemed sacred and unclean, and contact with it has negative consequences. Walton situates consciousness in Kant’s moral philosophy as what underpins the drive of human actions: the “categorical imperative” or behavior that results in the greater good is determined by considering the implications of the behavior in question, on all of humanity. In Totem and Taboo, S. Freud (1962) postulated that human conscious operates in taboo, when there is an “emotional ambivalence” (p. 68; Walton, 2004, p. 248) or a conflict of desiring and repelling what is sacred and unclean (taboo). Guilt arises from violating a taboo, which is where S. Freud located consciousness. Rituals for the sacred and the unclean work to ease this ambivalence, yet both play on the fear of being harmed by or suffering as a result of exposure to the divine or the unclean.
Walton (2004) addressed the active form of shame (“I shame you”) by tracing the way shame has been used to punish:

The intentional infliction of shame through public humiliation of criminals and malefactors has been practised in jurisprudential systems since ancient times. It speaks to the desire of the mass of society and its institutions for a perfect atonement, encapsulated in the adage that justice should not only be done, but be seen to be done. (pp. 255-256)

Walton addressed the common use of the stocks and the pillories in the 15th – 19th centuries, where the punishment was publicly displayed, and where the public participated in the punishment by jeering, or throwing spoils and waste at the person. In Nathaniel Hawthorne’s (1850/2009) *The Scarlet Letter*, the understanding of the shaming tactic was described as Hester Prynne was sentenced to stand on a platform, once used for executions, for a set amount of time, to face the judgment of the townspeople. Walton (2004, pp. 259-260) points to Hawthorne’s understanding of shame to describe this aspect of shaming others: “There can be no outrage, methinks, against our common nature, --- whatever be the delinquencies of the individual, --- no outrage more flagrant than to forbid the culprit to hide his face for shame; as it was the essence of this punishment to do” (Hawthorne, 1850/2009, p. 83). Hawthorne described not only the shame during the event, but in recalling of the event: “in our nature, however, there is a provision, alike marvelous and merciful, that the sufferer should never know the intensity of what he endures by its present torture, but chiefly by the pang that rankles after it” (p. 83).

Lynd's (1958) and Walton's (2004) treatment of shame shows how literary and historical concepts of shame draw from multiple approaches rather than isolated in one
discipline. Shame is a sudden exposure to a social situation that is shows an incongruence of how one thinks of oneself, and that exposure involves the whole self. Shame reveals how one is connected to others through the limits that shame reveals. Like Darwin (1872/1965) and Helen Block Lewis (1971), Lynd (1958) recognized that the wordlessness involved in moments of shame and that shame is difficult to recognize is similar to Helen Block Lewis undifferentiated shame. Lynd references a threat to being exposed and loss of trust in self and others as the driving force of shame instances. Walton's (2004) also isolates exposure as an element of shame, but locates this exposure in a forbidden desire. This view connects with Lynd if the forbidden desire is outside of one's perception of self. The use of shame in punishment, and that punishment is not viewed as effective unless it involves public shame is part of political context, but also part of institutional practices.

Drawing from Scheff (2003, 2015), Pattison (2000) summarized problems in approaching shame as how the word shame is used in Western culture (intense shame), the variety of words used for shame (disguised), and the definition of shame as opposed to guilt. It is because of these problems that Scheff (2003, 2014) described shame as elusive, or difficult to pin down and grasp the understanding. If concepts of shame elusive, understanding the variety of words used to describe aspects of shame experiences will lessen ambiguity in understanding participants’ experiences.

**Sociological Approach: On shame and social interaction**
Sociologist Thomas Scheff’s (1997, 2000, 2003, 2014) theory of shame contributes to understanding that shame, along with embarrassment and humiliation, is part of everyday social interaction. First, Scheff points out that shame is ubiquitous in social interaction. Scheff describes shame as a “master emotion” and references Goffman’s (1959) writing on embarrassment in describing how the anticipation of shame is ubiquitous in social interaction. Second, Scheff draws from Elias’s (1939/1994) analysis of a nineteenth century text on etiquette to surface how shame is a hidden affect that is unrecognized. Third, Scheff notes that hidden and/or unrecognized shame is used to manage social behavior and enforce social rules. Fourth, Scheff draws from Retzinger’s (1991) research on violent emotion and shows that shame and anger threaten social bonds.

**Shame as ubiquitous in social interaction.** Scheff describes shame as the master emotion because the threat of experiencing shame is part of every social interaction (Scheff, 1997, p. 12; 2003, p. 239). He links the possibility of experiencing shame and other self-conscious emotions to social interactions from Goffman’s (1959, 1967/1982) writings on embarrassment in impression management in that all social interactions have a threat of embarrassment or humiliation (p. 243). Although shame was not the focus of Goffman’s research, Scheff (2003, 2006, 2014) drew from the connection Goffman made and emphasized how embarrassment, shame and humiliation in social interaction are used to influence or manage other people’s perceptions. Goffman specified the role that embarrassment has on managing perceptions in that “our every social act is influenced by the even the slight chance of public shame or loss of ‘face’”
The anticipation of shame, therefore, is what makes shame a “master emotion” in social interaction.

Scheff’s (2015) definition of shame includes a positive sense of shame that is part of everyday experience. This everyday sense of shame is expressed as shyness or modesty that are occasionally felt and are unlike the experience of intense shame that is painful and disrupting. This lesser sense of shame is what is in the background of social interactions and constantly anticipated (Goffman, 1959). Scheff draws from Darwin (1872/1965) in describing this sense of shame as deference, or the experience of getting or not getting what one expects. Sigmund Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1859/1957) also mentions shame as connected with being excited about something happening and then it not happening for example a child hoping for a Christmas present, and not getting it. Shame is in the perception of a desire or excitement being seen and then thwarted.

Incorporating a general understanding of everyday shame will work towards removing “the taboo from shame and make it available for our understanding” (Scheff, 2006, p. 146).

Whereas Goffman (1959) identifies emotions in social interaction (external), Cooley (1922) identifies shame as part of the construction of self from both internal and external interaction and the imagining of others’ perception of self: We live “in the minds of others without knowing it” (p. 208). Called the “looking glass concept of self”, Cooley identifies feeling shame and pride in response to how one imagines or believes the other is judging her or his appearance, thus forming beliefs about the social self. In this concept, the self “seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his [or her] judgment of that
appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or [shame]” (p. 184). Shame and pride are, therefore, psychological and social emotions that “signal the state of the relationship: either connectedness (pride) or disconnect (shame)” (Scheff, 2014, p. 131). Pride, or true pride in this context, is an affect from a sense of belonging (p. 133) rather than false pride or egotism which is an over focus on oneself and lack of focus on others.

**Shame is hidden, unrecognized and elusive.** Scheff’s (2014) approach to shame is that it is part of all social interaction but that is it elusive because it is hidden and unrecognized. Research on shame in sociology, psychoanalysis and psychology has taken a long time to build and Scheff points to specific aspects of research to answer why it has taken so long and to describe the implications.

Breuer and S. Freud (1895/1957) named shame as a hidden affect that causes hysteria. Shame is hidden in “that one would prefer not to have experienced that which one would rather forget” (p. 269); they saw that the connection between shame and repression was a cause of psychopathology. If this was part of S. Freud’s first findings, why did shame research take so long to take off? Researchers asking similar questions look to S. Freud’s subsequent writings and find that he came to view shame as being a regressive emotion, characteristic of children and women (1933/1961). Although S. Freud did not describe shame as elusive, the fact that shame moments are often hidden and repressed are part of the reason for the time it has taken to build shame research. The elusiveness of shame, therefore, is traced not only to it being attributed to women and children, but also to repressing a moment of shame.

Similarly, Lynd (1958) found that shame is involved in keeping things hidden. The elusiveness of shame is not that it cannot be traced in literature and research, but that
“[e]xperiences of shame are a painful uncovering of hitherto unrecognized aspects of one’s personality as well as of unrecognized aspects of one’s society and of the world” (p. 183). The elusiveness of shame is in the painful experience that comes from a sense of being uncovered or exposed. Because of this revelatory characteristic of shame, it is difficult to grasp an idea or new concept when experiencing shame and therefore understanding shame as a concept can also be elusive. Rather than hiding from what the unrecognized aspects of self or society might reveal, Lynd invites her readers to face the pain of shame because they “may throw an unexpected light on who one is, and point the way toward who one may become” (p. 20).

Whereas Lynd (1958) found that shame is involved in keeping things hidden, Helen Block Lewis (1971) found that a moment of shame can go unrecognized. Her research involved analyzing discourse between therapists and clients to explore if and how shame factored into clients’ decision to abruptly stop therapy. She used both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect and analyze data and from that data she conceptualized shame that was unrecognized or unfelt as such by her clients. Overt, undifferentiated shame is described as what happens when pain is experienced but the emotion is not identified as shame; bypassed shame is when the pain of shame was not evident to the client (1987, pp. 22-24).

Describing shame as repressed, unrecognized, undifferentiated and bypassed gives texture to the social concept of shame and as Scheff (2000) argues, contributes to understanding the historical elusiveness of shame in social science and psychological research. Even though there were researchers who talked about shame after S. Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957), either explicitly (Block Lewis, 1971; Elias 1939/1994;
Goffman, 1959; Lynd, 1958) or implicitly (Mead, 1937; Horney, 1950/1991), there was still a lack of focus on shame. For example, Cooley (1922) wrote that shame and pride arose from forming perceptions of oneself as seen in the mind of others, but he did not define shame or pride (Scheff, 2006, pp. 54-56). Goffman (1967/1982) implied that embarrassment, shame, and humiliation were closely related, and separate from disgust, but did not develop a concept for shame (Scheff, 2006, p. 52). Early research had to do with beliefs about emotions in general rather than a distinct appearance, origin, and emergence of particular emotions like shame (Scheff, 2006, p. 51). Scheff speculates that the lack of consistent attention in research had to do with a taboo on shame (Kaufman, 1989) and that researchers can experience an anticipatory threat of shame while doing the research (Elias, 1939/1994).

Scheff (2003) furthers his argument on the elusiveness of shame by showing that in American and British English, the word shame had been used only to name the most severe instances of shame. What is missing in American English is a word such as having inner restraint, modesty or tactfulness for describing the threat or potential of experiencing shame that occurs in everyday social interaction (p. 241). For example, in French, honte is used for describing a felt sense of shame and pudeur is used for describing the potential for experiencing a moment of shame. Similarly, in German, schande is the word used for physical sense of shame and scham is the word for susceptibility to shame. Scheff suggests that the word used for shame in American English is for the felt or physical sense of shame (similar to honte and schande) and that there is no English word that expresses the potential for a shame moment (similar to pudeur or scham). Because there has been no word in English for a lesser experience of
shame it continued a taboo on shame (Kaufman, 1989). Furthermore, familiarity with a word that describes a less intense form of shame would loosen the hold and the control of social behavior that taboo creates (Scheff, 2003, 2007).

What contributes to the elusiveness of shame is that the intense physical sense of shame is disguised by using what Retzinger (1991) calls “codewords” (pp. 68-70). In Retzinger’s research on anger in marriage, she identified more than 100 vernacular words that are used instead of the word shame. Codewords are a way of talking about shame without saying the word. The six categories for codewords are abandonment, separation, and/or isolation; ridicule; inadequate; discomfort; confused and indifferent (p. 69). The use of codewords can disguise or mask shame since their connection to shame is not generally understood.

**Shame is used to enforce social rules.** The effect of hidden and unrecognized shame is that it is used to manage social behavior and enforce social rules. The individual and internal aspect of shame evident in American English overshadows understanding the less intense social-shame. Scheff (2003) suggests that the reason shame is considered from a internalized perspective rather than a social perspective is that it is used for controlling social behavior. Additionally, it is a social taboo to speak of shame, thereby contributing to the illusion of shame as invisible or not occurring. That it is not okay to speak of it or say the word shame indicates that it is taboo (Kaufman, 1989, p. 46). To “act as if shame does not exist” (Scheff, 2003, p. 240) is a defense against experiencing shame. This social taboo is shown by Elias (1939/1994) to be an effect of the process for civilizing children (Scheff, 2014, p. 136).
In the modern era, the threshold for experiencing shame increased as the word shame was enveloped into a dynamic that involved a resistance to and perpetuation of social prohibitions (Scheff, 2014). For example, in Elias’s (1939/1994) *The Civilizing Process* he suggests that “as shame became more important, it also became less visible because the word *shame* becomes taboo” (Scheff, 2015, p. 115). Etiquette manuals taught the civilized way of responding to children whose behavior fell outside of what is acceptable or civilized was to evoke shame in the social interaction and then deny that the child experienced pain from shame thereby creating a forbidden aspect or a taboo on shame. The shame moment is not discussed, the topic that is considered shameful is forbidden, and the reactions of shame are denied which sets off a “chain reaction of hidden shame” (Scheff, 2014, p. 137).

Elias’ (1939/1994) interpretation of the civilizing process in Von Raumer’s (in Elias, 1939/1994; 1857) manual on etiquette involves a dynamic of hidden shame, the motivation and effects of instruction. In this text shame is used to repress curiosity about sex. The motivation of the instruction was to instill modesty, defined by Elias as “feelings of shame, fear, embarrassment, and guilt” (p. 181) and the instructions prescribed what was socially acceptable to talk about for daughters and mothers. It is noted earlier that there was a “aura of embarrassment” regarding sex in this era, therefore the writing of the text involved resisting shame and embarrassment inherent in the social context. For example, Elias interprets Von Raumer’s writing about sex as an act of denial or resisting shame and embarrassment.

**Shame is a threat to losing social bond.** Scheff (2003, 2014) continued to draw from Elias’s analysis of Von Raumer’s (in Elias 1939/1994; 1857) etiquette manual to
illustrate that the threat to losing the social bond causes a denial of and silencing in shame. The social bond is threatened because of the internal conflict from being shamed by the adults who are communicating the social rules. The internal conflict has to do with fear of not being accepted by the mother regardless of behavior (Schore, 1994; Hill, 2015); or that the desired unconditional acceptance turns out to be conditional on behavior. The fear evokes a denial of the experience of shame, which is an effect of the instruction. Shame was used to teach the daughter to comply and to teach the mother how to instruct the daughter. The result was that “shame goes underground, leading to behavior that is outside of awareness” (Scheff, 2015, p. 115). For example, Elias (1939/1994) states that, “Neither ‘rational’ motives nor practical reasons primarily determined this attitude [resistance of shame and embarrassment], but rather the shame of adults themselves, which has become compulsive. It is the social prohibitions and resistances within themselves, their own ‘superego’ that made them keep silent” (p. 153). Resisting shame and embarrassment is denying the experience of it. The denial of experiencing shame, as shown by Helen Block Lewis (1971), closes off emotional connection to the child.

Helen Block Lewis’ (1971) research shows how when shame is hidden, the social bond is threatened by either emotional withdrawal and depression or anger and aggression. The results showed that emotions of shame and embarrassment occurred more than other emotions, but that the words shame or embarrassment were not used as compared to words for other emotions like joy, fear, anger, grief. This “unacknowledged shame” is described as overt, undifferentiated shame or bypassed shame. In overt, undifferentiated shame, the words used to describe feelings and bodily responses to
shame were pain, embarrassed confusion, lack of clear thought, blushing, sweating, increased heart rate. Neither client nor therapist, however, used the word shame. In bypassed shame, participants did not mention feelings, but spoke of brief feelings of pain and demonstrated rapid thinking, speech, and behavior. What resulted from the shame moment was a disruption or severing of the social bond between client and therapist. Additionally, the absence of the use of the word shame may be connected to further evidence of the taboo on shame (pp. 196-198).

Scheff (2000, 2015) argues that the immediate response to a threat of a bond is evidence for including shame as a primary emotion. Much like fear (fight or flight), when threatened to be disconnected from a social group, the emotion of shame disrupts and overtakes in the immediate moment. What makes shame different from fear is that it originates from a threat to belonging rather than a threat to physical safety. In other words, the source of shame is social or relational, within human interaction.

Using Scheff’s (2000) theory of social shame situates the focus my research on shame in language and discourse. Although shame is experienced internally as pain from the threat of losing a relationship/social bond and the acceptance that the relationships brings, the source of shame in this theory is in human interaction. The individual (micro) component to this theory is evident in human-to-human interaction. But the larger (macro) component is in how the interaction uses shame to maintain social rules that are formed by social groups (Scheff, 1997). In the following section I will focus on how women in Brown’s (2006) study described experiencing shame and how shame is used to perpetuate unrealistic expectations in the discourse of American culture.

Psycho-social-cultural Approach: On shame and resilience
Shame is defined as painful feeling rooted in a belief that one is “flawed and unworthy of belonging (Brown, 2007, p. 5). Resilience is the ability to bounce back after falling (Southwick & Charney, 2012, p. 7). Developing resilience involves a process that works towards regulating one’s responses to shame rather than continue to be unaware of how a moment of shame can impact leadership effectiveness. Emotion regulation (Gross, 2007) is a conscious strategy or nonconscious response to appraising and responding to situations. Emotions are signals (Frijda, 1986; Scheff, 2014) that when cognitively attended to within the specific situation, can lead to emotion resiliency (Hill, 2015; Gross & Thompson, 2007). Brown’s (2006) SRT is a theory that is based on how women described regulating moments of shame. SRT involves learning to identify shame messages related to competing expectations in social cultural discourse and developing an understanding of what to do when experiencing shame. In this section I first present the background on emotion regulation as a larger framework for developing resilience and then I present Brown’s SRT.

**Resilience and Emotion Regulation.** Regulating emotions rather than being regulated by emotions allows for developing capacity to bounce back from adversity. This rapidly growing field of research (Gross & Thompson, 2007, p. xi) is based on S. Freud’s (1915/1957) theories of defense mechanisms and provides a perspective for what presents in a therapeutic relationship, namely the emergence of mechanisms that defend against painful experiences by repressing the original event, repeating patterns of isolation, or projecting emotional response on others (Gross & Thompson, 2007; Goleman, 1985; Hill, 2015).
In emotion regulation theories, there are different meanings for the words emotion, feelings and affect, although some use these terms interchangeably (Gross & Thompson, 2007). In this study, feeling is the sensed state of the emotion and affect is the biological component of emotion (Kaufman, 1989; Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963). Schore (1994) and Hill (2015) wrote of another level of distinction in primary affect and secondary affect. Primary affect is the physiological response to an internal or external stimulus (pp. 106-107). With awareness it is a felt experience (pleasant or unpleasant) that involves circulatory and autonomic nervous system. It results in elevating arousal or decreasing arousal. Secondary or categorical affect puts words around primary affect in a process of appraisal, creating categories such as Darwin’s (1872/1965) seven categorical affects: anger, joy, shame, fear, sadness, surprise, disgust. Because emotion regulation theories deconstruct emotion events into sections or sequences it is important to have a general understanding of the theories in order to understand how Brown’s SRT is situated within these theories.

Emotions are regulated consciously and non-consciously (Bargh, & William, 2007, p. 433). Awareness of the emotion and assigning meaning to the event for which the emotion arose are common elements to theories of emotion and regulation. It is important for this study because shame can be difficult to identify and becoming aware of the sensation of shame or how it is felt in the body is a movement towards naming and acknowledging shame. In the functionalist approach (Gross, 2007) there are three core features of emotion: first, emotion results when one attends and assigns meaning to a situation that is important for achieving an explicit or implicit goal. Second, the emotion is sensed as “whole-body phenomena” involving changes in behavior, subjective
experiences and physiological sensations (Gross & Thompson, 2007). Last, the changes “[interrupt] what we are doing and force themselves on our awareness” (p. 5) taking precedence over other functions and control. Awareness of when an emotion is experienced and attending to the context of that experience is also part of Frijda’s (1986, 1994) appraisal theory of emotions presented earlier. Similarly, the modal model (Gross & Thompson, 2007, pp. 5-6) describes emotions being evoked in response to an internal or external situation. Attention is drawn to the situation, and the individual makes an appraisal of the situation based on familiarity, values, and valence or the response and corresponding responses to the response (p. 5). These theories show that how emotions are regulated have to do with developing awareness of the physical sensations of emotion and the context for which they arose.

Affect regulation differs from emotion regulation in that the focus is on developmental processes that involve attachment to primary caregivers (Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994). This theory suggests that shame is significant at critical aspects of human development in how caregivers respond to an infant/young child after expressing shame. The response by the adult sets a pattern for inter and intra relational functioning: hyperarousal and avoidant or hyperarousal and preoccupied (Hill, 2015). If a caregiver responds by attuning (Schore, 1994) to the child’s affect (synchronizing to affect state), the sense of exposure and threat of isolation from shame will resolve as the caregiver responds to the emotions of the child. If the caregiver avoids the child, withdraws or does not move towards and attune to the emotionally injured child, the child will attribute this response or lack thereof as having something to do with being bad, or disgusting (p. 79). This is a neurobiological approach that identifies learned attachment traits
exhibiting hypo arousal of the parasympathetic part of the brain with avoidant relational tendencies and hyperarousal of the sympathetic part of the brain with preoccupied relational tendencies (tending towards enmeshed relationships), and the development of pathogenic personality disorders. First developed by Schore this approach investigates shame in relation to successful/healthy attachment in primary relationships (Hill, 2015, pp. 135-191). Brown’s (2006) resilience theory is a psycho-social-cultural approach that draws from emotion research and emotion regulation theory.

**Shame Resilience Theory.** Brown’s (2006) study on shame in women and how resilience is developed is yet another form of emotion regulation. This cognitive approach involves similar or related aspects of both affect regulation and emotion regulation. Before describing SRT, I will summarize Brown’s findings on the main concerns women had related to experiences of shame (Brown, 2006, pp. 44-45). The purpose of Brown’s (2006) study was to develop a theory, grounded in data, “that explains (a) why and how women experience shame, (b) how shame impacts women; and (c) the various processes and strategies women employ to resolve their main concerns regarding the impact and consequences of shame” (Brown, 2006, p. 44). Having awareness of an emotion event and developing strategies for resolving their concerns is similar to theories of emotion regulation (Bargh & William, 2007; Gross & Thompson, 2007).

Brown’s research participants articulated that their main concerns when experiencing shame were feelings of being trapped, powerless, and isolated (Brown, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2009). They felt trapped in and by expectations with limited options for change. Brown compared this entrapped sense to a double bind (Frye, 2001), where a
person feels pressed to measure up to more than one social expectation which, if met, cancel each other out. Similar to Kim’s (2015) description of not being able to meet competing social cultural expectations for Asian American women, female leaders also experience double binds in expectations for leadership. For example, a woman demonstrates assertiveness in her leadership style when leading her team and is judged as an effective leader, but when leading a work committee of her peers, she is expected to operate with a collaborative style and her assertiveness is judged as making her ineffective.

Participants also described feelings of powerlessness to act and to make an impact for change, when experiencing shame (Brown, 2006). Reasons for not acting were that they were unaware of shame when it was occurring and did not understand why it was happening. They were not able to make a choice about their actions because the experience of shame was confusing or experienced as anger (Retzinger, 1991; Scheff, 1987) and/or fear. Experiences of shame involve things that are kept hidden or in secret. In this way what elicits shame or the main concern becomes diffuse with the felt sense of shame, making it difficult to take out of hiding from oneself and determine what to do to bring about change. Lastly, as a result of feeling trapped and powerless participants described feeling isolated in their shame, unable to free themselves from the trap of expectations, and powerless in the midst of a shame experience to make choices that would bring about change. Brown (2006) used the metaphor of a spider web - the shame web - to illustrate the main concerns of women experiencing shame.

The metaphor of a shame web demonstrates why women feel trapped in shame and provides a visual representation of the impact of shame on women specifically
related to making choices for change. The shame web further explicates competing and multi layered social-cultural expectations that dictate who women should be, what they should be, how they should be (Brown, 2006, 2009). These expectations are communicated by family of origin, close friends and partners, community members, teachers, mentors, and media. Media is a primary storyteller that is laced with unrealistic expectations and directed to elicit a response from consumers (Brown, 2007). When undiscerned, these unmet expectations challenge what women believe about themselves as far as identity (ethnicity, gender, race, sexuality, social class etc.) and role (leader, pastor, professor etc.). Expectations differ for every woman, but what they have in common is that they are enforced by social groups and individuals, and reinforced by various forms of media (Brown, 2006, 2009).

SRT sets up categories that, if not carefully applied, ignore individual and contextual differences. Generalizing concepts across racial, ethnic, social class and gender boundaries does not provide evidence pertaining to the particular experience. Rather it can work to create a norm that makes up what becomes defined as “ordinary” thereby discounting what is experienced from perspectives outside what is determined “ordinary.” Weedon (1997) argued that forming categories from a study actually perpetuates the use of the categories, thereby contributing to oppression from the ism’s (racism, classism, ethnocentrism etc.) and to the phobias (homophobia etc.). Brown’s (2004, 2006) research sets up categories that can be viewed as perpetuating oppression, if the meaning of category is fixed. In this study, however, I use the categories for expectations described by Brown’s participants to define the limits of shame so that shame experiences can be deconstructed for new understandings. Understanding
Brown’s research on shame and women as a form of emotion regulation provides another connecting point from which to build the conceptual framework for this study.

Shame triggers (Brown, 2006) continue the explication of expectations, but specify how women experience shame. Shame triggers are situations which implicitly or explicitly communicate expectations for women and trigger a physiological reaction to set off a shame event. What triggers shame for one person may not trigger shame for the next; they are distinct according to culture and context. Within the social-cultural expectations for women, Brown (2004, 2006, 2007) identified eleven categories that trigger shame in women. They are “appearance and body image, sexuality, family, motherhood, parenting, professional identity and work, mental and physical health, aging, religion, speaking out, and surviving trauma” (Brown, 2006, p. 46). Brown added another area, “being stereotyped/labeled” in her curriculum published one year later (Brown, 2009). When expectations in a category are not met and the identity or belief about oneself in that category is not wanted, shame is triggered. Brown identifies “unwanted identities” (Ferguson, Eyre & Ashbaker, 2000) that emerge when relationships are threatened or when perceptions of oneself change (negatively) as a result of social-cultural expectations. Unwanted identities are beliefs about oneself (based on perceptions of oneself either ascribed by oneself or viewed as ascribed by others) that differ from ideals of oneself. For example, a woman wanting a promotion may see herself as qualified for the leadership position at work but she embodies a collaborative style of leadership which is outside of what is perceived a “effective” leadership for the position. A shame response would be triggered if the woman pursues the position and is not considered capable based on the perception of leadership style rather than the
evidence of her effectiveness. Eagly’s (2007) research gives evidence to how effective leadership is prescribed particular leadership styles enforced by social groups.

What one does in response to emotion triggers is significant to demonstrating effective leadership. Horney (1950/1991) described three types of response to emotional triggers. Although she does not specifically address shame, two of her response types resemble Schore’s (1994) avoidant and preoccupied traits (insecure attachments, pp. 373-384. In response to shame, one either moves away, moves toward, or moves against. Moving away response type is described as withdrawing or getting small. Moving toward response is hyper-focus on trying to please others. Moving against is an aggressive response to control by “getting big” in response to others. If a leader understands a pattern for which they respond to emotion triggers then they can learn to regulate their response rather than have emotions regulate their behavior and risk losing effectiveness.

**Vulnerability, shame and empathy.** SRT uses a metaphor for each process or strategy for developing resilience to shame, of which there are five in total (Brown, 2006). The first continuum represents the overarching process of developing resilience to shame. In this continuum, shame is located on one end of the continuum and empathy on the other. Vulnerability is the lever that moves along the continuum between either end of the shame resilience continuum (shame or empathy). According to SRT, the antidote for shame is empathy (Brown, 2007).

SRT proposes that the great majority of the emotions, thoughts, and behaviors demonstrated by women experiencing shame are efforts to develop shame resilience by decreasing the feelings of being trapped, powerless, and isolated and
to increase the opportunities to experience empathy by increasing connection, power and freedom from the shame web. (Brown, 2006, p. 47).

Empathy is defined as the ability to draw from one’s own experience and emotions to identify with the emotion of the other (Ivey, Pederson, & Ivey, 2001, pp. 28-30). Brown (2006) draws from Wiseman’s (1996) attributes of empathy to describe that empathy involves taking the position of the other person to see the situation from their perspective and understand their feelings, to restrain from judging the situation and the feelings, and demonstrate understanding to the person (Brown, 2006, p. 47).

The first continuum presented here was about the overall process, while the remaining four continua describe the strategies for developing resilience to shame. They are (1) accepting and acknowledging vulnerabilities and shame, (2) developing awareness of social-cultural expectations - critical awareness, (3) pushing past internal and external resistance and reaching out to others when in the midst of shame, (4) talking about shame - speaking shame.

**Acknowledging Vulnerability and Shame.** The second continuum is acknowledging vulnerability (in her curriculum and later books she changed this to acknowledging shame). Vulnerability is the lever that moves either towards shame as confusion, judgment, fear, anger, and blame, or towards empathy as recognition, awareness, protection, and support. The etymology of the word vulnerable from Latin vulnerare is “to wound”; “Exposed to the possibility of being attacked or harmed, either physically or emotionally”. SRT suggests that resilience to shame is increased in women when awareness of areas of vulnerability are acknowledged and understood and decreased when areas of vulnerability are unknown or unacknowledged (Brown, 2006, p.
Coming to understand one’s vulnerabilities can lead to greater empathy. “Empathy requires us to connect with the vulnerabilities of others and with our own vulnerabilities. If we have not acknowledged our struggles in a certain area it is very difficult for us to hear and communicate understanding” (Brown, 2004, p. 71). Feelings of shame can also involve confusion, fear and judgment. Having support from others during shame experiences provides a moment to gain perspective. Resilience involves a process of acknowledging vulnerabilities, recognizing potential woundedness, and understanding reactions.

**Critical Awareness.** Critical awareness (Brown, 2006, pp. 48-49) of social-cultural expectations and the ability to assess expectations particular to the context is the third continuum. Awareness is defined as “knowing something exists” (Brown, 2004, pp. 77). Brown draws from concepts of critical consciousness and critical perspective (Collins, 1998; Freire, 1970/2014; hooks, 1984) to support her definition of critical awareness as “knowing why [something] exists, how it works, how we’re impacted by it and who benefits from it” (Brown, 2004, p. 77). Developing critical awareness builds on noticing an area of vulnerability and understanding why the vulnerability was there and how it triggered shame. Acknowledging vulnerability in this continuum would indicate movement towards empathy and require analyzing expectations that would result in demystifying, contextualizing and normalizing expectations or movement towards an experience of shame described as reinforcing, individualizing, and pathologizing expectations (Brown, 2006, p. 47).

Critical awareness involves understanding the social-cultural expectations and how they inform systems for building beliefs about self. Developing critical awareness
deconstructs shame experiences by asking questions about the context, structures, beliefs, and messages that surround the experience, how expectations work, and the benefits from adhering to or disrupting the system (individuals, group, media culture) that enforces the expectations (Brown, 2006, p. 48). In Brown’s study, practicing critical awareness included connecting personal shame experiences to what was learned about the context, which moved the participants into demystifying, contextualizing, and normalizing their experiences (Brown, 2004, p. 80).

The participants with little or no critical awareness appeared to often lack the skills necessary for deconstructing and contextualizing their shame experiences. Rather than linking their experience to larger issues, they individualized the situation, reinforcing the idea that they were bad or flawed and unworthy of acceptance. Without a larger context, the issues appeared to be perceived as personal flaws rather than a larger collective issue. This, in turn, seemed to lead women to pathologize the shaming behavior or thought, ‘something is inherently wrong with just me’. (Brown, 2006, p. 49)

Awareness in this context is to decipher the shame message that is scripted in sociocultural messages (Brown, 2006). Like in the acknowledging vulnerability and shame continuum, there is an implicit requirement for awareness of feeling the physical sensations of shame as an emotion.

Steege & Terwogt (2007) distinguish an emotion experience from awareness. An emotion experience involves the situation, sensation and the related action. Frijda’s (1986) definition of emotion includes this aspect; emotion is a “felt action tendency” (pp. 237-239). For Lambie and Marcel (2002), awareness involves describing what the
emotion state “was like” (called first order awareness) and second order awareness involved describing thoughts, names for the emotion state, and “how we feel, why we feel that way, and what we can do about it” (Steege & Terwogt, 2007, p. 271). It is through this second order awareness and using a framework for emotion theory to appraise an event that increases the quality of appraisals and corresponding actions or responses. Having a framework for understanding emotions and developing awareness of experiences of shame, therefore, is important for determining what to do and developing resilience to it.

**Reaching Out and Speaking Shame.** The fourth continuum in SRT is defined as reaching out and responding to others to develop mutually empathetic relationships (Brown, 2006, p. 49). Participants reported resilience increased not only when receiving an empathic response but when giving empathy to others. In her curriculum (Brown, 2009) Brown stresses the importance of building relational connections within the context of relationships with individuals that understand and are learning about shame because when shame is not understood, it can actually be reinforced, even in caring/compassionate relationships. Additional benefits of reaching out were noted as increasing critical awareness as shame experiences are deconstructed and decreasing isolation as participants make connections to their own experiences when in conversations.

Speaking shame is the fifth and last continuum in SRT. It involves developing emotional competence and linguistic fluency to talk about shame experiences. In this element of shame resilience, Brown (2006) suggests that understanding the differences between self-conscious emotions such as shame, guilt, and embarrassment make way for
increased awareness of and ability to speak of shame. “Women reported that acquiring language that allowed them to accurately express their shame experiences increased their ability to recognize and name shame and increased their understanding of the importance of externalizing and sharing shame experiences” (p. 49). Brown’s participants described the difference having language to talk about shame made for them. They described how lack of understanding shame and “not knowing what was happening to them, but knowing it was bad and they shouldn’t talk about it” (p. 49) led to internalizing the shame by keeping silent about it. Reaching out and speaking shame allowed them to experience connection in the midst of and after a moment of shame, thereby decreasing the pain of shame.

Like Brown, (2006), many researchers have found that irrespective of education or nationality, humans talk about some emotions more than others (Rimé, 2007, pp. 466-485) after an emotional experience. Finkenauer & Rimé (1998) showed that anger, sadness, joy, and love were talked about, but less frequent were shame and guilt. Zech and Rimé (2005) tested for the impact of sharing emotions in an experimental study and found that compared to the control group, the social sharing participants reported that the sharing interview was overall useful, soothed their emotions, helped them process the experience, and provided comfort but not did not lead to recovery from emotions (p. 283). They concluded that sharing emotional experiences does not take away the impact of emotions, but that the effect on people is beneficial. This supports Brown’s reaching out and speaking shame, in that it provides a sense of not being alone in shame. Unlike Brown, however, this suggests that emotion sharing does not take away the intense pain from shame.
The affect shame, is not something that can be prevented, fixed or cured; it is a “full contact core [primitive] emotion” and is universal to all humans (Brown, 2009, p. 55). As an emotion, however, shame can be regulated and resilience can be developed. Brown’s SRT works as an emotion regulation theory that appraises the shame event or attends to a situation that is important to achieving a particular belief about self in the critical awareness continuum. Sensing shame as a “whole-body” experience leads to developing the ability to acknowledge shame. Reaching out and speaking shame allows for regulating responses to sensation of shame and/or when looking back on the experience, understanding how the interruption of shame impacted the behavioral response (Gross & Thompson, 2007, p. 5; see also Frijda, 1986). Increasing critical awareness of what triggers shame (competing expectations in shame categories), why it is triggered (feel trapped, powerless to change, isolated), and how it is triggered (messages enforced by groups/individuals/media) may explain why some women choose to move into senior leadership roles and why others do not. I suspect that if leadership educators were to teach on emotion regulation and talk about their experiences of shame, it would help young leaders develop a framework for making sense of how their emotions and behavioral responses impact their effectiveness as leaders.

On Shame and Social Role Theory: Gender-based stereotypes

Brown’s research indicated that gender-based stereotypes communicate explicit and implicit expectations, and when not met, can trigger shame. Eagly’s (1987; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Eagly, Wood & Diekman, 2000) social role theory conceptualizes how expectations were formed for gender-based roles and enforced by social groups. When expectations for roles are adopted by a social group, a stereotype is formed. Gender-
based stereotypes are shown to disadvantage women in leadership (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 1991) and role congruency theory describes how attitudes of prejudice and discriminating behavior arise when behavior in leadership are different than what is prescribed by a social group (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, 2004). This results in creating and/or maintaining dominant group biases and sameness rather than allowing for particularities in how roles are fulfilled that arise with diversity like color of skin, social class, ethnicities, nationalities and/or gender. Describing the purpose and function of stereotypes is helpful for tracing a cause of prejudice and discrimination, which can initiate change. It glosses over, however, the inter and intra personal details of how women respond to stereotypes (like in shame or anger), break out of rigid social roles, develop resilience and move toward leadership. If stereotypes in female leadership are shame triggers for some women leaders in higher education, then how do they regulate their experience of shame? How did they become aware of the stereotype and their response to it, and what did they do about it?

**What are Stereotypes?** Stereotypes are mental associations that when enacted, become social constructs; they are used by social groups to govern who is and who is not at the leadership table (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). Stereotypes elicit attitudes of evaluation that can result in prejudice and discrimination. Knowingly or unknowingly, groups use stereotypes to enforce gender roles that prescribe qualifications for and effectiveness of leadership (Eagly, 2007). When integrated into social discourse and enforced by social groups, stereotypes become descriptions for effective leadership. Adhering to stereotypes to determine leadership therefore, can impact which perspectives are considered when making decision, and which are left out. With awareness of stereotypes women can
develop an understanding of the possible barriers and/or pathways that stereotypes enforce in leadership.

Awareness of stereotypes leads to understanding the power of the social group and the norms created by the group. If not made explicit, implicit stereotypes are used to privilege certain qualities, groups or individuals over others.

**How are stereotypes formed?**  Eagly’s social role theory (Eagly, Wood & Diekman, 2000) conceptualized the social construction of social roles and expectations therein, formed by social groups. The process for forming a stereotype begins with the perception that behaviors are required to fulfill a role needed by a group. The group make inferences about required behavior for a role and the behavior is qualified as required traits for the role and generalized into stereotypes.

Eagly & Karau’s (1991) study showed that female and male gender personality traits were carried over from behaviors related to economic and social needs. Prior to and after the industrial era, women developed communal personality traits because their primary economic activities were childbearing and childrearing, which required staying near the family (Eagly, 1987). In the industrial era, however, men’s work required time away from family; therefore, men developed agentic characteristics that included speech, visual dominance, and self-promoting behaviors. Additionally, social role theory suggests that gender personality traits were formed around social behavior (Eagly & Karau, 1991, pp. 686-687). Women’s behavior was viewed as relational, and men’s behavior was viewed as task-oriented. These behaviors and traits have been assimilated into social discourse for creating norms that attempt to define gender roles. Gender roles
are beliefs about female and male attributes that are assigned by social groups (Eagly, 1987).

Generalizations about gender roles in private lives spill over into organizational settings. Carli and Eagly’s (2012) analysis showed that women were disadvantaged by organization structures supporting an “ideal employee” (p. 458). This socially constructed ideal generalizes the dominant/white perspective for meeting economic needs; men traveled from home and worked long hours including socializing after work hours, without having to return home and take care of domestic responsibilities themselves. Research showed, however, that women who have stepped into organizational leadership continue involvement in domestic needs of the household and therefore do not measure up to the ideal employee stereotype (Carli & Eagly, 2011, pp. 457-459). Not meeting the expectations inherent in the ideal is a likely setup for triggering an emotional response like in Brown’s (2004, 2006) shame web.

Generalized gendered subtexts embedded in the discourse for infrastructure and operating principles in Western capitalist organizations reproduce gender-based oppressions that exert power-over women (Acker, 1990). Similar to Carli and Eagly’s (2012) “ideal employee,” Acker (1990) describes a process of oppression that is through the perception of a “universal worker.” This universal worker is a disembodied individual that works a job based on expectations and social behaviors stereotyped for men. It does not allow for factors related to female bodies, social interests, emotions or family responsibilities (pp. 150-151). This is particularly important when ranking positions in organizations. If ranking is based on having minimal responsibilities outside
the job, or confined emotional expressions, or interests in male-centered activities, women will not move into higher ranks in the organization (p. 153).

Acker’s (1988) theory of gendered organizations shows that the production and distribution of wages are “gendered processes” (pp. 477-478). Organizational structures and relationships are based on perceptions (beliefs and images) of gender (p. 477), and by operationalizing perceptions of gender, gendered perceptions are reproduced. Furthering the implications of this argument is that is that wage was distributed through marriage and family relationships. Marriage and family were the social structures whereby wages were distributed; wages of the male were distributed to the family through the woman and her unpaid labor. Though this ideal of a family wage is a twentieth-century white Western phenomenon, “it is still enshrined in much of American family law and cultural notion about family” (p. 484). Federal and state governing systems have, until recently with the redefinition of marriage with a ruling on June 26, 2015 (https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/marriage), utilized the male/female-gendered ideal of family to prescribe wage distribution and assistance with wages. Whether earned or provided by the state, personal relations are recognized as a structure/rule for distributing wages.

**How do stereotypes function?** Stereotypes enforce expectations for social roles and elicit conscious or unconscious attitudes of prejudice. When stereotypes are left unexamined and unchallenged, the gender roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002) in the stereotype can be internalized and attached to beliefs about oneself (Eagly & Carli, 2007). If Brown is correct, then shame can be triggered by not meeting expectations, and even more so when these expectations are internalized.
Acker’s (1990) theory of gendered organizations describes processes by which prescribed gender-based stereotypes govern organizational relationships (pp. 146-147). How is gender constructed in this context? In Acker’s theory, gender is constructed in relational processes that compare differences between women and men and have something to do with power (Scott, 1988). The processes are: first, divisions relating to type of work, positions, ways of behaving, and operational rules that reconstitute gender divisions; second, the construction of ideals and images that reinforce gendered divisions such as acceptable ways of dressing; third, socializing processes such as content of conversations; fourth, the use of these processes to construct gender-based identity, for example, constructing effective leadership as the embodiment of the masculine; and last, the underlying assumption that organizations are gender-neutral rather than identifying the perspective (male) that formed the substructures and define what is necessary for positions within organizational ranking and hierarchy (Acker, 1990, pp. 146-147). For example, job evaluations work to define what is expected at particular ranks in an organization, but it also reinforces the values determined to be successful in leadership ranks and gendered social roles. If the evaluations are based on male leadership traits, individuals would run up against expectations for the role based on traditional male traits.

Furthermore, stereotypes have been found to have prescribed what is defined as competence in areas such as leadership. Goldberg’s (1968) research on studying discrimination in hiring and promotion processes showed that when women exhibited agentic vs. communal personality traits, their competence was perceived differently (Eagly & Karau, 2002, pp. 582-583). When women led with agentic traits, they were evaluated as less competent, even though they had to meet higher standards than men to
prove they were qualified (pp. 583-585). When comparing responses to women and men’s speech, men responded positively to tentative speech from women and women responded positively to assertive or confident speech from women. Finally, women gave a lower rating to self-promoting female participants than men but gave a higher rating for men who promoted themselves (p. 584).

Stereotypes are used to select and exclude because prejudice is elicited when gendered traits and leader roles are incongruent. Gender roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002) are formed when behavioral expectations were generalized for sex, either men or women. When a leadership role intersects with an injunctive norm for a gender role (e.g. communal for women), it elicits prejudice. When a leadership role intersects with gendered descriptions that prescribe traits as feminine or masculine, prejudice is elicited. To demonstrate this point, Eagly and Karau’s (1991) study analyzed research data on the emergence of a leader in a leaderless group and examined gendered behaviors associated with designated tasks of the groups. They found that men emerged as leaders in leaderless task-oriented groups. Women emerged as leaders in groups assigned tasks requiring relational traits. A significant finding was that tasks worked to define who would lead. Women and men emerged as leaders depending on the competence of the leader related to the task. Women were associated with negotiation and dialogue, and men were associated with tasks requiring less social interaction. Therefore, women emerged as leaders in groups that had more time to complete the task, allowing for more relational interaction (pp. 704-705).

Stereotypes prescribe leadership styles and limit women’s options. Leadership style is defined as the way a leader consistently behaves in a leadership role (Eagly &
Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Carli and Eagly’s (2001) meta-analysis found that women were perceived as less effective leaders when using leadership styles that did not align with social roles. Females exhibited interpersonal and democratic leadership styles and males exhibited task-oriented and autocratic styles. When females exhibited autocratic styles they were evaluated negatively (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Gutek and Morasch (1982) argued that private to public “gender roles spillover” in organizational settings, constraining leaders to behavior that aligns with gender roles. This spillover effect aligns with Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) research on gender bias, where males and females demonstrated task orientation in organizational settings, but females diverted and aligned with gender roles in experimental settings by leading in a communal style. Although task orientation gender bias did not remain evident in an organizational context, it was evident in context that prescribed autocratic leadership styles. This shows that gender-based roles are not fixed but remain a factor that can limit options.

Like social rules for girls (Elias, 1939/1994), or unrealistic expectations for women’s bodies, shame can be triggered when expectations that make up stereotypes are internalized (Brown, 2009). The effect is that “I am bad because I do not measure up,” which impacts one’s perception of oneself. Since stereotypes affect organizational relationships and prescribe competent leadership they impact all levels of leadership. It seems likely that prejudice towards styles of leadership and gender traits would elicit shame.

**How do stereotypes change?** Stereotypes are not insurmountable. Research that shows evidence of changing stereotypes for leaders is evidenced by increase of female traits used to describe effective managerial roles (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). That
stereotypes are not static or fixed leaves room for acceptance of diversity with more than gender, but racial, ethnic, and religious differences. The challenges created by gender stereotypes have not stopped women from moving into senior leader roles, though representation is still low (Gangone & Lennon, 2014; Kellerman & Rhode, 2014). One way of developing leadership is to become aware of and understand the use of stereotypes, while navigating leadership (Brown, 2007; Koenig & Eagly, 2014). In this way one could say that these theories give credit to the development of resilience in female leaders.

One way to change a stereotype is to change the group’s social roles and related behaviors for roles (Koenig & Eagly, 2014, p. 381). Obstacles and resistance to changing stereotypes include attaining access to roles and role incongruity. In Koenig and Eagly’s study, when the demands of the new role differed from current role it elicited prejudice towards the group member entering the role (see also Eagly, 2004; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Some leaders that did not fit stereotypes for roles were viewed as exceptions and did not contribute to changing the stereotype. It was only if the observable behavior of the larger group changed that the stereotype changed (Brewer, Dull & Lui, 1981). When new roles were acquired, the behaviors changed to reflect the gendered stereotype of the new occupant of the role (Koenig & Eagly, 2014, p. 382). Currently, the lack of women on senior leadership could be related to roles that are stereotyped for a specific gender, thereby discriminating against women.

**What are the implications?** As social constructs, stereotypes form beliefs that can elicit prejudice and discrimination. Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) studies unpack social psychological dynamics that are “under the surface” of social discourse and that are
misapplied and assimilated into beliefs about gender and leadership. Eagly’s work allows for awareness of how prejudice emerges and how it contributes to disadvantaging women in leadership. Without these words and ideas to explain the impact of engaging stereotypes, discrimination against women in leadership would continue to be a barrier to women in leadership.

The impact of prejudice and discrimination as a result of gendered stereotypes was found to be a cause for the underrepresentation of women in senior leadership positions (Carli & Eagly, 2012). Carli and Eagly’s analysis of studies showed that whatever gender was stereotyped for a particular position, the same gender was favored for the position in an interview, even though each gender was equally qualified. Men were favored for jobs that were considered gender-neutral while women were favored for jobs that were specified as normative for females (p. 452). Carli and Eagly’s research showed that female leaders were discriminated against when applying for leadership roles that were incongruent with gendered stereotypes. They suggested that to avoid bias women needed to align behaviors with injunctive norms, which are beliefs that depict what a woman ought to do and are enforced by the group. For example, women ought to care for family because they are more relational. “Research thus makes a strong case that prejudicial barriers against female leaders are a major factor accounting for their rarity in elite leadership roles” (p. 457). Based on this study, women who did not fit the gendered behavior assigned to a leadership role were discriminated against. Surprisingly, women that move into leadership roles that are not congruent with gendered stereotypes may find themselves metaphorically on a glass cliff.
The “glass cliff effect” (Ryan & Haslam, 2005) is a metaphor for describing the vulnerability of leaders who are in a role incongruent with gendered stereotypes. Brescoll, Dawson, & Uhlmann’s (2010) study was designed to examine the glass cliff effect and how making one mistake in a gender incongruent job impacted the participant’s status. Predicted in this study was that females and males who were in roles congruent with their gender would be evaluated as competent. When they were in roles incongruent with their gender, and made one mistake, they would be discriminated against. The research participants were female and male police chiefs and presidents of a women’s college. The results indicated that the leader in a gender incongruent job was viewed as incompetent when a single mistake was made (a female police chief, and a male president of women’s college); when they did not make a mistake, their competence was rated similar to the gender congruent participants. The risks involved for leaders who take on leadership roles that are not congruent with their gender roles are that they will fall off a professional cliff, from perceived incompetence (pp. 1641-1642).

Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) research works just under the surface of unconscious social psychological dynamics, but it stops short of explaining the intrapersonal and biological dynamics (Lewis, 2000; Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963) at play when engaging with stereotypes. A cognitive approach to understanding stereotypes can explain the way stereotypes govern social interactions, decision-making, and preferences, which is helpful in articulating the challenges faced and strategizing for change. But the current state of females in leadership, with women prepared to take the next step but not taking it, indicates that there is more to the story (Kellerman & Rhode, 2014; White,
2014; Teague, & Bobby, 2014). My research takes a deeper look under the surface of stereotypes how emotion regulation (Gross & Thompson, 2007) is at play.

**What Happens when Engaging with Stereotypes?** One aspect of Eagly’s (2007) research that opens a way to a deeper look is what happens when a stereotype is activated. If a stereotype has a negative association for the role, the threat of being associated with that stereotype can impact perceptions of effectiveness or, even more to the point of shame, a sense of belonging. But how is the threat navigated? How does navigating this threat build resilience? And, to dig deeper into the experience of the threat, what affect is experienced in this threat?

Stereotypes are used to fit into a group and elicit belonging by defining and enforcing acceptable and unacceptable behavior for social roles. “Unconscious activation of gender stereotypes” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 94) occurs when there is threat of association with an unfavorable stereotype by a group member or stereotype threat (Schmader, Johns, & Forbes, 2008). For example, after crying in front of her colleagues, a female leader may experience anxiety about being perceived as not strong enough or equipped to lead because of demonstrating behavior (crying) that is generally associated with women (Barrett, Bliss-Moreau, & Phelps, 2009; Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000; Schiffenbauer & Babineau, 1976) and anticipating that the effect would be to be interpreted as ineffective or incompetent, especially in contexts where masculine leadership traits are the norm.

Awareness of the [unfavorable] stereotype and concern about fulfilling it can interfere with a person’s ability to perform a task well, lessen working memory (Schmader & Johns, 2003) and cognitive capacity (Forbes & Schmader, 2010) even when
that person does not believe the stereotype to be true (Schmader, Johns, & Forbes, 2008). In Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky’s (2001) study on the effect of gender-based stereotypes and performance in negotiations they found that when stereotypes were implicit, performance was undermined by the threat of fulfilling the unwanted stereotype. When the stereotypes were explicit, however, the responses of their participants differed from what the stereotype predicted. They conclude “that performance would best be improved by making the implicit explicit. At least that offers the women a chance to rebel against the stereotype” (p. 956). More to the point of teaching on resilience in leadership education, Forbes and Schmader (2010) found that retraining attitudes from stereotypes can make a difference in performing tasks associated with the stereotype.

What I am most interested in Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) research is the emotion response to stereotypes and how female leaders and educators respond when a stereotype is at play. If some women become anxious and avoid leadership for fear of confirming doubts that are embedded in negative stereotypes about female leadership, then how would other women leaders know how to navigate these occurrences? Can it be assumed that female leaders are aware of stereotypes? Where is a trace of shame and emergence of resilience in either response?

The purpose of social role theory is to explore challenges and barriers in female leadership and equip leadership educators. Research on social roles and stereotypes have informed leadership educators and contributed to increasing the number of women leaders, but there needs to be more. Social psychology and leadership researchers have been exploring the challenges and barriers that impact the development and advancement of leaders (Eagly, 2007; Longman & Anderson, 2016). Theories on stereotypes and
social roles have provided significant information for understanding the conscious and unconscious dynamics that are at play in leadership. By equipping educators with an understanding of social roles these theories have contributed to growing numbers of women in the leadership pipeline. Challenges that are not explicit, articulated, or acknowledged can become barriers for women leaders.

**Relevant Theorists**

**Jacques Derrida: Deconstruction.** The first theorist relevant for my research is Jacques Derrida, a French philosopher known for approaching knowledge, meaning and truth by looking for the tensions and heterogeneities in the structure of language. Deconstruction works against the modernist approach that meaning and knowledge are fixed and closed (St. Pierre, 2000, pp. 481-484). In 1967, Derrida published *De la Grammatologie* which was one of over 70 published works. Deconstruction has persisted through over forty years of opposition and acknowledgement, in part due to the implication that it destroys or deconstructs what essentialism would posit as truth or reality or in the terms of poststructuralism, it denies that there is a signifier that represents a “transcendental signified” (Scott, 1988).

**Deconstruction Described.** Derrida (1967/1974) challenged the notion of a metaphysical hierarchy that privileged the spoken word over the written word (logos) and that the written word signifies the spoken word (Scott, 1988). Deconstruction is based on the concepts of structuralism (Saussure, 1998), that language is a structured system made of up parts of language that are defined in contrast or equivalent with each other. The components of Saussure’s structured system of language are a signified, signifier, sign and referent. A signifier is a word that represents a concept or idea which is the signified.
A sign is made of both a signified and the signifier. A referent is the object or idea. There is a difference between an idea of an object and the object. Additionally, the relationship between the signifier and signified is arbitrary (no “natural” connection) which accounts for why there are different words for the same object. For example, the signifier “tree” represents an idea and image in my mind that might be different from someone who does not live in the northwest. This arbitrary connection between the signifier and signified is what poststructuralism expanded its theories on.

Barthes (1975), influential in poststructural thought, noted that all understanding is built on referencing other signifiers. For example the signifier for tree, can also be a signifier for forest, which can also be a signifier for environment etc. Derrida (1967/1974) refers to this chain of signifiers (Spivak, 1989) when writing that there is “no meaning outside the text” (Derrida, 1967/1974, p. 158) or that understanding is built on a system of language and that language refers back to language for meaning.

Additionally, understanding is postponed because all referents and meaning can reinterpreted to mean something else. Instead of assigning a meaning to a sign that is no longer open for new understanding (modernism), Derrida (1967/1974) believed that a sign not only has meaning but the meaning differs and defers or delays. He coined the term différance (differ and defer) and that there is a play of meanings between them. Deconstruction questions meanings in a sign and finds there are more than one, that they are in tension, and that there are meanings that are also delayed. In this way there is an absence of the deferred meaning and a presence of the meaning(s) that are evident. Some might say that this is a negative perspective. Another way of thinking about it is that
there is an ability to understand multiple meanings in the text and that there is a sense of flexibility that one can play with meanings that contrast in the text.

This play of meaning may sound irresponsible or disrespectful, but as Derrida (2002b) describes it, deconstruction is something that affirms (p. 27). Derrida’s critics pointed to valuing of the historicity of the text. Derrida was clear in stating that deconstruction begins with developing an understanding of the “tradition” of the text by looking to the historical context such as the etymology or origins to understand the beginning. Then the philosophical, theological and theoretical history of the concept and how it evolved, changed, and opens. The posture that Derrida describes having when approaching the texts was not one of “commanding, repeating, or conserving this heritage. It is an analysis which tries to find out how their thinking works or does not work, to find the tensions, the contradictions, the heterogeneity within their own corpus” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 9). The difference between the origins of a concept and its evolution, are the tensions that point to transformation.

The intent of deconstruction is to move in and among the text, rather than approaching it from the outside. Deconstruction is not a tool used to transcribe interviews; it is more of what happens when in an interview conversation.

“Deconstruction is something which happens and which happens inside” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 9) an event of analyzing “the functioning and disfunctioning of [the] work” (p. 9) and of “keep[ing] the event of tradition going, to keep it on the move, so that it can be continually translated into new events” (p. 37). Caputo describes this tension between keeping with tradition and disrupting for something new in this way (Derrida & Caputo, 1997):
Deconstruction is made of: not the mixture but the tension between memory, fidelity, the preservation of something that has been given to us, and, at the same time, heterogeneity, something absolutely new, and a break. The condition of this performative success, which is never guaranteed, is the alliance of these to newness. (p. 6)

The alliance to newness is the hope that this approach brings, though as Caputo (1997) writes this success is not guaranteed. Near the end of the preface in Of Grammatology, Spivak (1976) reflects on why undo and redo text; why not situate fixed meaning in the text? Why question what an author is saying? She describes two “desire[s] of deconstruction”: first is to work with the text to demonstrate what the text “does not know,” and second is to work with the text so that it is no longer closed and enter the “open-ended indefiniteness of textuality” (p. lxxvii). This approach has drawn me in because of my desire to understand the shame and how the concepts for shame have been redone through the years.

Deconstruction at work. In this study I have put deconstruction to work by looking for understandings in and around the texts, not privileging the voice over the text or closing meanings as fixed, universal, absolutes. Instead it looks for the moment in narratives where the text indicates a disruption or expansion of concepts outside of or different than prior understanding. This disruption could be evident as a “trace” (Derrida, 1967/1974) or an indication that a historical or traditional meaning is present and at play in the making of a new understanding. This relates to Scheff’s (2014) focus on expanding or unfixing the understanding of shame in the Anglo West to include embarrassment and guilt. It relates to Brown (2006) by “decentering voice” and looking
in the text for how the participants find new meaning in shame experiences. It relates to Eagly (2007) by identifying “trace” of what was, such as a previous understanding of shame from engaging stereotypes enforced in leadership. Finally, it relates to “event” as a moment of deconstruction preserving what is known and looking for a new understanding (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 10).

Etymology is the study of the origin and meaning of words and is useful in exploring the limits; it allows a search for “the tensions, the contradictions, [and] the heterogeneity within” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 9). The etymology of the word shame from the OED Online stems from the Germanic roots skam, and Old High German scant meaning “ashamed” (“shame, n.”, 2011). The pre-Germanic root is thought to be skem (variant of kem) meaning “to cover.” The act of covering up is an expression of shame. Applying this to Von Raumer’s text for girls written in 1857, the trace of shame is in instructing mothers to cover up or silence conversations about sex (in Elias, 1939/1994, p.149-154).

Additionally, meaning for heterogeneity and tensions are found in its Latin root. One Latin root for shame is rubor (OED Online, “rubor, n.”, 2011), which can be translated as “redness,” “blush,” “modesty,” “shame,” and “disgrace.” Redness, blushing (“blusher, n.”, 2011), shame, disgrace, are symbols of modesty and was the intended effect of the Von Raumer’s (in Elias, 1939/1994; 1857) instruction. “The primary concern was the necessity of instilling ‘modesty’ (i.e., feelings of shame, fear, embarrassment, and guilt) or, more precisely, behavior conforming to the social standard” (Elias, 1939/1994, p.152). Rubor or redness, therefore, would be a mark of modesty that included shame and disgrace; displaying this was physical evidence that social standards
were enforced and adhered to. Shame in this context is developed to enforce socially appropriate behavior.

In deconstruction (Derrida & Caputo, 1997), keeping within tradition is important, as is looking and listening for “the in-coming of the other” (p. 42) understandings. Therefore, the etymology of shame will be analyzed from an essentialist, conventionalist, and deconstructionist lens (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). If shame were considered from an essentialist point of view, it would be viewed as unchanging. The experience of shame would be considered as expressed the same today as yesterday or tomorrow, because the essence of shame would not change (Crotty, 1998). In the Christian educational context, this is significant for women who have absorbed from cultural discourse a sense that the essence of woman is associated with shame, as portrayed in the Genesis 1 and 2 Biblical texts. Also contributing to the discourse are early writers of the church whose influence is traced in current theological and ecclesial doctrine (Fiorenza, 1986). These concepts are absorbed by women as a cultural stereotype and become an inherent belief about self (Brown, 2009; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Wood & Eagly, 2015). They may feel as if they are a disgrace and “try-harder” to believe otherwise (VanVonderen, 2008). But what if shame were understood outside a concept of transcendental essence of woman?

A conventionalist perspective (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) would consider shame from a historical standpoint and how it has been expressed in the past. This is significant for women in theological education who attend seminary but do not consider congregational leadership because, for instance, the denomination they are associated with does not teach the history of women in the church and adheres to a conservative
interpretation of Biblical scripture that prohibits full congregational leadership for women (women teaching men, for example) (Gallagher, 2004; Smith, 2000). In the conservative evangelical subculture, the discourse is often silent about women and leadership much like Elias’s (1939/1994) read of Von Raumer’s text. The underlying message of keeping silent utilizes hidden shame as a taboo (woman as shame) to regulate social standard. It is a taboo to speak of shame in these contexts, yet “speaking shame” is an important aspect of developing resilience to it (Brown, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2009).

A deconstructionist perspective (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) would question inherent oppressive beliefs of self and make apparent the tensions of reductive perspectives based on categories associated with sexual biases (Weedon, 1997). Women leaders in Christian education learn to question the ancient, historical and current cultural standards. For example, women in the religious context may realize that they had been taught that to act modestly means to cover up characteristics of leadership in order to uphold the acceptable social standards and beliefs of self for women.

**Chris Weedon: Feminist Poststructuralism.** The second theorist relevant to my research is Chris Weedon (1997). Weedon’s framework for understanding gender in Western society centers on patriarchy and the power that is produced by discursive practices and how gender is constituted in discourse that. “Patriarchal power rests on the social meaning given to biological sexual difference. In patriarchal discourse, the nature and social role of women are defined in relation to a norm which is male” (p. 2). The traditional/historical use of the word “man” or “he” for “human” is evidence of the literary subjugation of women to men.
Like Derrida (1967/1974), Weedon (1997) focuses on the use and function of binaries to define words in comparison to other words, and written to represent which word is used to define the other. For example, in the male/female binary, the word female is defined as opposed to male. Another example of a binary is guilt/shame. In this example, guilt is defined over and against shame and represents how I described the historical development of understanding guilt and shame (from S. Freud). The reason this is significant is the privilege of the one (male and guilt) and the subjection of the other (female and shame). It produces a power structure in language that represents and reproduces social structures of power. "Deconstruction, by reversing these oppositions, is able to show how discourses achieve their effect, rhetorically, and to displace their systems” (p. 159). The task of deconstruction is to decouple the binaries and unfix their meanings by examining the limits of each word, searching for contradictions and heterogeneities, to bring in new understandings of the words. Deconstruction is included in poststructuralism.

Feminist poststructuralism adds the element of undoing hierarchy as it relates specifically to gender. And for Weedon (1997), it also includes unfixing hierarchy that perpetuates a “power over” dynamic/subjugation in regards to race, ethnicity and social class. The feminist poststructuralism critiques “the way in which texts construct meanings and subject positions for the reader, the contradictions inherent in this process, and its political implications, both in its historical context and in the present” (p. 162). This critique does not support humanism’s claim to an essential nature of women and men, rather looks to social discourse for evidence of the construction of gender that “encompasses desire, the unconscious and conscious emotional life” (p. 162). Neither
does it support an essential feminine in the biological processes of women, such as childbirth or menses. Rather women are constituted as subjects in historical discourse yet may not have access to the process or the production of gendered experience and relations of power in discourse. Experiences of women are not interpreted as a one-size-fits-all but that there are multiple understandings and have implications that disrupt structural systems.

Following the argument that natural/biological processes determine social roles and tasks is a “fundamental patriarchal assumption” (p. 2). This line of thinking results in discriminatory practices that reproduce labor division per gender such as maternity leave for women and not men, and expectations for senior leadership roles that do not consider responsibilities for family and thus privilege men over women.

Weedon (1997) argues that recent structures are organized around biological sex that women are equal but different, and policies that consider “natural differences” such that women are naturally equipped for family responsibilities. Expectations for the role of mother or father, and definitions of what are traits for a good mother or father are attached to biological sex. A good mother is caring, so women are naturally more caring, and a good father is strong so men are naturally stronger. These ideals become rules for dictating division of labor around what qualifies as feminine or masculine traits for roles; historically, feminine traits have been assigned to education, nursing, customer service and masculine traits to scientists, management, executives, although since the second wave feminist movement, these roles have been shifting (Koenig & Eagly, 2014).

Weedon (1997) describes the task for this feminist critique is to look to the text for understanding how gender is constituted. She attends to the critique of early
feminism as a generalized perspective based on white, middle-class Western women, and directs the researcher to look for the ways race and class are also depicted when gender is constituted in discourse (p. 163). Furthermore, Weedon directs readers and researchers to consider the historical and current context from which the text emerges, and discourses therein.

**Review of Study**

In Chapter Two I presented a review of the literature on approaches to shame, shame and social interaction, shame and resilience, and gender-based stereotypes. Additionally, I presented two theorists who provide a guiding lens for my study, Derrida (1967/1974) on deconstruction and Weedon (1997) on feminist poststructuralism. These theories situated my study in the language used by participants in retelling a moment of shame in leadership. The point of my research was to produce knowledge on how women move through shame and the effect of moments of shame in leadership, and what they do to develop resilience to it. I continue in the following chapter to detail how I will conduct this study.
Chapter Three Methods

This study is designed to contribute to the knowledge of shame and women leaders in Christian higher education. It could have been designed as a quantitative study from a psychosocial approach that explored the intersection of female leadership, shame in social discourse and gendered social roles/stereotypes. Based on the review of literature, there seems to be a growing interest in shame and threat to stereotypes (Forbes & Schmader, 2010; Schmader, Johns, & Forbes, 2008). The research I found, however, did not speak to instances of shame for women leaders in institutional social discourse. Furthermore, Brown’s (2006) research explicitly covered why women experience shame, and other psychological researchers (Tangney & Dearing, 2002) address this aspect as well. Although I am deeply committed to understanding inter and intra relational aspects of shame experiences in women leader or why women experience shame, that kind of research, is best left to psychologists, therapists, and social workers who are trained to notice shame in its various instances: chronic shame, shame and trauma, shame and attachment theory. My interest is on how shame is expressed in language from women working in the context of leadership Christian higher education. I am interested in naming shame messages that are embedded in Christian higher education, noting the trace of gender-based prejudice and dismantling the binaries like shame/vulnerability, shame/women, shame/motherhood, shame/singleness, shame/non-maleness, shame/Christian etc.

The purpose of this study is to produce knowledge of what women leaders in Christian higher education do when engaging with gender-based stereotypes that elicit a moment of shame and how they have made sense of the experience in a deconstruction
event. I approached this study by considering this question: how does the moment of shame for women leaders in higher education disrupt the institution? The study is designed to decenter the subject by folding in the theory of deconstruction as an event (Derrida & Caputo, 1997). I will put the concept shame/leader under erasure as I analyze the data for an event of deconstruction and look in the excess for the trace of resilience to shame and gender stereotypes.

I begin this chapter by presenting a background of theoretical frameworks for research methods within qualitative research to situate this study in the larger context of social science research. I follow by introducing deconstruction and how informs this study and what it allows for in research. Next I describe “plugging one text into another” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) as the methodological stance best suited for producing knowledge on what female leaders do in moments of shame. The remaining sections of this chapter detail the process I used for selecting research participants, collecting and analyzing data, ethical considerations and limitations for the study.

**Research Methods**

Poststructuralism is a way of conceptualizing how humanity has organized around thinking about meaning and understanding. The theoretical paradigm I am using in this study is a poststructuralist framework. It is helpful to understand the progression of paradigmatic frameworks over the course of time, and consider how thinking as theorizing have been and are being framed. The focus in this recounting is to understand the “tradition” of concepts and look for the “trace” (Derrida, 1967/1974) of tradition through emerging frameworks. The point is that language is a system of relationships which are in constant flux and flow, chained together by signifiers that represent the trace
of tradition. Modernism, postmodernism, structuralism, poststructuralism are connected in the system of language with signs and symbols that depict how meaning has been made and that new understandings are always already forming in the absent presence of différance. What defines poststructuralism and why is that important to thinking and learning? I will begin with modernity and trace the sociopolitical movements of modernism and postmodernism. Then I will move into structuralism as it relates to modernism and discuss central aspects of poststructuralism focused on Derrida’s work therein. I will conclude with descriptions of applying deconstruction to my research on shame.

While modernity was a historical movement of culture, modernism describes the sociocultural response to the shift. The industrial revolution changed western culture by developing and propagating the “modern machine” (Wertsch, 1998). It centralized workforce in urban settings and increased the speed at which goods could be produced, first treating human workforce as machinery and eventually replacing human workforce with machinery. Crotty (1998) situated this shift historically as modernity. Prior to modernity reason and rationality were the centering forces of the Enlightenment. They propelled human thinking and organizing away from Pre-enlightenment ways of knowing that were commonly depicted as irrational superstition and into a system of beliefs in truths that could be reasoned. With the emergence of the scientific method, truth could be “discovered” and defined the limits of what became known as “the universal truth” and knowledge. Alternatively, Harvey (1989) described modernism from an architectural perspective that emerged as a reaction to “belief in linear progress, absolute truths, the rational planning of ideal social orders, and the standardization of knowledge and
production” (p. 9). In the late nineteenth century modernism emerged in art and literature as a “response to modernization and modernity” (Crotty, 1998, p. 186). Like modernity, it explored ways of knowing through experimentation, but looked into paradox and ambiguity.

Structuralism is similar to modernity (Crotty, 1998) in that it is a quest for grounding and locating meaning in forms much like text and modernist art. In structuralism, language is a social structure that produces meanings in speech and words (St. Pierre, 2000). Meanings of speech are ambiguous until they are attached to a sign or symbol as in a word. Although speech is part of the system or institution of language the sign of a “word is an event” (p. 198). Saussure (1998) theorized that human systems center around language. Saussure conceptualized language as a series of signs (Weedon, 1997, p. 23) or science of signs known as semiotics (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 27). Signs are comprised of signifiers (written words, spoken words and sounds) and signifides (meaning). For example, the word or sign of shame signifies a concept or meaning of shame. Signs “have no intrinsic meaning … [as in humanism] but obtain meaning because of their difference from other signs in language” (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 481). For Saussure (1998) the signifier as form or symbol communicates the meaning of the signified as concept or idea and the meanings of concepts are fixed. The relationship between the signified and signifier is arbitrary in that that they are a discrete, self-referential system. In this way they are a self-enclosed system.

Whereas structuralism fixes meaning in the concept that is signified by sign, humanism (St. Pierre, 2000 p. 478) posits that meaning is found in conceptualizing the essence of a thing. Humanist theories of language generally work toward the things in
the world being named and signified by a word. Between the word and the thing is an identity or an essence from which categories are formed. Essence is “the single, unique factor that enables one to identify something or someone and group it with others of its kind in various structures” (p. 480). Meanings for shame, from a humanist standpoint, may be considered as concepts, independent of words “out there” to be discovered (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, pp. 68-70). As concepts, they have meanings independent from the words and carry those meanings into categories such as woman—woman as shame or woman as vulnerable.

In structuralism, signs are set up in a binary to define meaning by what the other is not. For example, in the guilt/shame binary, guilt is defined by what shame is not, and shame is defined by what guilt is not. In a poststructural perspective, the understanding of guilt and shame as signs are not fixed, but change when in different contexts. Scott (1988) describes poststructural thought as having “no transparent or self-evident relationship between [words] and either ideas or things, no basic or ultimate correspondence between language and the world” (p. 35). Binaries can serve to open rather than close understandings because language is contextually situated and not fixed in a universal understanding. For example, my understanding of guilt/shame shifted when talking about shame to a colleague who is a Keetoowah Cherokee (legal descendent) scholar and activist. In his culture shame is used to evoke a desire for belonging to the group followed by making reparation (guilt). My understanding of shame and guilt shifted by considering the intent for the use of shame—to bring back into the social group. In this way the binary guilt/shame was useful for opening up new understandings.
Postmodernism, on the other hand, is yet another movement of humanity’s way of thinking and organizing. As with modernity, postmodernity is conceptualized as a historical movement of culture. Lather (1993) described postmodernism as raising “issues of chronology economics (e.g., post-Fordism) and aesthetics” (p. 688). It emerged as a response to foundationalism that supports a belief in empirical knowledge that is discerned through the senses (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 457).

Postmodern discourses are all “deconstructive” in that they seek to distance us from and make us skeptical about beliefs concerning truth, knowledge, power, the self, and language that are often taken for granted within and serve as legitimation of contemporary Western culture. (Flax, 1987, p. 624)

Crotty (1998) situated postmodernism in the 1960’s as a new socio-political reality that required new “forms of representation and communication” (p. 191). A key aspect of postmodernism that differs from modernism is a “movement of ‘unmaking’” (p. 192). Distinctions of “high” culture and popular culture are blurred and no alternatives (such as objective, universal truth) are offered for the “radical ambiguity, hyper-reality and [prevailing] simulations” (p. 194) of postmodernism.

What of Poststructuralism? Poststructuralism, according to Crotty (1998), is a “corollary of postmodernism” (p. 196). Poststructuralism is not postmodernism but may be part of the framework of postmodernism, though a poststructuralist like Derrida (1967/1974), would not identify himself as a postmodernist.

Poststructuralism maintains four out of five characteristics that Milner (1991, pp. 65-66) characterizes of structuralism. First, structuralism is anti-historical which is a focus on a “never ending theoretical present” (p. 65) whereby hidden and deep realities
shape “the realm of the empirically obvious” (p. 66) and challenge perspectives that claim historical Truths can be universally applied. Second, it is committed to viewing the world as “contemplated differently” by “demystifying experiential reality” (Crotty, 1998, p. 199). Third, it invests in abstract theoreticals. Fourth, it is against humanism or human intention that fall outside the “structural properties of systems” (p. 199). The last character of structuralism is positivism. Crotty writes that Derrida (1967/1974) did not align himself with structuralism primarily because of his anti-positivist stand. Positivism splits object and subject, which is not possible from Derrida’s perspective; the observer cannot separate oneself from the observed (Crotty, 1998, p. 205). Additionally, Derrida (1967/1974) incorporates tradition which can be the historical understanding of concepts and signifiers and does not discard it.

A poststructuralist framework is a move away from structuralists pursuit of the “true” depths of meanings in language. Saussure (1998) preferred spoken language (phonocentricism) over written text to designate the transcendental signifier or essence of meaning to be truer in the spoken word (logocentricism) (Crotty, 1998, p. 207). Weedon (1997) described logocentricism as fixing meaning to spoken word because the consciousness of the speaker or speaker as writer is the source of the meaning (or metaphysics of presence). While Saussure privileged the concept/signified in speech, Derrida focused instead on written text and moving between texts as inter-textuality: “there is nothing outside the text [there is no outside-text; il n’y a pas de hors-texte]” (Derrida, 1967/1974, p. 158). According to Spivak (1976), Derrida described text as “a play of presence and absence, a place of the effaced trace” (p. lvii). The trace (Derrida, 1967/1974) of shame lurks prior to speaking the word shame and Derrida eschewed the
spoken word (phonocentricism) as an essential truth that reveals true meaning. Once the sign of shame occurs in the present, it is also absent and open for incoming of another understanding.

**Qualitative Research**

Qualitative research has a history of finding its place amidst methodological struggles that impose positivism as the gold standard for research, asserting legitimacy and therefore authority when it comes to educational policy, grant funding, publishing etc. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, pp. 1-2). Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) define three types of research in the social and behavioral sciences. First the studies that analyze numbers which are typically a quantitative approach in the postpositivist paradigm and second, studies that analyze narratives which are typically a qualitative approach and working in the constructivist paradigm. A third approach is to mix both quantitative and qualitative types of data working in paradigms such as pragmatism and transformative-emancipatory (p. 4).

The struggles of qualitative research are described in Teddlie and Tashakkori’s (2003) historical account of three paradigms conflicts. Prior to the 1950’s positivism and quantitative research was the “unquestioned methodological orientation” (p. 4) with some exceptions in anthropological and sociological studies. The 1950’s to the 1970’s were years of questioning the limits of positivist approach in “post” positivist research, although they continued to work with quantitative data. In the 1970’s and 1980’s postpositivist-constructivists argue against positivism while moving outside of the numerical approach to data and into narrative. Between 1990 and 2005, the conflict expanded to include critical theory paradigms against positivism. Currently evidence
based methodologists are in conflict with the mixed-methods, interpretive and critical theory methodologists (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, pp. 4-6). In the midst of these conflicts “[t]he field of qualitative research is on the move and moving in several directions” (p. 1). Qualitative researchers are developing emerging and hybrid paradigms that question interpretivism alongside of postcolonial epistemologies and social theory ontologies.

Denzin and Lincoln (2018) describe resistance to qualitative research evident in political discourse in and outside of the academy. At the beginning of the twenty-first century the political environment was reinvigorated with the reemergence of positivist evidence-based research in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (p. 13). Valued in this shift were quantitative studies, specifically causal models based on controlled experiments that could be replicated and results generalized. Of the qualitative methods, interviews, case studies and ethnographic models were considered beneficial because they provide descriptions that can be tested by experimental models, but in general, “qualitative research was rejected as not rigorous enough to count as high-quality science” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 448). Qualitative research associated with postmodernism including feminist, postmodern, critical race, and queer theories (St. Pierre & Roulston, 2006) were not considered as valid for producing truth. They point to the need to analyze qualitative research for the political and the procedural and bring to the surface the lingering dominance of positivism (Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004, pp. 7-8).

Discourse about qualitative research that is imbued in positivism continues to describe it as a “soft” science that produces criticism rather than producing theory that disrupts (Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004, p. 8). Evident in the discourse is an uneasiness regarding the qualitative critique of positivism and postpositivism. The
tendencies to elevate an objective truth that does not attend to opinion, bias, and personal values is the basis of experimental positivist research and what qualitative research disrupts. Even with the recent push into experimental qualitative research, the positivist and postpositivist proponents have declared “there is no way of verifying their truth statements” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 8). Instead the idea of objective truth is perpetuated in the assumption that reality is fixed and therefore can be explored, pinned down and assigned meaning. Opposing this view is poststructuralist method of describing how truth is constituted and deconstructed in discourse and other narrative methods. Positioning of one truth over another is the core of this continuing debate (p. 9).

The legacy of scientific research has been implicated as participating in colonial and European imperialistic oppressions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). It was in the name of research that anthropologists and ethnographers, and before them, colonialists justified explorations of the exotic and indigenous other (Erickson, 2018). “From the very beginning, qualitative research was implicated in a racist project” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 9). Because of the implications of research on participants, Denzin and Lincoln suggest that researchers study within their own context.

Understanding qualitative research inside a historical perspective gives a partial presentation of the complexities and transformations that are occurring. Qualitative research locates itself in the environment or context and through interpretive or material practices, the researcher “makes the world visible” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 10) through representations like interviews, documents, media, field notes etc. Qualitative research involves collecting material that describes the particular event or problem in the
moment of the participant’s life, and utilizes interpretive practices to understand what, why and/or how meaning is made of the particular instance or phenomena. Using more than one interpretive practice (triangulation, for example) in a study shows how the world looks different from different perspectives.

Qualitative research is a site of interpretive practices that does not privilege particular methodological practices. Each method (research strategy) has a history of practices with various uses and meanings. It “embraces tensions and contradictions, including disputes over its methods and the forms its findings and interpretations take” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 13).

Poststructural qualitative research that examines the interacting subject is criticized for elevating the experiential and disguising it as “authentic” (Silverman, 1997, pp. 248-249). On the other hand, examining the textual, narrative, and performative is viewed as devaluing the lived experience (Snow & Morrill, 1995). From the Chicago school tradition, Atkinson and Delamont (2006) support both qualitative and quantitative as long as the research is “conducted rigorously and contribute[s] to robustly useful knowledge” (p. 749, emphasis in the original). Their support of postmodern qualitative research is qualified because of the threat on traditional (positivist) qualitative research. Along the same lines, Denzin and Lincoln (2018) summarized Adler and Adler (2008) suggesting that radical postmodern research “give up” for the sake of social science and society (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 15).

St. Pierre (2013) adds a layer of understanding the evolution of qualitative research. She identifies “conventional humanist qualitative inquiry” (p. 451) that has remnants of positivism and calls for a “resurgence of postmodernism” (p. 450) to “get on
with the invention of science” (p. 451). In the institutionalization of qualitative inquiry, protocols for practicing have tightened the reins resembling what qualitative inquiry opposes. Therefore, she presents “post qualitative inquiry” to indicate after conventional humanist qualitative research, and to describe the work as an act of deconstructing conventional humanist qualitative research (p. 452). As a qualitative methodologist, St. Pierre works within the structure to critique it as “one [who] cannot not (wish to) inhabit” (Spivak, 1993, p. 284) it which is a deconstructive perspective. Deconstruction for St. Pierre (2013) is to put the qualitative research sous rature, or under erasure, keeping the structure of it (concepts and categories) and crossing it out by analyzing its limits and excesses. Her desire is not to destroy qualitative research, but it open it up for new understandings or ways of knowing. The point is to reimagine social science inquiry and to produce different knowledge and produce knowledge differently (pp. 450-452).

Disruption, however, occurs as the limits are cracked open like a nutshell (Derrida, 1967/1974; Derrida & Caputo, 1997) and the center is dislodged, similar what has been described in the history of social science and behavior research. “We move away from Plato's positioned gift of ontological determination, a logic of identity and prediction—Science is this; science is not that—toward a logic of the ‘and’—This and this and this and this. . . Thinking and doing that science is the invitation we risk accepting” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 452). What happens when the nutshell of qualitative research is cracked open, there is room for new understanding or ways of knowing. In Derrida’s (1967/1974) différance, the new way of knowing is on the move, it is differed from what has been and perpetually becoming (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). After
displacement from disruption, the task is not to find alternatives, but “pursue supplement, what always already escapes the structure” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 452).

**Introducing Deconstruction**

Deconstruction involves being responsible with “what has been given to us” (Derrida & Caputo, 1997, p. 6) while at the same time being open to new and dissimilar understandings. By saying responsible with I am referring to the tradition of the concept that is being deconstructed. Deconstruction is a break from tradition or what has been. It locates inconsistencies in concepts, making room for “the irruptive emergence of a new ‘concept,’ a concept which no longer allows itself to be understood in terms of the previous regime [systems of oppositions]” (Spivak, 1976, p. lxxvii). The concept of deconstruction as a way of thought began with Derrida (1967/1974) in *Of Grammatology*, where he challenged modernism (Crotty, 1998, p. 205) in its definition of meaning, truth, and knowledge as fixed and closed (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 482). His work disrupted the nature of truth by pushing out the boundaries of meaning in the structure of language that encapsulated philosophical disciplines. Derrida did this by questioning the foundations of truth in speech and text, and moving out of the text and into the spaces between the text because there is “no outside-text” (Derrida, 1967/1974, p. 158). The location of understanding was not in the essence of the sign (humanism) or the structure of the text or the opposition of the binaries (structuralism), but in the différance or the absent presence of understandings yet to come.

Furthermore, Derrida (1967/1974) did not see a signified and signifier as fixed but continually moving. The signified and signifier are in perpetual flux and flow with the incoming and absence of meaning. A way to signify this fluid movement is putting a
sign, for example shame, under *sous rature*, or erasure. Crossing out the sign shame indicates the need for yet inadequacy of the word (Crotty, 1998, p. 206) to display the trace of the absent yet present meaning related to the sign. Crotty adds, “Instead of assuming a definite sense in what is written, we remain aware of the infinite regress of meaning just referred to” (p. 206). Deconstruction works not to destroy, but to disrupt the text for the sake of potentialities.

Spivak (1976) wrote that Derrida’s (1967/1974) conceptualization of text as a place where the trace of tradition and new understanding is in flow of what is absent and present (p. lvii). This opposed a humanist understanding of the center as a place that contains the essence of meaning; the metaphysics of presence which was “the illusion, the ruse, the cheat, grounding mistake of Western metaphysics and positivist philosophy of science” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 460). Instead, the trace (Derrida, 1967/1974), for example, of shame lurks prior to speaking the word shame. Once the sign of shame occurs in the present, it is also absent and open for incoming of another understanding. In this way, understandings are multiple and differed. The moment there is understanding in a sign, the trace of another, like a historical meaning, postpones understanding (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 18). This is the absent presence of Derrida’s différance (Crotty, 1998, pp. 207-208).

Deconstruction is not an instrument, a method of analysis (St. Pierre, 2013, p 458), or “an essence. It’s not a school of thought; it is a way of reading” (Spivak, 1989, p. 135). It does not work on text as a hammer on a nail. Rather deconstruction happens to itself: “It is in some way the operation or rather the very experience that this text, it seems to me, first does itself, by itself, on itself” (Derrida, 1989/2002a, p. 264).
Deconstruction affirms new understandings in the absent presence rather than “preserv[ing] the illusion of truth as a perfectly self-contained and self-sufficient present” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 18). Derrida’s task was to move analysis out into aspects of discourse such as what is between the text as in the silence or in other forms of discourse such as humor (intertextuality). In order to affirm new understandings, fragments of understanding disentangle from a coherent whole and what was assumed as truth is now left open for new understandings.

The effect of dismantling of binaries in a deconstructive event is the breaking free of one sign defined over and against the other, like an act of justice that sheds light on a oppression that was once closed or fixed. St. Pierre (2013) refers to this as the ethical nature of deconstruction. “Once we give up appeals to transcendental/foundational truth, essence, and originary meaning (the universal, the eternal), responsibility and justice assume their full weight” (p. 461). The weight, for example, of dismantling gender, racial, ethnic stereotypes that prejudice and oppress. “If one has been on the wrong side of binaries and trapped in essentialist structures that control and shut down meaning and lives, the persistent critique of deconstruction against their founding violence can, indeed, be liberating” (p. 462).

**How does deconstruction inform this study?** A deconstructive event (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, pp. 17-18) that happens is different from deconstructing messages in culture discourse in SRT (Brown, 2006). Brown uses deconstruction as a method or a tool to describe a process of identifying shame when not measuring up to expectations communicated in television, music, mentors, friends, faith communities, advertising, magazines, colleagues, educators, books, and/or partners (Brown, 2006, 2007, 2009).
This use of deconstruction is not described as an event that happens, as it is for Derrida (1967/1974); the deconstruction of Derrida occurs without preconceived intent, but in the moment. By “in the moment” I am referring to the moment when what was once thought as true shifts to something new. The cultural messages, however, compete by depicting conflicting discourses of who, what, and how women “should” be and generated a sense in Brown’s participants of feeling trapped into believing they are unworthy of relationships because they could not measure up to the competing messages. Although this study is focused on the deconstructive event in the interview transcripts, noting identifying messages of shame in discourse may take on a non-Derridean form of deconstruction.

Poststructuralism allows for conflicting discourses and fragmented understandings like what occurs in a deconstructive event. Deconstruction destabilizes concepts like shame, in order to allow for new understandings. In the task of deconstruction, fixing meaning in a signifier like shame is impossible and/or paradoxical (aporia) because the word shame has multiple meanings (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 17). The task of deconstruction is to situate the meaning of shame only long enough to crack the nutshell of the concept open. This is an affirmative aspect of deconstruction and creates optimism. It resembles Brown’s resilience theory partially, by first, identifying shame messages in discourse, and second in speaking shame to trusted individuals thereby disrupting the threat of not belonging. The third aspect of Derrida’s task of deconstruction is where the concept is open for new understanding is not part of Brown’s resilience theory. For Brown, “there is nothing positive about shame. In any form, in any context, and through any delivery system shame is destructive” (2004, p. 51)
Considering a chain of signifiers of shame: blush - modest - embarrass shows how a moment of shame might be named shame but tilt more towards embarrassment rather than closed around a previous understanding of the moment named shame. I suspect that women leaders in my study will use different signifiers as they talk about how they developed resilience to shame.

A deconstructive event around patriarchy and scripture is a significant paradigm shift and even more so if there is a trace of shame in the event. Women in higher education, leadership who are conscious of the effects of patriarchy in scripture, are likely conscious of patriarchy in the institutional discourse of Christian higher education. The focus of this study is on women in Christian higher education leadership and what they have done in moments of shame in leadership, and how they have made sense of the experience. If Scheff (2014) is right in that shame in discourse is a silent and invisible threat, then shame would be “lurking” in the discourse of Christian higher education. If Christian leaders, regardless of gender, were aware of and able to talk about the shame experienced every day, then, according to Scheff, the violence that can occur as a result of unacknowledged shame (Block Lewis, 1971) is ameliorated.

**What does deconstruction allow in research?** Moments of shame are ordinary and familiar. When I start by defining shame in a class on shame, grace, and resilience, students often respond with, “Oh yeah, I know that feeling.” Once a concept of shame is constructed by distinguishing shame from guilt, embarrassment, and humiliation and moments of shame arise and students talk about it, the idea of shame transforms into something different. “Deconstruction deals very seriously with a very familiar concept and the aim of deconstruction is to examine a concept ‘with literal seriousness, so that it

Since shame is experienced as pain (Brown, 2006) or as a threat to social bonds (Scheff, 2000, 2003), it is bypassed (Block Lewis, 1971), denied or repressed (S. Freud, 1915/1957b; Goleman, 1985; Hill, 2015). But when a student faces into their shame (Lynd, 1958) the idea of shame and associated meanings are transformed into something new. Deconstruction allowed me to trace shame and look for new understandings from deconstructive events in interview transcripts.

Deconstruction also looks for differences, contradictions, irruptions. In the interview data I looked with an “eye on what the subjects are saying, writing, doing. But the other eye, a cock-eye, [will be] on what is not said, what discourses make it impossible to say, what practical or theoretical logics hide away from sight” (Miller, Whalley, & Stronach, 2005, p. 313). Through my analysis of the data I hoped to destabilize the text and expose the boundaries of constructs in the data to push the limits of the concept in a deconstructive event.

“Plugging In” as Methodology. My research methodology was modeled after Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012, 2013), thinking with theory and plugging in one text into another. My research design relied on Jackson and Mazzei’s analysis using Derrida’s theory to design analytic questions to engage with in the analysis of the data, like a conversation partner. As I was considering different qualitative methodologies for this study, I considered the psychosocial studies mentioned in my literature review. Most were based in positivist or constructionist qualitative methodologies. Scheff (1997) used discourse analysis and Brown (2006) used grounded theory with analysis techniques that themed, coded, and categorized shame. Eagly’s (1970, 1987, 2007) primary methods
were meta-analysis and experimental mixed methods qualitative research. Each one centered the understandings of the subject, found in the narrative and word patterns. Instead of centering the subject, I put the concept shame under erasure as I analyzed the interview data for an event of deconstruction and looked in the excess for trace of threats to social bonds, race, gender, social class. For example, putting shame under erasure in the analysis I found that one of my participants talked about emotions from a social constructivist framework while another from a Freudian framework. The meanings they assigned to shame was not fixed, however, as the conversations continued they added to their understanding of shame and sometimes changed it.

The simultaneous process of thinking with theory while reading the data is a methodology that is within and against interpretivism. Jackson and Mazzei (2012) are qualitative methodologists who have been writing on the limits of qualitative methodologies by deconstructing (Derrida, 1967/1974) elements of conventional qualitative methodologies such as voice (Jackson & Mazzei, 2009). They are not alone in this pursuit of new methodological knowledge as noted by Scheurich’s (1995) writing on interviews, Lather (1993) on validity, St. Pierre (1997) on data, and Pillow (2003) on reflexivity (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 452). Since the process decenters the subject, voice, data, etc. it goes against conventional interpretivist methodologies. They write,

It is such a rethinking of an interpretive methodology that gets us out of the representational trap of trying to figure out what participants in their studies ‘mean,’ and helps us to avoid being seduced by the desire to create a coherent and interesting narrative that is bound by themes and patterns. (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. viii)
The process of thinking with theory came about as Jackson and Mazzei (2012) researched first generation academics. They had already moved away from coding and categorizing as in conventional forms of data analysis, but had not systematized their processes. An opportunity arose to write a process-oriented book that would detail how to think with theory while studying first generation academics: *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research* (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). In the study they interviewed 10 women who identified as first-generation academics and put to use specific concepts from six poststructural theorists Derrida, Spivak, Foucault, Butler, Deleuze, and Barad.

Jackson and Mazzei (2012) described the process of “plugging one text into another” (p. 1) as coming from noting their own processes when engaged with the interview text. As they were reading the interview transcripts, they were thinking thoughts from deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1974), for example, and entering the assemblage. They were making new connections while “arranging, organizing and fitting together” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 262) in a process of assemblage in formation. In making connections they made different relationships among the texts, so that they constituted one another and created something new (p. 264); they produced new knowledge in a creation from chaos.

Drawing from Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 23), assemblage is made up of three fields: field of reality (the world), field of representation (the book), and field of subjectivity (the author). Jackson and Mazzei (2013) described the three fields as data, theory, and method in the field of reality, producing different knowledge in a field of representation, and becoming-researcher in a field of subjectivity. They plugged in two of the ten participants interview transcripts in the field of reality, and paid attention to the
how the participants situated themselves, the way they made meaning of their experiences, and how they described them in particular ways. For example, in my study I plugged in concepts of SRT (theory), the language of my participants (data) and the analytical questions that arose from looking at the data through SRT (field of reality). I questioned the text and looked for contradictions and other tensions and produced new knowledge of how resilience was present in a moment of shame (field of representation). I also paid attention to my own reactions and responses during the interviews and analysis and used this information as part of the data. Jackson and Mazzei stated: “There is nothing pure about what [the participants] told us, yet we needed their ‘stories’ to knead the dynamics among philosophy, theory, and social life to see what gets made, not understood” (p. 263). They looked not for the sameness in the data, but for the differences in each participant's descriptions or answers.

The point of plugging in is not understanding but making; what gets made in the making and unmaking of assemblage (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013)? They asked two questions in this process: How are things connected and what territory is claimed in the connection? Plugging in is a process (not a concept) that does not result in a thing that is commodified. The process is that fields of the assemblage - theories, data, methods, and becoming-researcher - are plugged into the machine of the researcher with fields of her own (p. 263). It is a plugging in one machine, then plugging in another machine so that there is a continual making and unmaking of knowledge that emerges from the process (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987): “But when one writes, the only question is which other machine the literary machine can be plugged into, must be plugged into in order to work (p. 4)”. 
Jackson and Mazzei (2012, 2013) used the idea of threshold to describe the place when they created new analytical questions by plugging one text into another. The image of a threshold conjures coming and going, but the word threshold also describes a limit and excess. In the space of an imaginary threshold connections are made between the theory and data so that they make or constitute one another, and also collapse their differences (2013, p. 264). Theory and data are not centered, but engaged with and then transformed repeatedly. For example, they analyzed the same excerpt from the transcripts with vocabulary from key concepts of each theory, and then plugged that into the data, and likewise into the theory. In this spiral-like process, they pushed the “research and data and theory to its exhaustion in order to produce knowledge differently” (p. 265).

When data and theory are engaged as co-producers of knowledge, the opposing forces of a binary, for example shame/women, collapse. In this study, the analysis of the interview transcripts showed that what was communicated as shame because of being a woman collapsed as the participated talked about how they enacted resilience. In their stories of resilience was the trace of resilience—the binary dissipated and there was the ideas of shame, women and resilience together without one superseding the others. The flattening that revealed how they constitute each other and the suppleness or excess and a folding of data, theory, becoming-researching into each other (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 266).

To summarize, plugging in involves maneuvering concepts from theorists to engage theory in the data analysis and analysis in the theory, to show how they make or constitute each other. Analytical questions based in the vocabulary of the theory are used
to think with in the middle of the threshold or plugging in. Finally, as the data and theory fold into each other and themselves, the excess or suppleness of theory and data are revealed (see Appendix A for analytic questions).

**Research Participants**

The participants in this study were academic administrators and/or faculty who had experience serving as academic administrators in Christian higher education. Leadership researchers and educators are curious about the continued lack of women in senior leadership positions when the pipeline is full of qualified women (Gangone & Lennon, 2014; Kellerman & Rhode, 2014; Teague & Bobby, 2014; White, 2014). Karen Longman, Director of the Women’s Leadership Development Initiative (WLDI) for the Consortium of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) commented in a presentation for Christians for Biblical Equality that the lack of women in senior leadership indicates that there is more to explore for leadership researchers. Because I work as an academic administrator in a CCCU institution, and participated in WLDI, I am familiar with the complexities for women who are leading in these institutions. Having similarities to the participants in the study can be an advantage in gaining access to interviewees (Esterberg, p. 90). Unlike in positivist studies with structured interviews that focus on extracting information from an interviewee, feminist poststructural qualitative studies stress that the nature of the interview is a relationship and that disclosing information to establish familiarity can add to establishing rapport (p. 91).

In deciding whom to interview, I limited the participants using these criteria: had a terminal degree, had served in a position of leadership in a Christian higher education institution for at least one year, and identified gender as female. Based on my experience
in the academy, these three criteria resemble female senior leaders, or leaders who are
department chairs, deans, provosts, vice presidents, or presidents.

In qualitative research, the focus is not on producing results that generalize
characteristics over a select population; rather the focus is on particularities, differences,
and insightful details (Esterberg, 2002). My goal is to select interviewees that provide
the “greatest possible insight” into the study (p. 93). Because of level of depth requested
of the participants, I decided to narrow my research to six participants. This fits within
Creswell’s (2014, p. 189) review of qualitative research studies that are most like my
study: narrative research included one to two participants, and phenomenological studies
between three and ten.

Purposeful sampling provides a way for choosing participants who “can
purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem” (Creswell, 2007, p. 125)
and is the sample method selected for this study. In my research had access to senior
leaders that were willing to talk about shame and leadership in Christian higher
education. Purposeful sampling allows the researcher to work with an “expert
participant” (Patton, 1990, pp. 169-183) who will refer a group of people for the study. I
had conversations and multiple email exchanges with women and men who were part of
WLDI or employed at a ATS (Association of Theological Schools) or Christian
university to describe my research and ask if they would be willing to refer me to leaders
they believe would provide insight into this study.

After getting a few referrals, I started contacting the women for the study. I used
snowballing or chain referral sampling (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981); snowballing is a
method similar to purposeful sampling whereby a small number of participants help by
referring others participants that meet the criteria for the study (Lewin, 2005, p. 219).

These two methods for sampling allowed me to access individuals that had closed social systems because of the influential nature of their role in the institution. Although I built rapport on my own, having the referral allowed me to draw from the rapport of the expert or other research participants.

**Data Collection**

My study was located primarily in the context of Christian higher education. By plugging in with theory I hope to make shame visible in the discourse of Christian higher education through interviews, research notes, and journaling (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 10). I find the concept of bricoleur described by Denzin and Lincoln (2018) helpful in describing how I will enter the fields of my study. A bricoleur constructs or produces representations dependent on the methodology (pp. 11-12). In this conceptualization, a bricoleur works within a selected paradigm and its belief system (such as poststructural feminism) to create a lens from which to engage the study. “Paradigms represent belief systems that attach the user to a particular worldview” (p. 12). Perspectives are different from paradigms, in that they are less developed or the limits are not as defined creating opportunity for the methodological bricoleur to move about and in between perspectives. For example, using a poststructural lens, one perspective of shame can be considered from analyzing interview transcripts; another perspective can be considered from examining documents related to the context.

*In-depth interviews.* Interviewing as a means for collecting data has been favored in qualitative sciences (Brinkmann, 2018). Interviews have been traditionally viewed as a method for understanding the perspective of the interviewee, a conversation
that hosts an unfolding and uncovering of meaning making and their lived experience (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 1). The dynamics of the interview process (e.g. role of researcher and participants, material aspects of the interview) and the effect they have on knowledge production (particular knowledge rather than universal or generalizable) are important considerations for my study.

Although the interview has been used in journalism since the 17th century (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 7), it has been used in social sciences since the early 20th century. Prior to naming the intentional conversation “interview”, there were conversations that reported history in ancient Greece and conversations to form ideas of justice, truth, and beauty initiated by Socrates (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 583). Sigmund Freud (1963) described his method of psychoanalytic interviewing as “talking-cure” whereby curing was to have occurred simultaneously with research. The production of his research has resulted in knowledge about guilt and shame, for example, which continue to be foundational for understanding neurosis (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 584). Humanist psychologist Rogers (1945) developed a “nondirective” method for interviews in social science where the researcher moves into the “private thoughts and perceptions of the individual” (p. 282). His approach purported that building rapport with participants allows for the deeper truth from the participant. This approach has been scrutinized by the suspicion that the influence of the researcher and the need to maintain rapport would impact the responses of the participant (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 584). These early studies influenced a significant research project carried out by Mayo (1945, pp. 73-74) who interviewed over 21,000 workers about changes in lighting at the Hawthorne production plant in Chicago. Continued development of interviews have created an “interview society” (Kvale &
Brinkmann, 2009, p. 18) whereby polls and surveys have become acceptable social practices for producing knowledge, particularly useful for consumerism.

Contrary to the popular methods for consumer information rooted in quantitative research based on positivism, poststructural theories have challenged the notions that the researcher is objective and neutral in the interview (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 585). Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) describe the research interview as a conversational connection between the researcher and participants: “An interview is literally an *inter view*, an inter-change of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest” (p. 2). The stance in this approach is against the idea that there is neutrality in the structure and delivery of an interview (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 696).

In a postmodern framework, the roles of the interviewer and interviewee are blurred in collaborative interview structure (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 586). In a semi-structured interview, the researcher and participant are “co-constructors of knowledge” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 18). Although the researcher has prepared questions in advance that are guides for the conversation, there is not a strict adherence to the questions. The interviewer takes the time to clarify and follow up on the participant’s conversational responses. It allows for the interviewer to direct the conversation away from the interview guide, “becoming visible as a knowledge-producing participant in the process itself” (Brinkmann, 2018, pp. 579).

I followed Seidman’s (2006) format for in-depth interviews to collect most of the data for this study. I adapted his phenomenological approach, using a three-interview process to address the subject of shame in leadership. Conceptually, talking about shame often evokes a sense of shame, and having three interviews allowed the participants to
identify a moment of shame and then think through a response to shame; this had the potential of being satisfying and transformative for the participants. I reworked Schuman’s (1982) three-interview series and began with establishing context for the study and developing rapport in the first interview, discussing what they did when they sensed shame in the second interview, and reflecting on further meanings in the third interview (Seidman, 2006, pp. 16-19).

**Interview process.** After receiving approval from Gonzaga University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB, Appendix D) I set up initial interviews through email and phone calls (Seidman, 2006). The interviews took place in person or on a video conferencing platform (Skype). The first interview was scheduled for 25 minutes; the following two interviews were scheduled for 60-90 minutes. When possible, the interviews were spaced no more than one week apart. I sent the consent form and interview guide prior to the initial interview (Esterberg, 2002, p. 94).

In the initial interview I reviewed the interview guide (Appendix A) and informed consent form (Appendix B) sent prior to the meeting (Esterberg, 2002, p. 100), described my interest in the research, and why I thought the knowledge produced would be important for female leaders in higher education. My goal was to establish rapport, determine if the participants met the requirements for the study, prepare for the following interviews, and generate enthusiasm for the study. The purpose of sending the interview guide was to guide the participants in preparing for the interview, with the hope that preparation will allow for thick descriptions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 67) from the participants. When it seemed relevant, I talked about the potential need for processing emotions that were evoked during the interviews (Seidman, 2006, p. 63), and asked my
participants to consider securing supportive conversations if needed. After the initial
interview conversation I collected a signed copy of the consent form (or emailed consent)
and set up the next two interviews (p. 48).

I started the second and third interviews with clarifying questions that came up
upon my review of the transcripts and/or my notes of the prior interview. The second
interview was scheduled for the most amount of time so that the participants could talk
through moments of shame. The third interview was shorter since it was focused on
talking through further insights into moments of shame and wrapping up. After the data
analysis I sent the participants the interview transcripts for their review.

**Document collection.** In keeping with the textual emphasis in poststructural
research, I had each interview transcribed and stored digital copies of the transcripts and
interview recordings on a thumb drive in a locked box. I used pseudonyms and redacted
the text in my transcripts to protect the privacy of the participants. The identification of
the institutions and all persons mentioned in the interviews and on documents were also
given pseudonyms.

**Research notes and journaling.** Esterberg (2009) recommends writing field
notes directly after each interview (p. 107) while the physical context and interaction are
fresh in the mind. After most of the interviews, I noted technical difficulties,
interruptions, and material set-up in my research notes and reflected on the process of
each interview in my research journal.

**Data Analysis**
From a poststructural perspective, meaning is not “out there” as an object to be discovered or understood rather the interviews and analysis of data are the “production site of knowledge” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 53). The focus of interviews and data analysis is that they are the space where understandings are made, irruptions in coherent meanings are signified and the trace of shame and resilience is detected. I outsourced the transcription of three of the interviews and reviewed the transcriptions with the recordings to ensure they included the questions, responses and details like laughter and silence spaces that might indicate the trace of shame, resilience and a deconstructive event (Esterberg, 2002, p. 108).

Data analysis involved examination of the interview data in textual and audible form in order to detect elements of a deconstructive event. I used Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) thinking with theory and plugging one text into another to analyze the interview transcripts. Like them I attempted to lay aside positivist methods of coding and categorizing and move towards producing new methodology for approaching qualitative research with a poststructural lens (Lather, 1993; St. Pierre, 1997). Jackson and Mazzei’s move away from humanism that essentializes and centers subjects and in my case, shame, is what appealed to me. The psychosocial researchers like Scheff (2003, 2014) and Brown (2006) have already examined shame from humanist-constructivist paradigms. I was interested in following the signifier shame and related traces of resilience and gender-based stereotypes in social discourse through a deconstructive event to add knowledge of what women leaders do when they experience shame and how they made sense of it.
Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) process of plugging in is detailed above but summarized here:

1. Disrupting the theory/practice binary by centering each and instead showing how they constitute or make one another;
2. Allowing the analytical questions that are used to think with to emerge in the middle of the plugging in; and
3. Showing the suppleness of both theory and data when plugged in (pp. 9-10, emphasis in the original).

**Situational maps.** Deconstruction looks to unsettle the text, and thus it will be helpful to use visual forms of text to create a way of looking at the data in different ways. Clarke (2005) writes of using positional maps (p. xxxvi) to visualize the discursive positions to follow perspectives and contradictions in discourse. When analyzing the data I experimented with different visual forms to represent the theory intersecting with the data. I created a variation of a positional map to represent how resilience showed up in the language of the participants when talking about moments of shame. This exercise of representation helped me view the text from a different perspective. As a result I was able to loosen my linear analytic tendencies and open my analysis to different thinking.

**Reflexivity and validity in analysis.** Whereas postmodernism suggests that knowing is partial, contextual and time bound, poststructuralism “links language, subjectivity, social organization and power. “Postmodernism suspects all truth claims of masking and serving particular interest in local, cultural, and political struggles” (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 961). Conventional methods of knowing are open to inquiry as is new methods of knowing. The centerpiece of poststructuralism however is
language. “Language does not ‘reflect’ social reality but rather produces meaning and creates social reality” (p. 961). Constructing a sense of self or subjectivity occurs in the language of social and political discourse. One’s language is not individual or developed in isolation but contextual and historical with multiple and competing ways of understanding; one’s sense of self, therefore, is not fixed but changes. This reliance on language therefore, centers language as “a site of exploration and struggle” (p. 962).

In poststructural research, the conventional methods of validity that generate a sense of measuring valid research design and possibility of truth have been disrupted or troubled by competing ways of knowing (Lather, 1993). In this theoretical framework a researcher is not an objective observer, separate from the participant, rather the researcher and the participants are threaded together in knowledges that are “partial, historical and local” (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 962). One form of validating research results is through triangulation that is based on a fixing at least three components of data collection to triangulate the object. Richardson and St. Pierre propose the image of a crystal that is not fixed rather than the three-sided image of triangle. “Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities and refract within themselves, creating different colors, patterns, and arrays casting off in different direction. What we see depends on our angle of repose—not triangulation but rather crystallization” (p. 963).

Another method for validating research findings is “bracketing.” Moustakas (1994) writes that in phenomenology research one works to psychologically separate oneself from their experiences (pp. 58-62) (or bracket) to “take a fresh perspective toward the phenomenon under examination” (Creswell, 2007, pp. 59-60) in the data collection and interpretation. Whereas in bracketing, the researcher attempts to set aside her
perspective, reflexivity is a method for situating herself in the context of the study.

Bracketing seems to me to be an attempt to contain one’s perspective/experience and resembles positivist lens of knowing and learning. Reflexivity, on the other hand is when the researcher works to understand oneself within the study and what she brings to the research: her biases, historical lens, local understandings, memories, emotions, etc. which is more of a subjectivist lens. This reflexivity allows researcher to situate herself as much as possible, for particular time and place. Second, it acknowledges that research is contextual, partial and all-inclusive (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 962).

Richardson (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) lists four criteria as standards for social science research that I will refer in the data collection, analysis, writing and reporting of my study:

1. **Substantive contribution.** Does this piece contribute to our understanding of social life? Does the writer demonstrate a deeply grounded (if embedded) social scientific perspective? Does this [research] seem “true” – a credible account of a cultural, social, individual, or communal sense of the “real”?

2. **Aesthetic merit.** Rather than reducing standards, another standard is added. Does this [research] succeed aesthetically? Does this use of creative analytical practices open up the text and invite interpretive responses? Is the text artistically shaped, satisfying, complex, and not boring?

3. **Reflexivity.** How has the author’s subjectivity been both a producer and a product of this text? Is their adequate self-awareness and self-exposure for the reader to make judgments about the point of view? Does the author hold himself or herself
accountable to the standards of knowing and telling of the people he or she has studied?

4. **Impact.** Does this piece affect me emotionally or intellectually? Does it generate new questions or move me to write? Does it move me to try new research practices or move me to action? (p. 964)

This process makes “visible the practice and construction of knowledge within research to produce more accurate analyses” (Pillow, 2003, p. 178).

Reflexivity in poststructural paradigm has been critiqued as self-indulgence without demonstrating validity. Pillow (2003) explains that it “requires the researcher to be critically conscious through personal accounting of how the researcher’s self-location (across for example, gender, race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality), position, and interests influence all stages of the research process” (p. 178). Additionally, the researcher demonstrates awareness of the relations with involved in the study. These relations include: participants and researcher, and researcher and participant, and researcher and researcher, researcher and research, researcher and readers.

“Uncomfortable reflexivity” (Pillow, 2003, p. 188; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) is problematizing the researcher’s representation by asking, “What do I know and how do I know it?” The assumptions of power and/or privilege as researcher are at the forefront during the data collection, analysis, and write-up. Part of this reflexivity is not settling with the initial representations, but creating a study that prods the readers to unsettle the representation by questioning it. In order to develop a reflexive process for my study I kept a research journal to reflect on relationships, power, and privilege of researcher and the representations of my research.
Ethical Considerations

Ethical practices and principles serve as guidelines for social science research (IRB in Appendix D). An important question to consider is whether the risk to the participant outweighs the benefit of the research (Esterberg 2002, p. 51; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, pp. 68-69). Other crucial elements to consider are voluntary participation, no harm, confidentiality and anonymity, the researcher's role and the kind of relationship created with participants (Creswell, 2014, pp. 93-94; Esterberg, 2002, pp. 44-49; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, pp. 68-76).

The benefit of understanding how Christian leaders in higher education express shame and what they do about it will provide a rich look into an area of leadership studies that has not been addressed. Although Lynd (1958) and Brown (2006, 2007) wrote that moving through shame experiences leads to forming identity and resilience, thinking and talking about shame is not easy. The kind of care (Noddings, 1984) that I needed to demonstrate to the participants was a significant factor in creating an environment where the participants feel safe enough to expose vulnerabilities. I articulated clear boundaries and expectations of the content for the conversations in the informed consent, so to allow the participants to stay within a level of comfort (Esterberg, 2002, pp. 45-46). The potential for the conversation to move into a therapeutic-like conversation was possible with some participants even with a clear purpose and boundaries (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, pp. 68-76). During the interviews I worked to stay conscious of the purpose of the conversation (research). Esterberg (2002) writes that demonstrating reciprocity helps reduce the power differential (p. 49) in research relationships and in this context; I worked to establish reciprocity with empathy and care within a research framework.
Although shame is painful, talking about moments of shame can move towards developing resilience to it (Brown, 2006). It is based on this theory and my eight years of experience in teaching classes on shame and resilience that I believe this interview process will benefit the participants. Instead of “do no harm” as a guide for ethical practices, Piper and Simons (2005) “aspire to do ‘good’” (p. 56) and if moving towards developing resilience to shame is a product of the interviews, then it is also a way of doing good.

Each participant was required to sign an informed consent (Appendix B) which detailed the procedures I followed to maintain confidentiality and anonymity. The consent form was signed during the first interview so that they had a chance to ask questions and give “permission in full knowledge of the purpose of the research and the consequences for them of taking part” (Piper & Simons, 2005, p. 56). The digital copies of the interviews, transcripts and other documents are stored securely on an thumb drive. The participants were sent copies of their transcripts and will receive the final dissertation (digital) upon request.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study was designed to produce knowledge of what female leaders do when experiencing shame. As in poststructural research, the subject is decentered; therefore, what the research participants mean was not central to the study. Rather, what new understandings of shame and female leadership will be opened up in a deconstructive event? Additionally, the results of this study are specific to the time and context; they are partial truths and not to be generalized.
Limitations of language and discourse. The focus of this approach was on language and the discourse of the research participants context. Shame, resilience and gender-based stereotypes are not “out there” as essential elements or qualities “waiting to be discovered” as with a positivist approach. Deconstructive approach centers on the language and views these concepts as socially constructed in language. I have presented the “tradition” of shame research because “[d]econstruction presupposes the intensely cultivated, literate relation to the tradition” (Derrida, 2002b, p. 15). A limitation of this study was to give preference to the tradition and to look for central truths in the words of the participants (Mazzei, 2004) rather than noticing what is marginalized in the text, reversing the hierarchical order and include what is on the margin (Spivak, 1976, p. lxxvii). Noting, for example, the influence that Brown’s (2006) research on shame had on my students it was easy to make assumptions (Scheurich, 1997, pp. 71-74) about what I thought a participant meant when describing a moment of shame. Informed by my personal experiences, “particular class, gendered, racial, cultural, and ethnic community perspective” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013, p. 23) I made sense of the participant’s language from the basis of my understanding of shame and resilience research. To work with and against this ordinary tendency to interpret without consciously attending to my position in the process, I asked questions that aimed for having participants describe what they understood. I utilized a visual diagrams to provide an image driven perspective that shifted my first impressions and complicated my initial interpretations.

Emotional data. Since this study delved into aspects of shame and female leadership, the data collected and experienced in the process of collecting, analyzing and reporting will be emotional data (St. Pierre, 1997). Emotional data is transgressive data
in that is “out-of-category- and not usually accounted for in qualitative research methodology” (p. 175). The point of giving attention to transgressive data and developing methods of interpreting the data is to “produce different knowledge and to produce knowledge differently” (p. 175). If fieldwork in research is “emotional labor” (Van Maanen, Manning & Miller, 1993, pp. vii-viii) then part of the data is the emotions experienced in the research process. “[W]e might be made somewhat more comfortable if less of our efforts were devoted to the avoidance, denial, and control of emotions and if more of our efforts were directed to the understanding, expression, and reporting of them” (p. viii). St. Pierre (1997) describes how her emotions were part of the process of searching for validity in her research on the construction of subjectivity in the older women living in her hometown. Similarly, experiencing my emotions and reflecting on them was part of this study.

**Conclusion**

The focus of my dissertation was to look deeply into how women leaders make sense of moments of shame in a context where gender-based stereotypes (Eagly, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 1991, 2002) function as implicit rules (Scheff, 2003, 2014) for leadership (Christian higher education). Since the biological component of shame (Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963) impacts communication and clarity of thinking for a moment of time (Hill, 2015) it is likely that it impacts leadership effectiveness and/or the perception of effectiveness. Moreover, since shame is considered contagious (Block Lewis, 1971), it is also likely that a moment of shame is disruptive for coworkers or others who are present when the leader is experiencing shame. How leaders moved through shame and into resilience when engaging gender-
based stereotypes is the particular aspect of shame experiences that I analyzed. I hope that the results of this study will resource leaders and educators who are interested in understanding the transforming effects of regulating shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes in leadership.
Chapter Four Findings and Discussion

In this chapter I present the findings from my analysis of the text with a deconstruction lens and what became evident as I looked for moments of articulating shame that revealed resilience. I employed Derrida’s (1967/1974) Deconstruction as the primary theory for making sense of the data. I also used Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism and Brown’s (2006) Shame Resilience Theory (SRT) and asked questions of the text informed by their theories. Jackson and Mazzei (2012) detailed schematic cues to search for how deconstruction was at work in producing new knowledge, and I used these cues in each aspect of the analysis. The point of my research was to trace resilience in moments during the interview when the participants were describing the interplay of shame, gender-based stereotypes and leadership. The focus was not to fix the understanding of shame by retelling how the participants made meaning of the moment of shame but to bring to the surface how they moved through shame, which is an act of resilience (Brown, 2006). Furthermore, I examined the binaries shame/women and shame/woman leader not to perpetuate vicarious shame for women but to open up a conversation and make evident the vulnerability of being associated with a moment of shame. The six women in this study participated in three interviews totaling three hours each over approximately two weeks. I begin this chapter by introducing the participants of this study and then review the theories that I used “to think with” as I read the data. Then I present the schematic clues that led the way to finding when deconstruction was happening the in text, followed by a presentation of the analysis and discussion and the conclusion.
Participant Introductions

**Demographics.** The participants were vetted as having terminal degrees and served in leadership positions in Christian higher education. They were introduced to me by other leaders in Christian higher education. Five of the participants had degrees in psychology or sociology and the other two in general humanities. The age range spanned from in their 30’s to 60’s. Five participants were Caucasian and one was a person of color. They all identified as heterosexual. Although we did not talk about socioeconomic status, each had earned Ph.D.’s and five had tenure status. Regarding religious affiliation, the participants identified as Evangelical, progressive Evangelical or Christian.

**Leadership Experience.** Valerie’s experience was not only in Christian higher education but in a Christian denomination. She was in various positions of academic leadership including chair of her department, dean, and senior leadership. Adele served as dean of her department and executive leader at a Christian university. Irene’s executive leadership experience had been primarily at a public university although she served as chair of faculty and staff committees and “unofficial” department chair at a Christian university. Baylee served as interim dean, department chair, and head of a division in her department. She had also chaired of an organization for scholars associated with her religious affiliation. Rita was a director of department for students at a seminary. She had also served as pastor in a mainline denomination. And finally, Nancy was co-dean of a seminary and director of a graduate program.
Deconstruction, Feminist Poststructuralism, and Shame Resilience Theory (SRT)

Unlike traditional forms of qualitative research methods for analysis, this study was designed to forego bracketing (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 58-62) or setting my perspective aside as a method of validity. Instead I was immersed with the participant, as a co-learner in the interview process, and paid close attention to my reactions and responses during and after the interview (reflexivity). In the interview and analysis, I attempted to situate myself in the process and note the limitations of time, place and varying perspectives that were expressed (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 962). In this study, validity was demonstrated by approaching the data through multiple lenses, like the way light is refracted in a crystal -- it is not linear but changes directions when it enters the crystal (p. 963).

In the analysis, my posture shifted to read the data through the lens of three interconnected frameworks, similar to different streams of light refracting in a crystal, in order to produce new knowledge about how women leaders in Christian higher education made sense of moments of shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes. The theories are Derrida’s (1967/1974) Deconstruction, Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism, and Brown’s (2006) SRT. The primary analytic question used to analyze the data is: What are the moments of articulating shame and gender-based stereotypes, that reveal resilience? Each of the following theories informed the formation of this question: The first is based on the deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1974) that happens in an event (deconstructive event) during the interview when the participant is actively making sense of her experience(s) by processing moments of shame. This means that the focus of my analysis was on what happened during the interview, in the
moments where the participants looked back and described their responses to the situation, how they made and were making sense of it. To find the deconstructive events I went to the data and read for what Jackson and Mazzei (2012, pp. 17-19) termed “schematic cues” (detailed below). The second is based on Weedon’s (1997) framework for feminism, and the way that binaries produce and reproduce hierarchical power-over structures in language. The third is Brown’s (2006) theory for developing resilience to shame, SRT. Elements of her theory include a deconstructive process and becoming aware of cultural frameworks that oppress and/or dominate (similar to Weedon, 1997). It is through acknowledging and working through shame that resilience has opportunity to develop. Based on her theory, the process of articulating shame in the interview, the interviewee has the potential for developing resilience to it. My goal was to see if/when this happened.

I have worked in Christian higher education for over 10 years and in the interview and analysis, I found that I was empathizing with the participants. As I analyzed the data I experienced internal tension around a desire to tell their stories of shame. This, however, was not the purpose of the study. The shift away from their experiences and into the interview experience that we shared alleviated the tension and allowed me to focus on the deconstruction that was happening and if or how the trace of resilience showed up.

**Schematic Cues**

To find where a deconstructive event is occurring in the text I looked for Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) schematic cues. I will begin this analysis with presenting the schematic cues for a deconstructive event, and then I will move into the analysis and plug
theories into the data. The schematic cues are deconstruction, text, trace, aporia, absent presence, and différance.

The first schematic clue is *deconstruction* (Derrida, 1967/1974). When deconstruction happens it destabilizes understandings that were once thought of as fixed. Derrida centers text (logocentrism) rather than spoken language (phonocentricism) to make evident that deconstruction happens in language and that there is no external reality in the system of language, only intertextuality. Another way that logocentrism is evident is in the statement that “there is nothing outside of text” (Derrida, 1967/1974, p. 158) except for referents and assumptions (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p.17). For example the symbol for a tall plant with a trunk is the word “tree” (note the words tall, plant and trunk are also referents). Or relevant to this study (Eagly, 1970, 1987, 2007) the word or sign “woman” symbolizes a person with female sex traits and a word “leader” historically has referred to a person with male sex traits. This is an example of the use of words or signs to describe what they are symbolizing or referring to (referents) therefore demonstrating Derrida’s point that we perpetually use text to symbolize what is present. But what is really present?

The second schematic cue is *text*. In Derrida’s later writings he explains that text is more than spoken or written words. Text is words or signs but is also what is understood of the signifier (the physical form of a sign) and signified (the meaning of the physical form); it is in the stories and understandings that are communicated in the text that is not always just written but embodied (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p.19).
The third schematic cue is *trace*. The trace (or a track, a footprint, or an imprint) “inhabits language before we use it” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 19) and is within presence which is “unmediated experience” that is ready to be understood.

The fourth schematic cue that deconstruction has happened is *aporia* or paradox. Aporia is noted when a signifier has more than one meaning including meanings that contest a fixed Truth and/or “[propose] a difficulty in logic” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p.17).

The sixth schematic clue is *erasure*. Deconstruction happens when a signifier is troubled and the meaning of it is questioned. When the meaning of a signifier is exposed as uncertain, it is not destroyed and what remains is the possibility of what a signifier might become (transformation).

The seventh and final schematic cue is *absent presence*. Text or a sign is not limited to what can be described in the present moment because the present moment draws from what is absent--the trace of the tradition--in absent presence. The sign or word in text, however, “defers presence, [and] is conceivable only based on the presence that it defers and moving toward the deferred presence that it aims to reappropriate” (Derrida, 1972/1982). The deferred presence is absent or absent presence and is always and already there “preceding our speaking and writing” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 17). It is with this absent present approach that I read for the tradition of shame (historical understandings of it in Chapter 2) to locate the emotion response to gender-based stereotypes and the trace of resilience in a moment of shame. The absent presence of understandings can be ignored by long-held assumptions or hand-me-down explanations that are enforced as fixed understandings.
The eighth schematic cue is *différance* or how meanings and referents are continually deferred in a “play of language” (p. 18). Derrida (1972/1982) described différance as deferring of the sign that symbolizes the thing itself that is present (the meaning and what it refers to). “The sign represents the present in its absence. It takes the place of the present. When we cannot grasp or show the thing, state the presence, the being-present, when the presence cannot be presented, we signify; we go through the detour of the sign” (p. 9). The sign, therefore, is deferred presence. By differed presence Derrida explained that the sign is conceivable only on the *basis* of the presence that it defers and moving toward the deferred presence that it aims to reappropriate. According to this classical semiology, the substitution of the sign for the thing itself is both *secondary* and *provisional*: secondary due to an original and lost presence from which the sign thus derives; provisional as concerns this final and missing presence toward which the sign in this sense is a movement of mediation. (p. 9)

Building on Saussure (1998), Derrida (1972/1982) explains that différance is what makes up the sign; the sign is both what is signified (the concept) and the signifier (the word) (p. 10). Concepts are inscribed in a chain or in a system within which it refers to the other, to the other concepts by means of the systematic play of differences. Such a play, différance, is thus no longer simply a concept but rather the possibility of the conceptuality, of a conceptual process and system in general. (p. 11)
The differences not only play in words and speech but are effects. Différance, then, “is the playing movement that ‘produces’---by means of something that is not simply an activity---these differences, these effects of différance” (p. 11).

By continuing to review the schematic cues for a deconstructive event I was able to find the sections in the data when the participant seemed to be processing an answer to a question she had about gender, leadership, and self-conscious emotions like shame. Derrida’s deconstruction is not a tool that is used in analysis, rather it is an event, it is something that happens. And in that moment of happening, what was generally accepted as true is destabilized and what was once a whole and/or a fixed concept or idea shifts or is disrupted. The once held meaning assigned to the concept or idea bursts out of or erupts from the “tension between what is happening and what is perceived” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 23) and what was once sealed off and closed becomes open. Once opened then there is a flow or a wave of new understanding and new knowledge is produced.

This study brings an emotion component to Jackson and Mazzei’s plugging Derrida’s (1967/1972) theory into the data. For example, when analyzing for deconstructive events, there was likely a mention of emotion and if qualified by bodily sensations, an affective component. Deconstructive events are marked by explanations that show destabilized concepts or ideas and the expression or articulation of emotions that may signal this disruption. To speculate on why emotions might be present is to say more than this study was designed to address. The data of this study showed, however, that in Christian higher education, when something significant like how one perceived oneself as a leader was “pushed off balance” by new information and threatened existing
self-impressions (Goffman, 1959), emotions were stirred, expressed and/or exhibited.

For example, three participants described instances of uninformed interpretations that led to unwarranted critique, gossip and for two of them, a lack of support by colleagues. It made good sense to me to note the expressions of emotions that were evoked in the moment of the interview when deconstruction was also happening.

The analytic question that emerged as I thought with the theories of Deconstruction, Feminist Poststructuralism and SRT while analyzing the data is: *What are the moments of articulating shame and gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience?* To get to that answer, I asked questions of the data from each theorist: Derrida (1967/1972), Weedon (1997) and Brown (2006) (see appendix A). Although I analyzed each transcript in detail and in the linear fashion for which it was told, it was evident that in the second and third interviews, we circled back to the preceding stories and in that process, I often found snags that signified something more was there to be explored. In this report of the analysis I will not describe the complete stories as told to me. Putting deconstruction to work involves, however, looking at the data to find inconsistencies not to challenge their stories, but “to exploit the snag and to tear at what is not apparent in a search for the categories and patterns” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 17) of Feminist Poststructuralism and SRT. I was deeply concerned about not presenting a meta narrative whereby the participants unique expressions would be neutralized in the hopes of presenting a coherent whole and about not presenting an interpretation that would negate their understandings. Therefore, I worked to understand within the context of a deconstructive event, how they articulated their leadership experiences, shame, resilience, and gender-based stereotypes.
The following section is organized by what I was looking for in the data, what I found for each participant and relevant discussion to locate findings in previous research and theory (from Chapter 2).

**Analysis and Discussion**

I start this presentation of analysis and discussion of the findings with an overview of the primary shame moments described by each participant. Then I present the beginnings of how I plugged theory into data beginning with Deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1974) by analyzing for the limits of shame (how they used the word shame and what other texts pointed to shame). This provided me with a container for shame that emerged from the words and experiences of the participants, which I put under erasure while reading the data with the Feminist Poststructuralism and SRT lenses. I plugged these theories into the data as I analyzed for the engagement of gender-based stereotypes in leadership and the trace of resilience as the signifier shame was put under erasure. Next, I articulate what happened in the deconstruction event for each participant to explain how deconstruction happened. The last section is a discussion of what new knowledge was produced about shame and resilience in the interplay with gender-based stereotypes.

**Overview of the Primary Shame Moments.** In the second interview (see the Interview Guide in Appendix B), I asked each participant to talk about two moments where they experienced a sense of shame or other emotion (Scheff, 2014) when encountering gender-based stereotypes in leadership. The participants were selective with the details of their stories and most expressed (although not explicitly) how sharing the stories made them feel vulnerable or at risk of exposure. It is important to note that it
was the participants’ perspectives and interpretation of their leadership experiences that I used for data and that their experiences might be evocative to the readers. I have taken careful steps to anonymize the data and protect the participants from the risk of exposure.

Additionally, I have used text from each of the three interviews per participant to summarize the primary moment of shame that seemed central to how they articulated shame when they engaged with gender-based stereotypes in leadership. We did not talk directly about resilience until the last interview to give time for the participants to consider the emotions and/or affect in and of their experiences. It was from an examined and evocative space that the participants articulated how resilience was also part of their primary shame moment.

**Valerie.** The primary moment of shame for Valerie was when she was working as an associate provost. It was initiated by a less than favorable performance evaluation by her supervisor, the president of the university and the ensuing conversations. There had been a shift in his “estimation” of her leadership capability and his opinion impacted her ability to move into other leadership positions at the university. The conversations with her supervisor, administrators and faculty resulted in a public discourse about her leadership competencies and a private discourse about her character. Also, part of this moment of shame was the complicity of colleagues to make decisions that correlated with the public and private discourses. As a result, her position was eliminated without options for returning to tenured faculty status.

**Adele.** Unlike Valerie, Adele did not assign shame to what happened when she experienced gender-based stereotypes as a vice president of a Christian university. She did, however, describe experiences where she was aware that her gender as a woman was
at play in the institutional discourse. The primary shame moment was when she heard that elements of her professional relationship with the president was talked about by her colleagues. The conversation happened, unknowingly, when in the company of the president’s wife. The “sense of shame” that she experienced was attached to the resulting discourse and potential perceptions of her as a woman leader working with the president and the realization that the discourse could have been a threat to the public perception of the president and his wife.

Irene. Whereas Adele did not identify a sense of shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes until the last interview, Irene told of very concrete shame experiences that occurred while working in Christian and public higher education from the first interview. Irene’s primary moment of shame was not in one story or situation, but in how gendered expectations about her body were enforced in both the Christian and public sectors of higher education. In response to being an outspoken progressive feminist she was told, “They don’t want people like you in Christian higher education.” In both the Christian and public sector she experienced institutional enforcement of gendered rules about what she should wear or not wear to work and the meanings attached to how she dressed.

Baylee. Baylee’s primary shame moment had to do with enforced gendered rules and behavior in a work environment. She named two moments where she was excluded from participating because she was a woman. The first experience was in a postdoc where she was a part of a team of researchers (all men). After finishing one research project the group of men decided to make plans for the next project during a camping event. “And the head of the lab came to me and said, I'm sorry but you're not going to be
able to come because our wives and girlfriends wouldn't like it. It's just a guy weekend.”

The second experience was when she was at her first meeting as interim dean with the provost and other deans (all men). Before the meeting started instead of asking questions about family or work, the deans were “taking jabs at each other.” She interpreted the bantering as a way of setting a “pecking order” (positional power) for the meeting. “And what I realized [after the meeting] was me getting blindsided by hegemony. There were so many gender roles at play and some had rules that I was unaware of.”

**Rita.** Rita’s primary moment of shame and guilt around was around her “desire to be born a boy”:

> And what do you *do* with that, and what do you do *if* that? How do you come to know it? How do you fix it? How do you heal it? How do you endure it? How do you suffer it? How do you give it meaning? It’s really quite remarkable and it’s beautiful hellish to write.

What she meant by “being a boy” but did not clearly articulate was the following description of “desirable” characteristics to men: self-reliance, power, and hubris. Self-reliance was a *capacity for response* and inserting oneself repeatedly as opposed to dependence, which is a cultural definition of femininity. When she described power, she referenced her grandfather telling her that she was “limited in standing for [her] own purpose by that special relationship with men” and that she both forfeited and gained power because of relationships. Rita talked about being someone’s protégé ever since she was 12, and most her mentors were men. She defined hubris as a positive sense of entitlement or pride and described having an internal conflict about wanting this because pastors she knows have a “holy entitlement” while she experiences reluctance when
speaking and preaching. It was in the moments of expressing her reluctance in speaking and preaching when she articulated shame.

**Nancy.** Nancy’s primary moment of shame was also around speaking. When she became a professor she already had children and her “goal in teaching has always been shaped by my desire to explain things in a way my children could understand.” She credits her success as an instructor to this factor, but “on occasion in a meeting when I make a contribution I’ll stop and think that didn’t quite sound as highfalutin or whatever as so and so did” and she wondered if “somebody might think less of” her because of her contribution.

The participants responded differently during the interviews. Some of the participants told their shame experiences with emotional expressions like crying, anger, swearing, laughter, and long pauses. Other participants did not appear to experience much affect during the interview. Five of the participants hinted at feeling vulnerable from sharing their experiences and two mentioned looking forward to talking about their shame.

**Analyzing for the Limits of Shame.** The process of deconstruction is likened to breaking open a nutshell; if a concept or idea is questioned and understanding shifts, then the nutshell of concept has broken open. What was fixed and closed is now open for something new to emerge. It is with this in mind that I analyzed the text for how each participant expressed shame. The questions (Appendix A) I asked when analyzing through the lens of deconstruction were:

- What are the limits of shame or moments of self-conscious emotion as described by the participants?
- What are the differences, contradictions, and heterogeneity within the text?

- What happened inside the deconstructive event (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 20), that analyzed the functions and dysfunctions of the language for shame, resilience, gender-based stereotypes and female leadership?

I did not answer each one of these questions for every participant but covered them between all the participants. The last question will be addressed near the end of this chapter because it involves elements from the all the analytic questions.

Using the word shame. The participants varied in the number of times they used the word shame and how they described their experience of the emotion shame.

Valerie. Valerie did not use the word shame until the second interview, even though she talked about the primary shame moment when describing her leadership experience in the first interview. In the second interview, I asked her to describe one or two moments of shame (or other self-conscious emotions) when in leadership. She started by saying, “Yeah that is so hard to parse out. I have plenty of experiences of negative emotion and some of it is disappointment or anger or whatever. It’s hard to parse out.” The first time she used the word shame was during describing how her supervisor had shifted from affirming her leadership and seeking her perspective to communicating that he was no longer going to sponsor her in leadership: “there had been a long period of almost entirely positive comments and then a turn and then much - many more - ‘this is how you don’t measure up’ comments.” As she continued to talk about this shift in posture she went into detail about how the shift occurred by saying: “This part of the story is most shameful to me.” When talking about the reason given for why she was no longer eligible for leadership in the institution she said that she experienced “shame in being
seen as a threat to somebody’s family.” In three hours of interviews, Valerie only used the word shame 3 times.

Adele. Whereas Valerie used the word shame to describe some of her experiences, Adele stated that she did not experience shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes. Adele described shame as a negative withdrawal emotion that evokes sadness that leads to helplessness and depression.

So it’s not empowering. As an extrovert, as a psychologist, as one who is able to talk about emotions and talk about other people’s emotions, I think I’m high in intuition about how other people are feeling so I didn’t see a lot of purpose and efficiency in the negative withdrawal emotions (Laugh).

Adele was clear that she had not been curious about shame because of the result of feeling shame was inefficiency. There was a difference in her response between the second and third interview. Adele described an experience of being talked about behind her back but did not label it as shaming or that she felt feelings associated with shame. But in the third interview Adele indicated that a sense of shame was there. There was a helplessness (shame related?) in not being able to change the situation, “there was nothing I could say or not say - it already happened. The only thing I could do is wait for the consequences.”

When asked about contexts where she experienced shame she talked about her church community and that “I think I would be deeply hurt if they rejected who I was or what I did or something like...” And in response to asking if there were times when she experienced shame she said, “Um I think shame for me feels like rejection. Um and so I have to feel like I did someone-something wrong and then someone pointed it out or I-I
became aware of that. Like I would think would be a shame signal or something.” Adele used this rationale to describe how she did not experience shame when gender-based stereotypes were employed because she did not do anything to wrong in those situations, therefore she did not feel shame: “But I don't - I don't feel like there's, I don't - I don’t feel the shame on any level cuz I don't feel like I did anything wrong. There's nothing I would do differently if I had gone back and you know? What would I do differently?”

Irene. Irene used the word shame in her interviews approximately ten times more than Valerie and Irene. It was as if because she experienced feelings related to shame she was free to say the word and let parts of her story reside inside it as a container. She used the word shame to describe how she felt after a sexual harassment claim was made by her mentor and the discrimination that followed it, “As I look back on it, there is so much anger and I felt so judged and I didn’t think that I was a person worthy of being shamed from what I looked like or how I dressed.” Anger is associated with shame in Scheff’s (1987) shame rage, and Block Lewis’ (1971) humiliated fury which anger at oneself, even if taken out on someone else. It may be that Irene’s anger is different from these, but that it was part of her shame experience is important to note as a potential trace of shame. Additionally, feeling judged involves a response to what one thinks others are thinking of them. It is a perception, like Cooley’s (1922) looking glass self.

For Irene, she articulated and differentiated shame (Block Lewis, 1971) regarding a break with a personal relationship and how the shame hung-on after the instance:

So as the saying goes, time passes and healing takes place on an interpersonal level but the shame that I carry from that, probably stuck in my life for about 3 or
4 years where I knew that I was a terrible person. That I – I was, the bane, of most people, and how dare I do something like that…

That she added what people might think of her also indicates the shame in this instance. Shame and anger are coupled here again as above.

She makes a distinction between her context and the way she might have been treated if she were to have made the mistakes in the public rather than Christian sector. She talked about the religious nature of a Christian institution and that you are being evaluated on your ethics and your morality and your keen sense of God’s plan and what it means to be a woman and a man. And that can be a really beautiful thing until it turns on its head. And it’s used as a way to demoralize or diminish or to shame someone. I don’t experience that here at work anymore.

She attributes this to her supervisor, “He’s never shamed a woman or brought in a stereotype, he’s very careful with the language he uses.”

Baylee. Like Valerie and Adele, Baylee used the word shame only two times. She did not appear to express emotion during the interviews, other than occasional laughter. This is consistent with how she perceived experiencing emotions - by compartmentalizing them. The one segment in the interview when she used the word shame was when talking about areas of leadership that she did not feel competent in.

What has surprised me sometimes is - I mean, I just didn't expect to be so abysmal at managing money. There is a bit of shame around money for me. Still, I'm better. And I hire to my weakness. But, a lot of avoidance, a lot of getting deep in a hole behind other things. Anxiety. That's probably still where I get it.
So, although she answered the question about when she experienced shame and gender-based stereotypes by describing the postdoc and interim dean experiences, she did not use the word shame nor did she use any words to describe an emotion, affect, or feeling that she felt or was feeling during the interview.

*Rita.* More like Irene, Rita articulated the word shame when she was feeling shame in the moment or remembering feeling shame. She used the word shame 16 times in three interviews. “You know this is really activating and I am feeling shame and I’m feeling...and it’s really important, it’s really, really important.”

When explaining about a recent instance where she was presenting a devotional to a group that she had been a consultant for, she described her response as a “classic shame response - don’t look at me.” During the devotional, she felt awkward and self-conscious and at the opening of the devotional which I hadn’t thought about and had not planned at all was, “You all have settled in my heart in a way that I didn’t expect. And these words come to me out of that, I think.” And I don’t know how it was received and I was anxious throughout. And I was very anxious on the way home. And I expect because they’re - it's a different social location for me; very high socioeconomic status and high socioeconomic function - attorneys, businessman, and entrepreneurs on the committee. More men than women. Just slightly so. But I expect it wasn’t well received because it wasn’t polished; it wasn’t from an expert; it wasn’t directive though it was kind of...in a way (laugh). This excerpt describes not only how Rita experienced shame in the moment - while she was speaking (as self-conscious and awkward) but also after the moment; anxiety came
in when she was thinking about the moment of shame (appraising the emotion and affect). Then she described why she was feeling anxious and shame which involved estimating the social value of the group members, what their expectations might have been, and how she measured up to the expectations. She did not say anything about what was said or not said afterwards regarding the content or delivery. The laughter at the end could have been a way to discharge the shame (Nathanson, 1992) re-experienced when talking about it. This excerpt shows an internal discourse (Brown, 2006) of Rita making sense of the moment of shame.

_Nancy._ For Nancy, shame is a concept that has to do with “who I am and not being enough.” She used the word 12 times and engaged with the concept of shame from a cognitive behavior approach which has to do with the connection of changing behaviors by changing thoughts. This is a very different approach to shame than Rita or Valerie who seemed most in touch with their bodily response to shame or how shame feels in our body. If she did not use the word shame then how was she articulating her emotion? In describing shame in women, she referenced her grandson’s response to playing poorly in a baseball game and she said to him: “Rough night, huh?” and he said, “Yeah, thanks for the book…” Nancy said that women tend to internalize making mistakes or losing in a competition by saying as a reflection on themselves, “‘I’m not a good player’ as opposed to ‘Oh, I had a bad night’.” Yet when talking about herself she said, “That’s not who I am - it doesn’t define me.” She reflected on her mom’s perpetual caution against pride (yeah). My mother was very concerned – I often heard her condemn people for being prideful – I often heard her talk about people who are always talking about “me, me, me” – that were promoting themselves
and so there are those occasions. Again I don't see this as shame as much as times when I would not promote myself because – I didn't want to be arrogant, or because, or at fault, because it felt a little pushy or against – and again I'm not sure that I saw that as a gender thing – girls shouldn't do this as much as good Christians shouldn't do this.

Also in this excerpt is Nancy’s resistance to articulate a connection between shame, pride and gender. Even though she was not sure if her mom intended to emphasize the message to her because she was a girl, that it was part of her thinking in the moment shows that shame may be working (shame message) to enforce her mom’s directive that impacts her ability to promote herself (Brown, 2006).

*What other “texts” point to shame?* In deconstruction, text is more than a particular word and its meaning; it is *what is communicated*. To account for participants expressing or communicating shame without using the word shame, like the point that shame is elusive (based on Lynd, 1958; Block Lewis, 1971; and Scheff, 2014) I noted other ways shame or related self-conscious emotions might be present in the text.

*Valerie.* Although the word shame was not used in these excerpts, the pain because of shame moment is evident in these excerpts. In describing the reason given to her for why she was no longer eligible for leadership she said,

> And - and this is I’m sure what he said to other people about why I had to go - because his wife was uncomfortable with me being there. And this is horrible for me (tears).

This speaks to a concern for what was being said about her and that it (shame?) feels horrible.
This segment aligns with Goffman’s (1959) impression management, Cooley’s (1922) looking glass self, and Block Lewis’ (1971) definition of shame that is based on the mind’s eye of being looked at and condemned by others. In this excerpt, Valerie described her pain after having been told she no longer had a position at the university and the way she perceived others were thinking of her:

And they also - ah - I was like bleeding from every pore - you know - sorrow and anger - nobody was like ‘Let's bring this into the department and nurture it back to health’. And nobody wanted - you know.

Valerie expressed being angry because of the sexism she experienced in this shame moment.

The whole gender dynamic of Evangelicalism mitigates against women being successful in a field where men dominate. And not just because the men are sexist but because their wives are also sexist. And/or other women are sexist.

And so it's ah - makes me angry when I think about.

Helen Block Lewis (1971) writes of humiliated fury because of shame. Although I cannot know whether this is what Valerie was experiencing, it seemed that her anger was not only turned towards the husband and wife in this situation, but also towards herself as she identified as Evangelical and as a woman.

Identifying other self-conscious emotions that are in the “family of shame” (Scheff, 2015) is also part of understanding the limits of shame. In this excerpt, she described the relationship dynamics that resulted from not being chosen to interview for an executive leadership position:
I felt embarrassed to be around anybody who's been on the committee. I didn't know what to say to them. I worked with many of them (laugh) - and help them with their problems (crying) or you know - and then I couldn't look at them. And they couldn’t look at me either (crying). They were also embarrassed.

Shame is described as wanting to disappear or hide (Lynd, 1958), the opposite of being seen. Not looking into the eyes of another, in this context, is a signal of broken attachment (Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994) or a social bond (Scheff, 2000). Valerie also expressed the effect of working in the same office as the person who shamed her

That was a nightmare. And in the same physical proximity too, cause the president’s office was over here. (Yeah) And my office is over here. So I’d see him every day. Oh it was awful, awful.

Evident in this excerpt is that being seen re-evokes the pain of shame. But what is also evident is what might have been the source of shame for Valerie, in this moment.

According to Tomkins (1963), the affect shame is evoked when desire is thwarted, and since Valerie was pursuing leadership her desire was being thwarted in this moment of shame. She reflected on this without assigning the affect shame to her experience: “I didn’t really dream of being in leadership in any college anywhere. I tried it you know I applied to different places but I think I always felt conviction that I really didn’t wanted to go - and so. That was it.” Her desire was to lead in the university she was part of and interprets the moment of shame as ending her career in higher education.

**Adele.** Adele described herself as “cerebral” when it came to emotions and leadership and did not express her emotions during the interview in tears or anger.
I don't, I'm not of the camp where like I'm *like oh poor me poor me*. I guess I'm more cerebral and that way. I just process it - what's good, what's bad, what's wrong with that, what can I learn and then move forward.

The emotions that she talked about in relation to leadership were fear and anger. She saw that her training as a scholar did not equip her well for the relational aspects of leadership. Her approach was to argue her point of view and to question others’ as a good scholar does in research. She found that her cerebral approach was effective for the bottom line - return on investment - and instigating change in the infrastructure, but not for attending to the reactions of her staff who were afraid their positions would be cut. She described how she removed a director when she took the executive leadership position.

I’m created like shock and awe across the university. So I think you know - I think that it was a difficult and stressful situation. But if - but I just felt like - it's not that complicated. We just figure out what the right thing to do is and we just go do it. It does not matter what we feel about it. (Laugh.)

Adele described the primary shame event as a time when she experienced fear (not shame).

The president's wife could have told the president, “I’m uncomfortable with this. I would like you to moderate that”. And it would have been a very different V.P. experience as well as a different mentoring experience. So I’m extremely grateful in this case to the president’s wife.

This situation as the only experience she identified in the interviews where she had a problem due to gender because, “it created fear.”
She used the word anger in relation to her expectations for high performance from members of her department. On one occasion she was angry with a senior staff member because he dismissed her expectations and voiced disagreement about her decision-making behind her back. “So - I - so when he was doing that, I think I was eager to ding him publicly because I don't want him to, I don't want there to be a precedent that this is okay.” She challenged him in a department meeting and “responded in anger” because she felt angry. This response backfired because he responded by withdrawing (shame) and “it just looked like I was abusing my staff” (gave the impression of shaming her staff?). She made sense of this as a learning lesson because she was an inexperienced leader.

*Irene.* Irene expressed her emotions in the interviews by crying. She did not explain the pain - what it felt like or where she experienced the feelings in her body. She was clear on what she thought of shame and wanted to talk through her experiences of it.

Irene named the comments people made to her on how she looked and dressed and about pursuing leadership in Christian higher education, microaggressions. In my research journal I noted awareness of feelings of anger during and after the interview for what she described, and I was surprised that Irene did not express anger in the interviews. What she did say about her current context might address how she made sense of the microaggressions:

I live in a world now where I never, all the language in my head of wondering if my boss or colleagues think I am a good person, it doesn’t happen anymore. I’m probably a little more guarded and I don’t reveal as much of my deepness with people because I think that that’s a way to protect myself.
That she was in a context that affirmed her leadership was a clear theme in her transcripts.

Baylee. Baylee used the word shame in connection with anxiety when describing what happened when she looked at spreadsheets about money. She related this to her “family of origin stuff” that she was still hanging on to. Anxiety is associated with shame in that it is an internal feeling state that can evoke a sense that “I am not enough” or that “I do not belong” (Lewis, 1971).

There were other words that resembled what shame looked like to Baylee. When she described the response of the lab tech to hearing that she was excluded from planning the next research project she said “he just shriveled up and I could just see him shrivel.” Baylee responded in silence and withdrawal: “And I just didn't know how to respond in the moment so I was silent and shortly thereafter I left the lab. I just was gone by my choice. Things wrapped up and I, and I’ve never had contact with them since. I’ve never talked to them.” This resembled an undifferentiated shame response (Block Lewis, 1971) where the sense of shame is not identified.

Baylee used the same word to describe a situation where she was overheard talking about her experience in the lab with a woman researcher:

And all of these men had been listening to our conversation - and I could just kick myself. I just really felt very badly and shriveled a little bit - that I had done that so publicly. Not that I didn't believe my experience, but that I wish I hadn't said it in public.
Baylee referenced the public component of shame that Lynd (1958) identified as being publicly exposed or surprised by a public impression that is different from what one believes about oneself (pp. 43-44).

*Rita.* Rita articulated emotions as she was experiencing them in the interview and described what she was feeling in her body (Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963). The words she used were not names of emotions but were descriptive of her immediate experience:

“This is really activating”

“I’m sorry Darla, I’m getting into such a wordless place”

“And the reluctance...that landed in my stomach somewhere and I don’t know...the words went away”

“I don’t know...I don’t have any words but I have a lot of emotion - well – thinking back to that experience and just the experiencing of it (pause)”

Although she could articulate when she was experiencing shame, these instances could have also been signs of emotion that she had yet to appraise (Mascolo & Fischer, 1995) like undifferentiated shame (Block Lewis, 1971).

*Nancy.* In Nancy’s descriptions of shame, she also expressed feeling self-conscious about what other people might be thinking about the way she communicated or if she was acknowledged and taken seriously in meetings. When talking about how she recognized emotions in her body she said, “Probably for me - physically it would be my gut or if I feel my stomach tensing up, when I feel my heart racing a bit.” She added a cognitive element when she talked about feeling self-conscious about something she said:
I had those flashes of moments where I thought somebody might think less of - that - but I don’t own that - so perhaps that’s a resilience against the shame in thinking that was not enough but actually being convinced that that’s the best as opposed to not being good enough.

Nancy recognized the bodily sensations and thoughts that were evoked and responded by utilizing her cognition - “being convinced” - that she said what was good for her to say and therefore did not take-in or integrate the negative thought. This is an example of emotion regulation that is part of developing resilience (Hill, 2015). Like Adele and Baylee, during the interview she did not express feeling self-conscious emotions.

**Summary of findings.** In this section I examined the limits of shame for each participant to understand what words they used to express shame and other self-conscious emotions. Valerie, Adele, Irene, Baylee, Rita, and Nancy all have different ways of understanding themselves in shame moments and some of them talked about the formative moments in their life that shaped their understanding. What was clear to me was that even though participants did not use the word shame much (it varied from 3-16 times) it did not mean that they were not talking about shame, guilt, embarrassment etc. or not experiencing the affect. Additionally, the participants who did not show or say what they were feeling in the moment, did not mean that they were not feeling emotions at the time.

What is also important to note is that combination of shame and anger was evident in all the participants, although it may have been subtle. For example, Nancy used the word disdain in talking about the limitations of gender-rules but did not further articulate if this disdain was anger, shame or something different. Interestingly, anger is
an emotion that is culturally acceptable (in the West) for men to show (Else-Quest, Higgins, Allison, & Morton, 2012). Women in this study might have benefited by understanding the connection between anger and shame (Retzinger, 1987; Scheff, 1987) as a means for determining the trace of shame in moments of anger.

**Putting Shame Under Erasure.** In deconstruction, signifiers like shame are analyzed for inconsistencies, contradictions, and heterogeneity in the text. Under the umbrella of deconstruction, the next step in analyzing the data by plugging in theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) is to read the data while thinking with Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism and followed by Brown’s (2006) SRT.

**Feminist Poststructuralism: Binary’s and patriarchy at play.** Weedon’s (1997) feminist poststructuralism is a framework for understanding how gender is constructed and reconstituted in institutional discourse. It explains the structures that reinforce patriarchy and enforce gendered social rules that inscribe restrictions for behavior, speech, position, power, race, sexuality, class etc. It is the social cultural underpinnings behind gender-based stereotypes, although the focus is on text or discourse, whereas Eagly’s (1982) research focuses on the influence of social roles from a social constructivist view of gender and sexuality. The questions (Appendix A) I asked when analyzing the text were

- What binaries are articulated?
- What are the current social and political implications of “power over” dynamic represented in the binaries?
- How is gender constructed and reconstituted in the institutional discourse?
I did not answer each one of these questions for every participant but covered them between all the participants.

Valerie. In reading the data through Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism what became evident to me was how Valerie was aware of the male/female binary in the institution and the power (in opportunity) that would extend to her by developing collegial relationships with men. She described being intentional from the beginning to move towards male colleagues and how her athleticism assisted her in this, since competition was part of the institutional environment for men and women who wanted to lead. She also identified the underpinnings of patriarchy inherent in the hierarchy of the leadership structure based on deeply held Evangelical beliefs about women and men (Gallagher, 2004). For example, Valerie was described as a “different kind of woman” by another woman asking about qualities needed for leadership.

Valerie located the harm done in the primary shame moment in the words of her supervisor, “the way he phrased it was the most harmful way possible to phrase it (tears).” It was this quality of discourse and the positional power of the person that framed narratives about Valerie’s leadership effectiveness and suspicion of her character that led to her not being interviewed for an executive leadership position that she was preparing for and the eventual lack of leadership possibilities at the institution.

The question of shame/woman leader was continually resisted by Valerie. The data showed that Valerie did not really want to believe (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 23) that shame discourse dominated and oppressed her desire for leadership in the institution as noted in this question: “Is it me or is it, you know, I think that’s the questions women have to ask all the time; is this because of who I am personally or is this because people
cannot see past my gender?” Yet her opinions about the sexism of Evangelical men and women showed how she made sense of where the beliefs about her leadership formed the discourse and how they seemed to go unchallenged by her Evangelical colleagues.

Additionally, she troubled the idea of her womanness being noticed and the expectations for her role as associate provost: “it's as if to notice that I'm female shifts everything into a sexualized mode where then once again I don't get to be who I am - I have to be, I have to fit, I have to deal with that paradigm.” As a woman and a leader, she was directed to “be a spokesperson” for the president, and “represent his point of view” and not her own ideas. This was a result of the discourse that ensued after she was estimated as not capable for executive leadership. It showed an ambivalence in the institution’s perspective of women leaders and how, to a certain extent, they were willing to support female leadership. It also showed what they did to enforce traditional roles.

Could this be the glass cliff effect (Ryan & Haslam, 2005)? Valerie attempted to ascertain what she had done to evoke the change of estimation in her leadership capabilities by her supervisor. She asked him if she made a mistake and/or what she needed to do to regain his estimation. The answer she was given attached the blame to being a woman: “he expressed that he needed to distance himself from me because his wife said so. And it affected my career. And it was not my fault.” The institutional discourse that resulted reinforced gender-based stereotypes that rendered the perception of Valerie’s leadership as ineffective. Valerie reached out for support from an advocate outside the system which led to reinstating her position as faculty (but without tenure). Reinstating her positions could be viewed as an act of “benevolent sexism” (Glick & Fiske, 1996) that covered up the harm from the sexism that fueled the discourse.
Adele. Like Valerie, the Evangelical family represented by the persons occupying the top leadership position are afforded the power of influence. Adele attributed power to the president’s wife because of how she interpreted the conversation and influenced the president (wife of president/woman leader). It seemed the president’s wife in this case, was given power to manage perception of the President. If the president’s wife had any doubts Adele was certain that she would have had her husband change or eliminate Adele’s position (as in Valerie’s case).

After Adele made statement of her appreciation for the president’s wife’s advocacy on her behalf, she reflected on the how the way she looked might have contributed to why the perception was not suspect. If she had looked different then it might have been an issue. At another point in the interview Adele described her dress as androgynous; “I think I’m gender-neutral. Like in the way I dress. I don’t wear dresses sometimes to board meetings. I rarely on day by day, it’s usually like business suits.” Adele seemed to be addressing the idea that the sexualization of a woman would impact public perception, and I would add that the trace of the gender-based stereotype of woman as Eve or temptress is at play.

Another issue of gender that Adele mentioned was related to her public exchange with the senior leader who brushed aside her authority: “And because I'm a woman...that's your problem. Like that's not - laugh. I am like I'm sorry that you have to be in the situation and it is awkward.” Although Adele did not attach shame to this situation, she recognized that gender was part of the reason for the senior leader’s resistance to her authority (male/female).
Adele described a mentoring relationship with the president who downplayed the gender dynamics she was navigating. When she responded in anger to the senior leader she talked to the president about it. His response lacked the nuance of Adele’s position as a woman leader. She recognized this by saying, “So it's like well, I'm not a white male. And you know (laugh). I don't assume those kinds of privileges nor do I want to.”

Adele understood that the executive leadership position came with privileges that were mostly inhabited by white males. Since hierarchy distributes power to the top positions she was compelled to use her power to disrupt the system. She described having the privileges of being given sideline passes for the football games and that she would bring other women of color to stand with her on the sidelines. In standing on the sidelines she was disrupting the perception that all the executive leaders were white male. It was important for her contribute to creating this perception because the parents are looking seeing that their kids are playing but the leaders are on the sidelines and they tend to be all white males - and that sends a strong message in the middle of Black Lives Matter, and the middle of all this Charlottesville - all this diversity issues going on across the country. Like, people have those frames, and they’re looking at OOO[name of University]. And so I'm trying to represent it, better than we are. So, that's my way to steward that privilege in a way that is, that is honoring.

This excerpt shows that Adele is disrupting the binary white male/female.  

Irene. Irene’s primary moment of shame had to do with experiences in Christian higher education that she described as shaming and discriminatory. The reasons she gave for this were that she was “a little bit outside the mold” because of how she dressed, what
she looked like and that she presented a perspective that challenged the patriarchal norms inherent in some Evangelical traditions. This was demonstrated by her experience with a mentor and with the Human Resources department of the university.

A lot of discrimination I experienced had to do with the way I looked. And there's a lot of shame around that and because of the way I was made to feel about the way I looked and how I dressed, so it just wasn't... well here's how I got here but you just worry about being a good professor, and they don't want people like you, that's what he said, they don't want people like you in Christian higher ed.

The mentor ended up claiming sexual harassment against Irene for a dress related instance. The HR director enforced a rule of dress for her that played to the male traits and normed as appropriate, inherent in the system (Acker, 1990), which constituted a sexualized gender stereotype of women. This was part of the policies in the institution that governed a safe and effective work environment. How far this institution would go to enforce gendered norms was evident in the what was required of her after the claim.

Irene was told the type of clothes she needed to wear, the parts of her body she needed to cover and that she was to check in with another woman who would approve her clothing every day. Additionally, she had to bring a change of clothes to the office in case she misjudged the appropriateness of her clothing. Irene was not only speaking from a perspective that was disruptive to the institutional norms, but her presence on the campus was a disruption. By dressing differently, she was challenging the norms and threatened dismantling the ideal of Christian woman.

Although the norms were different in Christian and public sectors of higher education, Irene’s body was still a point of disruption on the public university’s campus.
In the interview, she did not make connections to the instance above when she was told about the satirical portrayal of her by the university’s theater company, where she was depicted as a beautiful, sexual, and stupid. Her response was about the fear of being perceived as an imposter: “I don't feel shamed by that, I think what I feel more than that is the lie of the imposter syndrome, which is that - no one takes you seriously.” This is connected to comparing herself to the executive leaders she worked with and that she did not go through the usual steps to get the position. “When all these other faculty look at me they just think I got the job because I am blonde or whatever.” She also compared the way she looks to the way the other woman executive leader presented herself. This interrupted her thinking when in meetings with senior leaders:

When I'm sitting in Senate or I’m sitting in cabinet often times I'm thinking it feels awkward in my body of like they probably don't think I'm legit. Mmm because of what I look like and how I present myself. Maybe if I was older and I wore different types of clothes or whatever, maybe they I would take me more seriously.

So, the satire was a public representation of the imposter Irene had in her mind's eye. It showed, however, that the public university, or the persons that approved of the production, were resisting the notions of what a legitimate leader looks like.

Baylee. Gendered games were part of the leadership meeting culture when Baylee was an interim dean. They took place before meetings and were exclusive to men and detrimental to women:

I also learned that women can't play those games. (Oh yah?). Um hm, you can't go in - in my experience - you can't go in and join the pecking order game.
Because you will get trounced. You have to just kind of play a parallel game and just dive in as the, I mean it didn't stop me from diving in. But I never played those games. Because...there was another woman and she joined in, and she was not respected. (Really?) Really, really not respected.

Not all women stayed out of the games. Baylee talked about two women leaders that she knew; one who understood the social rules and navigated them enough to become a VP and then become a president. Another woman tried playing the gendered games which ended her leadership.

In the second interview, we revisited her experience with gendered games. She said, “I, I really did work to try and make sense of it” and she did that by reaching out to her husband and reading a book on power. She learned that hegemony determined the social and cultural rules like what is a good worker or good leader. Learning the rules is amplified when “you see them in relief against the other. So, you can see gender rules if you go and you cross a gender rule, you know?” She described her time as a dean as a “quick course on hegemony around gender.”

It caused me to recognize a lot of those rules. One of those things I recognized was that there were different ways of interacting in meetings. Different ways of socialized interaction and socialization. Different ways of expressing aggression and talking about ideas. There were different ways of doing leadership. And I'm not the first to say this but women and people of color have a more distributive justice and more distributive leadership style. And white men tend to be very hierarchical and point to a chain of command.
Another example of hegemony occurred when Baylee was in a meeting on developing women leaders. When speaking about women in leadership at the university, the president “looked right at me and he said, ‘and some women need to know that they’re just won’t be jobs for them here. That if they want to do, you know, some leadership jobs, they may have to leave the university to do it.’” Baylee interpreted this as a direct message to her - that she would not be promoted to other leadership positions at the university. It was the dominant position of power that determined what was viewed as an effective style of leadership as Baylee described in her other experiences as dean.

*Rita.* Rita’s understanding of institutional patriarchy and the limitations that were inherent in policies (Acker, 1990) were evident in this story about negotiating for maternity leave at the first church where she served as pastor. It was in the early 1980’s and the denomination was just starting to ordain women for pastoral ministry. To one of the most resistant members of the board of elders she said,

You know the only reason I’m considering this position is because my husband’s willing to subsidize your ministry by supporting my income. That’s the fact. If you want me, you have to give me maternity leave. The senior pastor was sitting there and you could see him smiling the whole time. And it became the basis for the [denomination] to develop a maternity leave policy. They were so surprised that it showed up and that I negotiated it.

Based on Rita’s explanation of leaving a science-based career and going to seminary to be a pastor, it seemed realistic that she might have been surprised by her own willingness to negotiate as well.
Resistance to disrupting patriarchy did not always come from men nor did it look the same. Rita quit her job when her first child was born and her “fellow women clergy” gave her all kinds of flack and said she was “undercutting progress and giving into conventions.” The response of the women clergy was likely related to stereotype threat which means that they were threatened by Rita’s moving into the stereotype (Inzlicht & Schmader, 2012) of the “traditional” white, middle class, stay-at-home mom. The expectations for being a “working mom” as enforced by the women clergy were competing with the expectations for what she wanted for herself and her child (Brown, 2006). Rita described experiencing shame because of this encounter with gender-based stereotypes when she reached out to her mentor-professor:

I told him about the tension and the sadness in the shame. I felt ashamed. I understood philosophically where they were coming from and I felt it too. Why go through all of that that travail to get it and then not use it?

And he told her that it was about having the choice and exercising the choice (agentic) rather than the threat to the relationships and/or self-perception.

Nancy. Nancy’s experience as a co-dean of a seminary showed how gendered activities excluded her from conversations relevant to her leadership position:

I remember us at the end of the year planning an event to go out and do something and it ended up being the three guys went golfing and I was walking around the golf course with the women (oh my goodness) no one even asked...and the women were the secretaries in the office – no one even I even asked if I wanted to go golfing.
Nancy noticed this enforcement of gender rules and that because she was a woman and excluded from activities, she missed conversation relevant to her position. There was a competing thought, however, where Nancy experienced their deferral to her expertise in discussions about students and believed when they were at the table “I was a full equal and I never questioned whether I was respected and heard and yet in those kinds of situations we jumped right back into that model.”

Nancy was not as respected when working in her denominational setting outside the seminary. She was asked to be on a committee and the leader who was a retired missionary acknowledged everyone’s scholarship and expertise but when it came to Nancy he said, “and to have Nancy who is giving us a woman's perspective (laughing). And I said and I'd like to think that my counseling experience and training has something to do with that.” Nancy had explained that when speaking up in certain context she had echoes of shame. In this instance she said,

Again, it was one of those where I could have just sat down and shut up but I also knew that the other two men on the committee who were my colleagues, one of them who was the one responsible for me being hired and would have spoken into that but I also knew that in his mind that was where he had compartmentalized so he had the stereotype but I didn't own it. I was able to push back. The reason she said she could push back was because she knew he would understand that her intention was out of kindness. Nancy’s assertiveness was tempered by a relational or communal aspect of leadership which is a stereotypically female leadership trait.

*Summary of findings.* The analysis of plugging in Feminist Poststructuralism into the data showed that the participants identified and wrestled with binaries and the power
over dynamic represented by the binaries. It was not only the male/female binary that was articulated but a further attribution of power in white male/female. Additionally, there was a recognition that power was distributed to positions: president’s wives/executive woman leaders and that stewarding the privileges was intentional and strategic. The participants noted that discourse of male executive leaders had the effect of enforcing gender rules for leadership effectiveness.

The participants articulated that gender was constituted in how they dressed, what activities they participated in and in institutional policies that pertained to women’s bodies (maternity leave). Institutional policies and discourse that enforced gender rules for leadership therefore reconstituting gender. The participants talked about managing their bodies and their dress to either downplay their sexuality and lessen the threat of being sexualized (and rendered ineffective) or not downplay their sexuality and represent womanness in their dress to make apparent that a woman is present at the leadership table. The data also showed that power was extended to women that participated in traditionally gendered activities such athletic competition but that gender rules in conservative Christian contexts provoke a tension that can exclude women from certain activities and taking part in conversations relevant to their positions.

**Shame Resilience Theory (SRT).** The next step in analyzing the data was to plug Brown’s (2006) SRT into the data. The analytical questions (Appendix A) that came to mind when reading the transcripts were

- How did the participants describe regulating shame or another self-conscious emotion?
- How is shame communicated and/or and used in the institutional context?
• How is shame and resilience embodied?

I did not answer all these questions when the data did not lead to answering these questions.

Valerie. Aspects of Brown’s (2006) SRT evident in Valerie’s transcripts were social-cultural expectations for women and reaching out for support. First, her communication style was pinpointed as a “problem” that did not fit the stereotype for what was expected from women in leadership. But the underlying narrative which was the linchpin in the shift in her sponsor’s (the president) posture towards her was related to her character - her trustworthiness - in the workplace. This less explicit narrative evoked a “woman as temptress” stereotype played off the Biblical story of Adam and Eve assigning Eve the blame for being the temptress to Adam resulting in “the fall” (Irons & Mock, 2015), that played into the decision to halt her progress in leadership at the institution and “ended her career.”

Valerie was clear in the interview that she did not deserve to be shamed by her supervisor and that she after “enormous amounts of self-examination about whether - what my participation was and how much of this was my fault and what I could’ve done differently” she realized that “it was not my fault.” Although she experienced the pain and shame of the event, the resilience is noted in where she located herself in the situation.

Other evidence of a quality of introspection that is important in resilience was in her reflection on how she got into the situation in the first place

And I also discovered that I could be manipulated through the idea of leadership and that I had been manipulated - by say by sincere or maybe insincere - but
really I don't know. But anyways it was really easy for me to be manipulated by holding out promises of leadership opportunity. And I did - I was - that's the lesson I learned and so I became kind of allergic to the word leadership for a while.

Valerie articulated the lesson learned and that she saw the complicity of her own desires and willingness to participate the environment - to a certain extent. When her supervisor became president of the university the rules for leadership were prescribed and enforced based on his biases (sexist).

The embodiment of shame noted in what she did when she experienced shame, showed the absent presence of resilience in the shame. The way she viewed herself - as competitive and as competent leader showed how in the moment of shame she was living into or embodying resilience, “I don't know. It's just something I do. (Laugh.) It's just an effort to be in charge of my own life and not be a victim.”

Valerie embodied shame resilience by questioning and standing up for herself. She questioned the president’s interpretation of a policy that would have prevented her from leading her department. She reached out for advocacy when after being told she would have not a job because the department was being reorganized, she was not offered a faculty position. Rather than running and hiding, Valerie stood up for herself.

Another way Valerie embodied resilience as the absent presence of shame was her pursuit of leaving the institution on her own terms rather than being forced out. She couched the reason for staying at the institution by identifying the value she placed on her work and the identity she formed around it. She troubled the idea that resilience is easy or that the development of resilience involves positive feelings like happiness and that it
is the same for everyone. She even pinned the end of her career in higher education on
this act of staying which further troubled the notion that developing resilience leads to
more opportunity. “So, the resilience against part when I was staying at OOO [name of
University]- to stay in the context - when I was so miserable was - I came to work every
day determined not to lose. I felt like I was kind of - I was in a battle.” She understood
that resilience is developed differently for everyone, “And another person might have
exhibited resilience by leaving. And I could still have a career if I'd been willing to do
that. But I was just so aggravated about being pushed out that I wouldn't go.” Valerie
could see the injustice as it was happening and could not stop it from happening but with
her words and her actions, she disrupted the tradition of shame/woman leader.

_Adele._ Adele’s primary reference of resilience had to do with her willingness to
take in negative feedback and learn from her mistakes. She did not see the leadership
mistakes she made as something that defined her and did not blame herself:

I guess I don't have that self-blame, self - like, I wish I, I just feel like, I can just
do my best, I'm just trying to do my best, to work for the school to be a good
leader and I'm young and I'm inexperienced and part of that means I'm going to
run against the wall a lot. And it's important to learn and to ask myself what can I
learn from this and then learn and then move on. Cuz how else am I going to
learn and then I'm already doing my best so I don't know what else I could do.

Adele gave credit for the opportunity and for her resilience to having access to the
president as a mentor. Since he recruited her, she could talk to him without fear of losing
her position and his estimation of her abilities (as with Valerie).
Irene. Resilience for Irene had to do with having a group of friends to reach out to and having supportive conversations (therapy) and a spiritual community. Irene mentioned that the ways that gender expectations were enforced at the Christian university *sounded* like kindness but were actually enforcing a dominant gender narrative. These statements were made mostly by men but not exclusively. She interpreted their comments as “you must need this accommodation because you are a woman.” Or motherhood should be your top priority, which is another gendered stereotype that is supported in the conservative Christian context. The tone of the statements was kind which made it difficult to notice at the time comments were said to her. It wasn’t until later realized how inappropriate they were. Having a group of friends to make sense of these kind of comments was essential for her.

Additionally, she detailed a cognitive process she followed: First she sorted out of what was really said, then she criticized herself for not realizing what was happening in the moment, and finally, she judged herself for not speaking up in the moment.

I just remember at the time thinking that's like a microaggression - like did they really just say that? Or maybe I'm, I heard that the wrong way and I go back home and think gosh dang! Why didn't I say hey that's not really appropriate? I think that's where micro aggressions and stereotypes can be so, hurtful. That in the moment unless they're outright or blatant you don't, you just take it in, and it's later that you realize how inappropriate those comments were.

Irene’s explanation of how the satirical representation of her did not evoke shame speaks to her comment of having more awareness of the micro aggression when it is “outright or
blatant” and the harm done when it is indirect. It is the “taking it in” and I would add nonconsciously integrating it that leads to perpetuating the oppression (Gross, 2007).

The method she described for becoming aware of the microaggression is like Brown’s (2006) critical awareness in SRT. Irene was highly aware of gender-based stereotypes yet continued to pursue leadership despite institutional and sexist resistance.

The way she embodied her womanness was a disruption for her (internally) and for the institution. When I asked her about how she managed the internal discourse in her mind while leading she said,

I notice the script and ignore it; I know when it will show up. Like when in in front of senior faculty or administration, I know it will show up but when in front of peers, students or external constituents, I do not notice experience the internal discourse.

Irene described a turning point in regulating her shame and anger. She let go of the excruciating self-judgment and anger in a spiritual ceremony. The shame continued to linger for three years, however, but because of the letting go ritual, it was no longer distracting her.

Baylee. Baylee identified and became aware of the expectations for leaders at the university and decided, despite the expectations, that she was going to lead in a way that best fit her values.

So, I made a conscious decision that I wouldn't do that. That I would lead the way I wanted to lead. And there were people who appreciated that and there are people who said, ‘You don't know how lead at all.’, ‘You're leading from behind’, ‘You don't know what you're doing.’
She was viewed by some as an effective leader and by others as ineffective. But ultimately she decided “The suit doesn’t fit as well. You know. So, you just get judged as less effective than your male counterparts.” Identifying the expectations was not enough but accepting it, and making choices to invest in leading from the options available to her was how she has made an impact and found satisfaction.

A stable work environment also contributed to Baylee’s resilience. Baylee said that her department was differentiated and respectful: “We value each other’s strengths and compensate for each other’s weaknesses,” have clear goals, and are valued for individual contributions.

Paradoxically, Baylee stated that resilient leaders are flexible with their style of leadership; they adapt to the context and/or the situation. “In places where they can lead using a diversity or feminist style they do. But in the places where they would be judged inadequate for using that style, they’ll just use a hierarchical white-male style.” Baylee described a situation where she analyzed the behavior of the women and of the men at a work event. She decided what to do based on her values and her role in the group. “I said, ‘What should I do?’ And then I said, “What am I here for?” ... “I tried to be crystal clear about serving my values, you know? What’s the goal of the situation?” Baylee showed that analyzing the situation helped her notice and prepare for the gendered games.

Rita. Rita’s response to my question about how she developed resilience was enveloped in her experience of a relationship with God: “It’s so important that in every step I took I was empowered by a discerned sense that that’s what God wanted from me; that will sustain me; that’s what revived me; that’s what let me step into hard places.”
When I reread through her transcripts I saw Rita’s resilience in the way emotion regulation and attachment theory approaches resilience. She has her first mentor at twelve years old. Rita’s resilience came from having relationship with herself in different moments of her life: “Becoming a minister had to do with becoming my own best father.” And when she was earning her PhD it was about “becoming my own mother and truly valuing the mothering task - the feminine task rather than being the boss of the world,” and of her most recent training to be an analyst “becoming an adult; being a protégé of myself.” She articulated that shame was not something that would go away, although she wished it would. “Shame is not healed; it’s been wired off, calloused off - not healed or dead.” The resilience then, comes as she continues to understand, acknowledge, and work with it.

_Nancy._ Nancy described developing resilience as learning not to internalize the discourse (external and internal) and to determine what is important to speak into.

So, I did not internalize it - I took it, weather right or wrong, as a compliment that I think was underneath it. And I just said well it’s your loss or something...I don't remember what I even said. But I don't remember slinking away from that or being… there was a twinge of discomfort but again kind of reminding myself of that.

In the excerpt above Nancy could have a critical awareness of what was being said and by whom, and then respond accordingly. There are times when she does speak back to the gender-based discourse: “my emotion might have been a little bit of anxiety in both of those situations where it's kind of …. okay I'm going to speak back to this - screwing up
my courage to speak back to it, to say it, thinking … how do I say this graciously and not be offensive?”

Summary of findings. The text showed that the participants talked about developing resilience to shame in different ways. They each acknowledged shame (Brown, 2016) to different degrees as noted in the analysis for the limits of shame. For Valerie, it involved gritting her teeth or enduring the pain of shame which was also living into resilience as she stayed in the same context and enacted resilience by showing up and doing her work well. Resilience for Adele had to do with having a mentor that coached her. She could lead unselfconsciously knowing he had her back. Adele also had a pragmatic approach to leadership and accepted that as new leader, she was going to make mistakes. Irene was more of a perfectionist (Brown, 2006) than Adele. She wrestled with self-conscious thoughts about the way she embodied leadership but the process for identifying the emotion, thoughts, and feelings had made her work through her emotions and get to the other-side with less disruption (Hill, 2015; Siegel, 1999). Baylee and Nancy, like Irene, developed a cognitive strategy (Brown, 2006) for seeing the gender rules and navigating through them without integrating them. Rita’s approach was much more of an inside-out process (Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994). She takes in, looks inward, and then moves outward to engage in relationships.

Elements of Brown’s (2006) SRT were found in all the participants. What was evident in all the transcripts was the critical awareness to be able to name the expectations enforced by gender-based stereotypes. Of the participants that acknowledged shame, some talked about reaching out to friends and spouses when they were triggered by shame messages but this was not an explicit strategy for regulating
shame. Reaching out for therapeutic support was mentioned by half of the participants. Speaking shame was noted by using the word shame and evident in two of the six participant transcripts. One explanation for this is the elusiveness of shame (Lynd, 1958; Block Lewis, 1971; Scheff, 2014). Another is that they did not feel shame and/or identify shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes.

The data showed that resilience did not develop without experiencing distress (anger, anxiety, fear, shame). Shame can feel so overwhelming that it seems as though the best option is to repress or deny it. Each to a different extent, the participants showed that to develop resilience to shame, to bounce back from the painful experiences, involved moving through it.

**What happened inside the deconstructive event?** In the section above I presented the parts of the data where participants talked about shame and elements of resilience. In this section I describe how a “transgressive reading” of the text showed the event of deconstruction happening. As I read the transcripts, I considered the words and what the words communicated (the actions, behaviors etc.) by the participants to describe themselves because it gave me an idea of their response to “the process of deconstruction [that] results in a destabilizing of that which we have unproblematically come to accept” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 17).

During the interviews the participants retold and, in some ways, relived the details and emotions of the primary moment of shame. We revisited the primary moments during each interview to keep the sense making process moving forward in the context of our conversation. This provided space for a deconstruction event to happen “in the moment when the interviewee recounts disruptions that unsettle what has already been
said or remembered” (Jackson & Mazzei, p. 22). In the retelling, the participants referred to leadership, teaching or ministry experiences outside of the academy; they were building and reframing their building of shame as signifier as we were talking and some of the data includes these stories.

Valerie: Personality and gender. Valerie described herself as competitive, self-confident, articulate, playful, woefully introspective, and an atypical Evangelical woman (liken to her mother). Even though she viewed herself as atypical, she expressed dislike when described as “a different kind of woman” by a colleague when asking about qualities for leadership in Christian higher education. Although the conversations centered on a set of events that were shaming, Valerie articulated the “key question” that women leaders deal with, which insight into where her conceptualization of shame was snagged: “Is it me...because of who I am personally or because people cannot see past my gender?” She wrestled with how much of the leadership problem was due to her personality or gender, both of which played a part in her primary shame moment. The limits of shame were found in words she used to describe what she felt, the emotions she expressed during the interview, what she did is a response to the primary moment and how she embodied resilience and shame.

Adele: Competency and race. Adele described herself as rational, cerebral, fun, an athlete and leader, a scholar and pastor. She loved rigorous academic debate where she could “duel” with ideas even when the feedback was harsh because she could learn from it. In the second interview, she detailed her rationale for why she did not experience shame but then after thinking through it, she changed her mind. She realized that the discourse started by her colleague impacted the president: “and then I ran into the
president the next day - and the president talked to me about it so I know it was a thing because if it’s not a thing then why are you guys talking about it?” Adele equated shame with doing something wrong and when examining this situation, she did nothing to cause it therefore did not feel shame. Adele spoke with confidence about her ability to use reason to understand emotion moments and it was this competence that was threatened when she realized there was something more at play.

In the third interview, she questioned how the information was known by her colleague, and wondered if what she was sensing was shame because she could not have done anything about it, which aligns more with Tangney and Dearing’s (2002) definition of shame. Additionally, the surprise component in hearing about this from her colleagues and then having the president approach her about it is an element of shame (Lynd, 1958; Tomkins, 1963). In the framework of deconstruction, this was an irruption that showed a dismantling of her previous understanding of shame. This was evident in transcripts of the third interview when she changed her previous interpretation and stated that she did experience “a sense of shame” which showed that she was making new meaning of her response.

Further analysis of the transcripts showed that fear was present in the folds of shame. She resisted a deferred understanding of shame until the snag of the threat of being perceived differently by the president’s wife and therefore treated differently by the president because of her race and gender. This was an irruption in her understanding of her response and the sense of shame she experienced in this moment. Adele’s response aligned with a response from a woman invited to participate in my study. She said that she did not experience shame from gender-based stereotypes, but she did experience
shame because of race. Since the interview was centered on gender, I did not notice the hint of race in her response during the interview. It was the tension between eruption (external tensions of race and gender) and irruption (internal tensions of race and gender) or the “tension between what is happening and what is perceived” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 23) that showed up in the analysis indicating that race was at play in this moment and Adele’s “sense of shame.”

**Irene: Body and gender.** Irene described herself as an athlete, instructor and a leader. She did not hesitate to use the word shame and was emotive during the interviews. She approached the interview with some anticipation of it being useful to her. There’s a very, very intense story that I’m actually, Darla, really thankful that I get a chance to talk about this with you because I haven’t talked about it in a long time. And (tearing up) a lot of it I’ve chosen to forget. And in knowing I might have the opportunity to talk to you about it, a lot of memories are coming back. And I haven’t talked about it with my colleagues here...it’s really none of their business but I’m really looking forward to telling you that story. Sorry to be emotional.

In the interview, she made connections with her experiences in the Christian and public higher education context that related to how she was perceived as a woman. Irene described herself as an unapologetic progressive feminist and that she brought sexuality and gender into leadership conversations. She referenced her feminist perspective as part of the tensions she experienced in higher education. When comparing the Christian versus public university’s she originally said the public context was very different (affirming) from the Christian context. But in the last interview she noted that there were
similar points of resistance. This noticing indicated the absent presence of shame that she associated with her body. Furthermore, the idea that woman is shame (shame/woman and shame/woman leader) was continually deferred by Irene as she actively resisted stereotypes associated with woman leader and lived into resisting the stereotype of beautiful blonde = stupid and/or not a leader. By examining shame in her life and putting it to erasure, what was evident was a trace of resilience that would not have been there without the presence of shame.

**Baylee: Choice and gender.** Baylee described herself as a teacher and statistician. She was unfamiliar with experiencing of emotions in the moment because she was “pretty compartmentalized.” Making sense of the moment happens after, when she has time to think and ask questions about what happened and why. Baylee’s deconstructive event was read as becoming critically aware (Brown, 2006) of the gendered rules in the workplace. For example, the effects of an experience in her postdoc had “just shaken” her; it had “taken years” to talk about. And the emotion response was still evident when she was reminded of the experience:

> When stuff comes up in the news about, you know, the head of all the grants in the European Union said women just aren't good at science, you know, that kind of thing, that happened 2 years ago. Oh why would anyone ever say that? Or the head of Harvard said that women just couldn't do math and STEM sciences - you know, you know - I have to say I've experienced that.

Baylee likened the shame she experienced in her “postdoc” to the gendered rules used to privilege and distribute power in leadership. The power dynamic that was implicit above was made explicit with her experiences as interim dean: “That's what the dean position
was. It was a quick course in hegemony around gender. It caused me to recognize a lot of those rules.” The expectations for leadership in her context was male-gendered and she decided not to “play that game.” The absent presence of shame from the postdoc was echoed the moment of not knowing the rules of the gender games in leadership. The excess folds of the signifier shame showed the trace of resilience in agency by resisting the desire to lead if it meant changing her leadership style to be viewed as effective, to make a choice to invest in teaching instead of pushing into the resistance (like Irene) and finding a place to lead that valued her leadership style.

**Rita: Self-reliance and gender.** Rita described herself as a “renaissance woman” because she had four to five different careers. She was very articulate about the new connections she was making in the interview. Multiple times she said, “I’ve not thought of that before” or “I need to think about this more” or something similar. Some of these comments were cues to see when she might have been rethinking a disruption in what had already been said (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 21). Like the when I asked her about the shift from being a protégé for a man for 45 years, then switching to being a protégé for a woman for the last 20 years. Having male mentors that modeled the skills and expectations necessary for success reinforced the desire to be something she was not; an absence of being male and yet the presence of skills modeled by men.

**Nancy: Agency and self-acceptance.** Nancy described herself as approaching life not clinging to the absolutes; “I’ve always been a - life is gray person - not black and white.” She was articulate about cognitive processes for regulating emotions but was not as articulate for describing shame experiences. The data shows many statements where she resists assigning shame and gender-based stereotypes to her experience. For
example, when she was a new seminary student she told her professor that she was going home to bake cookies: “but there was that fear for me. So, in that sense I suppose that might qualify as a shame-based kind of a response, as a woman, perhaps that was the wrong thing to do in a professional setting.” She qualified assigning her response as shame-based by saying, “I suppose.” This resistance might be an irruption or an internal movement that was disruptive but not articulated:

“Again, it wasn't a gender thing I don't think it was a shame thing - I think it was just a…”

“part of the reason that I'm struggling coming up with examples of shame…”

“again I don't see this as shame as much as times when I would not promote myself…”

The text shows similar resistance to assigning gender:

“I don't see that as a gender thing, I don’t see that as a personal thing, I see it as ‘them’.”

“and again I'm not sure that I saw that as a gender thing - girls shouldn't do this as much as good Christians shouldn't do this”

“But again not a gender-based thing but I guess that's part of the resilience piece. Instead of saying I'm not adequate, I'm not good enough for them, I just said - okay if that's what they want (yeah) the consequence is for them…”

That is not to say that she did not assign shame or gender but that the there was an active resistance and a “struggle” to come up with experiences of shame when encountering gender-based stereotypes as noted above but these statements are a hint of eruption or irruption indicating “something may be wrong with what I currently believe” (Jackson &
Mazzei, 2012, p. 23). What if the element in the deconstructive event that was absent from our discussion but present in Nancy’s concepts of shame and gender was a conservative Evangelical perspective whereby the “problems” of shame are already solved because humanity has been rescued from shame (Pattison, 2000)? And what if the meaning she previously made of shame (tied to a belief system) was being dismantled in the interview process that evoked new connections and meanings? There was no indication of this in the text but the signifier shame seemed to be destabilized with “loose ends” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 31) of unarticulated examples of shame and gender.

Similarly, the data showed resistance to identifying gender-based stereotypes because of the threat of being identified differently (as a feminist?) than how she described herself - “girly.” Nancy was clear that she preferred to do things that are historically assigned to women and yet her life as a professor might be viewed outside the norm of what is girly. The instances of shame that she articulated were centered on speaking or representing herself in a professional context and being respected by men as an expert, which stands in tension with a perception of what is “girly.” Additionally, she described herself as located outside the norm already in her role in the seminary and denomination, just because she is a woman leader. Moving towards the edges by becoming more aware of shame when engaging with gender-based stereotypes may have been too extreme, the tension too great for continued dismantling in the context of the interview resulting in a struggle to articulate experiences of shame as the text shows (above).

**Summary of findings.** The events of deconstruction written above are based on my reading of the interview transcripts. My goal was not to interpret what the
participants were really meaning (centering subject) but to take the text that included their stories, their words, their emotions, and their bodies that described how they understood shame, gender-based stereotypes and resilience (decenter the subject) and look for what was being communicated. Shame was put under erasure by identifying and following the traces of represented shame and resilience for each participant, the absent presence of the meanings they were drawing from and making in the moment and noting the snags or imperfections in the text that indicated the différance or deferral of how they understood shame. Although the words I used to locate the participant’s understandings can be used to create categories that become fixed and used to generalize, my intention was to temporarily fix my understandings in the words so that new knowledge can be produced (and reproduced). To summarize, shame and resilience were both present and absent in personality and gender (Valerie), competency and race (Adele), body and gender, (Irene), choice and gender (Baylee), self-reliance and gender (Rita), and agency and self-acceptance (Nancy).

What was produced? Although I analyzed for a deconstructive event, “it is not just that deconstruction happens which is important in our attempts to make sense, it is what happens because of the deconstructive event. In other words, it is what is produced by the event that is deconstruction” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 23).

Valerie: Grit and surrender. The analysis shows that the presence of Valerie on campus, during and after the primary shame event, was a deconstructive event for the institution in that as a woman leader who was shamed, did not run and hide but she stayed and continued working as faculty member. The shaming discourse or narrative that was told of her leadership capabilities and her character disrupted the institution by
her continued presence and doing “good-work.” It was if her physical presence was signifying resilience while absent of shame (absent presence of resilience in the shame).

Valerie said that her motive in staying was to prove something to herself and to the president but from the lens of SRT, her willingness to stay and teach was the embodiment of resilience. She was living into what it took to bounce back (resilience) and because of her presence, the institution’s use of shaming discourse to enforce gender-based stereotypes was disrupted and another discourse had the opportunity to emerge; one that speaks more about the grit of perseverance in the face of shame. The deconstructive event produced resilience as knowing when to quit.

**Adele: Competency and competition.** When putting shame under erasure in data from Adele’s transcripts, fear was the excess fold of shame. She articulated feeling and evoking fear because of competitive posturing and assertive communication style when she was just starting in the position. Adele embodied her authority as an executive leader by using the positional power given to her by the president to fire longstanding employees. She was aware of the hierarchical structure and used it to fulfill the role and the goals that she had been recruited by the president to do. Her view of authority (“duty to follow the authority given to me by God”) empowered her to inhabit the leadership space with boldness.

Yet lingering or haunting that space were the gender-based stereotypes for women as leaders and race. Adele utilized positional power and privilege to empower women of color and disrupt the “all white male” picture of leadership on the sidelines of the athletic events, for which she received remarks that questioned her intentions. Her leadership style was agentic and assertive (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau,
2002) - more driven by the return on investment (ROI) and her desire to fulfill the goal rather than to attend to the feelings of those she was leading, which resembles stereotypes for male gendered leadership traits. As a result, she experienced resistance to her leadership style (not “fun” enough) from within her department. Adele was coached by the president to create a relational environment, that was affirming, and very concerned with “face” or maintaining image impressions (Cooley, 1922). This way of enacting executive leadership did not produce the results that Adele was working to make happen and the enforcement of this prescribed leadership style led to her decision to leave the position.

Irene: Perseverance and self-acceptance. Like with Valerie, Irene’s presence and the way she was present (dress, body) on the campus was disrupting. Although she experienced shame publicly as did Valerie, the shame was more than a negative withdrawal emotion, or an affect that leads to aggression (shame rage). The idea that shame and resilience are connected is a paradox (aporia) in that something that feels like whole body (Lynd, 1958) weakness like shame, is also something that can strengthen into resilience. How can something that can lead to forming perceptions that are harmful lead to something different than disqualification (the satire)? This is a the différance of shame. The meaning of shame is not closed or fixed in Irene’s life. Rather as Irene lived into and through shame she developed strategies for processing the microaggressions from gender-based stereotypes and awareness of them so she could move in and through them. The deconstructive event produced knowledge that resilience was living into accepting self as “good enough.”
**Bayle: Self-assuredness and agency.** Putting shame (in the way Baylee expressed it) under erasure showed a different response than Valerie and Irene. Baylee pushed up against gendered rules, which is where shame was historically present for her. Her interpretation of effective women leaders, however, showed a snag in her understanding of shame. It disrupted the meaning made of her experience of leadership in that context, which might have been described as “women cannot lead” - much like the president said. It moved more with her thinking that women play a parallel game and if they are flexible and aware of the leadership style needed for different situations, they could lead in her context. The deconstructive event produced an understanding that resilience was having a choice to be flexible with leadership style (play gender games) and the choice to participate.

**Rita: Responsiveness and integration.** What the deconstructive event produced for Rita was knowledge that what she desired was something that she already embodied. The text showed that Rita developed an ability to be responsive when facing criticism from men that have power and significance. For example, she described self-conscious feelings she experienced while preaching. This moment had a trace of shame from an experience in seminary where she was demeaned by the professor in front of her all male preaching class. Instead of questioning her preaching competence she could turn her attention from the self-conscious feelings to being responsive to a man who was critiquing her sermon. When I asked how she made the shift from hyperconsciousness to attuning with the other she said:

So by the time I was shaking his hand at the door the self-consciousness was different than it was stepping into and being in the pulpit. But I don’t think that’s
what my tearfulness is about, it’s something about a really profoundly central aspect of me - to take care of the other person. It’s almost as if as soon as I can shift my attention to the other person and their experience and then I can be okay.

The deconstructive event in Rita’s transcripts produced knowledge that resilience had to do with being responsive in the face of criticism and shame.

**Nancy: Standing out and groundlessness.** The deconstructive event in Nancy’s transcripts had to do with the tension between keeping in the gray or the in middle and away from the edges of an ideals (like shame or gender) that have the trace or echo of black and white thinking that is part of some conservative Evangelical discourse. For example, the discourse on feminism is that the ideas about gender and sexuality threaten the divine order of creation by which the model for family is based on (Gallagher, 2004).

The act of naming a moment or event of shame can evoke shame because it threatens a fixedness – that the concept cannot or should not be changed. Caputo (2005) writes that events (moments of shame) and names (signifiers like shame) go hand and hand; there is no privilege in the name.

[A] name is never the equal of the event that stirs within it, the name can never be taken with literal force, as if it held the event tightly within its grip, as if it circumscribed it and literally named it, as if a concept (*Begriff*) were anything more than a temporary stop and imperfect hold of an event. (pp. 3-4)

Nancy did not outright say that she was opposed to feminism but the transcripts show there was resistance (and shame?) to considering that gender and shame were at play in her experiences. The knowledge produced, therefore, was that resilience involved
awareness that shame can be evoked while in the process of coming up against the limits of previously held beliefs (staying in the gray is the ideal).

Additionally, Nancy experienced shame when standing out or being different when contributing in meetings yet standing out also was also the trace of resilience in the shame. In answering a question on the difference in her leadership between when she started and now she said, “I think perhaps appropriating more voice that I know I have had all along.” Resilience for Nancy, therefore, was standing out amongst her peers.

**Summary of findings.** When analyzing the text for new knowledge it was evident that where there was shame there was the trace of resilience. For each participant, the text showed that resilience was lurking in the shadows of shame. Resilience was not easy to trace because the shame was weighty, hidden, and/or fluid like. Shame seemed to overshadow the trace of resilience. For some of the participants the pain of shame made the analysis process thick and weighty. In these transcripts, the trace of resilience looked like grit (Valerie) and the perseverence of running a long-distance race (Irene). For others shame was hidden in between or behind their experiences of race and/or gender, which made it difficult to pin down. Resilience for these participants looked like competency, self-assuredness, and agency (Adele and Baylee). And analyzing for shame and resilience in the transcripts of the last two participants involved diving deep into the psyche and then coming up to the surface for air. Resilience lurked in the acknowledging that they embodied what they desired: responsiveness (Rita) and standing out (Nancy).

When the idea of shame as resilience started surfacing there was a snag – how could it be? It doesn’t make sense. Yet the data showed that resilience was present during shame.
Conclusion

In this chapter I presented an analysis of the interview transcripts and the knowledge that was produced. I reviewed the schematic clues used in the analysis and then plugged theory in the data to address the primary analytic question: What are the moments of articulating shame when engaged with gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience? In the next chapter I will present a summary of the analysis, conclusions to this study, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter Five Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study is to produce knowledge of what women leaders in Christian higher education do when engaging with gender-based stereotypes that elicit a moment of shame and how in a deconstruction event they made sense of the experience. To fulfill this purpose, I interviewed six women who were leaders in Christian higher education (including Christian seminary). Each had a PhD and had served in leadership for at least two years. We met three times for a total of three-hour in-depth semi structured interviews (see interview questions in Appendix B). The participants were purposefully selected and the data used for this study was interview transcripts.

The primary question that informed my analysis was, what are the moments of articulating shame when engaged with gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience? This question focused my thinking on how the participants deferred their understanding of shame and what they did when they experienced a moment of shame. The data showed ten aspects of resilience that are detailed below. The findings show that when the participants were experiencing shame they were also enacting resilience. In other words, resilience is present in moments in shame. In this chapter I present a summary of the analysis, conclusions of the findings, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of Analysis

Deconstructive event. The deconstructive event was made apparent by looking for Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) schematic cues in the text and signals of when the participants were making new meanings of their experiences of shame. I used the
schematic cues to point me to the part of the text where a participant was making sense of a moment of shame in a different way than they had made sense of it before. In other words, the cues indicated the parts of the transcripts where the participants were referring to their “traditional” understanding of shame in the event and articulating the enactment of resilience or the trace of resilience that was in the event as well.

The meaning the participants were making in the moment(s) of the interview was no longer fixed understandings of shame but disrupted by the presence of resilience in the midst of the shame moment (absent presence, Derrida 1967/1972). For example, when Baylee was told that her collaborative style of leadership disqualified her from being a leader in the institution, she experienced shame because it was a desire that was thwarted (Block Lewis, 1971) which is a traditional understanding of shame and she also talked about redirecting the focus of her energy on teaching which was enacting resilience.

The findings showed that in moments of shame in leadership there was an absent presence of shame and the trace of resilience. The participants articulated moments of shame in leadership in these areas: personality and gender (Valerie), competency and race (Adele), body and skills (Irene), choice and gender (Baylee), responsiveness and gender (Rita), and agency and self-acceptance (Nancy). These areas were not categories to be generalized for all women leaders, as in Brown’s (2006) categories for critical awareness. Instead they were where the transcripts showed the participants were making new meanings of shame as identified by the schematic cues. The trace of resilience was also present and made evident in what happened as a result of the event.

What was produced? In the analysis, I was not only looking at what was happening in the deconstruction events, but I was looking for “what happen[ed] because
of the event” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 23). The deconstructive events produced descriptions of resilience that were more than a cognitive process for appraising emotions and behavior as in Brown’s (2006) SRT. What was found was that resilience was embodied or enacted in the moments of shame.

By “in the moments of shame” I do not mean to say that at the same point of time they were feeling shame and feeling resilient, because in the interview conversations the participants were looking back on their experiences. But in the moments of the interview when they were making new sense of their primary moments of shame, they were articulating resilience as part of their shame moment. This is the significant aspect of this study. That as participants recalled and made sense of shame experiences, they included the points of their story where they demonstrated resilience. And the resilience they focused on was more than a cognitive strategy but involved their physical presence and their actions (embodied and enacted). So, in the process of acknowledging shame they were also acknowledging acts of resilience. This aspect of resilience is not found in SRT (Brown, 2006) or the emotion regulation research and theories I reviewed (Davidson & Begley, 2012; Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994; Siegel, 1999).

It could also be said that the very act of making sense could be viewed as part of the process of bouncing back (resilience) and Brown’s (2006) SRT supports this. And this finding described how that happened: that the acts of resilient behavior were articulated as part of moments of shame which refocused conversations around shame or disrupted the weighty aspects of shame that threatened and thwarted naming and acknowledging shame. Naming resilient behavior did not, however, take away the physiological sensations of shame in the moment of recall. It seemed to be more like a
dissipation of the weight of shame into something new that was less threatening and yet also inspiring or uplifting (bouncing back). It could be that in the release or discharge of shame like in laughter (Block Lewis, 1971; Nathanson 1987), or in the process of developing critical awareness (Brown, 2009) the participants were able to consider how they were not flawed and unworthy of belonging (Brown, 2006) and that they showed this belief in their actions. The findings showed resilience in the articulation of grit and surrender, competency and competition, perseverance, self-assuredness and agency, responsiveness and integration, and standing out and groundlessness.

**Conclusions of This Study**

**Aspects of resilience and shame.** What was produced in analyzing the text by plugging in Derrida’s (1967/1972) Deconstruction, Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism, and Brown’s (2006) Shame Resilience Theory (SRT) was that resilience was present in the moments of shame. Resilience was not only cognitive process like what some of the participants do to work through experiences of shame. For each person resilience was enacted or embodied. It involved staying in an emotion moment to prove themselves resilient, facing a person that might have been harmed or that harmed them, being flexible with leadership styles, being responsive in the face of criticism, and standing out.

Detailed below are the results of the deconstruction analysis for shame resilience in the language of the participants. The list is not meant to prioritize one aspect of resilience over another but followed the order in which I analyzed the transcripts. There were common elements of resilience and shame among the participants, which is significant for further research but the intention of this study was to demonstrate the
distinctness and nuance of the way resilience was lived into, especially since shame was present in instances of resilience and resilience was present in moments of shame. Resilience and shame are not mutually exclusive and are connected to each other by how each person makes sense of their experiences of shame.

- Resilience in leadership involved disrupting systems that used shame to enforce gendered rules for leadership.
- Resilience in leadership involved agency.
- Resilience in leadership involved naming fear and anger.
- Resilience in leadership involved empowering others.
- Resilience in leadership involved facing into experiences of shame.
- Resilience in leadership involved employing leadership styles appropriate for institutional and leadership cultures.
- Resilience in leadership involved making choices to step out of leadership and/or change contexts.
- Resilience in leadership involved being responsive to oneself and others in the face of criticism.
- Resilience in leadership involved awareness of the influence of shame in learning.
- Resilience in leadership involved standing out and being seen.

I have grounded the aspects of resilience for leadership in Christian higher education in the research that supports these conclusions. These aspects of resilience (and shame) also address each of this study’s research questions (found on p. 32) and I’ve expounded
on a couple of the questions immediately following the ten aspects of resilience in leadership.

**Resilience in leadership involved disrupting systems.** The first aspect of resilience is: embodied resilience disrupts systems that use shame to enforce gendered rules for leadership. In this study, gender rules in discourse were described as part of the leadership culture of the institution (it’s “in the air we breathe”) and enforced by senior leaders, employees and family representatives of the institution (identified as women and men). Like the enforcement of acceptable conversations about sex in Elias (1994), shame was used in social discourse to enforce gender rules in Christian higher education. Furthermore, in this study women leaders who did not follow gender rules for female leadership (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001) were shamed by discourse intending to enforce gender rules (Brown, 2006) and the implications of the shaming discourse (for example, losing senior leadership position). Based on these findings, social discourse (Weedon, 1997) is used to shame (Brown, 2006), which enforces gender rules (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Moreover, the physical presence of a woman leader who had been shamed in discourse evoked self-conscious responses in others (Block Lewis, 1971, p. 15). The response to self-conscious thoughts and feelings disrupted ordinary connections in relationships (Hill, 2015; Schore, 1994) indicating a threat to the social bond (Scheff, 2007).

Since expectations for leadership in higher education are socially constructed (Weedon, 1997) and male gendered (Longman, 2016), the rules for engaging with shame were not explicit for the women leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Schmander, Hall, &
William, 2014) and some of the women leaders were not “allowed” to play the “gendered games” in leadership. Some of the participants took-up styles or skills that deflected from their sexuality (competitive, athletic, or androgynous dress) in order to lead while other participants resisted (see below). There was, however, institutional ambivalence (acceptance and resistance) to the participants taking up male gendered traits for leadership (Ryan & Haslam, 2005). One reason for this resistance was because the gender constructs in Christian higher education were grounded in the Biblical narratives of men and women (Ammerman, 1987; Gallagher, 2004; Schussler Fiorenza, 1986) that informed the gender stereotypes (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Irons & Mock 2015). Since the Biblical narratives were foundational beliefs for the institutions and shared by the families and employees invested in the institution, these shared beliefs empowered families and constituents to influence the enforcement of the gender rules for leadership.

Embodied resilience was described as more than a cognitive process for appraising emotions and associated behavior (Mascolo & Fischer, 1995, p. 65), it involved their physical presence in the space that was shaming (inside “the moment of humiliation”). This resembles what Davidson (Davidson & Begley, 2012) and Siegel (1999) describe as part of the process for changing neuro pathways and eventually internal and external responses to events that evoke emotions like shame. For example, speaking up in the midst of the shaming discourse, standing up for themselves when the implications of the discourse were unjust, reaching out (Brown, 2006) to mentors during leadership conflict and threats therein, and choosing to no longer pursue leadership because of the leadership culture compromised personal values.
Whereas Siegel (1999) and Davidson (2012) emphasize behavior, resilience as described by Brown (2006) is more of a cognitive process. Two of my participants noted having an understanding of Brown’s SRT yet this study did not show that they demonstrated more resilience (embodied or cognitive processes) than other participants. Based on Siegel (1999) and Davidson’s (2012) research, changing behavior is the key changing neural pathways or in this context, more of a lasting change in response to shame. In this regard, Brown’s (2006) SRT is part of the process but falls short. Conducting research on the influence of SRT on resilient behavior would be useful to understanding which aspects of resilience are beneficial to develop in teaching resilience in leadership education.

**Resilience in leadership involved agency.** In this study, resilience in leadership involved the participants acting for themselves (agency). Leading from a sense of agency is described as a male-normed leadership trait (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001) and one that my participants described as expected of women leaders in Christian higher education. Each of the participants described themselves as agentic in their leadership.

Enacting resilience also involves agency. The participants described what they did while experiencing shame and although they experienced the pain of shame, they were also enacting resilience in a cognitive process. For example, one participant used her ability to reason to determine what was “her fault” in a situation and what was not. She embodied this in a conversation with her supervisor. Another participant determined that the situation she was in was “not her fault” and although she expressed experiencing
shame from discourse, she stayed engaged in the conversations that impacted her future at the institution.

Brown’s (2006) research showed that cultural expectations can contribute to a double bind (Frye, 2001) effect where meeting the expectations for one aspect of a social cultural rule would be not meeting the expectations for another rule. This “damned if I do, damned if I don’t” effect leads to feeling shame from not measuring up to expectations (Brown, 2006, 2007, 2009). For the participants in this study, the double bind in embodying and enacting resilience in leadership was that the agency that was expected for leadership was also used as the agency to stand up in the face of shame in leadership. One the one hand agency was expected of competent and effective leaders and on the other hand the institutional leadership culture demanded that the leaders “towed the party line” and not acknowledge shame (resilience) or bring attention to the shame discourse. Yet their physical presence on campus brought attention to the use of shame in discourse and the impact of it.

**Resilience in leadership involved naming fear and anger.** Acknowledging fear and anger is part of developing resilience to shame. Whereas Brown’s (2006) SRT includes acknowledging shame, the participants in this study identified fear and anger which are emotions related to shame (Retzinger, 1991) rather than shame. Whether or not the anger and fear noted by my participants was another way of expressing shame was not as significant as *what happened* when the participants talked about fear and shame in leadership. The significance was in understanding *how* fear, anger and shame impacted their leadership effectiveness. Most of the participants noted that the implications that the shame discourse had on key relationships (mentors, colleagues, supervisors,
employees) was part of how they determined their effectiveness and the presence or intensity of shame. If their mentor’s belief in the participants’ leadership capabilities was changed to the negative by the discourse, then the shame was intensified; if the mentor’s estimation of the participants’ leadership capacities did not change because of the discourse, they did not experience shame.

The significance of the relationship that was involved in the primary moment of shame was part of identifying the loss of the social bond and the intensity of shame experienced (or not). Naming emotions that were similar to shame opened a way for questioning and understanding the play of shame in their experiences, how it impacted their response to the situations and how they made meaning of it. The elusiveness of shame (Block Lewis, 1971; Lynd, 1958; Nathanson, 1987; Scheff, 2003) and the threat of shame (breaking a social bond), therefore, makes the act of naming shame a process that needs further research in leadership studies so that beginning women leaders can learn how to trace shame in their responses and develop strategies for resilience.

**Resilience in leadership involved empowering others.** This study found that resilience in leadership involved actions that moved to empower others. Developing resilience comes from transforming the impact of harm from gender (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, 2004) and racial prejudice into behavior that strengthens (Siegel, 1999). One of the participants of this study used the privilege and power she had from being an executive leader to make space for other women of color. She demonstrated resilience to shame as a woman of color (shame/race and gender) working with an executive leadership team of white men. Critical awareness of expectations for race and gender are part of Brown’s (2006) SRT. She clearly articulated the leadership
expectations patterned after white males in her institution and how she fit and did not fit those expectations. She worked within an androgynous model for leadership and gender and expressed that she did not feel shame in relation to gender.

That shame was not experienced in relation to race is similar to what Kim (2015) wrote in that she was perceived first through the lens of race and second as woman of that race. If Kim’s experience speaks to the participant in this study, then she would have experienced shame more in relation to race as noted previously. Stereotypes are different for women of color than white women and in respect to stereotypes, Kim wrote that women of color are viewed “as inferior to white women” (p. 52). Although this was not discussed in the interview as a reason, the participant chose to empower other women of color (did not mention doing the same for men of color) therefore modeling resilience to shame and empowering women of color to do the same.

It was not apparent, however, that empowerment involved explicit conversations about shame and race. Other participants talked about how they used their experiences of shame and gender to mentor women leaders but were not clear on how direct they were about how shame was involved. Shame was implicit in their stories and explanations about them, but not explicitly addressed. This falls short of Brown’s (2006) employment of SRT and once again, speaks to Scheff’s (2003) elusiveness of shame. It points to the necessity of research to look for methods for training resilience to shame in leadership with attention to different stereotypes for women and the impact that race, ethnicity and sexual orientation has on perceptions (internal and external) of leadership effectiveness.

**Resilience in leadership involved facing shame.** This study showed that experiences of shame involved feelings of a threat towards effectiveness, to success in career, to loss
of significant relationships, and the questioning one self-worth and competence. The experiences were described as intensely painful and could be likened to the sense of breaking, of feeling flawed, and isolated in their experience. This is similar to the descriptions of shame as feeling like one does not belong (Brown, 2006), as a whole-body weakness (Lynd, 1958), and feeling judged and condemned by an internal colloquy (Block Lewis, 1987, p. 37). Some of the participants’ descriptions resembled Block Lewis’ (1971) undifferentiated shame where the pain of shame is experienced and then repressed or denied in order to protect and defend from the threat (p. 38).

Noticing when shame is at play, therefore, is not easy because shame as an affect (Kaufman, 1989; Nathanson, 1992; Sedgwick & Frank, 1995) feels (physiologically) primal – like a threat to survival and impedes ordinary activity (Kaufman, 1989; Nathanson, 1992; Tomkins, 1963). The first impulse is to run and hide (Block Lewis, 1987; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007), lash out in defense because of shame towards self in humiliated fury (Block Lewis, 1971) or towards others in shame rage (Scheff, 1987; Retzinger, 1987). Most of the participants in this study did not articulate an experience of shame during the interviews except for one participant who said, “this is really activating and I am feeling shame” and she marked it as “this is really important.” This level of bodily awareness in the moment, and ability to articulate that the sensations are signals (Siegel, 1999) of something that is important is a key aspect in developing resilience to shame. It is part of Brown’s (2006) acknowledging shame but because the level of vulnerability involved in acknowledging the threat of/in feeling the physiological sensations of shame is not conducive to the mindset of production in the workplace (Wertsch, 1998) and the nonembodied “universal worker” (Carli & Eagly, 2012) or “ideal
employee” (Acker, 1990). Yet bodily sensations are part of the workplace and emotions are the “invisible force” (Siegel, 1999) that is at play in leadership therefore necessitating more attention in shame and leadership research.

**Resilience in leadership involved adaptability.** The participants in this study employed various styles of leadership. They described their styles as collaborative and relational, and authoritarian and agentic thereby crossing the categories for socialization of sexes (Eagly & Steffen, 1984). One participant observed that the women leaders in Christian higher education who were in executive leadership positions were “flexible” with the styles of leadership they would employ and would change or adapt the style based on the context.

The ability to adapt leadership styles to contexts, according to this study, involved being critically aware (Brown, 2006, 2009) of expectations for acceptable leadership styles and expectations for gender (Carli & Eagly, 2011, 2012). The tension between the two may lead to a double bind as noted above and/or prejudice as in role congruity theory (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 2002) and could result in the glass cliff effect (Brescoll, Dawson, & Uhlmann, 2010). What was significant in the participant’s observation was that flexibility demanded detaching from a particular style that might be viewed as reflecting the leader’s personality. Flexibility requires viewing leadership styles as a resource and determining which style fits the situation best and the risks that might be involved. Brown’s (2006, 2009) critical awareness develops the capacity for becoming aware of expectations in leadership and gender and provides a way to acknowledge vulnerability to shame in particular areas or expectations.
Another theory that is useful in further developing this idea of adapting leadership styles to context is Adaptive Leadership Theory (Heifetz, 1991). Adaptive Leadership Theory articulates a similar idea to Brown’s critical awareness (2006). The images used are a dance floor and a balcony (Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009). When leaders are in the midst of a leadership situation that is contentious, complex, or too thick to see through, they are on the dance floor. In order to get perspective and understand the situation they imagine themselves getting off the dance floor and viewing the situation from the balcony. From this perspective they can consider various interpretations of what might be happening, detach from one interpretation and consider others. With more information they can adapt to what is needed for the situation.

Being adaptive in leadership can be especially difficult when experiencing shame (Lynd, 1958; Block Lewis, 1971). Understanding that leadership styles are not part of identity (Heifetz, 1991) but are like a tool that one decides is effective and then uses for a particular situation is essential for this aspect. Developing a mindset that leadership style is not fixed based on social roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002) or predetermined based contextual limitations but is adaptive or flexible is also essential for resilient leadership. To further this idea, research that looks at how employing adaptive leadership impacts perceptions of women in leadership in Christian higher education would be beneficial.

**Resilience in leadership involved making choices for change.** Adapting to situations based on information gathered “on the balcony” of a leadership problem (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009) involves making decisions that may have significant impact on the situation at hand, the people involved and the perceptions of the leader. For example, adapting leadership style for context might sound like a gateway to supporting
leadership undirected by personal ethics. If style is viewed as a tool, the leader and the character qualities that guide their decision making are part of the process for choosing a particular tool and when to use it.

This means that what might also be at stake in resilient leadership is choosing to step out of a leadership position or choosing to change institutions or contexts. Five of the participants stepped out of leadership and changed contexts and each of them referenced aspects of gender-based stereotypes that influenced their decision. Three of them referenced the effects of the loose coupling (Chaves, 1999) of what was said and what was actual for women in leadership in their institutions. Two of the participants reflected on their experience of gender-based stereotypes outside of the Christian higher education context and expressed that gender-based stereotypes were still being engaged but the enforcement was not as rigid.

Of the difference that Christian belief systems had on the institutions leadership culture, one of the participants said it was the “character of the leader” that determined the leadership culture and not the doctrinal statements of the institution. Understanding how a leader might use or not use shame in social discourse for enforcing gender-based stereotypes, or on the other hand, rules for equanimity and diversity, would be useful to better inform this aspect of resilience.

A study on gender dynamics in evangelical institutions (Reynolds, 2014) surveyed over 600 evangelical leaders and found that, “Even as almost all the leaders surveyed affirmed women in leadership within society, many respondents perceived that their peers did not affirm women leading” (p. 22). Based on Reynolds’ research, there is more than the character of the leader at play in affirming women leaders but the perceptions of other
women leaders. And incorporating the idea of making a choice to leave a particular context or position based “on my own terms” was especially significant for the participants.

**Resilience in leadership involved being responsive.** Another approach to what might be considered an aspect of agency and choice is self-reliance and responsiveness to self. Four of the participants noted the significance of having mentors during their beginning leadership experiences. Many were “tapped on the shoulder” for leadership opportunities by their mentor. Self-reliance and/or agency may seem to oppose mentorship if filtered through the lens of traditional stereotypes of women as dependent versus independent.

Block Lewis’ (1971) experimental research supports aspects of this traditional stereotype of women. She found that women were more “field dependent” or more dependent on external cues from others to determine their perspective. This research was based on the differentiation construct, which is “a difference between people in the ease with which they are able to maintain their orientation in space” (p. 127). Lewis found that participants who were more “field dependent” were more prone to shame and participants who were more “field independent” were more prone to guilt (1971, p. 175). Female participants were found to be field dependent and male participants were field independent (1971, p. 55; 1987, pp. 182-197). This suggests that mentorship for women could lead less to increasing agency and/or self-reliance and more to increasing dependence. I did not find this to be true in this study. One of the participants described self-reliance and responsiveness, similar to field independent, as traits she desired to emulate from her male mentors. It was clear for the participants who had mentors, that they were developing skills that led to self-reliance, agency and responsiveness.
Being responsive to self and others was mentioned by the same participant as an aspect of resilience. She explained that being self-reliant was like being responsive to self and others because it involved attending to self-conscious thoughts and feelings with care, and this freed her up to respond with care towards others in the face of criticism. Developing the ability to notice what happens when the body is triggered into shame (Brown, 2006) and self-conscious thoughts that impede the moment is part of resilience in leadership. Shame impacts leadership effectiveness because when in a moment of shame, it is difficult to attune and respond to others and the environment (Hill, 2015). Brown (2007) touched on attending to self-conscious thoughts when she referenced Neff’s (2003) research on self-compassion as a means for reaching out to self when in the midst of feeling the pain of shame.

Self-compassion (Neff, 2003) is a method of administering compassion and care to oneself similar to the way one would administer compassion to a child. The concept is based on mindfulness (Siegel, 1999) research that has shown that meditation practices enhance the ability to notice self-judging thoughts that increase the effect of shame. Neff’s (2003) approach is to add a compassionate response to mindfulness meditation practices. When the pain of shame is realized one applies compassion by saying soothing statements to oneself. The participant in this study did not mention self-compassion but showed that she responded to herself with compassion, which allowed her to move out of self-conscious thoughts and respond with care in the face of criticism from a place of having experienced self-compassion. This is supported by Brown’s (2006, p. 47) research which focused more on the impact of empathy (Ivey, Pederson, & Ivey, 2001;
Wiseman, 1996) and that having received empathy from reaching out to others, that one was able to empathize more with oneself.

**Resilience in leadership involved awareness of shame in learning.** Adopting an attitude of being open to new understandings is not easy when the topic involves a threat to one’s self perceptions. One of my participants showed that shame and resilience were at play as she verged on making new sense of her experiences of gender-based stereotypes and shame in leadership during the interviews. The transcripts showed both a desire and resistance to make connections with her experiences. I am not saying that she experienced shame during the interview because of this sense-making process, what I am saying is that shame as a self-condemning voice can be alive and well as “shame messages” (Brown, 2009) in one’s internal discourse. Shame messages in this instance might sound like, “I see how this makes sense, yes!” “I don’t want to see how this makes sense, no!” and then “You can’t figure this out!”; it threatens a sense of belonging to a community of like-minded individuals. This is particularly important in communities or institutions of faith. Belonging is threatened in communities that hold to strict adherence of particular ideas of gender and moving into managing one’s impression (Cooley, 1922) in the eyes of others becomes paramount to survival (as belonging).

Another approach to this is that shame is active when coming up against something that was held as a foundational truth. Deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1972) threatens the sense of truth being fixed because it recognizes the transformation of understanding that happens when the tradition of knowing changes. The process of this transformation is that the tradition of knowing is placed in a signifier and that knowing is then differed and transformed into something new, although the signifier looks the same (Caputo, 2005).
For example, the word leader on this page is historically the same word but the understanding of the word leader has changed. At one time the word leader in the West signified white men in positions of power, now the word leader signifies non-white women and men in positions of power. The understanding has changed but the word looks the same and in the process of confronting change by integrating new meaning from experiences or theories, the threat of what might be lost (belonging, perception of self) evokes a sense of shame which closes focus or the mind (Siegel, 1999) to protect and impedes openness to new understanding. Supporting this idea of shame and learning is Tomkins (1963) concept of shame. Shame is activated when a desire is thwarted, like a desire to stay within the boundaries of religious ideals or a desire to not stand out too much. Resilience in leadership, therefore, is attending to shame and self-conscious thoughts that are active in learning something new by applying self-compassion (Neff, 2003) and/or reaching out for empathy (Brown, 2006, 2009).

**Resilience in leadership involved standing out and being seen.** A significant part of leadership is standing out and being seen, even when mistakes are made and when people get hurt. Shame can also be activated, however, when one senses that one is being perceived different from how one perceives oneself (Lynd, 1958; Scheff, 2003). When the weight of authority is given to the perception of others for leadership effectiveness or competency, then leaders run the risk of being what one participant described as a “spokesperson” for the leadership or a “perfectionist” linking impression management with not making mistakes. This is the opposite of other aspects of resilience noted above: self-reliance and agency where one is self-directed in leadership roles (like spokesperson) and takes responsibility for making mistakes even if it leads to a negative impression.
The tension in this, however, is what is called the “glass cliff effect” (Brescoll, Dawson & Uhlmann, 2010). Women in leadership positions that engender male leadership traits run the risk of being perceived as ineffective when they make mistakes. Shame can be evoked when perceived ineffective by external sources (as in not measuring up in Brown, 2006). Resilience involves noticing the signal of shame and tending to oneself when standing out and being seen. It is significant enough (in that it is aporia) to state again that these aspects of resilience do not stand outside of moments of shame but stand with and in them.

The participants described practices like self-reflection, participating in competitive sports, meeting with mentors and talking with friends and spouses that fostered aspects of their resilience. Some participants mentioned participating in therapeutic support during times when their shame or related moods and emotions were most activated and/or when they wanted a psychological perspective. Additionally, participating in a church or spiritual community was a significant resource to feel known and supported (“belonging” in Brown, 2006) and to foster their relationship with God. It’s important to note, however, that it was the connections made with people who were not part of the institution that were important resources for support during the primary moment of shame.

Leadership in Christian higher education. The leadership context for this study was Christian higher education (Christian University, Christian College, Seminary). Each of my participants had experience leading (to various degrees) in Christian higher education and developed an understanding of gender-based stereotypes and male normed hierarchy in leadership (Kezar, 2014). They were asked to reflect on
the experiences when they were beginning leaders which led some to think through what they learned before working in a Christian university or seminary. Each had some background on understanding shame, resilience and gender-based stereotypes; some had done research or they were in a field of study where they had thought about one of the components but none of the participants mentioned how the three concepts may be connected. It was evident to me was that they were each exploring the idea that shame was connected to gender-based stereotypes in leadership during the interview with varying degrees of having identified it or relating to the connection of the three concepts from their own experiences.

The participants learned that the person in the highest position of power in higher education leadership sets the expectations for the acceptable leadership style and its traits, and they set the tone for how gender-based stereotypes are enforced. For example, if the participant reported to a VP, then they experienced the expectations she or he set for enacting leadership. The complicating factor was that the expectations for leadership “at the top” may not have been the same (or may have been unknown) for those reporting to those further down the institutions hierarchical structure. And also the higher the participant was in organizational leadership structure, the more rigid were the gender norms were and the more they were enforced.

Increased rigidity for gender rules in executive leadership makes sense in conservative Christian higher education. Generally speaking, in this context the rules for sexuality (women and men) are interconnected with interpretations of Biblical scripture and are foundational for Christian ethics or rules governing behavior (Bonhoeffer, 1995). It makes sense, therefore, that moral shame (Block Lewis, 1971) would be used to
enforce gender norms. Furthermore, this speaks to the research considering why qualified women leaders in the “leadership pipeline” are not moving into senior leadership positions (Kellerman & Rhode, 2014). If gender rules are strictly enforced, then based on the findings of this study, the capacity and skills that it would take to move into these positions would involve operating within the tension of feminist and patriarchal values, employing male and/or androgynous leadership traits and dress, and adopting a flexible style that adapts the style and traits needed for various contexts (Fiorina, 2007; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009).

The dynamic of shame and the way it plays in our mind’s eye and internal discourse about our competencies and effectiveness may contribute to what Longman (2016) calls “internalized barriers” for women leaders in the Consortium of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Especially in Christian institutions where the trace of “a creation order” (Gallagher, 2004) may be a foundational belief of the institution that implicitly or explicitly inform the organizational structure and the gender-based (and sexuality-based) expectations for leadership. Furthermore, if the institutional expectations are not clear on who can be “at the top” of the hierarchy, then it might be reinforcing a “glass ceiling” effect where women are encouraged to develop and pursue leadership opportunities which will not be available to them in that context. Chaves (1999) coined an aspect of this effect in Christian institutions a “loose coupling”; what is communicated (implicitly and explicitly) about gender and leadership is not what is occurring or in place. If resilience is a weighty factor to identify and develop, especially regarding shame and gender-based stereotypes in leadership, then this study is significant to inform educators
and mentors who are developing all leaders (not exclusive to those who identify as women).

**Consideration of other conclusions.** This study supports Brown’s (2006) research in that I found elements of SRT in the participants’ description of resilience and shame. I have discussed them in the list above. Different from the concept of SRT yet a significant component of my participants’ experience of resilience and shame was their emphasis on resilient behavior in how they made sense of moments of shame. One reason is the approach to language used by the participants. Brown and her team of researchers used words of the participants (discourse analysis in grounded theory) where this study focused on the “text” (Derrida 1967/1972) or what is being communicated in *all* of the language of the participant (the actions and behaviors in the text). It was from this approach to text and language that resilience and shame were found occupying the same space; the trace of resilience was in the deferred understanding of shame (différence).

This study also supports Scheff’s (2003, 2014) contention that the word shame is elusive and that there needs to be another word to describe the social aspect of shame. In tracking with the number of times the participants said the word shame and how they were communicating shame in other forms of “text” (Derrida 1967/1972) without saying the word, I found that two out of the six participants used the word shame more than six times in three hours of interviews. In my conversations with the participants I was not conscious of the fact that they were not using the word shame and I did not notice this until analyzing the data. It seemed to me that we were implicitly talking about shame the
entire time; I did not need to hear the word “shame” nor did they need to say it to communicate the shame that they experienced.

The other forms of text used for communicating shame were expressions like tears, pauses, words about their feelings during and in between the interviews, the actions they were describing, as well as named emotions and moods like anger, fear and sadness. This resembles Helen Block Lewis’s (1987) undifferentiated shame where the pain from shame overwhelmms such that shame is not identified or articulated and responses to shame like denial or repression keep awareness of shame at bay (pp. 22-24). For example, three of the participants mentioned what it was like to be seen, be in the same room or have eye contact with the person who had shamed them. They used statements like “oh it was awful” or “I was bleeding from every pore” to express the sense of pain from the experience of shame.

Finally, I was not expecting to find that resilience was in the trace of shame. I had thought (without realizing it) that resilience was a result of a shame moment much like a cause and effect: “I made sense of the moment of shame and then I developed resilience to it.” This is more of a dualistic or binary approach where shame is defined as over and against resilience. But what I found was that resilience was present in different ways like in acts of perseverance during their primary moments of shame. I am not talking about overly aggressive behavior or violent behavior (Scheff & Retzinger, 1991) like in Scheff’s (1987) and Retzinger’s (1987) shame-rage. For one participant, it was the enactment of her agency during a shaming experience. For another, it was her self-assuredness and competency that was present as she was experiencing a sense of
shame. For another it was her acts of resistance against the shame discourse that was the bouncing back of resilience.

**Limitations that may affect validity.** The validity of this study is based on looking at the data (the interview text) from multiple angles. I used Lather’s (1993) concept of refracting to analyze the data that challenges the traditional notion validity that is encumbered with positivism. I did not try to separate myself from the text but considered my words, my body, my emotions and my thoughts during the interview as part of the data. Using emotion as data is “transgressive” (St. Pierre, 1997, p. 175) because it is subjective and goes against positivist leaning qualitative research, yet to deny it would be to ignore that my presence as interviewer did not influence the interview conversation (attachment theory would refute this) or that my lens in analyzing the data was not purified of my own personal experiences with shame and resilience. My goal was to locate myself as both separate and part of the conversation in the analysis as I was experiencing my own emotional responses to aspects in this research process. I used a field journal and a research journal, therefore, to note my experiences throughout the data collection, analyzing, and writing steps of this study.

I approached the data from three theoretical perspectives and used these perspectives as a lens to read, think with and disrupt the data. Using Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) thinking with theory I plugged one text (on theory) into another (the interview transcripts). I gave preference to the tradition of shame (or the approaches to shame) (Derrida, 2002b, p. 15), looked for central truths language or words of the participants (Mazzei, 2004), included what was in the margins (Spivak, 1976, p. lxxvii), and unfixed the hierarchal order of binaries. The first theory I used was Derrida’s (1967/1972)
Deconstruction, the second was Weedon’s (1997) Feminist Poststructuralism, and the third was Brown’s (2006) SRT. In this way analytic questions (Appendix A) emerged that informed what I was asking the data. The primary question was: What are the moments of articulating shame when engaged with gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience? Jackson and Mazzei (2012) imagined this process as standing in a threshold that has limits and excess. Using this picture, I stood in the threshold with readings and theories to see how they constituted each other. What resulted or what was produced was that resilience and shame are not opposing forces as the binary suggests, shame/resilience. Instead they co-mingle in the same container or in the absence and the deferred presence of the signifier shame.

**Contribution to leadership studies research.** There is a growing interest in popular culture for understanding Brown’s (2006) SRT. The access to her books, TEDx talks and online curriculum and the concept of shame is becoming more accessible and integrated into social conversations. That does not mean that it is understood, however, or recognized when is it used to enforce rules for social behavior (Elias, 1994). Nor does it mean that it is an acceptable topic for conversation in the workplace. If shame is contagious (Block Lewis, 1971) then it may not be something useful in a context that does not allow for the processing it. Shame cannot be contained, however, because it is in every social interaction (Scheff, 2003). It’s is part of the way we think about ourselves (Goffman, 1959) and the way we manage impressions of ourselves (Cooley, 1922). To relegate shame to the personal and/or interpersonal and not to bring it out into the open in the workplace, is to deny the invisible emotional force (Siegel, 1999) that it can have in
and over us. It is attuning to this aspect of resilience and shame and the impact it has on leaders and the workplace that is missing in the leadership literature.

Leadership theories like EI and Adaptive Leadership Theory are getting at the general topic of emotion and resilience. In this way they are approaching the topic of shame from the side rather than directly engaging with how the experience of shame can internally and socially interact. If shame is contagious (Block Lewis, 1971) and therefore disruptive to a work environment, this may be the best way forward. Yet taking into consideration the increased familiarity with Brown’s (2006) research, I suggest that it will not be long before leadership contexts will be primed and ready to bring shame to the table. Especially if alongside the concept of shame is also the concept of shame resilience; if we work to dismantle the binary shame/resilience or shame and resilience as mutually exclusive and see them as happening at the same time.

The two theories that have paved the way for resilience and shame to be part of the leadership conversation are Emotional Intelligence (Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) and Adaptive Leadership Theory (Heifetz, 1991). Emotional Intelligence (Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) works to identify competencies in managing emotions. It is effective in linking behavior to emotions and its practical tools give leaders multiple entryways into paying attention to emotions in the workplace.

Adaptive Leadership Theory (Heifetz, 1991; Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009) works outside of dealing explicitly with emotions and addresses the concept of adapting in leadership. Its roots are grounded in Transformational Leadership Theories that look to relationship or the communal aspects of a leaders to nurture and grow them. Adaptive
Leadership Theory provides a framework for distancing oneself rather than closing-in on one-side of a situation or of a leadership problem as mentioned above. Much like Brown’s (2006) critical awareness it provides a way to look for and articulate the bigger picture with more than one interpretation of the event or issue at hand. Brown (2009) used the metaphor of a zoom lens where one “zoom’s-in” to examine oneself and “zoom’s-out” to consider other relevant factors. This study sits within these three theories addressing resilience through the container of shame.

**Recommendations for further research**

The first recommendation for further research is to consider the data from the theory of intersectionality (Collins, 1998). My experience of inviting women of color to participate in this study gave me a hint that other distinctions like race, sexuality, and social class evoke shame more than gender. I am a white middle class, middle aged woman and my research was limited by my location. Yet as I was analyzing the data it was clear to me that for the one person of color that was in my study, race was central to conscious awareness of shame and it confirmed my suspicion that (in this case) shame from gender in higher education leadership was more of a white middle-class woman’s problem. Approaching this study from the theory of intersectionality would provide a framework to consider how each aspect of identity (as beliefs about oneself) are considered.

Another recommendation for further research is a study of body and dress in leadership. Three of my participants talked about their body or the way they dressed as a significant aspect of how they managed their impression as a woman and as a leader. One of my participants stated that once it was noticed that she was a woman it
“shift[ed] everything into a sexualized mode” and her effectiveness as a leader was in suspect. Another participant talked about wearing dresses occasionally but that she preferred to dress androgynous in order to take sexuality out of the picture. Another participant used her dress and her body to make her sexuality or her womanness apparent as she sat at the table of leadership (Morse, 2008). This was not to seduce or manipulate but to make a way in the system, work to establish a new norm, so that women do not have to be ashamed of their bodies in male gendered contexts like leadership in Christian higher education.

The last aspect in need of further research for leadership in Christian higher education is how the use of power “at the top” resembles a Biblical interpretation of family. Three of my participants identified how the dynamics of family of the president (and the president’s wife) was a significant aspect in their experience as senior leaders. Two of the participants talked about the power given to the president’s wife to influence the opinion of the husband on their behalf and that it could have significant impact on their career. One of the wives was known to advocate for women in leadership and the other was not. The third participant experienced what was interpreted as “benevolent sexism” (Glick & Fiske, 1996) where an act of benevolence worked to perpetuate traditional gender roles through kindness and reasserted the sexism inherent in that system. For example, the institution paid for therapy for a participant which gave the impression of caring for the woman and perpetuated the stereotype of women as the weaker sex who are in need of being rescued. That is not to say that this act was not generous but that the discourse of this act supported an impression of the president as a benevolent leader.
Conclusion of the chapter

The point of this study was to consider what knowledge would be produced when women leaders in Christian higher education consider their experiences of shame, gender-based stereotypes and resilience. The methodology for this study was thinking with the theories (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) of Deconstruction (Derrida, 1967/1972), Feminist Poststructuralism (Weedon, 1997), and Shame Resilience Theory (Brown, 2006). The knowledge that was produced was that resilience is enacted in moments of shame. The aspects of resilience found in this study had to do with demonstrating leadership traits like agency that are typically considered male traits (Eagly & Karau, 1991), and Adaptive Leadership Theory (Heifetz, 1991). Additionally, when women in this study enacted resilience in primary moments of shame their presence disrupted the institution’s systems and the gender-based stereotypes inherent therein. They showed that developing resilience was not easy or fun but that their experiences strengthened their ability to navigate gender-based stereotypes and regulate self-conscious emotions like shame.
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APPENDIX A

Analytic Questions

Following Jackson and Mazzei (2012) methodology of “plugging one text into another”, the analytical questions below were developed from Derrida (1967/1974), Weedon (1997) and Brown (2006). The interview questions listed in Appendix B were generated from the perspective of these theories and are subject to modification as during the study.

Primary question that combines of all the theories:

- What are the moments of articulating shame when engaged with gender-based stereotypes that reveal resilience?

Derrida: Deconstruction

- What are the traces of shame and resilience in language when engaging gender-based stereotypes?
- What are the differences, contradictions, and heterogeneity within the text?
- What happened inside the deconstructive event (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 20), that analyzed the functions and dysfunctions of the language for shame, resilience, gender-based stereotypes and female leadership?

Weedon: Feminist Poststructuralism

- What binaries are articulated?
- What are the historical, and current social and political implications of “power over” dynamic represented in the binaries?
- How is gender constructed and reconstituted in the institutional discourse?

Brown: Shame Resilience Theory

- How is shame articulated and regulated?
- How is shame communicated and/or absorbed in the institutional context?
- What behavior (of the participant or others) is described in a moment of shame?
APPENDIX B

Interview Guide

There will be three in-depth interviews lasting from 25-90 minutes over the course of two weeks.

First Interview Session (25 minutes)

The goal is to establish rapport and a sense of emotional attunement by describing the experiences that enticed my interest in the research and to get a sense of how the participant articulates shame. Answer questions related to the interview process.

- When hearing my experiences of shame, resilience, gender-based stereotypes and leadership, what comes up for you?
- How do you describe shame, resilience and gender-based stereotypes occurring in your workplace?
- What questions do you have about the interview process?

Second Interview Session (60-90 minutes)

The goal of the second interview is follow-up with questions after the initial review of the transcripts and to move into in-depth conversation on moments of shame.

- Describe one or two moments of shame related to gender-based stereotypes when beginning in your role as a leader in Christian higher education.
- Recall your behavior and actions during and after the moments of shame. What resources did you use to move through the shame?
- What were the effects of the shame moment (on oneself, on others, on perception of leadership effectiveness)?

Third Interview Session (60 minutes)
The goal of the third interview is to follow-up with questions after the initial review of the transcripts from the second interview, to focus on emotion regulation and to conclude the conversation.

- What are the differences that you see in yourself and your behavior when encountering moments of shame between when you began as a leader and now?
- What are the different resources you have developed for moving through moments of shame between when you began as a leader and now?
- What have you learned about developing resilience to shame as a female leader in Christian higher education?
INFORMED CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Project: Women Leaders in Christian Higher Education: Making Sense of Moments of Shame

Principal Investigator: Darla Tillman-Samuelsen, MDiv, doctoral student and Ph.D. candidate in the Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies at Gonzaga University

Other Investigators: None

Advisor or Sponsor Information: Shann Ferch, PhD., Professor of Leadership Studies, Gonzaga University

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

We invite you to take part in a research study Women Leaders in Christian Higher Education: Making Sense of Moments of Shame at Gonzaga University that will resource leadership educators and researchers in understanding how women leaders move through moments of shame and what they do to develop resilience to it. Please ask any questions about this study with the researcher.

The purpose of this research is to produce knowledge of what women leaders in Christian higher education do when engaging with gender-based stereotypes that elicit a moment of shame and how in a deconstruction event they made sense of the experience.

About six people will take part in this research.

PROCEDURES

Subjects: The participants will be female leaders working in Christian higher education as faculty and/or administrators in senior leadership positions. They will have terminal degrees and served in the leadership position for at least two years.

I will need to gain access to senior leaders that are willing to talk about shame and leadership. Therefore I will use purposeful sampling and work with an expert participant who will refer me to women qualified for this study. After making the initial contact through the expert, I will send an invitation to participate via email to potential
participants. In the email I will include the purpose of the study and the requirements for participation. I will ask that those who are interested contact me via email within two weeks upon which I will schedule interviews and email the informed consent.

**Study procedures (will be shared with the potential participants):**
The interviews will be conducted over video conference or in person, and in a quiet location for both the researcher and the participant. During the first interview I will review the informed consent and the interview guide. Before the end of the interview I will collect the signed informed consent form.

Each participant will engage in three qualitative, in-depth interviews over approximately one to two weeks. The first will last approximately 25 minutes, the last two will last approximately 60-90 minutes. I will record the audio of the interviews and send to an outside vendor for transcription. Participants will receive a copy of their transcribed interviews for review. They may choose to revise/edit any interview data on the transcript.

I will used pseudonyms and will redact the text in my transcripts to protect the privacy of the participants. The identification of the institutions and all persons mentioned in the interviews and on documents will have pseudonyms. I will also use pseudonyms in my fields notes.

**TIME TO PARTICIPATE**

If you agree to be in this study, it will last about two weeks for approximately 3 hours. You will be asked to meet in person or over video conference three times. Each visit will take between 25-90 minutes (see above).

**DISCOMFORTS AND RISKS**

The only risk to participants is that they may be identified however I will take precautions to anonymize the data. The Informed Consent process reduces the level of risk in that participants will be fully informed of confidentiality and their right to withdraw or not participate.

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

There may be social benefits to participants for contributing to producing knowledge used to understand the phenomenon. They may also benefit to having the opportunity to reflect upon situations that were both positive and difficult. There may also be benefits from developing models to refer to for supporting beginning leaders. No promise or guarantee of benefits will be made to encourage participation. Participation will be acknowledged, however, in future presentations/publications.

**COSTS FOR PARTICIPATION**

**Costs:** I will not offer remuneration to participants.
Treatment and compensation for injury: If interviews involve paying for phone or video conferencing services, I will incur this expense. Any travel to a mutually agreed local site will be the responsibility of the participant.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

You will be given $0 on each visit to compensate you for your time and expenses for being in this study.

You will not be paid for being in this research study.

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.

Your research records that are reviewed, stored, and analyzed at Gonzaga University will be kept in a secured area in and will be stored in a thumb drive and secured in a locked file cabinet. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

We will keep your participation in this research study confidential to the extent we are able. However, it is possible that the Gonzaga Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies) may inspect and copy research records.

STUDY WITHDRAWAL

If you choose to participate, you are free to withdraw your permission for the use and sharing of your information at any time. You must do this in writing. Write to Darla Tillman-Samuelson and let her know that you are withdrawing from the research study. Her email is dsamuelson@zagmail.gonzaga.edu.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Taking part in this research study is voluntary. If you choose to take part in this research, your major responsibilities will include confirming and attending three interview sessions. You do not have to participate in this research. If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. If you decide not to participate or if you decide to stop taking part in the research at a later date, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS

You have the right to ask any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints or concerns or believe you may have developed an injury related to this research, contact Darla Tillman-Samuelson at 971.570.7928.

For more information about participation in a research study and about the Institutional Review Board (IRB), a group of people who review the research to protect your rights, please contact the Gonzaga IRB at IRB@gonzaga.edu.

SIGNATURE AND CONSENT/PERMISSION TO BE IN THE RESEARCH
Your signature below means that you have received this information, have asked the questions you currently have about the research and those questions have been answered. You will receive a copy of the signed and dated form to keep for future reference.

By signing this consent form, you indicate that you are voluntarily choosing to take part in this research.

----------------------------------  ---  ---------------------------------
Signature of Subject              Date                  Printed Name

Your signature below means that you have explained the research to the subject and have answered any questions he/she has about the research.

----------------------------------  ---  ---------------------------------
Signature of Principal Investigator Date                  Printed Name
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GONZAGA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)
PROTOCOL REVIEW & EXEMPT DETERMINATION LETTER

Gonzaga IRB Protocol Number: 1803SAMDPLS
Approval/Determination Date: March 8, 2018
Continuing Review Date: June 30, 2018
Principal Investigator (PI): Darla Samuelson
Advisor/Mentor: Dr. Shann Ferch
School Division: Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies
Study Category: Exempt, 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2)
Protocol Title: "Women Leaders in Christian Higher Education: Making Sense of Moments of Shame"

Dear Ms. Samuelson,

The Gonzaga Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed the protocol cited above on March 3, 2018. This research protocol qualified as an expedited review, and has been given an IRB Exemption determination under category, 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2).

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects’ responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects’ financial standing, employability, or reputation.

This study is approved without further delays and will be registered with IRB at Gonzaga University.

Although not a required change, please consider that a participant may have a strong emotional reaction to talking about shame. It would be wise to be prepared with resources to provide, should this occur.

If you have any further questions, please contact the IRB at IRB@gonzaga.edu.

Sincerely,

Elaine Radner, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Gonzaga University Office of Research Ethics & Compliance

Office of the Academic Vice President
502 E. Boone Ave.
Spokane, WA 99258-0099
509.323.6564
www.gonzaga.edu