2020

Citizens or Heroes: The Fall – and Rise – of Heroic Martyrdom

Megan R Wirtz, *University of Richmond*

8

Citizens or Heroes: The Fall – and Rise – of Heroic Martyrdom

MEGAN R. WIRTZ

"She died like a heroine."

The words, uttered by a German chaplain, sum up the life of Edith Cavell in many ways ("Account by Reverend H. Stirling Gahan," n.d.). Cavell's heroism began when she was tending to two wounded soldiers. A British nurse herself, she was stationed in Brussels (occupied by Germany) during World War One. These two wounded, British soldiers begat a massive "ring" that Cavell smuggled out of German territories; they started her heroism. Less than a year later, her efforts were squashed as she was arrested; she was executed two months later ("Who Was Edith Cavell?," 2018).

Here's the thing about Cavell, though: she was not partisan in regards to her job. Despite her heroism with smuggling the Allied men, she treated all of the wounded soldiers just as if they were themselves: men ("Who was Edith Cavell?," n.d.). Although her "heroic deed" was sided on the side of the Allies,

she actively attempted to make sure all of the soldiers felt cared for and safe with her. Yet, the German government found her guilty of treason, turning her from being a hero for both sides into a villain on one – and a hero and martyr on the other (Rigby, 2015). Thus, she wasn't a hero in the eyes of the Germans until they renounced Nazism.

Cavell is not alone in this sort of reverse-heroism, where one begins as a villain and ends up a hero. That is, due to revolutions and changes in society, those who promoted something previously "villainous" return as heroes after their death, once society has changed. They serve as martyrs, giving up their lives to successfully cultivate change in their society. Thus, their death begets and creates their heroism; the challenges they are faced with on the journey to becoming heroes become too much, and they pass away before their heroism is fully realized.

In other words, those who "fail" before their heroism is fully discovered hit a block at the initiation phase of the hero's journey. Joseph Campbell, the founder of the study of heroism, was the one who initially discovered the hero's journey, the pattern behind every heroic life in classic mythology. Every hero, Campbell posited, undergoes a process – the hero's journey – in which they are transformed through three phases. The first phase is separation (departure), when the hero becomes separated from their familiar world. The second is initiation, when heroes go through painful experiences that will help them to grow. The third stage is the return, in which the hero makes his or her triumphant return to society as a changed person (Campbell, 1949).

However, there is a small, but very interesting, subset of heroes who initially seem to fail the initiation phase. That is, the initiation phase becomes too much for them, and they pass away during their initiation. Often, they are the outliers and outcasts of society who don't fit in to some given societal norm, and as the pressure of being the antithesis of society mounts on them, they are forced to leave their lives too young. Years later, however, these heroes make a triumphant return as martyrs of the cause they often died from – the societal pressure that had weighed them down during their lives is now lifted. For instance, Cavell was executed by the Germans for helping smuggle Allied soldiers across the German border. Germany, since, has disavowed Nazism; thus, they have implicitly disavowed Cavell's execution.

This essay will delve into the lives of two more exemplars of this phenomenon. Both were deemed hero's under one of society's greatest examples of cultural change: the LGBTQ movement. Previously, nearly everywhere across the globe repudiated the concept of homosexuality; no matter what the culture or religion, homosexuality was a sin and went against all norms. Both men wound up dead or destitute because they were accused of gross acts of indecency – that is, homosexuality – which was illegal when they were alive. However, both of them returned in the 21st century as role models and martyrs for a flourishing LGBTQ community that is no longer illegal. This essay will take a detailed look at two of the world's most popular LGBTQ martyrs, Alan Turing and Oscar Wilde. This essay will look at how society can, at the time of the hero, consider the hero a villain – only to have that same villain return to society a half century later as a martyr for the cause for which they were originally killed or silenced.

ALAN TURING: HERO OR VILLAIN?

We'll start with Alan Turing. Turing's journey as one of the world's foremost mathematicians began when he enrolled as an undergraduate student at the University of Cambridge. After much success there, he completed a fellowship at the prestigious King's College, where he would meet a mentor and future collaborator, Alonzo Church, whom he would follow to Princeton University. One of Turing's greatest inventions, the Turing Machine, was adapted from his time as a fellow at King's College. In 1939, he joined the British government in fighting World War Two, working behind the scenes as a code breaker (Copeland, 2018).

Here is where Turing rose to fame. The governments of Poland, France, and England had been working to try to crack the Enigma – the principle encoder of the German army. Turing's arrival helped spur the Brits to the invention of the Bombe, a massive code-breaking device that would eventually decipher nearly 2 messages per minute every day. For his efforts, he was recognized with honors and awards (Copeland, 2018).

Unfortunately, Turing's story then turned somewhat bleak. In 1952, Turing was convicted of acts of gross indecency – that is, homosexual acts – which were illegal in Britain at the time. He was sentenced to a year of hormone therapy (chemical

castration) – an act that labeled him a criminal, and immediately ended his gov-ernmental career. This conviction led to his presumed suicide, and it was not until 2009 that the British Prime Minister apologized for Turing's treatment, and it took four more years for him to be granted an official pardon (Copeland, 2018). However, one important thing to note is that Turing was never necessarily upset about his punishment – he was, however, worried that his reputation would mar his discoveries and inventions for the future. In a letter to a friend, he is quoted as describing the discovery of his sexuality in this way:

"Turing believes machines think
Turing lies with men
Therefore machines do not think." (Couch, 2014)

It is horrific, especially in the decade of the 2020s, to think that one's sexual orientation may "prove" them to be a liar, or a fraud. However, because of soci-ety's borders, Turing had to worry himself about the idea that people might consider his discoveries unusable due to his sexual orientation. He was not wor-ried about his reputation, nor about what would happen to him as a homosexual individual, but was instead worried about what his reputation would do to the advancement of society.

Here, then, is where we round back to the hero's journey, in which society plays a major role. The first interesting aspect of Turing's life is that he had not one, but two, heroic journeys that he was taken on. His first occurred during his life, when he joined the war and fought as a code breaker. He was thus removed from society, as much of society was not actively trying to contain and halt the war. He was then faced with the initiation of breaking the Enigma, which would have been a massive hurdle and obstacle on his way to becoming a hero. He then returned to society, with honors and awards being bestowed upon him.

Then, though, Turing is forced to undergo another hero's journey. Just at the peak of his career, he is called a criminal on the basis of acts of indecency. He is separated from society via his criminality, and is faced with the initiation and obstacle of being forced to undergo chemical castration – an action that will ultimately kill him. Herein, then, is the most fascinating part of his second hero's journey: his return to society. As activism surrounding the legalization of LGBTQ marriages and relationships begins, Turing becomes a martyr for this

culture, someone who died for the cause that others are fighting so hard for. Thus, his return to society occurs when his name is cleared in the early 21st century, transforming him from someone who used to be the antithesis of societal morals to one who displays the best of them.

Thus, Turing has become a hero anew; he has, even post-mortem, completed the final lap of the hero's journey. But how was that leg completed? It's interesting to think about the fact that Turing's journey might not have been completed without some help from others along the way – namely, the shifting of societal norms. That is, had society not shifted, Turing might have not become a hero, and would have remained a villain in the eyes of many.

Thus, we have an example of what has occurred with so many who "push the boundaries" of society. Although they may be seen as a villain, as someone un-idealistic, they become a hidden leader of a societal shift and change; they become sparks for a communal change in morals and ideals. We've seen this shift time and time again, in different scenarios: feminism, civil rights, voting rights. One person, or one group of people, pushing the pendulum so far in the other direct that society has to take a hard look at where its values currently lay. These people can be as normal as Cavell, going about her daily work as a nurse while secretly smuggling soldiers across the border to safety; they can be as prominent as Turing, who hid his secret life away from the public while rising to becoming one of the most important theorists and inventors of our time; or they could be as flamboyant as Oscar Wilde, who changed the course of history by showing that even exceedingly accomplished artists did not always adhere to the morals that their societies set forth.

OSCAR WILDE: REPUTATION IS THE DEMISE

"Most people are other people. Their thoughts are someone else's opinions, their lives a mimicry, their passions a quotation" ("Oscar Wilde," n.d.). There is no better way to introduce our next exemplar, Oscar Wilde. Unlike Turing, Wilde was born into a family with two parents who were already somewhat well-known: his father was a well-respected doctor, his mother a poet and author. He studied, on scholarships, at Trinity College (Dublin) and Oxford (Beckson, 2018).

It didn't take long for Wilde to create a reputation for himself. When he was in his late 20s, he found himself the subject of a periodical, who cited Wilde for his "unmasculine" affinity for the arts. He peaked with the publication of his only movie ("The Picture of Dorian Gray") in 1891. Many of his publications dealt with the concealment of some major immorality or secret, which eventually led to his characters' demise. In fact, in an 1889 poem, Wilde insinuated that he himself was one of these characters (Beckson, 2018).

And here is where Wilde's initiation occurred. The Marquess of Queensberry, whose son was close with Wilde, accused Wilde of sodomy. Wilde then sued the Marquess for libel – an act that led to his ultimate demise. When the case turned unfavorably on Wilde, he was arrested, with two years of hard labor in prison. When he was released, he was completely bankrupt, and fled to France. He died a few years later (Beckson, 2018), but was pardoned in 2017 (McCann, 2017).

So, again, one could say that Wilde had a double journey – except Wilde's journeys were parts of other journeys. He was separated from society when he received a well-rounded education; his initiation occurred when he began to be ostracized for his affinity for the arts; and his return occurred with his literary success. However, he underwent a second hero's journey, as well. He was separated from society when he began to be ostracized for his affinity for the arts. He was initiated when the case against the Marquess flipped on him. And his return – post-death – occurred when he was pardoned, becoming a hero for a burgeoning LGBTQ community. Thus, once again, also, his heroism came about through changes in society – when society changed, so did his status as a hero (or a villain).

SOCIETY AS A FORCE OF CHANGE

Now, it feels necessary to clarify why these two exemplars have become "reborn" heroes. The fact that these two exemplars are both heroes for the LGBTQ community is not mere coincidence; neither, though, were these two chosen simply because they recognize that branch of the population. Those two were chosen because they only became heroes because society changed course. When they died, they were seen as villains in the eyes of society because their actions were illegal;

when they reemerged as heroes, it was because society had, by then, accepted and legalized acts of homosexuality (Allison et al., 2019; Goethals & Allison, 2019). In that same vein, we can look at famous feminists (think Susan B. Anthony) or those that fought for civil rights and integration (e.g., Martin Luther King, Jr.). There is a remarkable distinction we must make between how these exemplars became heroes. It is not, necessarily, that society changed them; it is that they changed society. Though neither Anthony nor King were necessarily "villains" in the eyes of society prior to their deaths, both of these sects of protestors fought the status quo. They both became heroes because they defied society, and thus they changed it.

While Turing and Wilde did not necessarily change society while they were alive, society changed while they were dead – and thus they transitioned posthumously from a villain into a hero. They gave their lives so that other might understand the depths of their despair and inequality, that they might incite a form of change. It is clear, then, that there is a bit of a chicken-before-the-egg puzzle here: did these heroes change because of their community changing, or did their community change because of them (thus making them heroes)?

This paradox is absolutely fascinating, and one that will be focused on for quite a bit more of this paper. The interesting thing about Turing and Wilde is that they did not transform society; society transformed them. They did not actively seek out their heroic status – how could they, when they passed away too soon to realize that they were even remotely heroic? And they were not the ultimate, catalyzing force that drove society to change. So, how did they become heroes?

TRANSFORMING SOCIETY – OR TRANSFORMED BY SOCIETY?

Here, then, is where we run into another intriguing paradox: can heroes be heroes if they themselves do not transform society? Here is where the concept of heroic martyrdom comes into play. By giving their lives to incite change, they served as martyrs for their community. A lot of the current research overlooks is the concept of heroic martyrs, because they tend to be the antithesis of the "prototypical" hero. They don't necessarily transform society. They don't necessarily win glory immediately. They typically aren't idolized or admired when they are alive.

However, there needs to be a shift in how we perceive these heroic martyrs, and we need to view them in the same light as other, more "obvious" heroes.

One of the reasons for this oversight of heroic martyrdom is that these are heroes who have initially failed. They weren't immediately successful, and when compared with people who developed cures for diseases or pulled someone from the wreckage of a car crash, they don't immediately strike one as heroes. Allison and Goethals (2017) argue that one of the benefits of the heroic transformation – which many would undergo during the initiation phase – is that this transformation allows for the ability to transform society. They also argue that the two types of transformation applicable are the self and society (Allison & Goethals, 2017). Thus, we land ourselves in a perfect in-between: how can we argue that these two were heroes, if their hero's journey was halted in the initiation phase, and therefore they weren't able to experience a transformation of their society?

Parks (2017) has an idea: what if their tendency toward heroic action was inhibited due to, say, societal pressures, or cultural norms? Both Turing and Wilde were forced to reckon with the fact that their way of being and their life ran against the cultural norm. In fact, Britain, at the time of Turing, was undergoing a something akin to a "witch hunt", wherein men who called in crimes were often found at the guilty end of gross indecency. Police were quick to arrest any man who displayed any amount of homosexual tendencies. No matter what the crime was that the police had been called in for, they would disregard it if there were the chance to make an arrest for the crime of "gross indecency" (Bedell, 2007).

There was a similar feeling toward homosexuals in Ireland in the 1800s. In fact, the Offences Against The Person Act of 1861 deals with the idea of homosexuality explicitly under its "Unnatural Offences" section: "Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with any animal, shall be liable…to be kept in penal servitude for life…". In fact, the Act goes even further: "Whosoever shall attempt to commit the said abominable crime, or shall be guilty of any assault with intent to commit the same, or of any indecent assault upon any male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor…" (Offences Against The Person Act, 1861). Thus, not only did committing homosexual acts come with a life sentence, but simply being regarded as having attempted to commit an act of homosexuality would be seen as a crime. And, if it were not

already obvious, there is a clear opening here for arrests to be made on the mere assumption that one is a homosexual.

Thus, what Turing and Wilde were doing was inherently illegal. They were pushing the boundaries of society while hiding behind the shadows – they did not want to necessarily change society so that it would adapt to them, but they did want to enjoy their lives the way they pleased. Thus, the cultural norms of Britain stopped the men from advocating for LGBTQ rights while they were alive, as they would have been arrested for their acts of gross indecency and had their reputations marred, and their advocacy would have been disregarded.

ARE MARTYRS HEROES?

This concept, then, is the first example of how heroic martyrs should be considered "heroes" just as much as any other hero. Even if a transformation of society is necessary to be considered a "hero", one cannot disregard those who were forced to evade society for their own personal well-being. In fact, it's fascinating that the one thing that the men ended up as martyrs for was the thing that stopped them from being heroes at the time they were alive.

Unfortunately, we cannot simply determine "heroism" by proving that the cultural norms of society impeded their attempted heroism; we must first acknowledge that their heroism was involuntary. Franco, Blau, and Zimbardo (2011) stated in their initial definition of heroism that heroism: 1) is directed toward others in need; 2) is voluntary; 3) acknowledges possible risks and costs; 4) is pursued while willing to accept the anticipated sacrifice; and 5) is pursued with the hero accomplishing their action without the inherent necessity of external gain. While both Turing and Wilde served others in need and recognized the potential risks of the intimate relationships, we cannot validly argue that any of these other criterion of "heroism" are true of them. Their heroic actions were not voluntary (unless we can count Turing's suicide as a heroic action that turned him into a martyr), nor were they prepared to accept or acknowledge any potential sacrifice or external gain because they were unaware that they were heroes. The way that society viewed them was as villains, as the antithesis of "normal"; they were not trying to fight against this notion.

So here we are, caught in a place of wondering whether heroic martyrdom makes one a hero. We can argue that their heroic actions were potentially impeded by cultural norms, but we cannot argue that their heroism was voluntary. There is a fundamental gap in the literature in regards to heroes who have become heroes post-death; do their actions count as voluntary? Do we acknowledge that any obvious heroism may have been precluded by cultural norms?

Thus, there must be a new definition of heroes created, one that includes those who have only recently come heroes due to the ever-changing society. To do so, we need to look at some of the current principles of heroism as they do or do not relate to both Turing and Wilde, and begin to dissect and unravel the notion that heroic martyrdom is somehow below other forms of heroism.

WHAT THE RESEARCH SAYS

Both of these characters were social heroes, which are described by Kinsella et al. (2017) as persons who risked personal sacrifice in the face of their society. This idea is different from the aforementioned theory that stated that a necessary facet of heroism was the recognition that heroic actions require personal sacrifice, because in this case, this theory is simply stating that social heroism involves some kind of personal sacrifice, not that the person necessarily needs to acknowledge that their actions are potentially sacrificial. In fact, the article gives the explicit example that martyrs are considered social heroes (Kinsella, Ritchie, & Igou, 2017). Thus, we can retain the idea that they are social heroes.

Both Turing and Wilde also meet the criterion for the functions of heroes. Kinsella et al. (2017) describe that a hero must have an enhancing, moral modeling, and protecting function. In the enhancing function, heroes will motivate, inspire, and provide roles models to society; I don't think we can argue that both Wilde and Turing have those functions. The moral modeling function of heroes argues that heroes help people understand society's norms, virtues, and models, and decide for themselves whether they want to adhere to these established norms. This argument is very important to note – it does not say that heroes encourage people to act toward the established norms; rather, it simply says

that heroes provide a moral guideline from which people can determine their own actions. Thus, because Turing and Wilde went against the morals of society, they can be seen as heroes – they provided society with that mirror on which to reflect themselves. The protecting function involves "doing what no one else will, helping, saving, guiding, and acting against evil or danger". It is important, especially in the case of heroic martyrs like Turing and Wilde, to look at how they acted against evil or danger. Both of them were jailed or treated with chemical castration due to their lifestyle – a lifestyle that they were told was illegal. Thus, they were, in a way, acting against what they deemed to be evil or dangerous, or at least dangerous to what they believed in.

Both men also meet the criteria for heroic transformations, as defined by Allison and Goethals (2017). The heroic journey implies that this transformation occurs directly after the initiation phase; but how can these exemplars be heroes if they did not complete the initiation phase, and therefore did not have a self-transformation? In the heroic journey, I think there is a general over-conceptualization that heroes must transform themselves so that they may be considered heroes. Nothing could be further from the truth. Allison and Goethals (2017) argue that there are specific subtypes of heroic transformation, the first being the transformation of the self or of society. It is not necessary that the hero experience this transformation unto his or her self; perhaps the hero, as the authors say, "serves as the catalyst for the transformation in others". This concept, then, would go along with the fact that society transformed them; when heroes serve as the catalyst for societal change, that societal change will loop back around and make them a hero.

In an interesting way, we can also apply some of Kohen et al.'s (2017) steps to heroic development. Expansive empathy – the idea that one acts heroically because they feel empathetic toward someone – is often associated with heroes, the ones who complete the heroic actions. In the case of heroic martyrs, however, the expansive empathy is retroactive, and something that is actually placed in the hands of the non-heroes – those who are making the martyrs a hero. By feeling empathetically toward the hero, they make the hero a hero – they recognize the sacrifice that the hero made for them, and feel empathetic to their plight, thus making them a hero.

Both Turing and Wilde fit the criteria for heroism throughout much of this research. The only facet that they really do not fit into is the idea of their heroism being voluntary – something that is quite literally impossible for them, given their circumstances. But isn't it fascinating that we are establishing that heroism is based on the concept that one is in the right place at the right time, and not on how much a person contributes to society?

There are a few directions in which I think this question could be resolved. Future research should delve further into the hero's journey, especially the possibility of expanding the initiation phase. It is possible for one to, essentially, fail their initiation phase, and become reborn as a new hero. The hero's journey tends to establish that one must make it through the departure stage and through the initiation phase before returning to society. However, the hero's journey needs to be readjusted to account for those who fail in their initiation phase – there needs to be room for them as a hero, as well.

Which leads us into the next categorization of heroism we need to account for: martyrdom. There is very little research on those of those who failed their initiation phase but returned as a hero through societal changes. Without taking these persons into account, we are probably missing several people who fought the status quo in their day, but whose names go unknown because they were held silent in their time.

What everything boils down to is the fact that there needs to be a change in the perception in our society of what makes a hero a hero. Heroes aren't always the ones who have biopics made of them, or the ones who make the front cover of newspapers because they foiled a terrorist-bombing plan. We need to recognize that there are heroes who are giving their lives on a regular basis to help us understand that certain societal changes must be enacted to progress our society further. We could argue that those children dying of cancer are martyrs for the cause of cancer research, because they are giving up their lives so that cancer research can progress further. We don't yet call them heroes, because our society has not yet developed a cure for the cancers that have caused them to pass away. However, I guarantee that when that cure is found, those children who have

passed will be considered heroes to the families of future children who have been diagnosed with the same type of cancer and are now saved.

Just because one passes away should not be an exclusionary criterion for how whether or not they are seen as heroes. We must expand our vision to be inclusive of those who have passed away, and those who are not "obvious" heroes. Those who have become martyrs for society through changes in the status quo deserve just as much importance and infamy as the others.

REFERENCES

Account by Reverend H. Stirling Gahan on the execution of Edith Cavell. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://edithcavell.org.uk/edith-cavells-life/account-by-reverend-h-stirling-gahan-on-the-execution-of-edith-cavell/

Allison, S. T. (2015). The initiation of heroism science. Heroism Science, 1, 1-8.

Allison, S. T. (2019). Heroic consciousness. Heroism Science, 4, 1-43.

Allison, S. T., & Burnette, J. (2009). Fairness and preference for underdogs and top dogs. In R. Kramer, A. Tenbrunsel, & M. Bazerman, (Eds), Social Decision Making: Social Dilemmas, Social Values, and Ethical Judgments. New York: Psychology Press.

Allison, S. T., Eylon, D., Beggan, J.K., & Bachelder, J. (2009). The demise of leadership: Positivity and negativity in evaluations of dead leaders. The Leadership Quarterly, 20, 115-129.

Allison, S. T. & Goethals, G. R. (2020). The heroic leadership imperative: How leaders inspire and mobilize change. West Yorkshire: Emerald.

Allison, S. T., & Goethals, G. R. (2017). The hero's transformation. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership (1st ed., pp. 379–400). New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Spyrou, S. P. (2019). Donald Trump as the archetypal puer aeternus: The psychology of mature and immature leadership. In K. Bezio & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), Leadership and populism. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., Marrinan, A. R., Parker, O. M., Spyrou, S. P., Stein, M. (2019). The metamorphosis of the hero: Principles, processes, and purpose. Frontiers in Psychology.

Beckson, K. (2018). Oscar Wilde. In Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Oscar-Wilde

Bedell, G. (2007, June 24). Coming out of the dark ages. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/jun/24/communities.gayrights

Campbell, J. (1949). The hero with a thousand faces. New York: Pantheon.

Copeland, B. J. (2018). Alan Turing. In Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Alan-Turing#ref214877

Couch, A. (2014, November 29). Alan Turing's 5 most powerful quotes. The Hollywood Reporter. Retrieved from https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/alan-turings-5-powerful-quotes-752669

Efthimiou, O., & Allison, S. T. (2017). Heroism science: Frameworks for an emerging field. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 58, 556-570.

Franco, Z. E., Blau, K., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2011). Heroism: A conceptual analysis and differentiation between heroic action and altruism. Review of General Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022672

Goethals, G. R., & Allison, S. T. (2019). The romance of heroism and heroic leadership: Ambiguity, attribution, and apotheosis. West Yorkshire: Emerald.

Hoyt, C. L., Allison, S. T., Barnowski, A., & Sultan, A. (2020). Lay theories of heroism and leadership: The role of gender, communion, and agency. Social Psychology.

Kinsella, E. L., Ritchie, T. D., & Igou, E. R. (2017). Attributes and applications of heroes. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership (1st ed., pp. 19–35). New York: Routledge.

Kohen, A., Langdon, M., & Riches, B. R. (2017). The making of a hero: Cultivating empathy, altruism, and heroic imagination. Journal of Humanistic Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167817708064

McCann, K. (2017, January 31). Turing's Law: Oscar Wilde among 50,000 convicted gay men granted posthumous pardons. Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/01/31/turings-law-thousands-convicted-gay-bisexual-men-receive-posthumous/

Offences Against The Person Act (1861).

Oscar Wilde. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/movingwords/quotefeature/oscarwilde.shtml

Parks, C. D. (2017). Accidental and purposeful impediments to heroism. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership (pp. 438–458). New York: Routledge.

Rigby, N. (2015, October 12). Nurse Edith Cavell and the British World War One propaganda campaign. BBC News. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-norfolk-34401643

Who was Edith Cavell? (2018, February 5). Retrieved from https://www.iwm.org.uk/history/who-was-edith-cavell

Who was Edith Cavell? (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.cavellnursestrust.org/edith-cavell

9

Sexism, Gender Roles and Heroism: Why Women are Underrepresented as Heroes

JESSICA M. STANFILL

Let's take a quiz.

For the following phrases, fill in the missing word:

1. If you want to offend someone you say: "You fight like a ___"
2. When asking who is in charge you say: "Who wears the ___ in this relationship?"
3. If you want someone to endure something you say: "Take it like a ___"
4. If someone does something bold you say: "That was a ___ move"

Shall I go on? If you answered "girl, pants, man, ballsy" you are a testament to the gendered society we live in—one where "girl" is synonymous with physical weakness, and male genitals are somehow interchangeable with virtues such as "courage."

It is no secret that in the hierarchical categorization of humans, men often find themselves at the top of the pecking order, with women at the bottom. Yes, society has advanced from the ways of the 40s and 50s, when overtly sexist sentiments flooded mainstream media, but the women of today still suffer from stereotypes, gender roles and marginalization; we, as a society, just disguise our sexism differently today than we did 70 years ago.

One way to observe the lack of growth in regard to public opinion on the capabilities of women is to take a look at the field of heroism. Between film, television, literature and the real world, women are counted out of the hero conversation more than they are counted in it. Is this because women are less likely to rise to the occasion and perform heroically than men? I don't believe so, no. Instead, I assert that women face a greater battle in being acknowledged as heroes than men for a very simple reason: we live in a sexist world.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the history of how gender roles and stereotypes have served as boundaries to women in the realm of heroism, and how this phenomenon has, and continues to, impact female potential in a vast variety of fields. I will investigate the decades long trend of androcentric hero research, the distinction between heroine and hero, and how sexism and gender roles serve to dissuade women from behaving heroically. To close, I will examine the life and impact of two women -- JK Rowling and Kathrine Switzer -- who have pushed past the boundaries imposed on them by a patriarchal society and served as exemplars of heroism.

A HISTORY OF HEROISM SCIENCE

Heroism science is but a mere infant among psychological research fields. However, society's fascination with heroes is as old as humanity itself. Over the centuries, the study of the strengths and outward capacities of humanity has evolved, but nonetheless, a common thread connects the knights of the Arthurian era and the superheroes we celebrate today: for the majority of its history, heroism has largely been a boys' club.

The unspoken assumption that the term "hero" implies "male hero" was not always the norm. In the early days of creation myths of western cultures, deities were of both sexes (Becker & Eagly, 2004). During this period, many goddesses such as Isis, Ishtar, Demeter and Cybele were portrayed as the equals of gods and as possessing powerful forces of nature, fertility and creation (Monaghan, 1990). Most famous of these strong, independent figures perhaps is Athena, the goddess of war and wisdom, who was associated in ancient Greek culture with symbols such as armor, helmets and spears—a stark contrast to the commonly held view of the past several decades in which women have not been conceived as being capable of contributing to war and handling weapons (Efthimiou, 2017).

The association of women with strength, war, and by relation, with the term "hero" came to a screeching halt in the 1st century AD. The development of Christianity was the significant event that produced a shift in perceptions of heroism during this period. Under monotheism, there is no possibility of intertwining pantheons of male and female deities. So, when the Christian era entered center stage, the male gods took over and the goddesses, to the extent that they continued to exist, came to play subordinate roles until the cultural relevance of gods and goddesses phased out entirely (Efthimiou, 2017). And thus, with the introduction of the medieval ages, a new cultural association was established that firmly aligned heroism with masculinity. For decades on, the prototypical hero image emphasized divine characteristics that could only be embodied by men, who were in the image of God. This point is displayed most clearly through Max Weber's Great Man theory, in which he asserted that the worship of a hero is the transcendent admiration of a Great Man (Waters & Waters, 2015).

The most influential shift to heroism science that has solidified a patriarchal worldview within the field, however, cannot be claimed by savants of the ancient, medieval or modern periods. Rather, it is my belief that the sustained feminine suppression that is visible within the field today can be largely attributed to a single man who entered the scene in the post-modern era: Joseph Campbell.

In *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, the classic study of how historic hero mythologies share similar plotlines across culture and time, Campbell (1949) documented the journey of a typically male hero. In Campbell's monomyth, in which an ordinary yet heroic figure leaves the comfort of home, immerses himself in the unfamiliar events of an outside world in which he has no real experience, fights and

wins a decisive victory and, once he has done so, returns home with some essential boon or blessing, the idea that the hero must always be male is implicit. And unfortunately, Campbell did not venture to consider females in his original writings. His theory, therefore, only served to prolong the trend of "male" and "hero" being intertwined. And as fait or matter of circumstance would have it, Campbell's monomyth has experienced a particularly long shelf life, and just so happens to continue to permeate popular culture today.

The popularity of film and television series based around comic book superheroes, for example, can trace their origins straight to Campbell's monomyth. So, on this basis, the patriarchal trappings that surround the field of heroism science today can be at least partially attributed to Joseph Campbell. Campbell did not force into law any rule that mandated women should not be admired and recognized as heroic beings the same as men, but so long as he is considered the "father of heroism science" he will inevitably claim a certain degree of responsibility for the field's large disregard for female heroes.

HERO VS. HEROINE

Not only did Campbell neglect to factor in exemplars of females serving as heroes into his framework, but he actively spoke against the qualifications of women to go on the journey. Campbell based his mythic stages on history and the times he looked back to were some of the most sexist eras of mankind's past (Campbell, 2018). In this history women were either the subjects of men—mothers, daughters, lovers—or were the temptresses of men. Just consider the Disney princesses of the time—Cinderella and Snow White—as examples. These women were feminine icons who provided many a young girl with ideas about what it meant to be a girl, and they're entire existence was consumed mostly by the motivation of finding a husband. And these examples only represent a larger trend of female suppression that permeated the early 1900s, when women weren't allowed to fight or go on dangerous journeys and were expected to be subservient to their male counterparts (Guo, 2016).

This history is obvious in Campbell's framework, as he detailed only two roles for women: 1) the Goddess—which references the woman as the love interest or as some sort of maternal divinity or 2) the Temptress—which references the

woman as a character that tempts the hero in a lusty fashion (Miyamoto, 2017). He even told Maureen Murdock, who would later go on to create a somewhat official "Heroine's Journey," that women didn't need to go on the journey (Murdock, 1990).

So, Campbell's vision, and by association the modern image of what a hero is, emulates the past. In an attempt to bring women into the hero conversation, Maureen Murdock created the heroine's journey (Murdock, 1990). This journey is not simply a female oriented version of Campbell's monomyth. Instead, it speaks to the specific challenges that women face in overcoming a male-dominated society.

In the 10-part heroine's journey, the day world is very specifically the male dominated world of the patriarchy based on chauvinism, where the man represents the power and the woman represents the sexuality (Stoffmuster, 2018). What happens in the heroine's journey is the woman has to use her masculine side and separate from the feminine in order to be successful in the male-dominated world. This journey therefore speaks to the fact that men who go on the hero's journey already have a certain degree of power, being that they are men. The heroine, on the other hand, battles not only the conflicts at hand within the story, but also deals with the prejudices associated with being a woman.

It seems clear that the only difference between a male hero and a female heroine, is that the heroine has to not only overcome whatever obstacle is in her way, but she also has to overcome the prejudices against her due to her gender. A true testament to change would therefore be the elimination of the use/need of the two distinct terms, heroine and hero. A world in which there need not be a distinction between heroine and hero would be a world where women didn't have to overcome a patriarchal society before embarking on their journey.

WHY WE NEED FEMALE HEROES

The 21st century has seen a number of blockbuster superhero action-adventure films. Batman, X-Men, Spiderman, Hulk, Ironman and a host of other "men" have flown, stomped, fallen and swung across screens in these Hollywood blockbusters. Although these plotlines are differentiated by different colored tights and capes,

an age-old premise of superhero lore keynotes them all: someone out there needs to be protected, and only a big, strong man can do the job of protecting. The idea that women should neither need nor desire more protection than men remains a powerfully radical idea even in Western culture. We can imagine that men can fly, but not that women can and should be able to protect themselves…or dare I say, others who are in need of protecting (maybe even male others).

In response to these conclusions, one might question, "What's the big deal? They're just comic book stories." Well, hypothetical person with that question, the answer is this: science fiction, fantasy and superhero narratives provide important places for imagining different here-and-nows; for defamiliarizing social problems and exploring them in a context that offers fresh insights and radical visions of the future. That television and film in particular can imagine men flying, spinning webs, wielding nuclear power and manipulating time, but cannot imagine women who don't need a man's protection is a singularly disturbing and reactionary failure of the imagination.

To this, our hypothetical inquisitor might offer, "What about Wonder Woman and Bat Woman? Those are female heroes. What more do you want?" In response to this line of argument, I offer a simple conclusion: the fact that the female heroes we do have are gender reversed knock-offs of established male heroes, does not count as equality in terms of representation.

Perhaps at the beginning of what looks to be a period of dramatic cultural change in regard to the female image, cultural producers might begin to imagine and value forms of heroism that transcend the old, tired stereotype of the damsel in distress. Sociologist Jocelyn Hollander (2001) described the dominant trend of how gender is represented in mass-media as follows:

Women are taught to fear violence and to understand themselves as victims in need of protection in ways that men are not. To be a woman is to be constantly encouraged to understand one's physical self as endangered. To be a man is to understand one's self as powerful and not physically vulnerable. (p. 85)

In agreement with Hollander's stance, I challenge the media industry, particularly film and television, to take responsibility for the role it plays in perpetuating the solicitation of female characters as the ones needing protecting.

The shortage of female characters that serve as exemplars of Campbell's mono-myth in pop culture is concerning for a variety of reasons. Chiefly, the lack of female visibility in the realm of hero worship poses a particular issue for a key group in society: young girls. Arguably, no theory on heroism explains the primary cause for this concern better than the heroic leadership dynamic (HLD).

The HLD is a metaphor of heroism proposed by Allison and Goethals (2014) that centers around the idea that 1) people need heroes and 2) that one's life circumstances determine which specific heroes one needs. According to this theory, half of the human population (women) will at some point in their life need, or at least benefit from, a heroic female figure who has faced and conquered similar circumstances as she. Other theories of basic human needs back this point as well.

Erikson (1977) theorized that heroes are not only beneficial to children as models, but that they also provide children with a way to understand their culture and place in society. According to this line of understanding, the differences in how men and women (or boys and girls) behave is therefore a function of the typical roles that each is expected to play, as modeled by the dominant figures within each sex. Under the current societal norms, it is often the case that these dominant figures are those heralded as heroes. Consequently, young girls are presented with an over-abundance of male hero options and few to no female hero options.

Unfortunately, the women who receive the greatest amount of media attention today are the likes of The Kardashians and Real House Wives. These women tend to embody qualities that are defined by their woman-ness. They are sisters, mothers, girlfriends, wives, grandmothers, irritating secretaries; they seem to exist to be loved or unloved by the male heroes. And so young girls are presented with two primary options: idealize a social exemplar of female inferiority and submissiveness or find a male hero with whom they can only partially relate. Either way, we are doing a disservice to our young women by delivering to them a message that it is rare to be a heroic female—a message that is likely responsible for discouraging a great number of would be young heroes from pursuing such a status.

The impact of the lack of depth in the category of strong, capable female figures cannot be overstated. Previous research regarding young people's heroes suggest that most children have a person that they would name as their hero (Bromnick &

Swallow, 2010). This fact reemphasizes how important it is for the whole of society to be cognizant of what kind of heroes we put out there for children to idealize; essentially, every kid is going to have a hero, and they are going to pick whoever is available. And for young girls, that often means settling for heroes that aren't female to fulfill this void, or worse—idolizing inadequate female social figures.

So, while our society can claim triumphant advances on many fronts, the minimum degree of cultural evolution in terms of the image of what a woman can do, has resulted in 2018 still carrying many of the same trappings of a patriarchal society as 1918. As a final thought on this line of commentary, ask yourself this: how can we expect more female heroes to rise to the occasion if they don't have strong, successful examples to look up to? A hint: we can't.

THE HEROISM OF J.K. ROWLING

J.K. Rowling should be heralded in history as one of the most impactful figures of her generation (notice I didn't say "female figures"). While she should be acknowledged for brilliance and virtuousness independently of her gender, for the purpose of exemplifying the point of this chapter I will devote the following section to speaking to how she, as a woman, faced more obstacles than a man in a similar position would have in order to make it to where she is today.

For those of you who don't know, Rowling is the creator of the infamous Harry Potter series and is the United Kingdom's best-selling living author. Her seven-book series has sold more than 450 million copies and has the record for the best-selling book series of all time (Rowling, 2016). Rowling is an international icon, but her personal journey to heroic status was not glossy. Here is her story:

J.K. Rowling (actual name, Joanne) always knew she wanted to be a book author and has related to fans that she knew that was her purpose and calling in life as early as 6 years old. Those who had a say in her evolution as a writer, however, did not taught her as being destined for such a career. Her secondary school teacher, Steve Eddy, remembers Rowling as "not exceptional" but "one of a group of girls who were bright and good at English" (Parker, 2012). That's a rather lackluster review of one of the world's most acclaimed authors.

Despite a gaping lack of mentorship or support, Rowling kept at her craft. Life, however, would prove to challenge a swift course of development as a writer. Throughout her teenage years, Joanne's mother battled multiple sclerosis—a fact that has lead Rowling to recall her childhood as not particularly happy. In 1982, she took the entrance exams for Oxford but was not accepted and studied French at Exeter instead. She graduated in 1986 and worked a desk job for Amnesty International and had her first inspiration for Harry Potter in 1991 while traveling for work. This fanciful world was swiftly cast to the side, however, by the death of her mother that same year. Rowling was 25 when her mother died—a day that she remembers as the most traumatizing moment in her life.

After her mother died, Rowling moved to Portugal for a fresh start. She started dating a man name Jorge Arantes, became pregnant and moved into a small two-bedroom apartment with Arantes's mother. She miscarried. And in 1993, she and Arantes got pregnant again and she gave birth to her firstborn, Jessica, that summer. After Jessica was born, her marriage turned physically and emotionally abusive, and so, with a 13-month-old infant, Rowling returned to the UK. As a newly minted single mother with no job and a cramped apartment, Joanne fell into a deep depression and even considered suicide.

Two things kept her going: Jessica and the sparsely written manuscript of Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone that she had kept stowed away in a suitcase all those years. In the following months, Joanne lived on state benefits and spent much of her time writing in cafes with Jessica sleeping in a baby carrier next to her. The first installment of Harry Potter was published in 1997 by Bloomsbury, who requested she take the pen name "J.K." since women's names were found to be less appealing to audiences.

In summary, J.K. Rowling was tossed aside as an unspectacular member of a group of girls in grade school. She lost the most influential female figure in her life at the harsh young age of 25. She suffered a miscarriage and was then subsequently impregnated and abused by a man who she thought she could trust. She lived on disability because as a single mother, she was not an attractive potential employee. And finally, when she achieved the greatest project of her life, she couldn't publish it under her given name for fear that potential readers wouldn't buy a book written by a woman.

That's a particularly excessive amount of gender-oriented suffering for one person to endure before the age of 35. But in typical J.K. fashion, she refused to be anyone's damsel. She rescued herself.

Today, Joanne is the only person to have fallen off Forbes' list of billionaires because of excessive charitable giving. She stands for female empowerment, is an advocate for self-love and mental health, and has inspired an entire generation to love reading. Although Harry Potter came to a conclusion 11 years ago, she actively contributes to the benefit of society by serving as a social, moral and political inspiration to her fans. In every conceivable variation of the word, J.K. Rowling is a hero. She is also a female. And society would do well to make it less difficult for more women like her to influence the world and have a platform.

KATHRINE SWITZER

In any conversation on the topic of women in sports and gender equality, one would be hard pressed to go without mention of Kathrine Switzer. In 1967, Kathrine became the first woman to run the Boston Marathon (Switzer, 2017). The story of this feat, while it has a happy ending, only speaks to the misogynistic outlooks that women are often forced to overcome if they wish to be treated as capable beings in a male-dominated environment.

During her undergraduate career at the University of Syracuse, Kathrine trained unofficially with the men's cross-country team. Kathrine wasn't trying to prove anything by training with the men, but she had always been an athlete throughout her life, and she didn't intend on terminating that part of who she was because of lack of opportunity; there was no running team for women at Syracuse in the 60s, or anywhere else for that matter.

While at Syracuse, Kathrine decided she wanted to run the Boston Marathon. At the time that she made this decision, she didn't consider the detail that she was a girl—she was just a runner with a competitive spirit, and Boston was an infamous test for runners looking to explore their limits. When Arnie, the coach of the men's team, heard of this idea he quipped, "No woman can run the Boston Marathon" (p. 190). Eventually, Kathrine wore Arnie down to agree that if she could run the

distance in practice, he would take her to Boston. Not only did Kathrine prove she could handle the 26-mile distance in practice, she put in an extra five-mile loop to total 31, "just to feel extra confident about Boston" (p. 192).

From her performance, Kathrine earned Arnie's respect and support for her running aspirations, but other men in her life, namely her boyfriend, were less than enthusiastic. Kathrine's boyfriend at the time was a 235-pound All-American football player who, upon hearing Kathrine's news announced that he would run Boston, too, and didn't need to train because "if a girl can run a marathon, I can run a marathon" (p. 193).

When Kathrine gathered the paperwork to register as a runner, there was no rule about gender listed in the bylaws for the marathon, so she sent in her registration form and signed it as she always signed her name: K.V. Switzer. On the day of the race, everything proceeded relatively uneventfully. At the starting lines, accompanied by Arnie, her chauvinistic boyfriend and another male runner from Syracuse, Kathrine was the only lipstick-wearing face in a sea of, well, non-lipstick wearing faces. But no one made much of a fuss about her. In fact, the other male runners were pleased to have a woman in their presence.

After the first few miles, however, the routine proceedings of the run quickly morphed into one of the most resilient displays of female strength in the history of sport. The following is an excerpt from Kathrine's autobiography:

Moments later, I heard the scraping noise of leather shoes coming up fast behind me. A big man with bared teeth was set to pounce and before I could react he grabbed my shoulder and flung me back screaming, "Get the hell out of my race and give me those numbers." Then he swiped down my front, trying to rip off my bib. Journalists rode alongside, thinking it was a prank and waiting for the moment when I'd give up. This made me even more resolved. In fact, it infuriated me. No matter what, I had to finish the race. If I didn't, people would say women couldn't do it. My mind was whirling, but that couldn't distract me from feeling the very big blisters in my arches that soon would burst. I could handle that; pain was nothing. It was part of what made you a hero, doing this, overcoming it, relegating pain to the incidental for a higher purpose. (p. 199)

Roughly four hours after the incident with the race official, Kathrine crossed the finish line. She didn't stop once. And, for those interested, the same couldn't be said of her super-star athlete boyfriend. By the end of the race, Kathrine was no longer just a kid who enjoyed running; she was a pillar of strength, an exemplar of what women could accomplish in the face of a mountain of voices which worked to minimize the extent of her capabilities.

In the years since her first marathon, Kathrine has tirelessly served the mission of empowering women. She campaigned to make women official competitors at the Boston Marathon and was eventually successful in 1972. She created the Avon International Running Circuit, a global series of woman's races that has grown to 400 races in 27 countries for over a million women. She was a major influencer in getting the women's marathon into the Olympic Games for the first time in 1984 in Los Angeles. She was inducted in the USA National Women's Hall of Fame for creating positive social change. And today, she continues to empower women through her foundation, 261 Fearless Inc., which serves to give women around the world the gifts of self-esteem, empowerment and fearlessness, through running.

Today, 58% of race participants in the U.S. are women. Just contemplate that statistic. In 1967, women represented 0% of participants. And the source of the exponential growth that the sport has seen in the past 50 years can all be traced back to a young college student who refused to stop moving forward when it seemed like the world was against her progress. I'd say that makes her a hero, and not only a hero for women, but for anyone who has ever been told they can't do something because of what is perceived of them from the outside.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter has been to illustrate that while men and women are equally capable of rising to the occasion and performing heroically when a situation calls for it, women face a remarkably greater challenge in being recognized by society as heroes—which is a central component in the actualization of heroism. The age-old trend of neglecting female inclusion into the realm of heroism has resulted in a modern society in which girls have more options of supermodels and reality television stars as female icons, than virtuous heroes. This lack of

representation is a problem. And it is constantly perpetuated by the engrained sexism and restricting gender roles that influence, to a certain degree, every facet of life.

If we wish to advance beyond the reality of our present circumstances, in which a female being recognized with heroic status is a rarer phenomenon than getting struck by lightning, there are a few action steps we can take. First of all, we can get rid of the word "heroine." It is old and haggard and when searched for on the internet, brings up images of a highly addictive drug, rather than strong women. Let us recognize our women for being heroes because they merit that title independently of their sex. Secondly, let us infuse child media with images of strong women who don't need protecting and rescuing by a more powerful man. Sleeping Beauty is a classic tale, but it also teaches our young people that a good hero tale involves a limp girl lying in a bed, waiting for a boy to rescue her with a kiss...this is a classic that could use a facelift. Finally, let us celebrate the women who are out in the world performing as heroes in spite of the obstacles they have faced.

It is my strongly held belief that the world has a wealth of female heroes in the waiting—many of whom just need to be shown that it is possible to be both a woman and a hero. The responsibility, then, of those involved in heroism science, is to help these women realize what they can achieve, by highlighting the journeys of their fellow woman.

REFERENCES

Allison, S. T. (2015). The initiation of heroism science. Heroism Science, 1, 1-8.

Allison, S. T., Beggan, J. K., & Efthimiou, O. (2019). The art and science of heroism and heroic leadership. Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers.

Allison, S. T., & Goethals, G. R. (2014). "Now he belongs to the ages": The heroic leadership dynamic and deep narratives of greatness. In Goethals, G. R., et al. (Eds.), Conceptions of leadership: Enduring ideas and emerging insights. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Becker, S. W., & Eagly, A. H. (2004). The heroism of women and men. American Psychologist, 59(3), 163-178. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.3.163

Bromnick, R. D., & Swallow, B. L. (2010). I like being who I am: A study of young people's ideals. Educational Studies, 25(2), 117-128. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055699997855

Campbell, J. (2008). The hero with a thousand faces (3rd ed.). Novato, CA: New World Library.

Campbell, O. (2018, July 12). The historical struggle to rid socialism of sexism. Smithsonian Magazine. Retrieved from https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/historical-struggle rid-socialism-sexism 180969610/

Davis, J. L., Burnette, J. L., Allison, S. T., & Stone, H. (2011). Against the odds: Academic underdogs benefit from incremental theories. Social Psychology of Education, 14, 331-346.

Efthimiou, O. (2017). Heroic ecologies: embodied heroic leadership and sustainable futures. Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, 8(4), 489-511. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-08-2015-0074

Efthimiou, O., Allison, S. T., & Franco, Z. E. (Eds.) (2018). Heroism and wellbeing in the 21st Century: Applied and emerging perspectives. New York: Routledge.

Guo, J. (2016, January 25). Researchers have found a major problem with 'The Little Mermaid' and other Disney movies. The Washington Post. Retrieved from   https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/01/25/researchers-have discovered-a-major-problem-with-the-little-mermaid-and-other-disney movies/?utm_term=.85799727723f

Hollander, J. A. (2001). Vulnerability and dangerousness: The construction of gender through conversation about violence. Gender & society, 15(1), 83-109. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/089124301015001005

Miyamoto, K. (2017, June 18). Why screenwriters should embrace the heroine's journey. Retrieved from https://screencraft.org/2017/06/18/how-screenwriters-can-embrace-the-heroines-journey/

Monaghan, P. (1990). The book of goddesses and heroines. Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn Publications.

Munley, P. H. (1977). Erikson's theory of psychosocial development and career development. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10(3), 261-269. Retrieved from   https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(77)90062-8

Murdock, M. (1990). The heroine's journey: Woman's quest for wholeness. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Parker, I. (2012, October 1). Mugglemarch: J.K. Rowling writes a realist novel for adults. The New Yorker. Retrieved from https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2012/10/01/mugglemarch

Rowling, J.M. (2016). J.K. Rowling. Retrieved from https://www.jkrowling.com/about/

Stoffmuster, V. (2018, September 23). Transformational storytelling: a conversation with Tom Schlesinger. Retrieved from https://stoffmuster.berlin/transformational-storytelling-a-conversation-with-tom-schlesinger/

Switzer, K. (2017). Marathon woman. Lebanon, IN: Da Capo Press.

Waters, T., & Waters, D. (2015). Weber's rationalism and modern society: New translations on politics, bureaucracy, and social stratification. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

10

Coming from Behind Once Again: An Analysis of the Underdog Phenomenon

EMILY E. BRAUNEWELL

The path of the hero is rarely free of trials and tribulations. Iconic comparative mythologist Joseph Cambell (1949) was sure to emphasize the obstacles fictional heroes often face on what he called the hero's journey. Even in real life stories of heroism, we see the struggles a person frequently faces on the road to achieving hero status. However, despite the ubiquitous hardships involved in heroism, none weigh down the odds of the individual -- or individuals -- in question like those faced by a particular type of hero: the underdog.

Underdogs by definition are coming from circumstances that put their chances of achievement nearly at zero. More specifically, Vandello and colleagues (2017) defines an underdog as "disadvantaged parties facing advantaged opponents and unlikely to succeed" (Vandello, Goldschmeid, & Michniewicz, 2017). These disadvantaged circumstances can come in a wide variety of forms; some heroes come from low socioeconomic status, some are faced with significant physical or mental inferiorities, others may be forced to

fight their way through socially oppressive scenarios. Underdog heroes are more common than we realize; characters in movies may be seen dragging themselves from hopeless upbringings, sports teams may face off against an undefeated competitor, or an underappreciated politician may be fighting for office.

Whatever the reason for their struggle, we love to root for the underdog, and the psychology behind choosing a hero that seems unlikely to succeed as opposed to a hero that will certainly achieve their goal has been difficult for researchers to untangle (Allison et al., 2019; Allison, Goethals, & Spyrou, 2019). There are also many conflicting themes and fragile framework of underdog appeal that adds to the complication of the phenomenon. Some individuals fear openly expressing their support of underdogs, for fear of being associated with a losing party (Vandello, Goldschmeid, & Michniewicz, 2017), or will only choose the underdog if it has minimal impact on their own well-being (Kim et al., 2008). However, despite these limitations, there are still an abundant number of underdogs—both fictional and in reality—that receive overwhelming support, and further understanding of why we support the underdog will aid psychologists in the in pursuit of a scientific understanding of heroism.
The Psychology of the Underdog Effect

HOPE AND SELF IDENTITY

Several theories have been proposed to better understand why underdogs are so popular among individuals. Evidence has shown that a prominent reason may be the way that we identify with underdog heroes. We see underdogs as versions of ourselves, as those that have to beat difficult odds to succeed. It is more difficult for us to picture ourselves as the superior challenger, who has no trials to overcome to achieve their goals. Rather, we align ourselves with the side that will have to fight harder to win. In identifying with the underdog, we allow ourselves to hope that we can one day also reach that same level of success despite obstacles that may obscure our path (Vandello et al., 2017).

A similar concept was examined by Kim et al., (2008). Their research on the reasons behind the support of underdogs elaborated specifically on the concept of the underdog's struggle. According to this theory, we are drawn to the underdog because we can empathize with the act of struggling, relating it to a time in our

lives when we too had to fight to achieve what we wanted (Kim et al., 2008). This focus on struggle also holds implications for why we are attracted to underdog success stories, particularly those in leadership roles, because they are physical examples of the overcoming of said struggle. Thus, the perseverance that underdogs exhibit attracts a stronger level respect and likability for those that have overcome those trials (Allison, 2019; Allison & Burnette, 2009).

ENHANCING THE EMOTIONAL BALANCE

Our tendency to side with the underdog hero appears to press further than self-identification. It is possible that rooting for the underdog is a way to maintain the most efficient emotional response, despite the underdog's success or lack thereof. Frazier and Snyder (1991) observed evidence towards this factor in their study, particularly in sports. This paper suggests that there is logic behind backing the underdog. When cheering for a favorite or a "top dog", referring to the advantaged competitor (Allison & Burnette, 2009; Allison & Green, 2020), The prospect of them winning is expected. Consequently, when the favorite or top dog wins, the emotional thrill is mild. However, when they lose, the emotional impact is much more detrimental, as it harms the confidence that was invested into a party that was assured victory. On the other hand, if an individual invests in an underdog, the emotional risk is significantly less. As the expectation is for the weaker party to fall short, the emotional payoff is significantly greater, being that the underdog defeated the odds set against them for achieve success (Frazier & Snyder, 1991).

Research has also been conducted to more thoroughly evaluate that excitement that follows the emergence of an underdog. In other words, the emotional payoff side of the scale that comes forward as we choose who to follow. When an unknown athlete comes from seemingly out of nowhere and challenges the undefeated champion, or when a politician who fought from scarce resources shows the potential to rise against the dominant candidate, it provides an atmosphere that shakes up our expectations and excites us into rooting for the underdog. This concept was examined by Vandello et al. (2007). The "thrill of the unexpected" is enough to draw people towards underdogs, because it breaks the status quo (p. 342). We put our faith then into a competitor that will provide that thrill for us.

The way underdogs evoke our emotional responses is therefore another piece in the puzzle of why we support these heroes.

While the underdog has the ability to induce hope and excitement in us, there are possible explanations for the phenomenon that are less about personal enhancement and more about targeting the top dogs. Several studies have examined the idea that our attraction to the underdog may lie less in our desire to see them prevail, and more in the desire to see the advantaged party fail. An underdog becomes a representation of seeing the odds evened out, where the hopeless odds get to overtake those with abundant success. Some may refer to this as ensuring that scales of justice are equal (Vandello et al., 2007) or keeping the odds of a situation fair (Allison & Burnette, 2009). One study viewed this from the perspective of competition in business, and the way the underdog phenomenon may encourage individuals to support small businesses over mammoth corporations (McGinnis & Gentry, 2008). Results showed that people tend to seek out disadvantaged companies due to dislike for large corporations or inequity in capital, or, on the other hand due to an affection for the "little guy" (p. 198). This affection implies that individuals may actively try to avoid a company that they know is already rife with resources.

A more cynical explanation has also been the subject of speculation with psychologists. Some researchers have contemplated the role of what is known as schadenfreude, which can roughly be described as the pleasure that one feels at another's misfortune (Heider, 1958). Kim et al. (2008) compared schadenfreude to the underdog phenomenon. Experiencing the desire to see a top dog fail could possibly lead one to root for the competitor that has a slimmer chance of succeeding (p. 2553). Here there is less support for the underdog than hope that the more advantageous competitor will not succeed. Still, it provides possible insight into the phenomenon of the underdog, and what leads us to support them.

Researchers are toying with the idea that the support of underdogs, what they are specifically calling the underdog effect, could coincide with that of another

phenomenon, called the bandwagon effect. While the underdog effect refers to the support of an individual or group that has little to no chance of success (Vandello, Goldschmeid, & Michniewicz, 2017), the bandwagon effect refers to a person's tendency to adopt a trend or behavior because they see others doing it (Cherry, 2017). Some psychologists theorize that individuals may choose to support an underdog through the bandwagon effect. That is, they see that others are beginning to support an underdog hero, and therefore choose to support them as well. A study on this possibility was assessed in regard to voting, and whether a person could be swayed to vote for an underdog politician because others are beginning to (Fleitas, 1971). The results did show evidence that voters could be persuaded to switch their vote to an underdog candidate if one candidate is painted as more domineering than the other (p. 438). However, this phenomenon needs more research before it can be confirmed as a viable way to predict underdog support.

TALES OF THE UNDERDOG: CASE STUDIES

While the reasons we support them are still obscure, the story of the underdog hero frequently reoccurs, both in fiction and in reality. It is difficult to go long without hearing of someone who overcame the odds or surpassed the powerhouse and achieved what seemed impossible. The following sections will track stories of those who overcame significant obstacles to reach their goals and can now claim the title of underdog hero.

Athletics are one of the most common places for an underdog to emerge. In this case, the struggle does not lie only on the field, but in the social contexts both inside and outside the team at stake. Thus, the story of the T.C Williams Titans, a high school football team fighting against not just rival teams, but the racial injustices of the south, has become an iconic underdog film, titled Remember the Titans. Although the movie was indeed based on a true story, this analysis will focus on the popular film version and its relation to the underdog phenomenon.

The Titan's Story

In Alexandria, Virginia, in 1971, racial tension was at a peak. The city's residents, both black and white, could feel this tension throughout their whole lives, even at

the level of high school athletics. So, when a law-change initiated integration of the black and white school districts, the result was far from peaceful.

Bill Yoast, a successful white football coach and nominee for the Virginia High School Hall of Fame, quickly realizes the challenges at hand when the head coaching job at the newly integrated T.C. Williams High School will be given to Herman Boone, a successful black football coach from North Carolina, and the city—specifically the players—are left up in arms. However, he is quick to learn that his challenges will be nothing compared to those of Boone, and those of his new team.

Upon arrival to their first week at training camp, Boone does not back down from the clear racial divide that is already in place, asserting his style as an unwavering "dictator" and forcing the reluctant black and white players to intermingle. Thus, Yoast and Boone face their first racial barriers within their own team, before they even reach the school year. It takes several weeks of camp before they are able to push past the discrimination and create chemistry among their players. This new-found comradery helps to smooth over the issues within the team, but the true challenges become apparent once they face the outside world.

The Titans must go from conquering the obstacles inside themselves, to conquering the obstacles provided by the people around them. Students and members of the community fight to try and get Boone fired, appalled that a white man lost his job to a black one. This discrimination leads to a must-win situation for the Titans; if they lose a single game, then Boone will be fired as head coach. Thus, the Titans begin their season at a severe disadvantage. With little support from their community thanks to racism and oppression, and the athletic threat of all-white teams who have never faced these kinds of set-backs, this team has become the underdogs.

They begin strongly, but an injury to the starting quarterback and racial pressure from the outside world begins to take its toll on the Titans. After local white men throw a brick through Boone's window, threatening both him and his family, the tension reaches an all-time high. Games are cut close, teammates begin to brawl, and it seems as though this team will fall apart at the seams. However, the team gets together and decides that they want more from themselves than players who will crumble at the first sign of trouble; they want a family who will defeat the

odds that have been set against them. So, Coach Boone, Coach Yoast, and the Titans continue to fight their way through the season, winning game after game, and overcoming the tremendous amounts of discrimination in their path.

Just when the Titans believe that they had overcome their greatest trials and were on their way to a perfect season, a tragedy strikes that leaves the Titans once again questioning their chances. Gerry "Superman" Bertier, the team's captain, is severely injured in a car accident just before the championship game, paralyzing him from the waist down. The team, devastated by the loss of their star teammate and the trauma to their friend, begin to fear that this is one hurdle that they just cannot overcome. They face a powerhouse team and a brutal loss, along with the continued social pressures closing in from the outside. Still, they choose to face this last challenge with grace, as they have since the beginning.

The Titans initially struggle, trailing George C. Marshall High until the second half. It isn't until a last-minute fumble by Marshall and a creative play from Boone, with the use of their still injured quarterback, that the Titans are able to push past that final obstacle and secure the title of State Champions—with a perfect season to go with it.

This team faced countless trials throughout their season—trials that most people did not believe they could overcome—and managed to beat the odds to achieve more than just a trophy; they showed those around them that they were stronger than the discrimination and doubt, and what it meant to be a true underdog hero (Bruckheimer, Oman, & Yakin, 2000).

Titans as Underdogs

The most notable factor that makes the story of the Remember the Titans classic underdog tale is that of disadvantaged odds. This team had more to overcome than simply a competitor on the field; the main disadvantage came from the social pressures that went on around them. The community surrounding the team did not initially support the integration of black and white students, and the racial tensions affected the players inside and out. Not only did they have to try and settle conflict among themselves, but they had to try and fight against those around them that claimed they should not be allowed to compete with one another. Additionally,

the issue of race forced the team into a must-win scenario, which added significant pressure to both the coaches and the players in every game they approached. Meanwhile, the issue of race was not experienced by the other teams that the Titans would be facing, placing their competitors at a significant advantage.

Aside from race, the Titans then had to face both the physical loss and emotional effect of losing a teammate to a severe injury. Without the presence of their captain and leader, a player who helped to bring the team as far as they had—both on the field and within their team culture—the rest of the players were thrown an unexpected variable at the last minute. While the team could have let this bring them down, they continued to fight for the title.

The theme of the community is what is interesting regarding Remember the Titans. In the beginning of the film, most of the city rejects the integrated team, claiming that Yoast should have remained coach and that black and white players were never meant to be together. However, over the course of the film, you can see that the immediate community around T.C. Williams High School does begin to recognize that the team is doing wonderful things. Thus, people begin to root for the underdog. The fans are excited by the unexpected outcome of a successful, integrated team, and are inspired to see a team overcome such brutal odds to take on the championship title.

Still, what is striking is that many of the fans are still reluctant to openly support the Titans, due to the intense racial tensions that are occurring. As mentioned earlier, a prominent phenomenon in the support of underdogs is the tendency to express support, for fear of being associated with a party that will likely prove unsuccessful (Vandello, Goldschmeid, & Michniewicz, 2017). Gerry Bertier's girlfriend and mother, for example, are hesitant to openly accept the team for what it is. While the team is inducing these feelings of hope and defeating these seemingly impossible odds, those around them still fear the retaliation of a community struck down by discrimination. These, and many other reasons, allow Remember the Titans to be labeled as one of the most inspirational underdog stories that has been told. For both athletes and non-athletes alike, due to the way the team fiercely overcomes the racial and physical barriers that stand in their way.

From Homeless to Hero: Christopher Gardner's Story

The athletic field is not the only place where an underdog hero can arise. Sometimes it happens in the professional field, when a person who had no resources and no hope rises above the odds to find success. This is the case for real-life underdog Chris Gardner, whose life was portrayed in a cinematic adaptation titled The Pursuit of Happyness in 2006. Gardner's life was a true "rags to riches" story, and the way that he achieved success and continues to inspire people with his determination makes him a perfect candidate for the title of underdog.

Christopher Gardner was born in Milwaukee in 1954. His upbringing was anything but easy; he and his sisters were raised by their mother and his stepfather. Gardner frequently watched his mother suffer abuse from his stepfather, taking much abuse himself, for the majority of his childhood and adolescence. Despite this abuse though, his mother never stopped telling Gardner that he could do whatever he set his mind to.

Gardner joined the United States Navy upon graduation from high school, and then shortly after his discharge from service he took a job as a lab assistant in San Francisco. This job served him well, and it seemed that he would be able to move on from his brutal childhood, until he became involved with a woman named Jackie Medina. The pair had a son together named Christopher Jr., and Gardner was forced to quit his job to try and find a career that could support his new child.

A critical moment in Gardner's life was when he approached a man who was parking his Ferrari in a parking garage. Gardner asked the man—named Bob Bridges—what he did for a living. Bridges decided to take Gardner to lunch, and this Gardner was introduced to the basics of the stock market. Gardner pursued this opportunity, landing a spot in a training program with E.F. Hutton that he believed would help him finally get his feet off the ground financially.

Despite his entrance in the program, Gardner's troubles far from disappeared. When the manager of the program was fired, he was left once again searching for options. He managed to befriend a broker that landed him an interview with Dean Witter Reynolds, but he continued to struggle. As a result, Jackie took Christopher Jr. and left after an aggressive argument between the couple that had Gardner arrested and taken to jail for 10 days.

Upon release from jail, Gardner was far from prepared from his interview. Dressed in stained shoes and a Members Only jacket, he was honest about his situation to the interviewer. As a man who had been beaten down his entire life, often having to fight to survive, Gardner still did not back down from the challenge. His charisma and natural intelligence wooed the interviewer, who saw the underdog's potential, and Gardner managed to find himself admitted to the Dean Witter Reynolds training program. Here, he was able to make a small salary and, after several months, saw Jackie and his son returned. Jackie believed that Christopher Jr. would be better off with his father.

However, the apartment where Gardner was living did not allow children. Gardner and his son were then forced to leave and find a new place to live. Homeless and alone with his son, Gardner had reached an all-time low. He was always on the hunt for a place to stay with his child; bathroom floors, churches, soup kitchens, to name a few. Yet, he continued to work and work at his training program, becoming one of the most successful trainees involved. When he was finally given his entrance exam, he scored an 88%, and was hired as an employee by Dean Witter, where his growth as a stock broker began.

After stints with companies in New York, Gardner decided to move to Chicago. There, he was able to open his own company, Gardner Rich & Company. By 1988, Gardner had surpassed any goals he could have imagined for himself; he was a self-made millionaire, now with two children, Jr. and Jacintha. Today, Gardner is worth $60 million. He has a new company by the name of Gardner International Holdings, and is now a motivational speaker to inspire those around them to never stop fighting for their dreams (Ewing, 2017).

Chris Gardner's continues to be treasured as a well-known underdog hero. The way that his journey from abuse to homelessness to millionaire-status touches individuals worldwide allows psychologists to further understand the underdog phenomenon. Gardner had to overcome countless obstacles to get to where he is today. He started life with few role models other than his mother and suffered physical and emotional trauma via his stepfather for most of his youth. His financial disadvantages throughout the rest of his life then led to difficulties in creating a stable life for himself and for his son. As well as this, the majority of those interviewing for the positions in stock broker firms likely had the previous

education to prepare them, and at least the money to provide adequate clothing for an interview.

Gardner was acting on information gathered at lunch and had to fight to prove his qualifications despite his appearance. He also had the weight of his son's health on his shoulders through it all. Yet Gardner managed to achieve his success despite all of this going against him. Gardner also had several people take a chance on him, despite his underdog status. People that had chosen to root for the underdog. Bob Bridges, Martyn and the interviewer of Dean Witter Reynolds, for example. He also continues to inspire and instill hope among those that can identify with his struggle, through his motivation. Individuals love Gardner's story because they can see a man who, despite countless disadvantages, went against any doubt or top dog in his path and achieved more than he could ever have hoped to.

CONCLUSION

The underdog remains a complex phenomenon in hero psychology. Why we choose to root for a party with seemingly no chances of success proves difficult to understand. However, the lack of probability for underdog success does not lessen the excitement that individuals feel when someone that never should have succeeded defeats impossible odds. Whether it is our identification with their struggle, the emotional payoff of seeing the "little guy" win, or the desire to see the top dog fall, the underdog hero remains a ubiquitous story across cultures.

Future research and understanding of this phenomenon can help psychologists to study the reasons we may be drawn to or may shy away from support of these heroes. This understanding could create implications for what may prompt us to support or ignore any kind of hero and allow researchers to untangle the mystery of what makes an individual or group a hero to begin with. Moreover, as underdog heroes are often the most creative heroes (Bennett, Efthimiou, & Allison, 2020), it is imperative that societies foster avenues through which underdogs can achieve their goals and disseminate their contributions.

REFERENCES

Allison, S. T. (2019). Heroic consciousness. Heroism Science, 4, 1-43.

Allison, S. T., & Burnette, J. (2009). Fairness and preference for underdogs and top dogs. In R. Kramer, A. Tenbrunsel, & M. Bazerman, (Eds), Social Decision Making: Social Dilemmas, Social Values, and Ethical Judgments. New York: Psychology Press.

Allison, S. T., Eylon, D., Beggan, J.K., & Bachelder, J. (2009). The demise of leadership: Positivity and negativity in evaluations of dead leaders. The Leadership Quarterly, 20, 115-129.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Spyrou, S. P. (2019). Donald Trump as the archetypal puer aeternus: The psychology of mature and immature leadership. In K. Bezio & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), Leadership and populism. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., Marrinan, A. R., Parker, O. M., Spyrou, S. P., Stein, M. (2019). The metamorphosis of the hero: Principles, processes, and purpose. Frontiers in Psychology.

Allison, S. T., & Green, J. D. (2021). Nostalgia and heroism: Theoretical convergence of memory, motivation, and function. Frontiers in Psychology.

Bennett, D., Efthimiou, O., & Allison, S. T. (2020). The role of heroic creativity and leadership in creative work. In A. de Dios & L. Kong (Eds.), Handbook on the geographies of creativity. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Bruckheimer, J. (Producer), Oman, C. (Producer), & Yakin, B. (Director). (2000). Remember the Titans [Motion Picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.

Campbell, J., Cousineau, P., & Brown, S. L. (1990). The hero's journey: The world of Joseph Campbell: Joseph Campbell on his life and work. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Cherry, K. (2018, September). Bandwagon effect as a cognitive bias. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com

Ewing, D. (2017, October 29th). Chris Gardner: The True Story of the Pursuit of Happyness. Retrieved from http://www.ninjajournalist.com.

Fleitas, D. W. (1971). Bandwagon and underdog effects in minimal information elections. American Political Science Association. 65(2). 434-438.

Frazier, J. A., & Snyder, E. E, (1991). The underdog concept in sport. Sociology of Sport Journal. 8. 380-388.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons

Kim, J., Allison, S. T., Eylon, D., Goethals, G., Markus, M., McGuire, H., & Hindle, S. (2008). Rooting for (and then Abandoning) the Underdog. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38, 2550-2573.

Vandello, J. A., Goldschmied, N., & Michniewicz, K. (2017). Underdogs as heroes. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership (pp. 339-355). New York, NY: Routledge.

Vandello, J. A., Goldschmied, N., & Richards, D. A. R. (2007). The Appeal of the underdog. Personality and Psychology Bulletin. 33(12). 1603-1616.

Section 4: Applications of Heroism

11

Heroism and Hofstede's Dimensions: A Cross-Cultural Analysis

ALEXA M. BERTRAND

Freedom is a right that many are denied, even now as we enter the decade of the 2020s. Freedom is an essential human right that many have struggled, fought, and died to preserve. Mahatma Gandhi and George Washington are no exception to this effort. In the years when the United States and India were under British rule, these men stood up for the rights of their countries and defended them tooth and nail. Many people owe their qualities of life to these men and few may acknowledge it. This research aims to shed light on what these men fought for, and how they became some of the world's most recognized and admired heroes.

HOFSTEDE'S DIMENSIONS

In the early 1970s, Geert Hofstede rounded up several data he had been compounding over the last five years in one of the most insightful and influential cross-cultural studies to date. Hofstede drew data from 116,000 IBM employees

around the world in 72 countries to analyze their workplace behavior and how they would like to interact with one another as well as their superiors. Primarily, Hofstede wanted to grasp "the way people in different countries perceive and interpret their world" (Hofstede, 1983). Hofstede was one of the first to conduct such a study aiming to shed light on differences between cultures and bring attention to value systems for theorists and researchers to take into account when collecting data.

Prior to Hofstede's work, statistically significant differences among populations of different origins would be accounted for as a "cultural variable" with no specific reasoning (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). Hofstede's work allowed the world to see the small intricacies of those populations that would cause these statistically significant results. Ultimately, Hofstede compiled his data to represent statistics of 50 countries differing across four cultural dimensions. The dimensions that distinctly came to view following close data analysis included: Power Distance Index, Individualism Index, Masculinity Index, and Uncertainty Avoidance Index (Hofstede, 1983).

In the field of heroism science, few scholars have studied the impact that culture has on the way societies in different geographic locations may perceive heroes (Allison, Goethals, & Kramer, 2017). Aspects that may make someone heroic in the United States may differ quite a bit from those that would predict heroes elsewhere. In a study concerning heroic perceptions of historical figures across 37 countries, several alarming data points arose. Muslim participants evaluated Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein significantly more positively than all participants of other backgrounds. However, all participants agreed that scientists Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein were remarkable heroes (Hanke et al., 2015). These data suggest that culture, specifically religious affiliation, may be a significant determinant in how individuals may be able to perceive arguably some of the world's most hated villains in a potentially positive manner. Conversely, extreme accolades in academia may simply be universally perceived as heroic. This study stresses the importance that culture may serve in a society deeming someone a hero.

In reference to the previous study mentioned, it may be interesting to analyze how cultures perceive heroes in reference to Allison and Goethals' (2011) proposed Great Eight traits of heroism. Perhaps these eight traits may vary across cultures, with some remaining similar and some being completely different. The eight traits describing heroes culminated in this study include: intelligent, strong, reliable,

resilient, caring, charismatic, selfless, and inspiring (Allison, Goethals, & Kramer, 2017). In relation to Hofstede's study, these traits of heroism may be fundamentally related to the cultural dimensions that Hofstede has determined per country.

In this chapter, we will first discuss Hofstede's four dimensions and the relationship that each holds with heroism. Then, we will look closely at two exemplars of heroism from vastly different cultures, George Washington and Mahatma Gandhi, to explore how and why they are seen as heroes today within their own cultures. In looking at these two heroes, we will discuss how their personal and situational qualities may predict the making of other heroes within their societies. Lastly, we will explore the heroism of other cultures that may be intriguing to analyze using Hofstede's dimensions and areas of future research.

POWER DISTANCE INDEX

Power distance refers to social inequality, particularly in relation to authority figures (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). A high power distance indicates that a society is highly stratified with a large degree of deference given to those of higher positions, while a low power distance indicates a society that is more equally leveled with subordinates maintaining a closer level of input to those of higher positions. High power distance cultures are often seen in those countries that still have some sort of caste system or extremely wide gaps between social classes. Low power distance is seen in more progressive countries where all opinions are perceived as valuable and society is less structured into classes. For example, Austria and Denmark have power distances of 11 and 18, respectively, ranking as some of the lowest power distances, while India has a power distance of 77, ranking as one of the highest (Hofstede, National Cultures in Four Dimensions: A Research-Based Theory of Cultural Differences among Nations, 1983).

Examples of power distance can often be seen in education, which as a child can significantly contribute to one's personal identity and formation of values. In countries of higher power distance, students are often encouraged to speak up and even challenge a teacher, in addition to education being student-centered and encouraging positive growth in a child's behavior. In countries of lower power distance, students must show the utmost respect to teachers and are rarely allowed to voice their opinions (Hofstede, 1986). Therefore, this measurement of

culture may be central to the perception of heroes in the degree that it plays in the development of the self in the relation to society. Heroes in cultures of low power distance may seem more relatable, further making the ordinary person believe that hero status is achievable, while the opposite may be seen for heroes in cultures of high power distance.

INDIVIDUALISM INDEX

Individualism refers to the "relationship between the individual and the group" (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). In other words, individualism speaks to the degree that an individual is free to act on his own free will and make decisions that may only benefit himself. A high level of individualism indicates a society where the benefits of the individual are taken into consideration before that of the group, in addition to loose ties to society as a whole with the freedom to move from in-group to in-group. A low level of individualism, otherwise known as collectivism, refers to a society where the best interest of the group is of higher importance than one's own self interest, and an individual is permanently tied to in-groups that expect ultimate loyalty (Hofstede, 1986). For example, countries of Latin America and East Asia are seen to have some of the lowest individualism scores with Guatemala and Indonesia ranking at 6 and 14, respectively, while the United States has the highest level of individualism at 91.

Perhaps the most blatant example of individualism relating to heroism is the concept of the "self-made man" or woman. Western culture has seen this sort of ideal across mass media, particularly in film and literature, as being wildly popular. These characters, either fictional or real, "transform themselves and their social situation through personal initiative" (Traube, 1989). In a study examining the differences and perceptions of the Disney version of Mulan in America, and the Chinese version of Mulan in China, significant disparities were found.

Primarily, the Disney version displays "a young lady coming of age...trying to find herself", a quote from Peter Schneider, director of films for Disney. Conversely, the story of Mulan in China is attributed more towards a young girl attempting to exhibit her patriotism to her country. Following viewing the their respective versions, American participants expressed thoughts and feelings of individualism, while Chinese participants expressed collectivism (Mo, 2015). This example shows

how the individualism index not only applies to culture, but is also widespread through media and is central to a society's concept of heroism and the purposes for doing heroic deeds.

Masculinity, in Hofstede's original terms, refers to the social implications of being born as a boy or girl (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). In later years, Hofstede has expanded this definition to include society's tendency to encourage assertiveness and self-reliance, rather than nurture and responsibility (Hofstede, 1983). Therefore, societies ranking with higher levels of masculinity tend to exhibit intense and firm leadership with fewer women in positions of power than countries with lower levels of masculinity, otherwise known as femininity. For example, Sweden is ranked the lowest in masculinity with a ranking of 5, while countries of Eastern Asia and countries recently occupied by Nazi Germany are ranked the highest with Japan and Austria ranked as the top two positions at 95 and 79, respectively.

Society often may make heroes out of powerful and innovative politicians or business leaders. In countries identified as more feminine, female heroes will tend to be more frequent as they have easier access to positions of power, allowing them to make some of these social or economic changes that may be perceived as heroic in comparison to countries that rank higher in masculinity. To give a little bit of perspective, in 2017, Sweden's governmental body was comprised of 43.6% women, while that of Japan was comprised of 9.3% ("Proportion of seats held," 2017). This staggering difference in percentage indicates that it would be much more difficult for women of Japan to make social change than women of Sweden, and could possibly be extrapolated to other dimensions of society. Therefore, the chances of women becoming heroes in Eastern Asian countries is drastically reduced in comparison to more progressive societies that have enjoyed some history of promoting gender equality.

Uncertainty avoidance refers to "the extent to which members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations" (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). This cultural dimension is perhaps the most centrally related to the idea of heroism, since risk is a key aspect to the definition of heroism (Allison, Goethals, & Kramer, 2017). Countries that have a higher ranking for uncertainty avoidance tend to discourage risk-taking behaviors and promote safety at all costs, while those with lower rankings tend to encourage risky decision-making and some may even encourage potential threats to one's safety to serve the greater good. Some examples include: Singapore and Denmark with scores of 8 and 23, respectively, while Guatemala and Uruguay have scores of 101 and 100, respectively. Although the reasoning for these countries having these scores seems convoluted, there is a basis.

With regard to an evolutionary perspective of heroism, Kafashan's kin selection theory may explain why countries of Latin America seem to rank the highest on uncertainty avoidance. Kin selection theory suggests that heroism often occurs when trying to protect one's kin to preserve their genetic contribution to society (Kafashan, Sparks, Rotella, & Barclay, 2015). The family unit in Latin America is arguably one of the strongest worldwide.

A study of the organization of Latin culture states that "families watch out for their members in return for loyalty." Outside of the family, Latin Americans tend to have a sense of distrust to all others who have not displayed undying loyalty (Osland, De Franco, & Osland, 2007). This insight suggests that Latin Americans are unlikely to engage in heroic behavior unless it is on behalf of their kin, therefore expressing high uncertainty avoidance. In addressing the other two rankings, Western European cultures tend to express firmness in business, as do countries of Eastern Asia, in addition to their profound sense of patriotism (Mo, 2015). These factors are all relevant in whether one will accept the risk of performing a heroic action.

In the next section, we will look more closely at Hofstede's dimensions in relation to the United States and India, which vary quite significantly. We will use George Washington and Mahatma Gandhi as examples to apply these dimensions

and draw conclusions on the implications that Hofstede's dimensions have in the perception of heroism within the context of these two countries.

THE UNITED STATES AND HOFSTEDE

The United States scores relatively low on Power Distance with a score of 40. The United States scores the highest of all 50 countries on Individualism with a score of 91. Slightly above average, the United States scores a 62 on Masculinity. Lastly, the United States scores in the mid-range of Uncertainty Avoidance with a 46.

The Case of George Washington

George Washington was born into a wealthy family in Virginia that was highly invested in the tobacco industry. His family had many connections and provided him with access to schooling. Upon the death of his father, his brother married into a very wealthy family, which afforded Washington the ability to learn complex subjects and pursue a career in surveying, otherwise known as map-making. Washington was a very bright young man, ultimately contributing to his strategic decision-making throughout his involvement with the birth of the United States as an independent nation.

George Washington's debut of heroism was during his commitment to his country in the French and Indian War. He left the war as a colonel in the Virginia military and made quite a name for himself. Shortly after, Washington was elected to the Virginia colonial legislature. He worked his way up to serve on the First Continental Congress and remained a vital part of the legislative group opposing the British in the American Revolution. During a congressional meeting in 1775, Washington was elected First General of the Continental Army. In a display of his humility, he refused pay for this position throughout the extent of the war.

Washington's initial efforts in the Revolution were met with great success. The army won several key battles under his leadership, such as the Battles of Trenton, Princeton, and notably, Saratoga. Following the Battle of Saratoga in 1777, Washington leveraged his connections with French officials to gain the support of the French army. Throughout the next few years, his soldiers experienced many hardships caused by illness, but Washington willed his men to fight

through the discouragement of quickly dwindling numbers of soldiers in their military.

In 1781, Washington and his men triumphantly defeated the British in the Battle of Yorktown, which resulted in the Treaty of Paris, recognizing the United States as an independent nation. Following the conclusion of the war, Washington assumed retirement and returned to his home in Virginia, much to the dismay of the public who expected him to become the leader of the newly formed nation. Upon the ratification of the Constitution in 1789, Washington was unanimously elected the first President of the United States. Washington's leadership as president reflected bipartisan values in constantly reasoning between the poor and rich economically. He served two terms as president and upon retiring, emphasized neutrality among political parties to serve the American people as best as possible (Huss, 2013).

As the leader of both the military and United States government, Washington displayed lower than average power distance by continually being directly involved in war even with the immense responsibility of serving as the nation's leader. Today, American leaders still reflect this dynamic with citizens. It is not uncommon to see an American president, senators, or representatives engaging with communities either through rallies, charitable efforts, and even social media. President Trump has notably used Twitter to engage with the public unlike any other government leader to date. "Mr. Trump's use of Twitter marked the culmination of two decades of change in the way politicians communicated with the public. That style has become more personal, more instantaneous" (Buncombe, 2018). This proximity between a leader with the American public shows how a low power distance has remained an integral part of American society from the era of George Washington to now.

Reflecting the American individualism score of 91, Washington characterized the American yearning for separation from British rule in leading the Revolution while also taking on this leadership position on his own. Washington's first term as President lacked much of the structure that American government has today. There were not as many Cabinet or departmental positions as are seen in the current government. Therefore, Washington had to display immense individualism to make positive decisions for the American people without much other support. In today's society, individualism is central to American culture. The First

Amendment of the Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, religion, press, and assembly to all Americans. "The subjective individualism of the First Amendment makes American society an open society" (Sanz, 2014). This openness of society allows Americans to explore individual identity and feel comfortable expressing that identity.

Washington's masculinity was particularly visible in constant negotiations with subordinates in the military as well as with his friends who had varying political views serving as his sole support system during his presidency (Huss, 2013). Washington had to maintain a fierce and assertive outlook as a leader so others would not cloud his judgment or potentially get in his way. In American society today, masculinity can often be seen in many business leaders and office cultures. Specifically, in business, Americans notably experience high levels of stress and are prone to mask weakness at all costs. Additionally, Americans often stray away from cooperation and when there are conflicts, prefer to address them head on (Fan & Zigang, 2004). This sort of assertive and confrontational behavior speaks to the higher than average masculinity score the United States attained in Hofstede's study.

Washington exhibited moderate uncertainty avoidance both in the war and as President. Knowing that the American military was less equipped than that of the British, Washington strategically calculated plans of attack. A noteworthy example is when Washington led his men across the Delaware during the night and across snow to ambush the British in the Battle of Trenton (Huss, 2013). Additionally, in knowing that the public strongly favored Washington to serve as President following the war, he expressed initial hesitance in taking on this role by retiring to his home only to be convinced into taking on the position.

Uncertainty avoidance can commonly be seen in American culture today in consumer purchases both in stores and online. American companies often provide a historical outlook on a company for reputable purposes, in addition to free help lines, frequently asked questions, customer reviews and more (Singh & Baack, 2017). Americans like to have some background knowledge before making purchasing decisions, however, many Americans also make impulse purchases. This tendency to want a small bit of information before making decisions reflects a medium uncertainty avoidance in American culture.

Hofstede and The Great Eight

The Great Eight traits of heroism are typically what is used now to describe the central features of a hero (Allison, Goethals, & Kramer, 2017). In referencing Hofstede's cultural dimensions and how they play into American heroism, we can attempt to find relations between each dimension and traits within the Great Eight. I believe that power distance is related closely with the intelligent and inspirational qualities of a hero. Those who are extremely intelligent and inspiring, as was Washington, seem almost on a higher level than the rest of society, therefore creating this idea of power distance. Americans often perceive heroes as being larger than life, especially with how they are received by society following their heroic deeds. This sort of societal response can almost elevate a hero from their once equal position, as reflected in the low score of the United States, to a higher-than-average power level, thus inducing this sense of power distance.

In relation to individualism, the Great Eight traits seem to stress a sense of collectivism. Perhaps this relationship contributes to why Americans perceive an individual as hero, since they are going against the norm of American culture. The traits I particularly see as relating to collectivism include the ideas of reliability, care, and selflessness, all exhibited by Washington. Americans are often preoccupied with their own affairs, which may contribute to the American perception of heroism. Those who sacrifice their individualism for others are few, therefore enhancing their sense of heroism to the American public.

I believe that masculinity is most closely related with the strength, resilience, and charismatic aspects of the Great Eight. Typical heroic figures of American culture are those who are not afraid to stand up to opposition and show that they are fierce. Washington clearly displays these traits in his opposition of the British through times of success and failure, as well as being elected to serve as the United States' first President. Throughout American pop culture and media, heroes who display a vast sense of masculinity are typically those that receive such high praise.

Lastly, I believe that uncertainty avoidance may only be related to intelligence. Those who have a high level of intelligence are able to critically analyze situations and make appropriate judgment calls concerning risk. Although Americans tend to avoid risk, perhaps what makes heroes so special in American culture is their

ability to take on risks even in the fear of the unknown. Washington strategically used his incredible intelligence to beat the British and liberate America. Kohen et al. (2017) alludes to the idea that many heroes often have some sort of special training that may even reduce their risk in situations requiring a hero, directly relating to the concept of uncertainty avoidance. Washington's previous experience in the military and with legislative bodies primed him to be exemplary in leading the American Revolution and serving as the first President. Many other American heroes have replicated this idea of heroism stemming from some special ability learned prior to their exhibition of their heroism.

India

INDIA AND HOFSTEDE'S DIMENSIONS

India has a high level of power distance, scoring at 77. In comparison to the United States, India has a much lower level of individualism, coming in as more of a collectivistic nation with a score of 48. Additionally, India has a slightly above average level of masculinity scoring at 56. India scores at a level of 40 for uncertainty avoidance, ranking as one of the countries with the lowest ranking.

Mahatma Gandhi

Mahatma Gandhi was born into a family that had very few material possessions and not much access to schooling. His father was the chief minister of their small principality, and his mother was very much absorbed in their Hindu-based religion. Gandhi went through a period of time in adolescence of rebellion only to be followed by a deep commitment of self-improvement. He found a way to get into college with a background of very little primary education and pursued a degree in law in England.

Upon returning to India, he found very little work and was forced to pursue a career in South Africa, also a colony of Britain at the time, where he was met with a lot of discrimination. Gandhi fought for the civil rights of Indians in South Africa and was met with a lot of opposition, sometimes even being physically beaten. He was absorbed in religious studies and ultimately took a mantra of "nonpossession" and "equability" (Nanda, 2018). Gandhi returned to India in January of 1915, where he gained traction as a political leader. As the British imposed ever increasing

repression on Indian citizens, Gandhi championed nonviolent protests against the British and was arrested. He remained in jail for two years and upon his release, found India to have taken many steps backward in its progression. In protest, he went on his renowned three-week fast and was ultimately named the president of the Congress party.

Gandhi led the well-known Salt March, defending the poor who had been imposed with a large tax increase on salt, with almost 100,000 people involved. Gandhi's efforts were centered around the desegregation of the Indian population and the "untouchables", those of the lowest caste (Nanda, 2018). Upon the start of World War II, the British aimed to reconcile with the Indians and allow them an independent state, so long as the Hindus and Muslims were separated, to Gandhi's dismay. This reconciliation resulted in the creation of India and Pakistan in August of 1947. He lived out the rest of his life opposing the animosity between Hindus and Muslims until he was assassinated on January 30, 1948 (Nanda, 2018).

Hofstede and Mahatma Gandhi

Gandhi was born into a middle class family and slowly rose through the caste system to become one of the most powerful political leaders in India. The power distance in India was depicted clearly in the British's attempts to segregate and dehumanize the poor, known as the "untouchables" (Nanda, 2018). Gandhi made it his life's work to fight against this extreme degree of power distance. In India today, power distance is exemplified by how an individual responds to another's accessories. For example, a rural cyclist will dismount his bike to stand attention to a passing Jeep, which is a symbol of a government official. Additionally, one who wears a white khadi, typical dress of an Indian "VIP", demands immediate obedience and preferential treatment wherever he may go. Through these behaviors, one can easily see that high power distance dominates Indian culture even today (Raghunathan, 2011).

Similar to India's relative score of collectivism, Gandhi fought for the rights of the "untouchables" most notably through the Salt March, which would not serve him or the members of his caste in any way. Gandhi aimed to better society as a whole rather than simply just himself on an individual level. Collectivism in Indian culture is most notably seen in family dynamics. Families often live together among three or even four generations, and each family member's decisions are usually

made together as a family in the hopes of benefitting the whole family. These decisions often center around career choices, religious preferences, and even marriage (Chadda & Deb, 2013).

Slightly more feminine than Washington, Gandhi pursued his political and social agenda through nonviolent ways and always discouraged violence. He was a man of a peaceful nature and encouraged the reconciliation of differences between two opposing parties. Among Indian workplaces, this sense of a medium degree of masculinity can be seen. Businessmen of India have consistently showed more interest in quality of life and personal relationships, while women have slowly been beginning to grow in numbers in top management positions of Indian firms (Ganesh & Ganesh, 2014). This change in a trend towards gender equality, shows that Indian culture is moving more progressively towards femininity rather than high masculinity, as in the United States.

Most notably, Gandhi displayed lower than average uncertainty avoidance with his incredible will to take risks. India was severely unequipped to face the heavily armed British in the hopes of gaining independence, yet Gandhi was not phased. He met the opposition with great strength and always stood his ground. India's risk-taking behavior can clearly be seen in it's deep desire to grow economically. Indian banks maintain high competition and are constantly engaging in risky behavior to provide those seeking loans with funds to promote economic growth (Sarkar & Sensarma, 2016). India has notably taken on business from multiple multinational companies and welcomed them into the economy without hesitation. The country is eager to expand its economy and compete as a world leader, therefore promoting risk-taking, or low uncertainty avoidance.

Hofstede and The Great Eight

Relative to the discussion in the section covering the United States, I believe that some of the relationships between the Great Eight and Hofstede's dimensions remain the same, while others differ in the Indian context. I do believe that the intelligent and inspirational traits of a hero relate to power distance in India, however, I would also venture to add the strength aspect. In Indian culture, those of lower castes appear to be weak. I would venture to say that those of higher castes, or of higher power in this context, are seen to be very strong

and powerful. Gandhi represented these three traits in relation to power distance. He was very bright, inspirational to most members of the Indian community, and displayed immense mental strength through constant fasting and standing up to formidable opposition. In extrapolating this idea to Indian heroism, I believe that it may be harder for those of lower castes to achieve a degree of heroism as many may feel discouraged by a lack of credibility. Being of a higher caste may be a strong predictor of heroism in Indian culture.

Contrary to the individualist nature of the United States, I believe the collectivist nature of India lends itself more to the reliable, caring, and selfless traits of the Great Eight. Gandhi exemplified all of these traits to their highest extent. He did not have to fight for the poor, as he was not a member of that caste, yet he felt strongly about equality for all. He represented the pinnacle of the collectivist nature of India. I feel that Indian heroism is centered around the necessity to live up to the Indian expectation of a collectivistic nature on a larger scale. Heroism in India resides on the basis of doing more for others besides simply one's family and extended family.

Additionally, the slight femininity of India is also related to the same three traits of collectivism. Gandhi represented a nurturing nature, specifically in choosing to reside in villages of the poor and constantly providing nursing to his sick father and wife in their late lives (Nanda, 2018). Those who admire Gandhi specifically speak of his kind and gentle nature. However, he also maintained a degree of masculinity, refusing to back down from the enormous challenge of gaining Indian independence. I believe that heroism in India may also be based on a perfect mixture of assertiveness and placidity.

Lastly, to address India's low uncertainty avoidance, I believe the trait of resiliency is highly related. Since Indians are prone to taking risk, they must possess the ability to arise from failures quickly and remain steadfast to their goals. Gandhi exhibited this quality throughout his multiple arrests, only to return to the political sphere and continue on in his fight for freedom for all. I do not believe that all people can possess this quality. Perhaps what makes an Indian hero so otherworldly is his ability to continue reaching towards a goal, even in the face of many obstacles that may seem difficult to overcome.

In challenging the Great Eight in an Indian context, I believe charisma is an after-effect of displays of heroism. Gandhi did not have a strong following at the beginning of his plight. He gained this following through his publicized struggles. He had to convince society to believe in his cause and join the movement. Additionally, I believe that in Indian culture, the trait of humility is central to the Great Eight. Gandhi lived by a mantra of not owning any material possessions and would return any funds he received to the benefit of others. Humility, I believe, is central to the collectivistic and feminine aspects of Indian heroism. This practice is ultimately what made him so admirable as not only a leader, but a hero.

CONCLUSION

The research on India and the United States provides valuable insights in cultural differences predicting and producing heroism. Although fighting for closely the same cause, there are vast differences between the behaviors that George Washington took and those that Mahatma Gandhi took in achieving fruition. I believe that these differences are fundamental examples of how cultures may differ in their production and reverence of heroes. In these in-depth case analyses, I have shed light on the importance of Hofstede's cultural dimensions in the cultures of these two nations and how they relate to heroism. As a result of these dimensions, the Great Eight may be subjected to potential changes cross-culturally.

I argue that the progression of heroism science would benefit strongly from the application of Hofstede's dimensions and deep analysis of heroes in other cultural contexts. I would be particularly interested in addressing heroism in countries that have a perplexing mixture of scores across Hofstede's dimensions. One area of possible future research would be the study of heroism in Latin America. The contrast between low scores of individualism and high scores of masculinity is intriguing in exploring the development of heroes. For example, Venezuela has a score of 12 for individualism, while having a score of 73 for masculinity (Hofstede, 1983).

Furthermore, it may be interesting to address cultures where Hofstede's dimensions seem to no longer apply. In the 1983 study performed by Hofstede, Yugoslavia was named one of the 50 countries (Hofstede, 1983). I would be very interested to

examine how the divide between this conglomerate of nations has affected these cultural dimensions, or if it has at all. It may also be interesting to analyze these dimensions within countries Hofstede did not analyze. A particular region that comes to mind is Eastern Europe with its recent economic boom and progression into the world economy.

This research has just opened the door to possibilities of cross-cultural analyses in heroism science. I believe there is much work to be done in this area, particularly in countries that have growing populations and are progressing developmentally. Future research should look towards extrapolating the Great Eight and definitions of heroism cross-culturally to see if there are any disparities. Perceptions of heroism differ from person to person, naturally they would differ across cultures. Cultural differences affect psychology in profound ways, it is of much value to see how they affect heroism science.

REFERENCES

Allison, S. T., & Goethals, G. R. (2011). Heroes: What they do and why we need them. New York: Oxford University Press.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Kramer, R. M. (Eds.) (2017). Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Kramer, R. M. (2017). Setting the scene the rise and coalescence of heroism science. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., Marrinan, A. R., Parker, O. M., Spyrou, S. P., Stein, M. (2019). The metamorphosis of the hero: Principles, processes, and purpose. Frontiers in Psychology.

Buncombe, A. (2018, January 17). Donald trump one year on: How the twitter president changed social media and the country's top office. Retrieved from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/the-twitter-president-   how-potus-changed-social-media-and-the-presidency-a8164161.html

Chadda, R. K., & Deb, K. S. (2013). Indian family systems, collectivistic society and psychotherapy. Indian J Psychiatry, 55(2), 299-309.

Fan, P., & Zigang, Z. (2004). Cross-cultural challenges when doing business in china. Singapore Management Review, 26(1), 81-90.

Ganesh, S., & Ganesh, M. P. (2014). Effects of masculinity-femininity on quality of work life understanding the moderating roles of gender and social support. Gender in Management, 29(4), 229-253.

Goethals, G. R., & Allison, S. T. (2014). Kings and charisma, Lincoln and leadership: An evolutionary perspective. In Goethals, G. R., et al. (Eds.), Conceptions of leadership: Enduring ideas and emerging insights. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hanke, K., Liu, J. H., Sibley, C. G., Paez, D., Gaines Jr., S. O., Moloney, G., et al. (2015). "Heroes" and "villains" of world history across cultures. PLOS ONE, 1-21.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural difference in teaching and learning. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. International Studies of Management & Organization, 13(1/2), 46-74.

Hoyt, C. L., Allison, S. T., Barnowski, A., & Sultan, A. (2020). Lay theories of heroism and leadership: The role of gender, communion, and agency. Social Psychology.

Huss, D. (2013). George washington (1732–1799). Retrieved from http://www.crfcelebrateamerica.org/index.php/holiday-heroes/89-george-washington

Kafashan, S., Sparks, A., Rotella, A., & Barclay, P. (2015). Why heroism exists evolutionary perspectives on extreme helping. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Kohen, A., Langdon, M., & Riches, B. R. (2017). The making of a hero: Cultivating empathy, altruism, and heroic imagination. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1-17.

Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2011). The evolution of hofstede's doctrine. Cross Cultural Management, 18(1), 10-20.

Mo, W. (2015). A cross-cultural analysis of disney mulan film and chinese mulan drama impacts on chinese audience's attitude (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from http://dspace.bu.ac.th/bitstream/123456789/1740/1/Wenmin.mo.pdf

Nanda, B. (2018, October 26). Mahatma gandhi. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mahatma-Gandhi

Osland, J. S., De Franco, S., & Osland, A. (2007). Organizational implications of latin american culture: Lessons for the expatriate manager. Economia e Gestão, 7(14), 109-120.

Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%). (2017). Retrieved from https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SG.GEN.PARL.ZS

Raghunathan, V. (2011, June 25). Power distance index and corruption. Retrieved from https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/opinion/et-commentary/power-distance-index-and-corruption/articleshow/8985180.cms

Sanz, E. (2014). The first amendment and cultural creation. Retrieved from https://law.yale.edu/system/files/area/center/isp/documents/esteve_sanz_-_the_first_amendment_and_cultural_creation_-_fesc.pdf

Sarkar, S., & Sensarma, R. (2016). The relationship between competition and risk-taking behaviour of indian banks. Journal of Financial and Economic Policy, 8(1), 95-119.

Singh, N., & Baack, D. W. (2017). Web site adaptation: A cross-cultural comparison of u.s. and mexican web sites. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 9(4).

Traube, E. G. (1989). Secrets of success in postmodern society. Cultural Anthropology, 273-300.

12

Heroic Transformation of Setting: The Relationship between the Hero and Her Environment

SHARON H. SHIN

Becoming a hero is a paradox.
To be a hero in your society, you must first leave it.
You must be willing to separate yourself from the place you love
To advance it.
Growing apart to be better together.
You will need to become independent from your society,
Letting go of many of the ideas and beliefs you've learned from it.
Distancing yourself from everything you once believed and embraced.
To be a hero, you will change in ways you've never expected.
You'll have adventures and thrills in your new environment
That you'll remember for the rest of your life.
You'll feel emotions you've never felt before.
You'll face the fears that agonize and pain you.

And you will become better than ever.
In the end, you'll appreciate your journey because you've gained the ability
To save and transform your society back home.
But when you come back, you'll realize that your perception of home has changed.
Is home the place you've known and loved your whole life?
Or is it the place where you've grown and learned to become your best self?
Your heart longs for home.
But where your heart longs for is unclear.

Heroic transformation is central to heroism because it marks the hero's coming of age, fosters emotional healing, cultivates social unity, and advances their society (Allison & Goethals, 2017). The transformation prepares the hero to ultimately return home to impart their knowledge and wisdom with their society, pushing them to grow just as the hero did. To continue advancing, societies require brave and passionate heroes who are willing to go through a transformation.

The three aspects of the hero's transformation are the transformation of setting, transformation of self, and transformation of society. By first experiencing a new setting, the hero is able to transform themselves, and by transforming themselves, they, in turn, are able to transform their society. Each step is important and produces the next. Without one, the other steps in the transformation process cannot happen (Allison & Goethals, 2017; Allison, Goethals, & Kramer, 2017).

In this chapter, we will be focusing on the transformation of setting, the first and foundational step of the hero's journey (Allison & Goethals, 2017). The change in setting occurs when the individual leaves their home and finds themselves in a new environment (Allison, Goethals, & Spyrou, 2019). The novel setting is fascinating, awe striking, and challenges the hero to step out of their comfort zones and grow. Though there are many ways a transformation of setting can lead to self-change, we will be focusing on a select few, and how these factors shape the individual to grow, learn, and ultimately become a hero.

BENEFITS OF A CHANGE IN SETTING

Being in a new setting challenges the hero to consider ways of thinking they've never considered before. In a new place far away from home, they must be willing to make the effort to shift their perspectives to adapt and persevere in their new environment. This step is critical to the hero's journey because it leads them to the face the fact that their way of thinking is not universal and superior. By being exposed to newfound ideas and beliefs in their new environment, they begin to understand that there are other perspectives out there in the world that are valid and worth integrating into their own lives. Upon this realization that the world is full of reasonable world views they've not thought of before, the hero is challenged to consider the reasonability of their own world view. This stage challenges the foundations of the hero's beliefs, shaking the hero to their core, testing which beliefs and ideas the hero is willing to leave behind and which the hero stays loyal to.

Thus, the change in setting is the first point in the hero's journey where they begin to transform mentally. With an inundation of new information surrounding them, they are tasked with the test of growing in a setting where everything is unfamiliar and strange. They are challenged to embrace a cosmopolitan mindset in their new setting where they can entertain, understand, and accept new ideas not previously held by their previous society. Engulfed with ideas that progress and challenge them, the hero learns to embrace and adopt different perspectives. In a new setting, the hero can implement new ideas, beliefs, and perspectives into their life that will ultimately advance their home society.

THE GREATNESS OF GINSBURG

Ruth Bader Ginsburg, America's second female Supreme Court Justice embodies this shift in perspectives through her experience of a change in setting. As a female growing up in a time without gender equality, she was discouraged from deviating from the societal norm for women and was actively barred from career opportunities due to her gender. As one of nine females in her class at Harvard Law School, she was openly criticized and shamed for taking a spot in the class meant for a man (Lepore, 2018).

As disgruntled as she was with the gender norms in the USA, her transformation of self did not occur until she experienced a change in setting upon her visit to Sweden. While working in Sweden on a book about civil procedures, she noticed that "between 20 and 25 percent of the law students in Sweden were women" (Galanes, 2015). Additionally, Ginsburg noted that while it was nonexistent in the United States, in Sweden, there were "women on the bench" (Galanes, 2015). While she was discriminated against and actively put down for her gender while pursuing a career in law in the United States, Ruth realized this inequality did not exist in other countries. She realized that it was possible for a country to embrace gender equality. There existed a world where women were supported and respected for being independent and pursuing their own careers.

Her trip to Sweden was the beginning of her hero's journey- she was introduced to new perspectives on gender roles, and she began to take note that women in other countries were being treated with equality and respect. Since then, Ruth Bader Ginsburg has been a champion for equal rights and opportunities for both men and women. By going to Sweden, Ruth was introduced to a new way of life that inspired her in how she viewed law. To Ginsburg, law was no longer something that was specifically catered to men. Rather, law was an area that offered her the ability to transform and progress the rights and opportunities women had.

In a new place, if a hero cannot be to be open-minded in their perspectives, they ultimately will not be able to become a hero. Subsequently, if they cannot come to appreciate new ideas and perspectives, they cannot effect change in their societies back home. A transformation in setting is critical to the hero's journey because it introduces new ideas, beliefs, and perspectives that captivate and challenge the hero. Without an appreciation of the newfound perspectives and beliefs in their new setting, the hero is limited in their abilities to grow and transform themselves.

In addition to experiencing a mental transformation in a new setting, the hero experiences a physical one as well. By being in a new setting, they can experience new ventures they would not have been able to in their own society. They can try new things, see new sights, and be engulfed in feelings of amazement and wonder. As these new adventures are often exciting and thrilling, the hero becomes more willing to step out of their comfort zones to try new things, a key component to the hero's journey. By opening up to the unknown and widening their scope of

willingness, the hero learns to embrace events that challenge and stimulate them. This eagerness, in turn, leads to the development of new heroic qualities such as being daring, being calm under pressure, and having confidence in their abilities and skills. If the hero can step out of their comfort zone to try new things, they may, as a result, also be more likely to step out of their comfort zone to help someone in need.

A key event the hero will face in their new setting while having new experiences is the necessity for self-reflection. As they will be inundated with hidden meanings, details, and symbols, they will need time to consolidate the information they are receiving. As these events may lead to contradictions and bouts of confusion, the hero will experience inner conflicts and turmoil they will need to address. To avoid having moments of cognitive dissonance, the hero will need to take a step back and allow themselves to process their emotions and thoughts (Allison, Beggan, & Efthimiou, 2019; Allison & Goethals, 2017). Through self-reflection methods, such as mindful meditation, the hero will be able to understand and make sense of their new knowledge, ultimately being able to "act in accord with their moral ideals" (Jones, 2017, p. 3). By being open about the feelings and experiences they are having, the hero is able to be vulnerable about their struggles and accept growth.

As thrilling as many of the experiences they will face will be, there will also be trials and tribulations that the hero will struggle through. When they are faced with encountering some of their greatest fears, the hero will need to address and confront the areas of their lives that they've avoided and suppressed. The trials that they face will require them to be open and willing to face their fears, challenging them to look deep within themselves to find a strength they did not know was there. Through the practice of self-reflection and connecting to their inner self, the hero will be able to find their inner courage to rise above what terrifies them.

THE REMARKABLE REMY FROM RATATOUILLE

An example of a hero who undergoes new experiences is Remy from the Disney movie, Ratatouille (Lewis & Bird, 2007). As a rat who aspires to be a chef, he is

exhilarated when he realizes he is in Paris. In fact, a key moment in the movie is when he climbs up onto the roof and is immersed in feelings of awe and wonder when he sees the Eiffel Tower and the skyline of Paris. As Remy is full of joy as he admires the bright lights and beautiful city, he notices that he is above his role model, Gusteau's, restaurant. This realization and overwhelming excitement about being in a new environment encourages Remy to go inside the restaurant and explore, a feat he would not have done previously.

Along with giving Remy the courage to go inside the restaurant, the change in setting also gives Remy the opportunity to cook in Gusteau's restaurant. Given the resources and the means to cook dishes he's always wanted to make, he is able to hone his cooking skills, practicing new techniques and flavor combinations. His dishes are met with raving reviews and help mend the diminishing reputation of Gusteau's restaurant. However, despite his gifts and skills, Remy is plagued throughout his journey by his fear that, as a rat, he will never be able to be taken seriously by the high-status cooking community (Lewis & Bird, 2007).

At the end of the movie, when Remy is exposed, he experiences his greatest fear: every employee in the restaurant was disappointed and quit because they did not want to be associated with a rat. They did not believe in his ability to succeed and dismissed him because he wasn't a human. Despite Remy's gift in cooking, his status as a rat prevented the employees from treating him with respect and consideration (Lewis & Bird, 2007).

However, in the moment when he is offered the decision of leaving to go back home to his family or to stay and finish the task of cooking for Paris' harshest food critic, Ego, Remy takes up the challenge and chooses the latter. Throughout the movie, we see him connecting to his deeper self, such as when he talks to the imaginary Gusteau in his mind about his fears about being exposed and rejected by humans (Lewis & Bird, 2007). With a guide to his inner thoughts, we see that though he is afraid that he will be belittled for being a rat, he comes to the point where he is willing to try despite his fears. Through learning new techniques in the kitchen and perfecting recipes, Remy learned to find his worth in himself instead of from others.

As Remy experienced, a change in setting allows for experiences the hero would not have had back in their homes. However, this change comes with the catch

that they will need to face the fears they were able to avoid before. A change in setting is inundated with new feelings, sensations, and emotions that need to be processed. Through connecting to their deeper self through methods of self-reflection, the hero is ultimately able to conquer their fears and move forward in their lives.

THE COURAGEOUS CARL WILKENS

In a new setting, the hero will encounter people who are different from them. Whether it is ethnicity, cultural beliefs, or religion, there will always be a factor that will divide the hero from their new community. While it has become normalized in our society to accept these barriers, the hero must be willing to reject this societal norm and aim to break down these barriers. Through spending time with, listening to, and understanding the "other," the hero is able to connect to and feel in community with their newfound group.

An example of a hero who overcame the boundaries between themselves and their new community is Carl Wilkens. Wilkens stayed behind in Rwanda during the 1994 Genocide to ensure the well-being of his two employees. With the US closing their embassy in the country and all the other Americans leaving, Wilkens risked his life at a time where everyone else chose to flee for safety. In fact, after the border closed, Wilkens was the only American to stay in Rwanda. In addition to risking his life by being potentially persecuted in the genocide, Wilkens also further endangered himself by helping and sheltering refugees (Kohen, Langdon, & Riches, 2017, p. 5).

When he was later asked about why he decided to stay, he shared that he was fearful and regretted his decision at times. Wilkens shared that he felt that he made a mistake for endangering his life when he had a family back home that he loved and cared about. However, when he thought about his two employees, his fears disappeared, and he was reminded of why he decided to stay (Kohen et al., 2017, p. 6).

In his thought process, it is evident that though initially he felt inclined to divide himself from the Rwandans, he actively changed his mind set to make that division went away. This decision to stay highlights Wilkens' courage and lack of

distinction between himself and the Rwandan community. To him, people were people who needed protection during a time of tribulation. There was no "we" vs. "them". It was people who were being persecuted, and people who had the means and abilities to help.

While the Americans leaving understood that the people of Rwanda were in danger, they did not fully connect to their community to feel obliged to stay. Unfortunately, this attitude is human nature. We are more likely to help people who are like us than people who are not (Kafashan, Sparks, Rotella, & Barclay, 2017, p. 38). As it is a natural tendency to draw lines, it is heroic and brave when an individual is willing to help regardless of these lines.

This phenomenon is also observed in Ratatouille. With Remy being a rat and Alfredo Linguini being a human, there were many initial struggles. First, since rats are the main vermin in the kitchen, Linguini struggled to accept Remy as a chef. Remy, in turn, also struggled to trust Linguini because Remy was told all his life about how cruel humans were. However, despite the initial stereotypes they used to judge one another, the pair eventually realized the stereotypes were false, and they began to appreciate one another's inner qualities

Through communication and acceptance, the pair were able to overcome the barriers of "us" and "them". In a world where they were discouraged from associating with one another, they broke down barriers to build a friendship. Even though they should have been mortal enemies, the change in setting for Remy led them to develop a friendship they would not have otherwise had. Between them, there was no "us" and "them." Regardless of species, stereotypes, and initial hesitations, they chose to be friends who cared about and supported one another (Lewis & Bird, 2007).

OPENNESS TO TRANSFORMATION

Being in a new setting paves the way for the hero to be more open to transformation. In a new place, they will have to learn to be independent and autonomous. Through this change, they are more likely to make decisions on their own behalf and not be swayed by others. Furthermore, as they are independent from their

society back home, the hero may feel more comfortable making decisions based on their own inclinations rather than making decisions society wants them to make. By being in a new society, the hero is no longer obligated to follow their previous society's expectations. They can act however they want, say whatever they want, and do whatever they want without the consequences that they would have faced back home. With a newfound appreciation to deviate from the norm, the hero can explore new limits that they were once banned from crossing. This newfound freedom leads to a transformation of self because the hero is no longer bound by what their society dictates is right and wrong. They are able to develop their own values independently from society.

There are both purposeful and accidental impediments by society to deter individuals from becoming heroes. Whether it is on purpose or not, it is evident that the social environment is a powerful motivator for individuals to act in ways that they would not have otherwise (Parks, 2017). Therefore, by being in a new environment that does not enforce the values of the previous society, the individual may be more likely to stray from their previous society's expectations. A transformation in setting may encourage the hero to explore their options in their behaviors and actions, leading them to become more comfortable with doing acts of heroism that were once suppressed by society.

Furthermore, a transformation in setting may not only dissolve the pressures of the hero's previous society, but it may also promote acts that are heroic. For example, the new environment may challenge the hero to behave in ways that are in more line with heroism. Therefore, upon arriving back home, the hero may exhibit the behaviors that they learned in their new setting. The power of a social environment is evident in how it can suppress acts of heroism. However, in the opposite way, a social environment can also promote acts of heroism. Though the social environment may be harmful to heroism at times, it is possible that being in a new environment can be helpful to the development of heroism.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg experienced the power of a social environment and subsequently exhibited changes from when she came back from Sweden. Though she used to fall in line with what society ordered females to do, after her trip, she began to deviate from the norm. By being in Sweden, a country where the gender norms of the USA were not enforced, Ginsburg felt more comfortable opening up to and exploring the areas of gender rights. As she was in a new environment with no

social consequences for being a woman, she was encouraged to become bolder and more grounded in her beliefs about women's rights (Galanes, 2015).

In her time in Sweden, Ginsburg interacted with women who were lawyers and even saw a woman in court working while she was eight months pregnant. This experience may have led to an epiphany for Ginsburg because it reminded her of her own experience when she purposefully hid the fact that she was pregnant from the university that she worked at because she was afraid of being fired from her position as a professor. While it was an offense that constituted job termination in the USA, being pregnant while working was something Sweden encouraged and protected (Lepore, 2018). The duality of being a woman who was appreciated both at home and in the workforce solidified Ginsburg's beliefs of the necessity of gender equality.

Therefore, by experiencing a social environment where women were equal to men in their rights and protections, Ruth was able to return home with courage and passion to transform gender rights. Though she was previously hesitant to speak up against the crowd due to being afraid to make waves, Ginsburg began to actively champion for equal rights after her transformation of setting. By experiencing a new norm, Ginsburg was able to shift from her previous society's perspective to the perspective that she wanted to embrace. In her new setting, Ginsburg found her courage to speak out against the crowd.

HOW THE SETTING DETERMINES HEROISM

As the first step in the hero's transformation, the transformation of setting determines whether the individual will become a hero or not. The setting is where they will be taught life lessons, inspired, and motivated to grow. They will be encouraged to embrace the new principles they learn in their new setting, implementing these notions into their life. They will have the choice of whether to grow or whether to stay stagnant: the choice of being egocentric and consider their own needs, or sociocentric and consider their society's needs (Allison, 2019; Allison & Goethals, 2017). The setting is also where they will learn the most about themselves and their society back home. It will be the place where the individual realizes that both they and their society are broken in some way, and that they both require transformation. In the new setting, the individual will be confronted with the notion that a change is

necessary and essential for advancement. It will be up to them to accept the hard truth that they will need to personally transform to advance their society. It will be a difficult and often remorseful feat- accepting that the society one grew up in is imperfect, and they are the only one who can do something about it.

The setting will also challenge the hero by bringing out their biggest fears and hurdles. In the moment, the individual will have two choices: running from or running towards the fear. By running towards their fear, they will ultimately be able to confront their fears, overcome them, and grow to be a stronger person. However, by running away, they may lose their chance at heroism. As a hero is someone who enhances, models morals to, and protects others, it is important that they learn to stand their ground when they are afraid (Kinsella, Ritchie, & Igou, 2017, p. 26). It is crucial that they can conquer their fears before helping and protecting others from theirs.

To enhance others, the individual must be able to enhance the areas where they need personal development. To model morals to others, they must be able to first stick to their own morals and follow them wherever they lead. To protect others, the hero must reach a level of selflessness where they value the lives of others equally to their own life. The setting in the hero's journey is juxtaposing because it will simultaneously be where they have the best and worst moments in their life.

CONCLUSION

The setting is where the hero's journey begins. It is the place where the individual must adapt from an individualistic perspective to a group-oriented perspective. As a hero, they must sacrifice their wants to benefit the entire group. They must be willing to set an example by being the first to put their lives and reputations on the line for what they believe in (Decter-Frain, Vanstone, & Frimer, 2017, p. 129). The ultimate marker of an individual becoming a hero is them returning to their society back home with a new way of thinking. With this change in perspective, they will be able to notice the cracks in society others have not seen, give ideas to problems others have not thought of, and advance society forward with their newfound knowledge and life experiences.

Heroic transformation involves a bit of a juxtaposition. By leaving their old traits behind in their new setting and bringing back their skills, beliefs, and perspectives home, the hero simultaneously exists in two planes. They exist as their old selves in their new society, and they exist as their new selves in their old society. Though it sounds lonely, this simultaneous existence may be a good thing. By existing in multiple places, the hero can connect to various societies around the world. They no longer belong to one place. Rather, they belong to the world, ready to help and transform where help is needed.

REFERENCES

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2019). Heroic transformation: How heroes change themselves and the world. Richmond: Palsgrove.

Allison, S. T., Beggan, J. K., & Efthimiou, O. (2019). The art and science of heroism and heroic leadership. Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers.

Allison, S. T., & Goethals, G. R. (2017). The hero's transformation. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Kramer, R. M. (Eds.) (2017). Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Kramer, R. M. (2017). Setting the scene: The rise and coalescence of heroism science. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., Goethals, G. R., & Spyrou, S. P. (2019). Donald Trump as the archetypal puer aeternus: The psychology of mature and immature leadership. In K. Bezio & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), Leadership and populism. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Beggan, J. K., & Allison, S. T. (Eds.) (2018). Leadership and sexuality: Power, principles, and processes. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Decter-Frain, A., Vanstone, R., & Frimer, J.A. (2017). Why and how groups create moral heroes. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Galanes, P. (2015, November 14). Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Gloria Steinem on the Unending Fight for Women's Rights. The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/15/fashion/ruth-bader-ginsburg-and-gloria-steinem-on-the-unending-fight-for-womens-rights.html

Goethals, G. R., & Allison, S. T. (2019). The romance of heroism and heroic leadership: Ambiguity, attribution, and apotheosis. West Yorkshire: Emerald.

Hoyt, C. L., Allison, S. T., Barnowski, A., & Sultan, A. (2020). Lay theories of heroism and leadership: The role of gender, communion, and agency. Social Psychology.

Jones, P. (2017). Mindfulness-based heroism: Creating enlightened heroes. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 58(5), 1-24.

Kohen, A., Langdon, M., & Riches, B.R. (2017). The making of a hero: Cultivating empathy, altruism, and heroic imagination. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1-17.

Kafashan, S., Sparks, A., Rotella, A., & Barclay, P. (2017). Why heroism exists: Evolutionary perspectives on extreme helping. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Kinsella, E.L., Ritchie, T.D., & Igou, E.R. (2017). Attributes and applications of heroes: A brief history of lay and academic perspectives. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

Lepore, J. (2018, October 8). Ruth Bader Ginsburg's unlikely path to the Supreme Court. The New Yorker. Retrieved from https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/10/08/ruth-bader-ginsburgs-unlikely-path-to-the-supreme-court

Lewis, B. (Producer), & Bird, B. (Director). (2007). Ratatouille [Motion picture]. United States: Buena Vista Pictures.

Parks, C.D. (2017). Accidental and purposeful impediments to heroism. In S. T. Allison, G. R. Goethals, & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), Handbook of heroism and heroic leadership. New York: Routledge.

13

Heroic Pursuits of Scientific Knowledge

E. H. HA

What is science? We define it as knowledge or a system of knowledge covering general truths or the operation of general laws especially as obtained and tested through the scientific method (Merriam-Webster, 2019a). What is the scientific method? It refers to principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formulation of a problem, the collection of data through observation and experimentation, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses (Merriam-Webster, 2019b). At what point is observational evidence considered to be sufficient enough to cross over to becoming a theory? Can we really know the scientific truth about the world when it is impossible to observe every aspect of the world? How and when do we know the officially abandon one theory in favor of another one? Is there really a one "correct" way of doing science?

As one can see, the relativity of the definition of the term "science" can be difficult to determine and is still up for debate on how to perform "good" science in

the pursuit of knowledge. "Science" comes from the Latin word Scientia, which is referred to the results of logical demonstrations that revealed general and necessary truths (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). Before we had the specific disciplines of science that we know of today, science in the 17th century was called "natural philosophy" (i.e. physics, astronomy, other inquiries into the causes of things) or "natural history" (i.e. botany, zoology, and other descriptions of the contents of the world).

Over time, science developed the need for observation and experimentation and the current understanding of the term "science" are products of the 19th century. Science is something that descends from specific people and places (i.e. Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, etc.), including the scientific field itself. Given the unwieldy beast that is the philosophy of science, many philosophers of science have and are currently still trying to debating on how to go about what is the best way to go about science. One of many science philosophers who have tried to answer this question is Thomas Kuhn (1962) with his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, which arguably has changed the entire field of science and was crafted in a uniquely heroic way.

Philosopher of science Karl Popper, an academic rival of Kuhn, proposed that a good scientist is someone who can come up with imaginative, creative, risky ideas and is willing to subject these imaginative ideas to rigorous critical testing (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). One pertinent risky example of this is Philip Zimbardo's Stanford Prison experiment, which served as a substantial beginning for social and moral psychology. Though Zimbardo was painted in a negative light due to the consequences of the study, Zimbardo was arguably heroic in certain lights as well. Throughout this chapter, I will elaborate on the heroic themes that Thomas Kuhn and Philip Zimbardo have embodied in pursuit of the Truth in the grand scheme of scientific knowledge by using the social influence-based taxonomy of heroes (Allison & Goethals, 2013; Goethals & Allison, 2012; Allison & Green, 2020).

THOMAS KUHN: DEFINING SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

Thomas Kuhn was an American historian of science whose 1962 book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* was arguably one of the most influential works of history and philosophy written in the 20th century (Britannica, 2018). Since its publication,

the view of science by philosophers, historians, and sociologist has drastically changed and shattered traditional myths about how scientific behavior has little to do with traditional philosophical theories of rationality and knowledge (Godfrey-Smith, 2008).

Kuhn (1962) made claims on how science operates and drew philosophical conclusions form these claims. Though it was controversial and influential, Kuhn showed how interesting it is to mix history and psychology of science with questions about evidence and justification (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). In other words, though scientists and some philosophers like Popper emphasize that the rigidity of science is what makes scientific progress successful, Kuhn argues the arbitrary, personal natural of factors that often influence scientific decisions are actually key to science's success. Without flexibility, scientific research would not have proceeded as effectively as it has done so far. Kuhn also popularized the term "paradigm", which he talks about in a broad and narrow sense. A paradigm is a whole way of doing science in some particular field, or a whole package of claims about the world with methods for gathering and analyzing data. Kuhn also wrote that not all science needs a paradigm, and that each scientific field has an additional state called the "pre-paradigm" state. During this state, scientific work still happens, but it is not as organized. At some point during work, some striking piece of data appears that provides scientific insight about the world and supplies a model for further investigation, and evolves into the first paradigm of its field.

There are two main points that Kuhn (1962) makes in his book that address Popper's rigid response to progressing science. Firstly, Popper believed that science should have a rigid set of rules by being permanently open to criticism, even on fundamental theories (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). Kuhn disagreed on the permanent openness to the testing of fundamental ideas since science would not be efficient if scientists argued on the basics beliefs around science. Science is meant to be efficient in making substantial progress, and debating about fundamentals defeats science's purpose of having a coordinated structure. In an odd way, according to Kuhn, having a rigid way of doing science makes it too loose and open, and having more flexibility gives science more structure.

Secondly, Popper believes that all science proceeds in a single process of conjecture and refutation, and while there are still revolutionary periods, these are

bigger and more dramatic conjectures and refutations compared to Kuhn's revolutionary science (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). Kuhn (1962) characterizes science into two distinct categories, and one transitional period called crisis science. Normal science is well-organized and can make clear progress, and scientists tend to agree on which problems are important and how to approach problems with possible solutions. Kuhn characterizes the work done in normal science as "puzzle-solving", where science uses the tools and concepts provided by the paradigm to describe, model, or create new phenomena. The "puzzle" is trying to get new cases and observations to fit smoothly into framework provided by the paradigm. Revolutionary science is when one paradigm replaces another, and it is hard to tell if progress has been made.

Crisis science is a special transitional period when an existing paradigm has lost the ability to inspire and guide scientists and no new paradigm has emerged to get the field back on track (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). At this point in crisis science, scientists tend to suddenly become interested in philosophy, which according to Kuhn, is a field quite useless for normal science. When Kuhn talks about changing from one paradigm to another, there is a gray area for when to abandon a paradigm. Theories can be refuted by observation by normal science, but completely abandoning a paradigm is much more difficult. Kuhn says that scientists can abandon a paradigm when a critical mass of anomalies has arisen and a rival paradigm has appeared. Kuhn's definition of an anomaly is a puzzle that has resisted a solution, which is called a "problem". All science will face anomalies, but as long as there are not too many of them, normal science can proceed as usual. Eventually, when there are enough anomalies, scientists lose faith in the paradigm and results in crisis science.

Kuhn (1962) argues that normal science is structured in a way that makes its own destruction inevitable, and the breakdown of paradigms is the "proper functioning" of science, though it does not feel that way to the scientists involved (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). However, paradigm breakdowns need to be in response to the correct stimulus. According to Kuhn's perspective on the destruction of paradigms, a paradigm acts similarly to a well-shielded and well-designed bomb. The bomb is meant to blow up at some point in time, but in very specific circumstances and not just at any old time.

After *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in 1962, Kuhn wrote a "Postscript" to *Structure* in 1970 and introduced the idea of incommensurability between paradigms (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). He expanded on the his previous book that when shifting from one paradigm to another, we should think of the shift like a "conversion" phenomenon, or a gestalt switch. The gestalt switch can be seen in illustrations that can be construed as either a rabbit or a duck, but not both at the same time. Relating this to paradigm shifts, Kuhn argues that revolutions are noncumulative in nature. When moving on to a new paradigm, it would feel like we feel like we've gained more than we have lost, but there is no unbiased way of measuring real progress. In other words, he thought that people occupying two different paradigms are incommensurable based on two reasons.

First, paradigms cannot communicate with one another because people from each paradigm will communicate in different ways and in a sense be speaking slightly different languages. Second, even when communication is possible, people in different paradigms will use different standards of evidence and argument and will not argue what a good theory is supposed to do. Though Kuhn thought he had a moderate view, philosophers of science have not found many examples of failed communication and are often adept at "scientific bilingualism". However, Kuhn raises a significant point: if paradigm shifts are not causal and are incommensurable, then are previous scientific revolutions, at least in part, based on irrational grounds?

THE LASTING EFFECTS OF KUHN: HEROIC OR VILLAINOUS?

The social sciences embraced Kuhn (1962) with enthusiasm. His depiction of science appeared to permit a more liberal conception of science and Kuhn's rejection of rules as determining scientific outcomes appealed to other factors outside of science in explaining why a scientific revolution took course that it did (Bird, 2018). The social scientists referenced Kuhn to use as a route to respectability and research funding by arguing that their field of expertise is in a pre-paradigm state, which eventually led to the emergence of scientific paradigms like economics (Bird, 2018; Naughton, 2012). His proposal that paradigm shifts are due to factors involving sociology and community agreement sparked a growth of a new academic discipline – the sociology of science-, in which researchers regarded

science as not an "untouchable product of Enlightenment but as just another sub-culture" (Naughton, 2012).

As mentioned before, Kuhn revolutionized how to define scientific progress. The point that shook the sciences is that shifting between paradigms ensues when sociology, enthusiasm and scientific progress agree in unison, and is not a logical, determinate procedure. The irrationality of paradigm shifts caused a major uproar in reaction to his work because the way to progress science is not an empirical way to expand the field of knowledge (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). Though Kuhn made significant points on how to define scientific progress, he struggled to identify what progress was in the final pages of his book. He claimed that more recent paradigms have more problem solving power than earlier paradigms when he was asked about how to understand progress in science, but he was still vague on his answers. Also, with his follow up work on incommensurability, he raised the question that there are no linear, logical pathway for science and if science is moving from paradigm to paradigm with no logical foundation, then are scientists basing current work on irrational grounds? Though most scientists and philosophers agree that this is not the case, Kuhn brings a poignant point for scientists and the future of scientific progress.

Webster's definition of a hero is "a contempt of danger, not from ignorance or inconsiderate levity, but form a noble devotion to some great cause, and a just confidence of being able to meet danger in the spirit of such cause" (Franco, Blau, & Zimbardo, 2011). Depending on one's definition, Kuhn can be regarded as hero, villain, or both. Though there are many ways to define heroes and villains, Goethals and Allison (2012) proposed a social influence-based taxonomy with ten subtypes of heroes: trending, transitory, transitional, tragic, transposed, transparent, traditional, transfigured, transforming, and transcendent. Within the three taxonomies of heroes, Kuhn's contributions to the scientific and philosophical community fits the transforming and transposed hero in the social influence-based taxonomy (Allison, Beggan, & Efthimiou, 2019; Goethals & Allison, 2012). Transforming heroes transform entire societies, which in this case are the science, philosophy, and sociology communities and their attitudes towards scientific progress. Kuhn revolutionized the definition of scientific progress, made a notable and noble contribution in the pursuit of truth, and paved the way for new disciplines like economics and sociology.

Kuhn could also be seen as a transposed hero that rapidly changed from a hero to a villain. Kuhn shifted from working as an esteemed quantum physicist from Harvard University to writing a philosophy of science paper that changed the views of scientists and philosophers , making them question their own paradigm (Naughton, 2012). Ironically, Kuhn weakened the faith of some normal scientists, even though Kuhn wrote that they should have deep faith in their paradigms (Godfrey-Smith, 2008). However, the case for seeing Kuhn as a philosopher and a scientist who made significant contribution to the field of science can be arguably be seen as more heroic than villainous since he asked the necessary questions and thoughts to expand the field of knowledge.

THE STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT: EXPOSURE OF HUMAN MORALITY

Philip Zimbardo and his colleagues made a major breakthrough in the field of social psychology through the Stanford Prison experiment. The Stanford Prison experiment was a 1971 social psychology experiment which attempted to investigate the psychological effects of perceived power, focusing on the struggle between prisoners and prison officers (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1973). Zimbardo and colleagues were interested in "finding out whether the brutality reported among guards in American prisons was due to the sadistic personalities of the guards (ie. dispositional) or had more to do with the prison environment (i.e., situational)" (McLeod, 2018; Haney et al., 1973).

The study was conducted between August 14 and 20, 1971, with 24 male college students who were judged to be the most physically and mentally stable, the most mature, and the least involved in antisocial behaviors were randomly assigned to be either "guards" or "prisoners" in a mock prison, with Zimbardo serving as the superintendent (McLeod, 2018). Several prisoners left the mid-experiment, and the experiment ended early just after six days rather than the intended two weeks. The reports indicated that the subjects quickly assumed their assigned roles, with the guards enforcing authoritarian measures and subjecting prisoners to psychological torture, while most of the prisoners passively accepted psychological abuse and, by officer's request, actively harassed other prisoners who tried to stop it (Haney et al., 1973; McLeod, 2018).

Zimbardo designed the experiment with the goal of inducing disorientation, depersonalization, and deindividuation in the participants (McLeod, 2018). Prisoners were treated like criminals by being arrested at their own homes without warning for armed robbery or burglary and taken to the police station. The prisoners were strip searched, fingerprinted, took mug shots, given prison clothes and bedding, and given their new numerical identities (Zimbardo, 2019b). The numerical identities were meant to induce a sense of deindividuation, and the prisoners also had to wear stocking caps to minimize self-expression (McLeod, 2018). The basement of the psychology department at Stanford University was remodeled to be like a prison to invoke a sense of disorientation and depersonalization, with barred doors and windows, bare walls and small cells (McLeod, 2018; Zimbardo, 2019a).

The assigned prison guards dressed in identical khaki uniforms with a whistle around their neck and a Billy club borrowed from the police (Zimbardo, 2019c). Guards also wore reflective sunglasses to further invoke the sense of depersonalization between the guard and the prisoner (Zimbardo, 2019c). The guards were not given specific training, but were instructed to do whatever they thought was necessary to maintain law and order in the prison and to command the respect of prisoners without physical violence (Zimbardo, 2019c). Though the prisoners knew that no physical violence would be involved, they were warned in the consent form to expect harassment, invasion of privacy, minimal adequate food, and other civil rights infringement in the simulated prison.

To ingrain the identity of the prisoner and guard, prisoners were regularly rudely awakened at 2:30 a.m. by the guards to do counts, which involves prisoners doing roll call with their numerical identities (Zimbardo, 2019c). The counts served to familiarize the prisoners with the numbers and for the guards to regularly exercise authoritative control over the prisoners. The guards also used push-ups as a way to "punish infractions of the rules or displays of improper attitudes toward the guards or institution" (Zimbardo, 2019c). Though this was initially deemed as an inappropriate kind of punishment, it was later learned that it was a form of punishment in Nazi concentration camps. During the study, one of the guards stepped on the prisoners' backs or made other prisoners sit or step on the backs of fellow prisoners doing their push-ups (Zimbardo, 2019c).

The first day of the experiment was uneventful, but a rebellion broke out on the morning of the second day (Zimbardo, 2019d). The prisoners "removed their

stocking caps, ripped off their numbers, barricaded themselves inside the cells by putting their beds against the door". The guards responded by shooting the prisoners with a stream of skin-chilling carbon dioxide from a fire extinguisher and forced the prisoners away from the doors (Zimbardo, 2019d). The guards realized that they cannot control the prison using physical tactics given the physical constraints of nine guards for nine prisoners, so they decided to resort to psychological tactics instead. "The guards broke into each cell, stripped the prisoners naked, took the beds out…and generally began to harass and intimidate the prisoners" (Zimbardo, 2019d). The prisoner's rebellion played an important role to produce greater solidarity among the guards.

The guards designated one of the three cells as a "privilege cell", where prisoners who were least involved in the rebellion were given special privileges such as getting their uniforms and beds back, were allowed to wash and brush their teeth, and were given special food. In an extra effort to break solidarity among prisoners, the "bad" and "good" prisoners switched cells after half a day of this treatment, and the prisoners became distrustful of each other. This tactic was used by real guards and prisons to promote aggression among inmates and to redirect the aggression from guard to prison mates (Zimbardo, 2019d).

The guards also implemented arbitrary control by granting or denying prisoners the toilet, and the prisoners were often forced to urinate in a bucket after 10 p.m., which the guards sometimes denied prisoners the ability to empty these buckets- further degrading the quality of their environment (Zimbardo, 2019d). Even Zimbardo was blinded by his role as a prison superintendent. When Zimbardo heard of a possible mass escape plot from a released prisoner, he moved the prisoners to the fifth floor storage room with bags over their heads while Zimbardo anxiously waited for the part participant to come (Zimbardo, 2019f). Instead, he was met with a former Yale graduate student roommate who wanted to see what the study was about and asked what the independent variable was. Zimbardo, to his surprise, got angry at him for asking such an unimportant question in amidst a potential prison break through, and that was when he realized that he was thinking like a prison superintendent rather than a research psychologist (Zimbardo, 2019f).

As the study progressed, the guards very noticeably escalated their level of harassment by having them do more push-ups, jumping jacks, and increasing

the length of the counts to several hours each (Zimbardo, 2019g). At this point in the study, Zimbardo invited a Catholic priest who had been a prison chaplain to evaluate how realistic their prison situation was (Zimbardo, 2019g). The priest interviewed each prisoner individually, and the prisoners responded with their number instead of their names (Zimbardo, 2019g). With each interview, the priest asked each of them what are they doing to get out of the prison (Zimbardo, 2019g). When the prisoners responded in puzzlement, the priest explained that the only way to get out of the prison was with the help of the lawyer. The priest volunteered to contact their parents to get legal aid if they wanted him to, and some of the prisoners accepted his offer (Zimbardo, 2019g). The priest's role blurred the lines between role-playing and reality for the participants.

During the sessions with the priest, one prisoner in particular, #819, did not want to see a priest but rather wanted to see a doctor because he was feeling sick (Zimbardo, 2019g). He was eventually persuaded to see the priest and Zimbardo to determine what kind of help was needed. The participant broke down and started to cry hysterically, just as the two prisoners released earlier (Zimbardo, 2019g). Zimbardo then released him to a room adjacent to the prison yard and told him that he would get him some food then take him to see a doctor. While Zimbardo was doing this, the guards lined up the other prisoners and had them chant in unison in utter conformity "#819 is a bad prisoner. Because of what Prisoner #819 did, my cell is a mess, Mr. Correctional Officer" a dozen times. Zimbardo realized that #819 could hear them chanting and rushed to the room where he left the participant and found him sobbing uncontrollably (Zimbardo, 2019g).

Zimbardo suggested that he leave, but the prisoner refused because he said he could not exit because the others labeled him a bad prisoner. Even though he was sick, he wanted to go back and prove he was not a bad prisoner (Zimbardo, 2019g). Then Zimbardo finally said, "Listen, you are not #819. You are [his name], and my name is Dr. Zimbardo. I am a psychologist, not a prison superintendent, and this is not a real prison. This is just an experiment, and those are students, not prisoners, just like you. Let's go". The participant suddenly stopped crying, and agreed to leave with Zimbardo (Zimbardo, 2019g).

The study continued to escalate, and the guards and prisoners became more and more entrenched in their assigned roles. Eventually, it became evident to end the study when some visiting parents asked Zimbardo to contact a lawyer to get

their son out of prison (Zimbardo, 2019g). Zimbardo and colleagues created an overwhelmingly powerful situation where prisoners withdrawing and behaving in pathological ways and guards were behaving sadistically (Zimbardo, 2019g). Zimbardo also learned that the guards were escalating the abuse of prisoners in the middle of the night when the experiment was "off" and thought no researchers were watching. Also, Christina Maslach, a recent Stanford Ph.D., saw the state of the study and spoke up in outrage by saying, " It's terrible what you are doing to these boys!", who was the first out of 50 outsiders who had seen the prison to question its morality. When the study ended, the guards, prisoners, and staff had a series of encounter sessions to reflect what they had exhibited and observed in the study and also made it a time for moral reeducation by discussing the conflicts posed by the simulation and their behavior (Zimbardo, 2019h).

Overall, the prison environment was an important factor in creating the guards' brutal behavior since none of the participants showed sadistic tendencies prior to the study. The findings support the situational explanation of behavior rather than the dispositional characteristics (McLeod, 2018).

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: THE CREATOR OF FRANKENSTEIN OR A HERO?

The Stanford prison experiment clearly breached ethical lines and tested the lengths of human morality. The study continued despite the fact that prisoners expressed their desire to withdraw, and the prisoners did not consent to being 'arrested' at home, which is a breach of ethics of Zimbardo's own contract that all their participants had signed (McLeod, 2018). Half of the prisoners were released early on in the study due to severe emotional or cognitive reactions (Zimbardo, 2019h).

The study was also funded by the Office of Naval Research, the Psychology Department and the University Committee of Human Experimentation to investigate the causes of difficulties between guards and prisoners (Zimbardo, 2019h; McLeod, 2018). Though the Committee did not anticipate the extreme results, alternative methodologies that caused less distress to the participants were looked at, but no other suitable alternative could be found that would give the desired information (McLeod, 2018). This funding could have indirectly pushed Zimbardo to progress the study the way he did.

Although the negative consequences seemed the most prominent after the study, Zimbardo argues that it provided insight about the current understanding of human behavior and society can improve to balance the distress caused by the study (McLeod, 2018). To Zimbardo's defense, he himself did not know the beast that he had created and has fallen into the trance of the study himself as a prison superintendent. After extensive group and individual debriefing questions and post-experimental questionnaires over several weeks, months, then years later, Zimbardo concluded that there were no lasting negative effects in the participants (McLeod, 2018; Zimbardo, 2019h).

However, decades after the study took place, "prison conditions and correctional policies in the United States have become even more punitive and destructive, with politicians vying for who is the toughest on crime along with the racialization of arrests and sentencing (Zimbardo, 2019g). The media contributes to the problem by generating heightened fear of violent crimes, even though statistics show that violent crimes have decreased. Now, the number of jailed Americans have doubled during the past decade. Another positive effect is that juveniles accused of federal crimes are no longer housed before trial with adult prisoners due to the risk of violence against them (McLeod, 2018).

Surprisingly, the American Psychological Association approved the experiment and concluded that all existing ethical guidelines had been followed (Zimbardo, 2019h). The experiment contributed to the creation of the institutional review board (IRB) for human studies and adhered to stricter guidelines for future human experimentation studies. The prison experiment propelled Zimbardo make positive contributions following the study. Zimbardo found a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting heroism in everyday life called the Heroic Imagination Project (HIP) in 2014 (Heroic Imagination Project). The prison experiment also motivated Zimbardo to write *The Lucifer Effect*, which he argues that humans cannot be defined as good or evil because humans have the potential to act both ways given the state of the situation (Zimbardo, 2007).

Zimbardo argues that good people can be "induced, seduced, and initiated into behaving in evil ways. They can also be led to act in irrational, stupid, self-destructive, antisocial, and mindless ways when they are immersed in 'total' situations that impact human nature in ways that challenge our sense of stability and consistency of individual personality, or character, and of morality." (Zimbardo, 2007). In

his TED talk The psychology of evil, he says that are seven social processes that led people down the "slippery slope of evil": mindlessly taking the first small step, dehumanization of others, de-individuation of self, diffusion of personal responsibility, blind obedience to authority, uncritical conformity to group norms, and passive tolerance of evil through inaction or indifference (TED, 2008).

Using the Goethals and Allison's taxonomic structure of the different subtypes of heroes, Zimbardo can be argued to be three subtypes of heroes: transforming, tragic, transposed, transitory, and transparent (Goethals & Allison, 2012). Although one of the first major controversial social psychology studies was the Milgram experiment at Yale University, Zimbardo's prison experiment contributed to the growing social psychology field, made a big splash in popular media, and made the potential limits of human morality known to the public. Zimbardo not only contributed to the beginnings of social psychology, but he transformed how much people weighted dispositional factors rather than situational factors when viewing prison and criminal justice systems. Zimbardo also fits Franco and colleagues' scientific (or discovery) heroes under the twelve subtypes of heroes (Franco et al., 2011). Scientific heroes are individuals who explore unknown areas of science, use novel and unproven research methods, or discover new scientific information seen as valuable to humanity, all of which Zimbardo did in the Stanford prison experiment.

From a certain perspective, Zimbardo is also a tragic hero. He began as a respectable psychologist who graduated summa cum laude from Brooklyn College with a triple major in psychology, sociology, and anthropology, and eventually completed his Ph.D. from Yale University. In some ways, Zimbardo tarnished his reputation with the Stanford prison experiment by bending his own ethical rules from his contract, succumbing to his own role in the study, and handling the consequences and long-term effects of the study. Despite his potentially tarnished reputation from the study, Zimbardo moved on to other great works and projects, which the acts can be seen arguably be seen as a transposed hero recovering from the study. In 2012, Zimbardo received the American Psychological Foundation Gold Medal for Lifetime Achievement in the Science of Psychology (Award, n.d.). He went on the pursue other projects like publishing his book *The Lucifer Effect*

and creating the non-profit The Heroic Imagination Project to increase awareness of the human potential to be evil and to instill good works in others.

Since Zimbardo was widely known for his Stanford prison experiment in the eyes of the public, he can also be argued to be transparent and transitory. He is widely known for the prison experiment, but his other future good works and projects seem to be less well known to the public. Richard Griggs (2014) looked at Stanford experiment coverage in textbooks, and 11 out of 13 discuss the Stanford Prison Experiment, 5 of which did not contain any criticism of the experiment and the other 6 provided very minimal discussions of the study's flaws. Some introductory textbooks are even starting to omit the experiment completely (Gray, 2013). Zimbardo can also be argued to be both heroic and villainous, but he has made long lasting contributions to the field of science, particularly social psychology, and his current works to improve society's morality has painted him as an overall hero.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Thomas Kuhn and Philip Zimbardo have expanded their respective fields of scientific knowledge. Kuhn's questioning of the foundations of scientific disciplines and of the definition of scientific progress through the paradigm shifts served as a rippling effect for the proliferation of other fields. Zimbardo's Stanford prison experiment expanded the realm of social psychology and provided significant insight on human morality. Both examples made took risks to expand the field of scientific knowledge and exhibited heroic qualities using Goethals and Allison's social influence-based taxonomy of heroes and Franco and colleagues twelve subtypes that call forth heroic action (Allison, 2019; Goethals & Allison, 2012; Franco et al., 2011). I hope that this chapter contributes to the growing field of the psychology of heroism by shedding light on scientific heroes who either do not get enough attention or the appropriate attention for the significant works that have influenced contributions towards our collective understanding of science.

REFERENCES

Allison, S. T. (2019). Heroic consciousness. Heroism Science, 4, 1-43.
Allison, S. T., Beggan, J. K., & Efthimiou, O. (2019). The art and science of heroism and heroic leadership. Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers.

Allison, S. T., & Goethals, G. R. (2013). Heroic leadership: An influence taxonomy of 100 exceptional individuals. New York: Routledge.

Allison, S. T., & Green, J. D. (2021). Nostalgia and heroism: Theoretical convergence of memory, motivation, and function. Frontiers in Psychology.

Award: Phil Zimbardo to receive the APA's Gold Medal Award. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20130116021952/https://psychology.stanford.edu/node/2533

Bennett, D., Efthimiou, O., & Allison, S. T. (2020). The role of heroic creativity and leadership in creative work. In A. de Dios & L. Kong (Eds.), Handbook on the geographies of creativity. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Bird, A. (2018, October 31). Thomas Kuhn. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/thomas-kuhn/#CritInfl

Britannica, T. E. (2018, July 14). Thomas S. Kuhn. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Thomas-S-Kuhn

Eylon, D., & Allison, S. T. (2005). The frozen in time effect in evaluations of the dead. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 1708-1717.

Franco, Z. E., Blau, K., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2011). Heroism: A conceptual analysis and differentiation Between heroic action and altruism. Review of General Psychology.

Godfrey-Smith, P. (2008). Theory and reality: An introduction to the philosophy of science. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Goethals, G. R., & Allison, S. T. (2012). Making heroes: The construction of courage, competence and virtue. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 46, 183–235.

Gray, P. (2013, October 19). Why Zimbardo's Prison Experiment Isn't in My Textbook. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/freedom-learn/201310/why-zimbardo-s-prison-experiment-isn-t-in-my-textbook?page=1

Griggs, R. A. (2014). Coverage of the Stanford prison experiment in introductory psychology textbooks. Teaching of Psychology, 41(3), 195-203.

Haney, C., Banks, W. C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1973). A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison. Naval Research Review, 30, 4-17.

Heroic Imagination Project. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20120425151645/http://heroicimagination.ning.com/

Kuhn, T. (1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLeod, S. A. (2018, September 16). Zimbardo - Stanford prison experiment. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/zimbardo.html

Naughton, J. (2012, August 18). Thomas Kuhn: The man who changed the way the world looked at science. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/aug/19/thomas-kuhn-structure-scientific-revolutions

Rabbit-Duck Illusion. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Rabbit-DuckIllusion.html

Merriam-Webster (2019a). Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/science?utm_campaign=sd&utm_medium=serp&utm_source=jsonld

Merriam-Webster (2019b). Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/scientific%20method

TED. (2008, September 23). The psychology of evil | Philip Zimbardo. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OsFEV35tWsg

Zimbardo, P. G. (2007). The Lucifer Effect: Understanding how good people turn evil. New York: Random House.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019a). 2. Setting Up. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/setting-up

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019b). 3. Arrival. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/arrival

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019c). 4. Guards. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/guards

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019d). 5. Rebellion. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/rebellion

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019e). 6. Grievances. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/grievances

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019f). 7. Escape. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/escape

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019g). 8. Conclusion. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/conclusion

Zimbardo, P. G. (2019h). More Information. Retrieved from http://www.prisonexp.org/faq/

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Tai Lea Ho is a graduate at the University of Richmond where she earned her B.A. in Psychology and Cognitive Science. She is a native New Yorker but still gets lost in the city from time to time. Born on Halloween, she is an enthusiast of the macabre and an appreciator of morbid art.

Esther (Heera) Ha graduated from the University of Richmond Class of 2019 with a B.S. degree in Psychology. Striving to be Rick in amidst a sea of Jerrys, she strives to be bold and different from the millennials, just like every other millennial. While she hopes to expand the current knowledge of moral psychology, she enjoys outdoor activities, particularly rock climbing (or pebble wrestling), chess, learning new skills, and smiling in her free time.

Jacob Roberson graduated from the University of Richmond in May of 2019. Born and raised in Richmond, Virginia, he played four years on the varsity football team while double majoring in psychology and sociology. He was Vice President of the UR Mentoring Network, an appointed member to the Dean's Student Advisory Board, and the President's Advisory Committee for Sexual Violence Prevention and Response, among other obligations. He enjoys relaxing with good company and listening to R&B and Soulful music as well as writing poetry. He plans to pursue a PhD in social psychology en route to becoming a professor.

Sharon H. Shin is a graduate of University of Richmond with a degree in Psychology. She loves to play Settlers of Catan, watch Disney movies, and quote vines. When she grows up, she hopes to go into the neuroscience field and learn about the relationship between the brain and mental illnesses.

Megan R. Wirtz is a graduate of the University of Richmond. A D.C. native, she graduated in 2019 with a B.A. in Theatre and Psychology, and a minor in Latin American, Latino, and Iberian Studies. She was the President of University Players, and was on the Kairos Leadership Team and Alpha Psi Omega executive board. After graduation, she hopes to continue her social psychology research while doing theatre on the side – she doesn't understand the concept of not being busy.

Lauren A. Lambert is a graduate of the University of Richmond, who earned her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in May of 2019. Lauren was the student captain of the University Dancers and an active member of the Delta Delta Delta sorority. She is excited to move to Nashville, TN to teach elementary school in August of 2019. She has a deep passion for Mexican food, babies, and Reese's peanut butter cups.

Jamie L. Katz graduated from the University of Richmond with a double major in Leadership Studies and Psychology and a minor in Religious Studies. She works to add people to the national bone marrow registry through a company called Gift of Life in hopes of discovering new heroes. She hopes to live by the water one day and is happiest when totally immersed in nature.

Chloe L. Zaloom received her undergraduate degree from the University of Richmond. In 2019 she graduated with a B.A in Leadership Studies and Psychology. Originally from northern New Jersey, she plans on moving back to the New Jersey/New York area to start her new life chapter in life. Her dream is to one day retire to a New England state and live on a farm full of Golden Retrievers.

Jessica M. Stanfill graduated from the University of Richmond with a double major in Psychology and Journalism. Jess was also a varsity athlete on UR's soccer team for four years. Jess enjoys photography, dogs, coffee and spending time with her family and friends.

Natalie R. Schiano is a graduate of the University of Richmond with a major in Psychology and minors in both Elementary Education and Leadership Studies. She worked as a Psychology Teaching Fellow and at the Curriculum Materials Center as a librarian. She was a member of of Delta Delta Delta sorority and involved in Best Buddies during her time on campus. Her favorite food is cheese, which is quite unfortunate since she is allergic to dairy.

Alexa M. Bertrand is a graduate of the University of Richmond with a major in Business Administration with Concentrations in Marketing and Management, and a major in Psychology. She is very musically inclined, and plays guitar in her spare time. When she's not playing guitar, she enjoys looking at photos of cats. She hopes one day she will be able to sleep for more than 4 hours a night.

Smaragda P. Spyrou is a graduate of the University of Richmond with a B.S. in Psychology and a minor in Mathematics. Born and raised in the Mediterranean, she hopes to never have to live away from the beach again. Smaragda likes to keep herself very busy, with 3 jobs and several extracurriculars – or she just has a hard time saying no. Her personality motto is Espresso Patronum!

Other Books in the Palsgrove Series

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2020). *Core concepts in heroism science: Volume 1.* Richmond: Palsgrove.

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2020). *Core concepts in heroism science: Volume 2.* Richmond: Palsgrove.

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2019). *Heroic transformation: How heroes change themselves and the world.* Richmond: Palsgrove.

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2018). *Heroes and villains of the millennial generation.* Richmond: Palsgrove.

Allison, S. T. (Ed.) (2017). *Heroes of Richmond: Four centuries of courage, dignity, and virtue.* Richmond: Palsgrove.

THE SERIES EDITOR

Scott T. Allison is Professor of Psychology at the University of Richmond. He has published 15 books on heroism and heroic leadership and over 100 academic articles. His books include *The Romance of Heroism, Heroic Transformation, The Heroic Leadership Imperative, Heroism and Wellbeing in the 21st Century, Conceptions of Leadership, Frontiers in Spiritual Leadership, Heroic Humility,* and *the Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership.* His work has appeared in USA Today, National Public Radio, the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, Slate Magazine, MSNBC, CBS, Psychology Today, and the Christian Science Monitor. He has received Richmond's Distinguished Educator Award and the Virginia Council of Higher Education's Outstanding Faculty Award.