CHAPTER 2
SYSTEMS PSYCHODYNAMICS

This chapter contains an exploration of the systems psychodynamic perspective and its origins. Furthermore it outlines the basic assumptions operative within groups. The application of the systems psychodynamic perspective is presented with the relevant concepts defined and processes clarified. The systems psychodynamic view of leadership is provided, wherein key terms are clarified and the leadership roles are defined. The five leadership styles are presented and clarified. Integration of the systems psychodynamic perspective and leadership follows the content presented and the chapter is finally summarised.

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the systems psychodynamic perspective, upon which an understanding of leadership and its impact within organisations can be clarified from this perspective. Thus the aim is twofold: first to present the systems psychodynamic perspective as a framework; and secondly to define leadership from a systems psychodynamic perspective and to explore its impact within organisations.

2.1. THE SYSTEMS PSYCHODYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE

The psychoanalytical theory is one of the key components that constitute the underpinning philosophy of the systems psychodynamic approach (Cilliers, 2005; Czander, 1993; De Board, 1978). While Freud, the father of the psychoanalytical theory, wrote very little on the subject of work, Czander (1993, p.7) said that from "a psychoanalytical perspective, attachment to work is considered the result of the gratification of conscious and unconscious fantasies" and goes on to suggest that it is "these fantasies and their analysis that present insight into how the organisation can change". A further contribution to the systems psychodynamic perspective is Klein's Object Relations Theory (Czander, 1993; Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965). This theory has less of an emphasis on instinct and sees an individual as object-seeking, thus permitting an

inclusion of "environmental or cultural factors in a systematic theory" (Czander, 1993, p.43). Object relations theory, which highlights how people use one another to stabilise their inner lives, helps to create an understanding of how psychodynamic processes within people shape the relationships between them (Hirschhorn, 1993).

Another of the aspects underpinning this perspective is the premise that groups or organisations are social systems and that the collective (groups or organisations) become a social entity with an identity that is separate from the elements which constitutes its make up. Czander (1993) said that there is an emergence of those who see the organisation as a cooperative enterprise that functions in harmony. The view of some is moving from seeing the organisation as only a rational system to a view that it is one "filled with intangibles that are complex sets of social relations." (Czander, 1993, p.4). This perspective is, according to Koortzen and Cilliers (2002), a rejection of the economic view of work within a group or organisation. Kets de Vries (1991) also contended that there is growing support from within organisations of the limitations of the logical / rational models and states that non-rational forces influence leadership, group behaviour and so forth.

Viewing an organisation as an open system (Gharajedaghi, 1985) is another important element within the systems psychodynamic perspective and is described by Miller (1993, p.10) as systems that "exist and can only exist by the exchange of materials with their environment". Miller (1993) added the contribution of Von Bertalanffy (1950), who pointed out a further aspect of open systems, i.e. equifinality. Equifinality suggests that a final outcome can be reached through various different means and routes. The theories of open systems enabled the researcher to evaluate the relationships between the social and technical elements of the organisations as well as the relationships between the part and the whole, and the whole and the external environment (Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965). In fact, Wells (1985, p.114) reported that the group-as-a-whole perspective emerged from the open system framework, and that this perspective "assumes that individuals are human vessels that reflect and express the group's gestalt". Group-as-a-whole refers to the collective that forms when systems operate as-one, forming a psychodynamic

relation, relatedness, and interconnectedness – implying that no event happens in isolation (Cilliers, 2005).

The systems psychodynamic perspective represents a development process that creates an understanding of the psychological nature and covert behaviour within systems (Cilliers, 2005). Czander (1993) suggested that the primary task of this perspective is to heighten awareness, so as to better understand the covert meaning of organisational behaviour, and thereby understand the deeper and unconscious challenges faced by leadership. While the unconscious is a source of destructiveness, it is also the source of creativity, and by allowing the unconscious to emerge, acknowledging it and linking it to the conscious aims can create a generative organisational environment (Krantz, 2005).

The systems psychodynamic consultant engages in an analysis of amongst others, but not limited to, interrelationships between such constructs as anxiety, social defenses, projection, transference and counter-transference, valence, resistance to change, boundaries, role, authority, leadership, relationship and relatedness, and group-as-a-whole (Bion, 1961; 1962; Hirschhorn, 1993). The consultant is aware of, hypothesises about and interprets dynamic and covert aspects of the system (and sub-systems) – with specific focus on relatedness, representation and authority (Cilliers, 2005). In order to interpret, the consultant takes cognisance of attitudes, fantasies, conflicts and anxieties prevalent that trigger social defenses and pattern relationships – determining how these affect task performance (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993). Projection of unwanted feelings, valence in the system and containment on behalf of the group are all products of the covert nature of group dynamics taken into account (Cilliers, 2005). Furthermore, understanding how unconscious anxieties are reflected in structures and organisational design is also reviewed by the systems psychodynamic consultant (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993; Krantz, 1998). This stance studies the system as a reality and as a 'system in the mind' / 'group as a whole' (Wells, 1985).

Cilliers and Koortzen (2000) summarised the systems psychodynamic consultancy stance as one that 'makes sense out of non-sense' – interpreting behaviour (verbal and non-

verbal) in the here-and-now, without presumption of coincidence, without memory or desire. Consulting from this stance implies "licensed stupidity" (Czander, 1993).

More specifically Koortzen and Cilliers (2002, p.178) suggested that the consultant will work with the following behaviour:

- the way individuals and groups manage their anxiety in the organisation by using various defense mechanisms
- the way authority is exercised in different systems
- the nature of interpersonal relationships within the organisation
- the relationships and relatedness with authority, peers and subordinates
- leadership practices and management boundaries
- inter-group relationships – between sub-systems or departments
- identity, roles, tasks, space, time, and structures as boundaries and the management thereof in coping with anxiety

2.2   THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Bion's (1961) theory of group behaviour has become the foundation of the Tavistock model of group behaviour. Bion (1961) viewed the group as a separate, yet collective entity. For the most part groups emerge from the acceptance or agreement that a common goal (positive or negative) exists. This manifest aspect of a group is Bion's work (W) group (Bion, 1961). Bion (1961, p.63) held that "people come together as a group for the purposes of preserving the group". Rice (1965, p.17) defined the primary task of a group or sub-group as "the task it must perform if it is to survive." Even though groups form, as stated, at an overt level to achieve a common goal, there are also latent or covert aspects within the group that are real (Banet & Hayden 1977; Bion, 1961; Czander, 1993; Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965). They contended that though there is a conscious effort on the part of the group members to pursue the common objective, there are often unconscious hidden agendas that interfere with the completion of work tasks. Furthermore, they suggested that individuals are often unaware of the controls in play which help to separate their stated intentions from their hidden agendas. The hidden

agendas of the individuals within the group collectively make up the latent (covert) aspects of group behaviour, which are referred to by Bion (1961) as the Basic Assumptions (ba) group (Banet & Hayden, 1977; Bion, 1961; Czander, 1993; Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965). This covert aspect of the group, though frequently disguised, is a latent motivating force for group members (Banet & Hayden, 1977). This relates also to Bion's (1961, p.65) description of group mentality: "Group mentality is the unanimous expression of the will of the group, contributed to by the individual in ways of which he is unaware, influencing him disagreeably whenever he thinks of behaves at variance with the basic assumptions." The group's culture is a function of the conflict between the individual's desires and the group's mentality (Bion, 1961). Thus the group's culture emerges and regulates group members' behaviour and provides evidence of the basic assumptions operative within the group.

The systems psychodynamic approach thus recognises two groups at play, viz. the W-group and the ba- group, both of these are real, operating and present simultaneously (Bion, 1961; Miller, 1993; Rice, 1965). Banet and Hayden (1977) depicted the W-group as being outwardly focussed on the task, while the ba-group is inwardly focussed on itself, and this creates an inevitable tension which is balanced by various behavioural and psychological structures like individual defense systems, ground rules and group norms.

Therefore to truly understand behaviour (whether of the individual or the group) one should first understand the inner state. An underlying premise of the systems psychodynamic consultancy stance is that individual behaviour is affected by unconscious forces and individuals and groups behave in ways that are not always rational and obvious (Rice, 1965). Furthermore, individuals influence and are influenced by all group members, affected by not only the rational, but more often the emotional and non-rational elements present in the group (Czander, 1993). It is often the state of anxiety that causes the development of a variety of defense mechanisms (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993).

Hirschhorn (1993) developed seven propositions upon which psychodynamics of work could be assessed, and these are:

1. Anxiety is at the root of all distorted or alienated work relationships,

2. Anxieties are managed by developing and deploying "social defenses" that depersonalise relationships and reduces the groups capacity to complete its primary task,

3. Social defenses also distort relationships between the group and the environment and these systematic distortions reduce anxiety by "scapegoating" the non-group,

4. Group development is however contingent on the group ceasing to scapegoat the "other" and confront its primary task,

5. There is an emergence of a desire to repair damage caused by scapegoating,

6. The desire for reparation needs to be stronger than the level of anxiety, otherwise it leads to more pervasive splits,

7. Through more detailed understanding people are more able to contain anxieties and thus make the necessary reparations.

An aspect of Hirschhorn's (1993) work related to anxieties operating within the individual and thus manifesting within the group. Clarifying these anxieties is best achieved through the psychoanalytical approach, including Klein's objects relations theory. Bion (1961, p.189) reported that the basic assumptions are the "defensive reactions to psychotic anxiety". Bion (1961) attributed much of this understanding to Klein's object relations theory and less to Freud's. It is thus important to be aware of these basic assumptions, even though these are not easily accessible or apparent to individual group members, because of the potential dysfunctionality that could manifest. A basic assumption is an implicit assumption and group members behave as if they are aware of it, even though it is unconscious (Rice, 1965). "Participation in basic assumptions activity requires no training, experience or mental development. It is spontaneous, inevitable, and instinctive" (Bion, 1961, p.153). Hirschhorn (1993, p.59) said that "basic assumption behaviour makes groups unproductive because group members are living a dream."

Bion (1961) related that these basic assumptions are dependence, pairing and fighting or flight, and goes on to add that these basic assumptions are seen to displace each other over time.

The table below outlines the characteristics of the three originally defined basic assumption states (as presented by Bion, 1961), according to the predominant defense mechanisms, the object relations, the narcissistic features, the mythic features, the roles, and the biogenetic core.

TABLE 2.1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BASIC ASSUMPTION STATES

	Dependency	Pairing	Fight-Flight
Predominant defense mechanisms	Introjection, idealisation, devaluation	Denial; repression	Splitting and projection
Object relations	Leader as 'container-breast' object hunger / object loss	Condensation of Oedipal and pre-Oedipal object relations via the primal scene	Bad, externalised object is pervasive, internal world is object-less
Narcissitic features	Over-idealisation of leader is defense against narcissistic injury	Narcissistic self-object; merger with pair	Primary narcissism; narcissistic rage
Mythic features	Leader is anti-hero, prophet, and deity	Messianic myths; myth of birth of hero; creation mythologies	Struggle between good and evil; paradise lost
Roles	The 'dual' of the leader; dependents	Over-personal and impersonal. Mary &	Fight leader; flight leader

	and counter-dependents	Joseph	
Biogenetic core	Child rearing and bonding	Reproduction and production	Protection of group from danger

(Adapted from Koortzen and Cilliers (2002, p.128-129))

These basic assumptions will be described briefly and thereafter some of the concepts that impact directly or indirectly will be injected to create further clarification.

2.2.1   Dependency

Bion (1961, p.147) reported that "the first assumption is that the group is met in order to be sustained by a leader… for nourishment, …and protection" and "met together to obtain security from one individual on whom they depend" (Banet & Hayden, 1977; Bion, 1961, p.66). Koortzen and Cilliers (2002) described this basic assumption of the 'worker' as the unconscious dependence on an imaginary parental figure or system and that when these needs are not fulfilled, the worker experiences frustration. They reported from earlier research that these frustrations are due to projections of individual insecurities or anxieties. The typical reaction is to establish structures and can be seen as an attempt to manipulate authority (Czander, 1993). Czander (1993, p.101) quoted Wilhelm Reich (1928) as saying "…every social organisation produces those character structures which it needs to exist." Structure is viewed as a rational response to the needs and strategies of the organisations, but Czander (1993) asserted that structures could also evolve from a set of psychodynamics that are not goal related and could in fact be counter productive to the organisation.

2.2.2   Fight or flight

Due to the presumption of anxiety present in the individual and thus also in the group (meso-system) or organisation (macro-system), the fight or flight defense mechanism emerges. Bion (1961) hypothesised that due to the primary task of the group (i.e.

survival or preservation) the group know only one of two techniques, fight or flight. Bion (1961) further determined that the individual's 'survival' is secondary to that of the group. Fight reactions are demonstrated through aggression, scapegoating, attack, rivalry, or competition. Flight reactions are typically through fleeing from the task at hand manifested through withdrawal, rationalisation or intellectualisation, avoidance, fleeing into the past or future, or illness. There is a general tendency to avoid the 'here-and-now' and refer to aspects 'out-there' (Banet & Hayden, 1977; Bion, 1961; Hirschhorn, 1993)

2.2.3   Pairing

Bion (1961, p.72) reported a tendency of a group to "break up the fight-flight culture by establishing pairing relationships". This assumption is a response to anxiety or loneliness and therefore an attempt to pair with others seen as being able to alleviate these anxieties. When this basic assumption is in play it is attributed to the group feeling that its survival is dependant on creating or reproducing. Pairing also implies that the group will be split and thus the pairing off of some will break the whole and allows for the establishing of a smaller system. Pairing thus has the effect of creating conflict, both within the group and between the group and others systems (Banet & Hayden, 1977; Bion, 1961; Hirschhorn, 1993).

Koortzen and Cilliers (2002) reported an additional two assumptions added to Bion's list by Turquet in 1974, i.e. Oneness (also referred to as We-ness) and Me-ness. These will be described in brief.

2.2.4   One-ness

One-ness is also referred to as "we-ness". This basic assumption is described by Turquet as occurring when "members seek to join a powerful union with an omnipotent force, surrendering self for passive participation, thus experiencing existence, well-being and wholeness" (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002, p.269). Lawrence, Bain and Gould (1996) added

that group members experience existence only through membership of the group. Thus, by being passive and sublimating the self to the union of the group, the individual experiences existence and wholeness. This type of behaviour is typical when a group is striving towards cohesion and synergy (Banet & Hayden, 1977; Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002).

2.2.5   Me-ness

This basic assumption is about a retreat into individualism. It, according to Koortzen and Cilliers, (2002) is an attempt to avoid the outer world (reality) and find solace in the inner world. The tacit assumption of the members is that the group is to be a non-group. In other words, only the individual is important and the group is of no importance (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). Lawrence, et al (1996) suggested that within this assumption there is the denial and exclusion of the outer environment, and a focus on the individual's own inner reality.

While these basic assumptions form the basis of the psychodynamic theory of groups and group behaviour, they also point to a number of concepts that are relevant to understanding the group. These concepts are dealt with in the following section.

2.3   THE CONCEPTS RELEVANT IN THE APPLICATION OF SYSTEMS PSYCHODYNAMICS

 "A key educative concept used in systems consulting is 'insight,' specifically, insight into the psychodynamics, or covert processes found in organisations" (Czander, 1993, p.201).

The following section reviews anxiety, resistance change, and conflict as these impact significantly on the dynamics within groups. The defense mechanism including, amongst others, projection, projective identification, introjection and introjective identification will be presented and defined. Furthermore, behaviours such as boundary maintenance,

taking up a role and managing oneself in a role, authorisation, representation, relationship and relatedness, and containment will be discussed. These concepts can be used to interpret the dynamics within groups, to analyse it and to thereby gain insights which can lead to development of the group. These insights enable one to work with groups and within organisations.

2.3.1   Anxiety

Anxiety is considered the root of all distorted and creative work relationships (Hirschhorn, 1993). Obholzer (1994) highlighted three layers of anxiety that need to be understood and then addressed: primitive anxieties, anxieties arising from work, and personal anxieties. Primitive anxieties, he said, are ever-present and all-pervasive, exiting in everyone. These are contained by imbuing organisations with the function to protect and defend the members by providing a haven and a sense of belonging and anything that threatens separation from the organisation will cause the return of these primitive anxieties. Primitive anxieties can be categorised in persecutory and depressive types (Czander, 1993). Persecutory anxiety is associated with the fear of annihilation. He said that persecutory anxiety is found in the paranoid schizoid position – characterised by paranoia and splitting.   The other form of primitive anxiety, depressive anxiety is associated with the fear that one's destructive impulses will destroy the dependent and loved object (Czander, 1993). This, he said, is never eliminated or ever fully worked through. He added that when individuals are unable to work through the depressive position, they deal with anger, guilt and loss by using the defense of splitting. Since organisational life often involves loss, in the form of constant change, it results in the individual appearing aloof, disinterested and apathetic in an attempt to avoid experiencing the affects associated with loss (Czander, 1993). With regard to work related anxieties, Obholzer (1994) said, work is organised not to achieve the primary task but rather to defend the members from anxiety. Personal anxieties are felt when something triggers past experiences. Obholzer (1994) said work-generated anxieties resonate with primitive and personal anxieties, at a conscious and unconscious level. Furthermore, he added, that using the organisation as a means to alleviate or contain

anxieties deflects from achieving the organisation's primary task and the changes needed to pursue it. In dealing with anxiety, using the organisation, its structures, policies, rules and standards to promote security and reduce stress or tension is common (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993; Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002; Krantz & Gilmore, 1989).

In order to contain their anxieties people employ various defense mechanisms (Czander, 1993; Hirschhorn, 1993; Obholzer, 1994). The social defenses created to reduce anxiety may narrow their range of experience and understanding, just when it should be expanding (Hirschhorn, 1993). The first defenses used to deal with persecutory anxiety are introjection and projection, while the key defense of depressive anxiety is projective identification (Czander, 1993). According to Czander (1993) though these social defenses are used to reduce anxiety, excessive reliance on these may contribute to dysfunctional forms of ego functioning and to pathological conditions.

Projection is one such mechanism often employed. Projection is defined as the process of locating feelings or parts of oneself onto others (Czander, 1993; Halton, 1994). That which is projected is often anxiety-provoking affects such as hatred, envy or greed (Czander, 1993). Anxiety due to internal conflicts drives the individual to focus more closely on external realities and thus projection could hold several advantages for the individual (Klein, cited by Czander, 1993).

Projective identification is the process of projecting parts of oneself and subsequently identifying with the projectee (Czander, 1993); it is unconsciously identifying with projected feelings (Halton, 1994). Knapp (1989, cited in Czander, 1993) defined projective identification as an interactive process where both projector and projectee consciously attempt to induce a particular role or feelings in another in order to reduce his own anxiety. While projection involves putting off parts of oneself onto others and then distancing from it; projective identification leads to feeling at one with the object of projection and attempting to control its reaction and behaviours (Segal, 1967 and Ogden, 1982, cited by Czander, 1993). Counter-transference is the state of mind wherein other people's feelings are experienced as one's own (Halton, 1994). Whether projective

identification is the result of internal experiences of threat or frustration due to an external object remains unresolved (Czander, 1993). Halton (1994) suggested that projective identification often leads to the recipient acting out the counter-transference that is derived from the projected feelings. It is through projective identification that one sub-system, on behalf of the system or other sub-systems, can become the 'sponge' for all the anger, depression or guilt of the entire group (Halton, 1994). Ashbach and Schermer (1987, cited by Czander, 1993) indicated that projective identification could be viewed as:

1. a defense where people can distance themselves unconsciously from unwanted parts and still keep these parts alive in another;

2. a mode of communication, through which the other is made to feel the same as the projector;

3. a type of relatedness, wherein the projector sees the other as a container of his affects;

4. a pathway to psychological change.

Persistent projections become internalised by the object of projections and these can begin to affect the sense of identity of the object (Knapp, 1989, cited by Czander, 1993).

Introjection is the process of internalisation in order to establish congruency to alleviate anxiety (Czander, 1993). Jacques (1971, cited by Czander (1993, p.113) suggested that introjective identification is "a process of construction of self-organisation according to a pattern provided by the introject". This happens in an adaptive manner, only when the introjected is consistent with the individuals pre-existing psychic structure (Czander, 1993).

Koortzen and Cilliers (2002) purported that understanding the anxieties within groups uncovers the conscious and unconscious motivations behind many self-defeating and ineffective behaviours.

2.3.2   Resistance to Change

"Human beings are notoriously resistant to change" (Obholzer, 1994, p.206). Inevitably, managing change involves managing both anxieties and the resistance arising from the change. Freud identified that resistance to change was of significant importance within the field of psychology (Czander, 1993). Organisational life involves much change; change in jobs, roles, titles, structures, and so forth (Czander, 1993). "Any living system will resist change, because as a living system its life depends on its ability to establish a steady state" (Rice, 1963, p.262). Groups under stress also tend to resist change and to collude into flight from their task (Bolton & Roberts, 1994).

Change will be explored in more detail in chapter 3.

2.3.3   Conflict

Conflict in inevitable within teams and according to Cilliers and Koortzen (2005) is the result of anxiety (defined as fear of the future) and uncertainty in the system. This supports Hirschhorn's (1993) view that anxiety is the root of all distorted relationships. Further, Cilliers and Koortzen (2005) suggested that conflict within teams, being a natural human condition, serves as a driving force or dynamo for the group's performance, creativity, innovation, and coping ability.   Conflict can manifest intra-personally (in the individual between ideas and feelings), interpersonally (between two or more group members), intra-group (between factions or sub-groups), or inter-group (between one group and others within the larger organisation) (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2005). In order to manage the conflict dynamics they developed the CIBART model. CIBART is an acronym for: conflict, identity, boundaries, authority, roles, task. This model provides a framework for understanding, qualitative assessment and resolving the causes of conflict (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2005). As a method, the consultant and the group work through the six constructs in an explorative manner, asking questions about how these manifest in behavioural terms, where and why the behaviours originate, what purpose it serves, what the behaviours represent, whether it needs to be addressed, and

what intervention would be helpful as well as how and by whom they should be managed. Since conflict is experienced at different levels, it is explored in terms of the intra-personal, interpersonal, intra-group, and intergroup manifestations.

The second construct, identity, refers to the characteristics that distinguish the group, its members, their task, climate and culture, from other groups (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2005). The group's identity, they say is influenced by the personality and style of the leader, how the team experiences the leader, and how individual leadership is allowed to be taken up by the members. A lack of identification with the team's nature and unclear identity boundaries creates a high level of anxiety (Cilliers & Koorzten, 2005). Therefore, the group is encouraged to explore the extent to which they identify with the leader and his goals and with the organisation's mission. Any discrepancies between the individual, the team and the leader, result in feelings of not belonging, hopelessness and helplessness (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2005).

The other constructs, boundaries, authority, role and task, will be explored under the separate sub-heading below, as they are helpful in exploring the management of conflict specifically as well as psychodynamics within groups in general.

To understand psychodynamics and in the application of psychoanalytical theory, Czander (1993) provided a framework and said that it is assumed all organisational difficulties can be traced back to one of these areas: boundary maintenance and regulation, task analysis, authority and leadership, role definition, inter-organisational relations, and sub-system dependency and autonomy. These constructs, as they manifest within groups, enable an interpretation of the psychodynamics operant within the group and therefore provide evidence of the basic assumptions present. These are briefly outlined in the following sub-sections.

2.3.4   Boundary maintenance and regulation

According to Rice (1965) living systems must interact with their environment in order to survive. These interactions are boundary interactions (Czander, 1993).   All systems, individuals, teams and organisations, have boundaries (Hirschhorn, 1993; Roberts, 1994). The main function of boundaries is to differentiate what is inside the system and what is outside (Roberts, 1994). Hirschhorn (1993) concluded from the works of Trist, Jacques, Menzies, Rice and Miller, that when faced with uncertainty and feeling at risk, people set up psychological boundaries that violate pragmatic task boundaries simply to reduce anxiety.

Koortzen and Cilliers (2002) indicated that setting organisational boundaries aims to contain anxiety and to make the workplace controllable. Rice (1963) conceptualised two subsystems: the operating subsystem (which performs the work of the primary task), and the managing subsystem (which is external to the operating subsystem, but has the responsibility of regulating and managing the boundaries of the organisation).

Boundary management entails setting boundaries in terms of time, space, and task (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002).   The time boundaries structure the work day; space boundaries structure the workplace (space), and task boundaries define the work content in terms of what is required and to what standard. Czander (1993) defined task boundaries to include more than the specific; it also includes the inter-dependencies and interactions with other subsystems required to accomplish the task, as well as the psychosocial climate needed to conduct the task in an enthusiastic manner.

Czander (1993) categorise the four types of boundary management for assessment into:
1. Regulation of task system boundary (the system's input, conversion, and output and their relationships);
2. Regulation of sentient group boundary (this refers to role and division of labour, as well as the emotional life of the members);
3. Regulation of the organisation's boundaries; and

4. Regulation of the relationships between task, sentient, and organisational boundaries.

Every boundary represents an opportunity for either collaboration or conflict and it is the managers of these boundaries / interfaces that hold the key to organisational success (Czander, 1993). During turbulent times, it becomes necessary to spend an increased amount of time at the boundaries – the role of boundary management, due to the constant change in both the internal and external environment, is becoming a crucial contribution of those in leadership (Rice, 1963).

2.3.5   Taking up a role and managing oneself in a role

"Role refers to the conscious and unconscious boundary around the way to behave" (Cilliers, 2005, p.4). The relationship between the individual (employee) and the role he occupies is inextricably linked to this consultancy stance (Czander, 1993). Czander (1993, p.295) defines role as "a mode of adaptation to authority, structure, culture, duties, and responsibilities" and entails behaviour subsumed under a title. He highlighted the impact role has on learning, perception and motivation of the individual. He added that employees are able, through defining roles, to clarify the relationships they are expected to maintain with other subsystems. Taking up a role according to Zalesnik and Kets de Vries (1984) is part of the individual's character and habitual mode of responding, while according to Sampson (1971) and Kohn and Schooler (1983) it has the effect of altering the individual's personality (cited in Czander, 1993). Kets de Vries (1991) referred to the job as being, for some, their sole identity, and thus highlighted that individuals fear that loneliness and depression will follow if they relinquish their role. He added that individuals dread the sudden silence which comes from turning into a 'non-entity' and this causes those individuals faced with relinquishing their role a lot of anxiety. This anxiety forms part of persecutory anxiety: the fear of annihilation (Czander, 1993). Role becomes one's identity because often role displaces other interests, and so securing the role comes at a high price (significant sacrifices), thus making potential loss of role a dreadful prospect (Kets de Vries, 1991). Czander (1993) highlights that one's role often serves a defensive and adaptive purpose, and that the defensive utility of being in a role is

found in both the skills required to perform and in the 'mood' required of the role. Furthermore, he added that the role serves as an opportunity to gratify unconscious wishes; wishes that serve to reduce some earlier conflicts and trauma and the anxiety associated with these wishes.

Taking up a role is a complex process and Czander (1993) said that identification is at the core; he has to 'take on' the requirements of the role and renounce behaviour not congruent with the role. This, he said, is achieved if the role satisfies wishes contained in the fantasies of the idealised self image. The stress of taking on a role is reduced by developing a professional (or work) ego, which contain fantasies of the idealised self-image. However, excessive anxiety results when the role impinges on characterological structure (Czander, 1993). Taking up a role also implies uncertainty and risk (Hirschhorn, 1993; Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). With regard to the manager's anxiety-in-role Krantz (1998) has said that it can be understood as the shadow of the future as people think about it and place it into an organisational perspective. Thus, these anxieties of the manager can be the early warning system for the organisation. Furthermore Czander (1993) highlighted that a misfit between the person and the role would lead to role stress, and how the individual deals with this is determined by the intensity and stress of the role, the degree of autonomy the role offers, the duration the individual is in the role, the age of the individual and most importantly, the fit between the individual's inner experience and the characteristics, gratifications, and social meaning provided by the role.

Obholzer (1994, p.44) said in relation to managing oneself in a role that the fundamental question is "how can I mobilise my resources and potential to contribute to the task?" Further explaining that this requires understanding of where one's role ends and another person's begins, the scope and limits of one's authority, and also the readiness to sanction that of others.

2.3.6   Representation

Representation occurs when one of the team boundaries is crossed by the individual or the team (Obholzer & Roberts, 1994). Koortzen and Cilliers (2002) explained that crossing boundaries happen at three levels:

1. micro-system level: the crossing of individual boundaries occurs during interpersonal communication, for example a performance appraisal discussion;

2. meso-system level: this entails interpersonal or team communication wherein two people from different departments interact or teams from different departments meet;

3. macro-system level: this occurs when an individual / team meets with an individual / team from another organisation.

When individuals / teams cross boundaries (at any of the three above mentioned levels), Czander (1993) said a transactional zone area is created, and consequently these individuals / teams become members of the transactional task system. This cross-boundary activity could be experienced as the rupturing of the original boundary and cause anxiety which has been dormant, to manifest quite acutely (Czander, 1993). He added that the adaptive and defensive response to this is typically to delineate new boundaries or to make existing boundaries more dramatic and rigid. Crossing boundaries (in order to achieve the primary task) is inevitable, but has to be managed and regulated.

Representation refers to the authority (or mandate) given to the individual or team who crosses the boundary on behalf of someone else, the department, or the organisation (Czander, 1993; Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002; Mosse & Roberts, 1994). Czander (1993) said the representative is required to act as the negotiator and that the nature and quality of the authority given to the representative is a crucial element in understanding group functioning.   More specifically, the choice of representative, his preparation, the information he is given, and his mandate will have significant impact on the negotiations within the transactional zone.

2.2.7   Authorisation

The mutual interdependencies that underpin any social system establish the processes of delegation, authorisation, leadership, and interpersonal collaboration that produce work (Krantz, 1998). Czander (1993) highlighted the importance of clarifying the nature of authority given to organisational representatives. The authorisation provided to these representatives is distinguished at three levels of authorisation, viz. representative, delegated, and plenipotentiary authority (Czander, 1993; Obholzer, 1994). These are explained by Cilliers and Koortzen (2005) and Koortzen & Cilliers, (2002) as follows:

- Representative authority implies being limited in giving and sharing sensitive information about the system with others across the boundary; it entails being given permission to observe on behalf of the group, but not being trusted to make inputs towards the task.

- Delegated authority offers more freedom in sharing with clear boundaries around the content of what is shared; it gives permission to freely interact, however within very specific task and outcome boundaries.

- Plenipotentiary authority provides complete freedom to the representative to use his own sense of responsibility and to make his own choices of what and how much to share.

When an individual crosses organisational boundaries into the transactional zone area to communicate, negotiate or sell, it creates anxiety – this anxiety is exacerbated when authority has not been defined and this hinders effectiveness (Czander, 1993; Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). However, authority is a dynamic phenomenon and thus needs to be regularly negotiated between the leader and the group (Cilliers & Koortzen, 2005). Since authority derived from structure produces a command and control environment not conducive to empowerment, a new form of authority relation is emerging that is based on negotiated agreement (Krantz, 1998).

2.3.8   Relationship and relatedness

Relationships include any interaction, as it happens, in the here-and-now. Relatedness refers to the ever-present relationships in the mind (Cilliers, 2005). The organisation represents the context that provides a sense of identity for the micro-and meso-systems within it, and is seen as the driving force for a lot of behaviour (Koortzen & Cilliers, 2002). They further highlighted that existing relationships might be the result of perceptions teams (individuals) have of themselves, and others, which if ineffective can hamper cooperation and performance of the entire system. In addition, Kersten (2001) asserted that the individual is an extension of these relationship networks.

2.3.9   Containment

Cilliers (2005) defined containment as placing a boundary around an experience or emotion – it could be managed or denied, kept in or passed on, experienced or avoided, so that the effects could be mitigated or amplified. He referred to Bion's (1970) container-contained model that describes the relationship between the contained and the container, indicating that the container could act as either a filter or sponge, managing difficult emotions, or it could become a rigid frame that blocks or restricts – thus making the contained something that can be experienced as a threat or a saviour.

2.4   THE SYSTEMS PSYCHODYNAMIC VIEW OF LEADERSHIP

The systems psychodynamic view of leadership is that of managing what is inside the boundary in relation to what is outside the boundary, and thus is required to have a inward and outward focus simultaneously (Obholzer, 1994; Rice, 1963, 1965). When boundaries are poorly designed and managed, they can cause a great amount of stress and anxiety (Hirschhorn, 1993). The task of leadership must therefore be located on the boundary between the organisation and the external environment (Rice, 1963). Thus, at the boundary, the leader integrates the mission with the means for accomplishing it,

weaving the means and ends to articulate a mission which can realistically be achieved (Krantz & Gilmore, 1989). Organisational leadership relates means and ends and has both a strategic and operational perspective. By standing at the boundary, leaders create a more controllable environment in which the activities within the boundary are organised and can be coordinated to respond to changes (Hirschhorn, 1993).

Obholzer (1994) added that leadership is also directly related to the pursuit of the organisation's aims and primary task. It is through monitoring the primary task that the leader is able to avoid abuse of power, maintain on-task leadership and minimise the occurrence and spread of basic assumption activity in the organisation (Obholzer, 1994). The relationship between the leader and followers will depend on the extent of the leader's capacity to manage the relationships between the internal and external environments in such a way that it enables the followers to perform their primary task (Rice, 1963). Furthermore, Rice (1963) reported that a task of leadership of a part is to manage relationships with other parts and with the whole.

Lapierre (1991) provided a definition of leadership derived from the works of Erikson (1958, 1969), Zaleznik and Kets de Vries (1975, 1991), Zaleznik (1977, 1989, 1990), Kernberg (1979), Kets de Vries (1980, 1984, 1989, 1990), Levinson (1981), and Kets de Vries and Miller (1984, 1987). Their view, he said, is that leadership is the result of the personal predispositions, qualities, and attributes of the individual occupying positions of authority. Thus leadership is defined as the part of executive action directly attributed to the person exercising authority, and more specifically to the projection of deep-seated elements of his personality (Lapierre, 1991). It is impossible to separate the leader from the person – the leader must bring his person (himself) to the role and invests his role with his own affects (Hirschhorn, 1993). Furthermore Hirschhorn (1993) added that often recognising and dealing with one's own feelings can be anxiety provoking. Lapierre (1991) highlighted that the exercise of leadership can activate or re-activate the most primitive fantasies that lie at the core of cognitive and motivational activity.

"In fantasy the leader is omnipotent – at once a generalist and a specialist, individually mobile yet cooperative as a member of a team, intellectual but with an acute sense for the common place. He is supposed to be a 'man' – aggressive, charismatic and stable – and at the same time exercise restraint and self control" (Levinson, 1980, p.145).

The terms, management and leadership are often used inter-changeably (Hirschhorn, 1993; Krantz & Gilmore, 1989; Lapierre, 1991; Zaleznik, 1991), and thus for the purpose of this study the distinction needs to be clarified. Lapierre (1991) referred to a common distinction between management and leadership, whereby management refers to dealing with the complexity of an existing state and leadership refers to promoting change from one state to the next. However, Lapierre (1991) held that there is no clear split between management and leadership and that those who hold authority in organisations are to some degree both leaders and professional managers. The key role of leadership is to develop an organisational mission which the organisation can realistically achieve, and to efficiently deploy its resources in service of its primary task (Krantz & Gilmore, 1989). According to Krantz and Gilmore (1989), drawing a distinction between manager and leader is a social defense in response to the complexity which is emerging in both the inner and outer environments, and thus is not a realistic distinction. However, Zaleznik (1991) cited Bass' (1985) research that highlights five factors that differentiate leaders from managers: charisma, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and management by exception. However, regardless of whether one is managing or leading, one has to be working with and through other people (the team) in order to realise a stated goal. Lapierre (1991) held that realising one's vision through others requires that the leader has a certain feeling of potency. He goes on to say that it is this sense of potency that makes the leader implement actions that have a far reaching impact on others.

Zaleznik (1991) suggested the difference between leaders and managers is also evidenced in how they choose to deal with conflicts in their lives. Leaders, he said, through turning inward to confront these difficult events, emerge with a created sense of identity and sense of separateness, which is a necessary condition for leading. This sense of

separateness is not veiled narcissism. While, in the process of our development narcissism is considered a necessary ingredient for self preservation, however extended and unmodified narcissistic fantasies may be the root of serious work disorders (Kets de Vries, 1995). Narcissism is considered an early stage of development when the libido is invested in the self or ego, in other words, love of self; in normal development this investment is turned outwards towards others, while in neurosis it remains fixed on the self (Czander, 1993). Separateness is an awareness of boundaries, whereby the leader can distinguish inner and outer worlds, fantasy from reality, and self from others (Zaleznik, 1991).

"Leadership is based on a compact that binds those who lead and those who follow into the same moral, intellectual, and emotional commitment" (Zaleznik, 1991, p.103). The legitimacy of the leadership compact stems from tradition or from the personal qualities of the leader. The leadership compact claims to effect cooperative efforts of both superior and subordinates to ensure organisational success (Zaleznik, 1991). He further highlighted that the most critical factor in the leadership compact is the willingness of those in positions of authority to use their power in the best interest of their subordinates and their organisation. Thus, he describes the leader as a selfless servant. Effective leadership thus implies being receptive to needs of the followers, which requires sensitivity and reflectiveness, and raises people to their highest levels of motivation and morality (Kets de Vries, 1995; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). Schuitema's (1998) model of leadership is based on the axiom that legitimacy in a power relationship requires that the super-ordinate (the leader) acts with the intention to empower the subordinate. He further emphasises that this relationship requires that the leader acts with sincerity, thus demonstrating his willingness to suspend his own agenda in the interest of the subordinate, and in so doing creates the conditions to enable the growth of the subordinate. The objective of this growth, according to Schuitema (1998) is to bring about the maturing of the subordinate to act unconditionally in service to the other.

These descriptions of leadership begin to clarify that which is considered functional in superior-subordinate relationships, and to define what the role is that leaders play in the

organisation. Clearly the impact of leadership is undisputed, though not isolated. Furthermore, understanding how the leader's personality impacts on his capacity to take up this role is of particular interest. Many studies have focused on simple dimensions of personality and its relationships to leadership, while Kets de Vries (2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) have focused on clusters of behaviour patterns, personality styles, considering these to be more stable over time. It is thus these personality styles that will be used as the basis for understanding leadership's response to change.

2.4.1 The leadership styles

Freud (1931) developed a typology of leadership and suggests that an employee's relationship to the leader as an object is a function of the relations between two or more intrapsychic agencies (cited in Czander, 1993). The three leader types explored by Freud (1931, cited in Czander, 1993) were:

- the erotic type: an individual concerned with being loved and dreading the loss of love, and who is typically dependant on his objects;

- the obsessional type: an individual controlled by his super-ego, dreads anxiety of conscience (guilt) more than the loss of love, and is more dependent on his inner ideals than on other people;

- the narcissistic type: this individual is not overly dependent on others, and does not feel much conflict between his ego (sense of self) and super-ego (internalised ideals).

According to Freud (1931) leaders often are of the narcissistic type, because of their capacity to be charismatic, aggressive, and independent (Czander, 1993). However adding that combinations are often prevalent and that in fact the ideal leader is a blend of the different types to achieve a balance which is in harmony with himself. One type of leader arises over another because a particular mode has been exaggerated or emphasised at the cost of others (Czander, 1993).

A more recent study conducted by Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) expanded on this typology. Kets de Vries (2001) argued that the individual's cognitive and affective map

is determined by a person's interior world (his fantasies), and that these determine the way in which the individual responds to their environment. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) established a relationship between personality, leadership style, and corporate culture, strategy and structure. The distinctions they made in terms of leadership styles were between dramatic (histrionic), suspicious (paranoid), detached (schizoid), depressive, and compulsive styles. Kets de Vries (2001) reflected that all of these styles have elements of success, and that often leaders blend a mixture of styles that derive from their inner scripts, often inter-changing styles as determined or triggered by circumstances – however usually favouring a particular style and this he has labelled their 'neurotic style'. He added that the different styles lead to failure when applied in excess and that extreme manifestations of any one style could signal significant psychopathology that could lead to impaired functioning.

Where authority is highly centralised, the person-organisation interface is so close that leadership impact very directly on the organisation, while by the same token where decision making authority is broadly distributed, the leadership style and organisational culture (pathology) is more tenuous (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). Furthermore, the stronger the personality of the leader, the greater the influence on organisational culture (Kets de Vries, 2001). The styles, as presented, are depicted according to the relationship between the style, its predominant motivating fantasy, and the organisational culture, as well as the organisation.

TABLE 2.2

THE FIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES

Fantasy	Style	Culture	Organisation
Persecution *Guiding Theme:* "Some menacing force is out to get me. I'd better be on my guard, I can't really trust anybody"	Suspicious Vigilant, prepared to counter any attacks and personal threats; hyper-sensitive; distrustful; over involved in rules and detail to ensure control; craving information; vindictive	Paranoid Fostering a "fight-or-flight" mode, including dependency and fear of attack; emphasising the power of information; uniformity and a lack of trust; intimidation	Paranoid Organisation is characterised by elaborate information processing, a lot of analysis of external trends, and centralisation of power
Helplessness *Guiding Theme:* "It's hopeless to try to change the course of events. I'm just not good enough"	Depressive Dependent The leader lacks self confidence; has low self esteem; ignores success and tolerates mediocrity; dependant on 'messiah'	Avoidant Passive and lacking of initiative; low levels of motivation; ignorant of external factors (markets); absent leadership;	Depressive Organisation is characterised by ritualism, bureaucracy; inflexible hierarchy; poor communications and resistance to change
Grandiosity *Guiding Theme:* "I want to get attention from and impress the people who count in my	Dramatic Histrionic / narcissistic; Attention seeking; craves excitement; has a sense of	Charismatic Dependency evident, "idealising" and "mirroring"; headed by a leader who is the catalyst	Dramatic Over-centralised; low level of influence of second tier executive

life"	entitlement; tends towards extremes	for initiative and morale of subordinates	
Control *Guiding Theme:* "I don't want to be at the mercy of events. I have to master and control all the things affecting me."	Compulsive Dominating; insistent that others conform to rules; dogmatic and obstinate; obsessed with perfectionism, detail, routine, rituals, and efficiency	Bureaucratic Rigid, inward focused, insular, populated with submissive, uncreative and insecure employees	Compulsive Organisation has rigid code, elaborate information systems; ritualised evaluation procedures; thorough; leader's status derives form hierarchy
Detachment *Guiding Theme:* "Reality doesn't offer any satisfaction, interaction with others is destined to fail, so it's safer to remain distant."	Detached (schizoid / avoidant) Withdrawn, uninvolved; lacks interest in present and future; indifferent to praise and criticism	Politicised Lacks warmth or emotions; conflict ridden; plagued by insecurity; and jockeying for power	Schizoid Internally focussed; and lack of external scanning; self imposed barriers to information flow

(Adapted from Kets de Vries and Miller (1991, p.246) and Kets de Vries (2001, p.146-147))

Kets de Vries (2001, 2004) pointed out that not all leaders are unhealthy or dysfunctional. He (2004, p.64) highlighted that those that function optimally are talented in self-observation, are reflective, lead balanced lives and "accept the madness in themselves". The crisis of leadership is not a problem of mediocrity of those in leadership roles, but

rather an unwillingness of many leaders to transcend their own personal agendas to create a better world (Kets de Vries, 1995).

2.4.2   Leadership and basic assumption groups

There is generally a basic collusive inter-dependence between the leader and the followers, whereby the leader will only be followed as long as he fulfils the basic assumption task of the group (Stokes, 1994). This is particularly important since, as Hirschhorn (1993) pointed out, no group is free from the irrationalities of basic assumption behaviour, and the ratio between the two modes of group life determines the level of effectiveness of the group. Work-group mentality is characterised by more cooperation, respect, and a focus on achieving the group's primary task (Stokes, 1994). It is clear that when taken over by basic assumption mentality, the group spirals into ineffectiveness (Stokes, 1994), and thus leaders need to challenge their followers to a work-group mentality (or at least a balance).

TABLE 2.3

LEADERS AND BASIC ASSUMPTION GROUPS

Basic Assumption Groups	Leader's function	Leader's Feelings
Dependency (baD)	The leader is restricted to providing for the members needs; he fulfils the role of 'messiah'	The leader experiences feelings of heaviness and resistance to change, and has a preoccupation with hierarchy and status as the basis for decisions
Fight-or-Flight (baF)	The leader must identify an enemy either within or outside of the group, and then lead the attack (fight) or flight	The leader experiences feelings of aggression and suspicion, and has a preoccupation with rules and procedural

		details
Pairing (baP)	The leader must foster hope that the future will be better, while preventing actual change from happening	The leader has a preoccupation with alternative futures, and has insubstantial hopes for the future outcomes

(Adapted from Stokes (1994, p.23))

According to Stokes (1994) the leader who fails to fulfil this function on behalf on the group will be ignored and eventually his followers will find an alternative leader. Thus the leader becomes a puppet or creation of the group and is manipulated to fulfil the group's wishes and to evade brutal realities. Followers use leaders as scapegoats to avoid facing their own contribution to organisational failure, placing all the responsibility on the leader and accepting none (Hirschhorn, 1993). Stokes (1994) added that basic assumption leadership results in the leader experiencing feelings related to the nature of the group's unconscious demands.

Kets de Vries (2004) and Offerman (2004) related that leaders are sometimes also vulnerable, especially in relation to their followers' attempts to manipulate their leader. In fact, Hirschhorn (1993) offered the perspective that often groups choose, shape and condition their leaders. Kets de Vries (2004) suggested that leaders have the ability to awaken transferential processes, in which individuals transfer the dynamics of past relationships onto present interactions. Offerman (2004) said that leaders could make poor decisions because the followers, who have been empowered, are persuasive about a different course of action. Alternatively, he added, leaders can be fooled by their followers either by way of flattery or deliberate isolation from the uncomfortable realities. A further vulnerability that he pointed out is unscrupulous and ambitious followers, who encroach on the leader's authority to such an extent that the leader becomes a mere figurehead, who has apparent responsibility but no power.

Thus it is evident that leaders and followers inform each other and that projections and introjections are common place in these inter-relationships. Hirschhorn (1993) suggested that an individual's capacity to lead is shaped by a force field of other people's actions and reactions. Common sense suggests that groups frequently get the leaders they deserve and vice versa.

2.5 INTEGRATION

The W-group and ba-group, both being present and real, operate concurrently and, from the theory explored it becomes evident that, often the ba-group displaces and overtakes the primary task – resulting in dysfunctional work patterns and relationships. This is likely to occur when anxiety is experienced and conflict arises.

2.5.1 Leadership and boundaries

Though leaders manage boundaries and thus manage the containment of anxieties, they too evoke anxieties in the manner in which they deal with authority and authorisation.

Every boundary represents an opportunity for either collaboration or conflict and it is the leaders of these boundaries that hold the key to organisational success (Czander, 1993). During change more time needs to be allocated to the role of boundary management, and during these turbulent times this role represents an important contribution leadership is called upon to make.

The task, space, and time boundaries which are defined to facilitate primary task achievement, also serve to contain anxieties. However, people also set up psychological boundaries that violate pragmatic task boundaries simply to reduce anxiety. The leader has the responsibility to regulate and manage the boundaries, failing to do this is a fundamental failure of leadership. However, since boundaries hold the potential for conflict, avoiding conflict could lead to a failure on the part of leaders to assume responsibility for this aspect. Managing conflict, it has been suggested, is facilitated

through heightened awareness of the conflict, identity, boundaries, authority, role and task (CIBART). Therefore, ignoring the role of boundary management could lead to anxiety and conflict, and ironically the way to deal with conflict requires dealing with boundary issues.

2.5.2   Leadership and taking up a role

The role of leader, as with all roles, represents the conscious and unconscious boundary around how to behave, and is often informed by what is expected of them. From the theory it became clear that roles are part of the individual's character and thus when taken on, has the effect of changing the individual's personality. This change implies anxiety, which as Hirschhorn (1993) has indicated distorts relationships. Roles, and specifically the role of leader, are shaped by the force field of other people's actions and reactions. This implies that groups create and shape leaders with their conscious and unconscious demands.

However, this is not one-sided – there appears to be an unconscious collusion between the group's influence and the extent to which these influences and demands resonate within leader. Taking up the role as leader requires that the individual take on the requirements of the role and disavow behaviours not congruent with the role. Identification is at the core of taking up a role, since the individual will only take on the requirements and renounce incongruent behaviours, if the role satisfies wishes contained in fantasies of his idealised self image. The group's conscious and unconscious demands define expected behaviours, and thus inform the role. Basic assumption leadership results in the leader experiencing feelings related to the group's unconscious demands. These unconscious demands require different things of the leader. In summary, baD basic assumption groups require that the leader provide for them and be the 'messiah'; baF groups expects the leader to identify the enemy and to lead the attack; and baP groups expect their leader to foster hope that the future will be better. Taking up the role of leader therefore implies that the leader would be willing to take on these requirements and furthermore that these roles satisfy wishes contained in his fantasies.

2.5.3   Leadership, representation and authority

Representation occurs when boundaries are crossed and since leaders do most of the work at the boundaries, it implies that it is often leaders who cross the boundaries and thus represent the group. Thus, a further implication is that it is the leader who creates the anxiety by rupturing the original group boundaries. When the representative crosses the boundary, he is afforded a certain level of authority to act on behalf of the group. The authority given to the leader is generally granted by a party outside of the group, and to whom the leader reports. The authority to act on behalf of the group is not given to the leader by the group and this signals potential problems with cross-boundary activity.

2.5.4   Leadership and containment

As indicated, containment entails placing a boundary around an experience or emotion. The container either filters or manages difficult emotions, or it blocks or restricts – and this makes the contained something than can be experienced as a threat or a saviour. From the theory it is evident that the leader is often required to act as the container. The leader thus contains for the group difficult emotions, and has to manage anything entering the containment boundary through either filtering it or blocking it. This describes another boundary regulating function for the leader.

2.5.5   Leadership styles and basic assumption groups

The five leadership styles (paranoid, schizoid, depressive, compulsive, and histrionic) are an extension of Freud's typology of leadership types. He described the erotic type (those who are dependant on others, want love and dread the loss thereof), the obsessional type (those who are not dependant on others, but rather on their super-ego / ideals and are driven by these ideals and by guilt), and the narcissistic type (those who are not overly dependant on others and who does not have too much conflict between the ego and super-ego).   The five leadership styles could probably be aligned with Freud's original

typology: histrionic and depressive styles aligning with the erotic type; compulsive and paranoid styles would align with the obsessional type; with the disinterested and dispassionate schizoid style aligning to the narcissistic type.

It is clear that a reciprocal relationship exists between the leader and the led. In exploring this reciprocal relationship it becomes clear that both the leader (and his style) and the group become mutually influencing entities. The organisation and culture associated with the paranoid style is one of centralised power and a basic assumption mentality of 'fight-flight' (baF). Within baF groups leaders feel aggression and suspicion and are preoccupied with rules and procedures. The latter baF group describes the paranoid style as postulated by Kets de Vries and Miller (1991). Due to the centrality of power related to the paranoid style, the leader exercises a significant influence on the group.

The histrionic style is associated with a culture of dependency (thus, baD group becomes operant), wherein the leader is the catalyst for the morale of the group. Within the baD group mentality the leader has to be the 'messiah' and feels 'heavy' and resistant to change.

The schizoid style is associated with a culture of conflict and an organisation which is cut-off from external realities. The intra-group and inter-group splitting results in a baP group mentality. Within this mentality the leader fosters insubstantial hopes for the future.

Existing theory has not expounded on the link between the depressive and compulsive styles and basic assumption group. Following the same logic, it appears that the depressive style is associated with the we-ness basic assumption and the compulsive style with the me-ness basic assumption. The depressive style is associated with a bureaucratic and ritualistic culture and an organisation which is resistant to change. The culture is also passive and lacking in initiative, with low levels of motivation. This is very typical of the we-ness basic assumption mentality wherein the individual sublimates the self, passively to the group and in so doing experiences wholeness. The compulsive style, on the other

hand, also associated with bureaucracy, demonstrates a culture of submissiveness, insecurity and a lack of creativity, and is organised hierarchically. The leader's status is taken from the hierarchy. The individual (leader) insists on rules being adhered to and is dominating within a culture which is insular and inward focussed. The basic assumption this aligns to is the me-ness mentality; wherein the central concern is for the individual. The individual denies external realities, focuses on his internal world only, making the tacit assumption that the group does not exist. Therefore interactions with the group are impersonal, narcissistic, and somewhat schizoid.

Determining an explicit link between the five leadership styles and the basic assumption groups is crucial, because, as Stokes (1994) pointed out leaders are only followed as long as they fulfil the basic assumption tasks of the group.

Leaders often set the tone for dynamics within the system, but this does not exclude the fact that they too are affected and influenced by the systems and their followers. Often being used by the followers to effect what the followers expect or want. These dynamics pervade relationships at work, and when it becomes pathological leads to dysfunctionality as it diverts the members from the primary task. Diversion from the primary task logically results in organisational decline and failure, which ultimately destroys the members.

Narcissism is a normal part of human development however extended narcissistic drives lead to dysfunction. In one way or another, the leadership styles depicted all show a tendency toward self-interest and self-serving behaviours. Over-extended narcissistic tendencies seem to be at the core of inappropriate leadership behaviour. Becoming aware of this tendency (gaining insight) and then being willing to suspend self-interest is the key to creating functional and constructive leader-subordinate relationships and this enables effective group and organisational functioning. The systems psychodynamic perspective provides mechanisms for gaining these insights and enables the individual, through awareness, to be liberated from destructive behaviours and motivations.

2.6   CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter discussed the origins and basis of the systems psychodynamic perspective as well as an overview of the basic assumption groups. Furthermore it provided the context for application of this perspective by clarifying relevant concepts, including amongst others anxiety, representation, boundaries, and containment.

The definitions and perspectives of leadership within this perspective were presented. Most importantly it set forth the five leadership styles that are used as the basis of this study. In order to highlight the impact of leader-follower interactions, basic assumption groups and its relation to leadership were discussed.   The chapter closed with an integration of the systems psychodynamic perspective and leadership.

The aim of this chapter was to provide an overview of the systems psychodynamic perspective, upon which an understanding of leadership and its impact within organisations could be clarified.