

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **FINDINGS**

This chapter contains the findings of the empirical research, presented in two sections. The first section presents the definitions of each leadership style, as provided by the focus group and are set forth in table form under the dimensions: cognitive, affective, motivational, and interpersonal. The second section provides the descriptions of how the different leadership styles cope with change under the same sub-headings as indicated above. This is followed by integration and discussion of the findings. Each manifested theme will be given according to its reporting and interpretation. The chapter ends with the generated hypothesis.

The aim of this chapter is to present the findings of how the five leadership styles respond to change.

#### **5.1 PARTICIPANTS' DEFINITIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLES**

This section provides a common frame of reference with regard to the leadership styles being researched and is not intended to be a comprehensive description. It also outlines the definitions as provided by the participants, and has been categorised along the cognitive, affective, motivational, and interpersonal dimensions. It was intended primarily to be an orientation for those participating in the focus group and attempts to highlight the predominant characteristics (in terms of the cognitive, affective, motivational and interpersonal dimensions) from an empirical perspective. It is set forth below in a table according to the cognitive, affective, motivational and interpersonal dimensions. This summary will later be compared to the empirical findings that describe the leadership styles' response to change.

**TABLE 5.1**  
**DEFINITIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP STYLES**

<b>Style</b>	<b>Cognitive</b>	<b>Affective</b>	<b>Motivational</b>	<b>Interpersonal</b>
<b>Paranoid</b>	Lacks insight and reflexivity	Feels self doubt	Expects the worse	Mistrusts people or does not trust people easily; he projects self doubt and assigns blame to others; he is bossy and sees others as lazy.
<b>Schizoid</b>	Thinks: "I'm right and world is hostile"	Emotionally detached and paranoid; he is unable to express his emotions and remains cold and distant; he feels a need to protect himself	He avoids issues and is disinterested in work routine	He is withdrawn, and cold and distant with others; he does not trust people easily; he is uncommunicative and unresponsive
<b>Depressive</b>	Thinks negatively	Sad and angry – anger is directed towards himself; feels insecure and inadequate; feels guilty, hopeless, helpless, and	Motivated by guilt and / or fear. Defers or shirks responsibilities; He anticipates the worst and adopts avoidant behaviour	Defensive and unwilling to share authority; he is deferent. He becomes dependant on the team to assume responsibility and requires them to nurture and

		disempowered, he has low self esteem; he fears loss – loss of status, position and even of self		protect him
<b>Compulsive</b>	Pedantic; rigid in his thinking, yet indecisive.	Emotionless; he manages anxiety by engaging in repetitive activity; he has a strong need for control, order and perfection; he is not sure of himself and does not have a good self-image; this projected into action (of doing and re-doing)	Doing and Re-doing, is done for the sake of re-doing. Tends to be neat and meticulous	Distrust of others and checking up leads to frustration in team; he is autocratic when dealing with the team; he sets high standards and is a hard task master
<b>Histrionic</b>	Does not think things through; he is narcissistic and self absorbed; his thoughts revolve	He experiences extreme emotions, both the positive and the negative	His exhibitionist behaviour is driven by the needs for all the attention and	High level of self disclosure, and exhibitionistic behaviour; he has unstable relationships; his

	around himself		wanting to be trusted; he wants to be important to others; he elicits compliments by giving compliments; he acts out his emotions impulsively	interpersonal relationships serve only his own purpose; he has no real concern for others
--	----------------	--	---	---

These definitions of the leadership styles, as obtained from the focus group, describe the typical characteristics under ‘normal’ conditions. These definitions were congruent to the descriptions in the Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) typology, and therefore it was concluded that the information was reliable, valid and trustworthy. Based on this trustworthiness it was determined that continuing the analysis of the data from the second question was appropriate. The analysis of the data from the first question also provided a baseline understanding of the five leadership styles, upon which a clearer insight into the responses to change can be gained. The section that follows describes the five leadership styles’ responses to change, along the same dimensions (cognitive, affective, motivational, and interpersonal) previously used.

## **5.2 THE FIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES’ RESPONSES TO CHANGE**

This section reviews how participants describe the different leadership styles when they are confronted with change. These findings are also presented under the dimensions of cognitive, affective, motivational and interpersonal.

### 5.2.1 Paranoid leader

- Cognitive

To the paranoid leader, the enemy becomes bigger in his head, and he starts to see friends as enemies. He experiences confusion of reality and does not know who he is and whom he can trust. Generally, during times of change, he will not know what is going on and will thus retreat into fantasy. He sees danger, whether real or fantasy, all the time. He uses facts to confirm his own worse expectations and is inclined to misread or distort facts. He criticises. His rigidity during times of change results in a lack of creativity.

- Affective

He will become more paranoid and even hostile when confronted with change. Where there was trust – he moves to mistrust. He becomes frigid, fearing change and needs reassurance – to be made to feel safe.

- Motivational

This leader is on his guard. In response to change he goes into planning and structuring everything – in an effort to keep the enemy at bay and / or to ‘sort things out’ and to ‘get it right’. He becomes rigid and compulsive – and unwilling to concede mistakes on his part. The defensiveness is also coupled with protectiveness – protecting ‘his own stuff’. He makes plans to attack real or imagined objects that represent change. He is constantly on guard to protect his own boundaries. He also tends to exaggerate the ‘enemy out there’ to create a firewall.

- Interpersonal

During change he becomes suspicious – especially of the instigator of the change and will tend to generalise this suspicion to others, even his own colleagues. He becomes

defensive and blames others for what is happening. He finds it necessary to assign blame elsewhere. The suspicion will turn into mistrust of the instigator and eventually of others as well. This will result in destroying relationships in the team.

When stressed, he will grind (pulverise) his colleagues. He will tend to be bitter and twisted, highlighting to colleagues their weaknesses, and accusing them of being stupid. He becomes rude to others. Though he expresses that others are not good enough for him, this in fact covers his fears that someone else is good or even better than him. This creates a general competitiveness towards others and he will do what he can to prevent others from getting ahead of him.

He will break the boundaries of his own reality, by for example treating friends as the enemy. His boundaries become rigid – and this is precisely why they are more prone to breaking. The boundaries that are at risk include boundaries of self, team, department and even the organisation. When he starts acting based on his own fantasy, real splits in relationships are experienced. These splits are exacerbated by a lot of criticism towards others.

However, he is very useful for the system, as he is the one that will see the danger posed to the system – the danger others may miss. He does an environmental scan, and tells others what is going on ‘out there’, keeping others abreast of what is happening on the outside and where the threats are. This has the effect of isolating those on the inside because no one else is looking across the boundary. He will also generally handle the politics within the system. The paranoid leader will make sure no one is better than his department or team – because he evaluates the competition and keeps them at bay. In this context the team charges his paranoia and gets him to act out whatever they want or expect.

This leader also makes subordinates feel unsafe, leaving them feeling jittery and with a sense that they have to keep him feeling safe. The subordinates have to reassure him: “I’m not against you and you’re ahead” – having to prove themselves in this regard can

be exhausting. It also leaves the subordinates feeling unsafe and uncontained. This constant reassurance of the leader is generally accompanied by the subordinates needing to convince the leader that they are coping with the change and with their responsibilities. In addition the subordinates have to convince the leader that they are honourable and will not betray him and this tends to leave the subordinates feeling insecure. This in turn leads to the subordinates over compensating and working harder to show the leader that they can be trusted. This saps their energies. They are scared; they feel the criticism of not being good-enough. This may be the product of the leader's projections, based on his own fear that someone may just be good enough – or even better. So just as he keeps the competition on the outside at bay, he works as hard to keep those on the inside of the boundary at bay – keeping them 'small' so he can be 'big'.

### **5.2.2 Schizoid leader**

- Cognitive

He believes in his own 'correctness' and that what is incorrect is outside of himself.

- Affective

During times of change, he is fearful, avoidant and emotionally absent. He forges emotional (not rational) ties with others – but remains cold. He has an unconscious fear of being 'de-throned'.

- Motivational

He will become more withdrawn during times of change. He also becomes ineffective – not performing the job well. Though he is not effective, he remains powerful because he does a lot to invest himself in a powerful position.

- Interpersonal

This leader does not allow others to know what he is thinking – he remains closed and uncommunicative. He will hide what he thinks and keeps others separate or at a distance.

He will only cope with change when he is surrounded by a warm team and with established trusting relationships. If this is absent, there will be a lot of distrust, because people would not know where they stand with him. The team will, due to his lack of communication, start to fantasise or imagine what he's thinking.

This leader politicises the culture in the team by drawing some team members closer to him. Having some people closer to him than others, is sometimes done to deliberately create splits in the team. The splits are created to more easily manage them (in other words, “divide and conquer”). The splits he creates will cause insecurity to grow within the team.

He will gladly abdicate, leaving others to do the job. He will however make himself more powerful by getting people to work individually not collectively, and thus become central to them, without necessarily being effective. Even though the relationships are poor, this leader will be able to get others to achieve the task – and thus elicits respect from others for getting the job done.

When he lashes out, he does so in a ‘nice’ way – and subordinates will not know when to expect it and will not see it coming. He can be warm, but only in one-on-one relationships, not in groups. This links with the tendency to isolate team members and to create splits in the group, so as to maintain the team's dependence on the leader and to cultivate warm relationships with those individuals he has elected to be close to.



### 5.2.3 Depressive leader

- Cognitive

When stressed about change he will have paranoid thoughts. He is also inclined toward denial about the change and delays any thought of the impending changes. When the change is upon him, he will wake up in a histrionic (manic) mode – which is only a ‘wake-up’ reaction.

- Affective

During times of change he becomes angry. He will also experience feelings of hopelessness and meaninglessness; feels that no one loves him and becomes sad. This is accompanied with a general feeling of incompetence, and low self esteem. These feelings also manifest as self anger and self-guilt: “how hateful I am”. This could lead to self-flogging and generalising this to ‘we’re not good enough’. In most cases these feelings are baseless and do not fit reality.

He could also swing into mania, which would result in compulsive behaviour to cover or recover from feelings of low self-esteem and self-loathing.

- Motivational

This leader lacks motivation. The lack of motivation stems from not seeing a reason for doing what needs to be done and not seeing the benefit in it. He is disinterested and defeatist, believing “nothing will work”. In order to cope with constant change he tries to maintain structure and status.

The manic moments lead to a lot of activity – doing or redoing simple administrative tasks that are small and controllable. This includes getting processes in order that are

already in order – in other words working with ‘nothing’, doing things that will have no real influence.

He has a tendency to be passive-aggressive.

- Interpersonal

This leader tends to be very demanding – expecting others to keep going and to maintain activities, despite his own lack of motivation. The team feels that they should work hard to look after him – the team starts to care for the leader. The subordinate becomes the nurturer.

His hopelessness, helplessness, lack of motivation and self-pity will bring the team down to the same state. Similarly, the self doubt is also projected and the team starts to experience the same amount of self doubt and feelings of not being good enough – they think of themselves as inferior. He contains the ‘not good enough’ and passes it on; does not value himself or others; plays a strong role in creating this timid self image by not acknowledging the strengths of the team.

He will not promote anyone – in order to maintain status and structure. This is a form of competition – to keep himself ahead he keeps everyone in his team back.

#### **5.2.4 Compulsive leader**

- Cognitive

When faced with change, he is able to see the plan ahead and make sense of it. He also pays attention to all the detail and often highlights to others what is overlooked. Though he is not creative, he is ordered in his thinking. He is paranoid and suspicious of the change. He is able to deal with simplicity – but cannot cope with complexity; especially complexity within relationships. He will attempt to deal with complexity by containing it

in an organogram or structure. When things get complex he 'grabs a piece of paper', attempting to reduce complexity.

- Affective

This leader wants to be in control during times of change. He tends to be angry, sad and in emotional pain. He does not want to deal with emotionality or with all the conflict that goes with change.

He feels that he should be an expert and in control of a world in chaos. This is due to his fear of making mistakes and feeling that he is at the mercy of events that are beyond his control.

- Motivational

The need to be in control leads him to wanting to fix a 'world in chaos' – and this predictably leads to failure. Failure on his part leads to him over-compensating and trying harder. This, much like wheel spinning, expends a lot of energy but creates no movement – and results in his burnout.

The valence of the compulsive is to 'get it right'. When he is unable to complete a task properly, he will simply keep doing it over and over, going into more detail each time.

In comparison to the other neurotic leadership styles, he will cope most successfully with change because of his ability to define delegation of authority clearly. He is competent in effecting the task – but not with dealing with feelings. He uses work as a defence.

When he is stressed he becomes more rigid and even sadistic.

- Interpersonal

He frustrates his team because during times of change he becomes overly bureaucratic. This leads to a decrease in the team's creativity and they become passive. His bureaucratic style stems from his need to control the whole process, even the feelings and thinking of others. He wants to control everything – and the more he wants to control, the more he encounters rebelliousness in his team. The team feels disempowered by him. This results in the teams wanting to leave or move on.

He is not open to projection because he is too busy with the task. He will also find fault with and criticise the team, considering the team to be ineffective relative to his performance and standards. The team would not be 'good-enough' for him.

This leader does not listen to the complexities in the relationships and he takes flight into structuring and re-structuring. Although his team could manipulate or seduce him by appealing to his need to 'get things right' – his sadistic nature would result in negative repercussions for the team when he realises their manipulation.

### **5.2.5 Histrionic leader**

- Cognitive

He avoids thinking; wants to act, not think; is impulsive and this leads to mistakes. He tends to act out or act in, while working covertly with the notion that change will not happen. He is able to delude himself that the change will not happen. He has a strong narcissistic tendency and is self absorbed. He is superficial and small-minded (shallow).

- Affective

He will exhibit all his emotions, anxieties and projections during times of change. He also tends to become angry when he is resisted and this leads to feelings of inadequacy and incompetence.

He is envious of those who do cope with change. He is emotionally immature and acts out his every emotion.

- Motivational

This leader tends to act so that he off-loads his own anxieties. He is quite happy to spread the news and also the panic. He resists dealing with the change in a real or authentic manner – but rather attempts to manipulate the process of change to his own benefit. He wants all the attention and yearns for the limelight and thus acts to secure it.

His behaviour is impulsive. He will act or react quickly to counter change in a way that satisfies him and his needs only. He tends to do a lot that is observable, but still manages to remain ‘stuck’ (paralysed) because he continues to resist the change.

- Interpersonal

He will generally establish relationships with anyone. He agitates everyone and creates panic. He projects his emotions onto others. He does not want anyone else to cope with the change when he is not coping.

This leader has good relationships with others in the team and seduces them easily. He also positions himself to be their saviour and to this end he can be charismatic. The relationships he has are not enduring because these relationships serve his needs only and are superficial. He is emotionally unavailable for others - because he is self absorbed, he

will not (and does not) look after the emotions of anyone except his own. He does not have the capacity or the need or want to look after others.

He will project his own sense of incompetence onto others in an effort to make himself feel more competent (by comparison). He acts with the view that to incapacitate others will make him look good. His narcissism leads him to discredit others in order to affirm himself. He will even take credit for the work of others. He cuts them down, so he is the 'last man standing'. He will even take revenge on them when they resist him. This makes his narcissism become sadistic in nature.

### **5.3 INTEGRATION OF FINDINGS**

This section provides an integrative profile of each leadership style, integrating the focus group findings with what is provided in literature. A description is given of how each leadership style respond to change at a cognitive, affective, and motivational level, as well as what the effects are on his followers and in interpersonal relationships. These descriptions are then linked to existing literature in order to distil the essence of how, from a systems psychodynamic perspective, the different leadership styles deal with change.

The findings show that each leadership style reacts in a distinctly different manner during times of change. Furthermore, the findings provide an insight into how the leadership styles impact on the capacity of the individual to take up the role of leader.

This study is based on the premise that the way in which people deal with their environments is generally embedded patterns of behaviour that are enduring and pervasive, and these determine an individual's cognitive and affective map (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) suggested understanding the individual requires understanding the "fantasies" that make up the person's internal world – which they said is generally a mixture of different styles, triggered by circumstances. They

assert that during anxiety-provoking situations one specific style will consistently come to the fore and be dominant – and furthermore that extreme manifestations of any one style could signal “significant psychopathology that seriously impairs functioning” (p.243). It is for this reason that the study strives to establish the key characteristics and patterns of behaviour that manifest during change, an anxiety-provoking situation, so as to determine whether any style is more prone to serious dysfunction. The response to change of the five leadership styles has not been investigated previously and therefore the findings below highlight what remains the same or alters along the dimensions when the leader is faced with change.

### **5.3.1 Paranoid leadership style**

The paranoid leadership style is described by the focus group as lacking in insight and reflexivity, exhibiting self-doubt and anticipating the worse, as well as having high levels of mistrust of others. This concurs with the clinical descriptions in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM IV) which elaborate specifically on the interpersonal dimensions, indicating that the essential feature of the paranoid personality disorder is “a pattern of pervasive distrust and suspiciousness of others that their motives are malevolent” (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 1994, p.634). Furthermore, it describes the constant vigilance to potential threats and thus he may act in a guarded manner. He also tends to quickly react or counter-attack with anger to any perceived insults (APA, 1994). The DSM IV indicates that because they act secretly, they appear to be cold and lacking in emotion. Their behaviour also appears to be objective, rational and unemotional (APA, 1994; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991), but is however underpinned by emotions of hostility, sarcasm, and stubbornness (APA, 1994). Kets de Vries (2001, p.15) describes the paranoid leadership style as: “People of this type are hypervigilant, distrustful, apprehensive, concerned about the hidden motives, prudent, and alert. They’re constantly concerned that someone else will pull a fast one on them”, which also seems to apply to this leadership style.

As stated, the cognitive aspect of the paranoid leadership style is typically described as lacking in insight and reflexivity. However, what this study shows is that when agitated by change, his cognition is affected negatively – leading to confusion and an inability to distinguish real from fantasy. In fact, there is a tendency to retreat into fantasy. The cognition of the paranoid leadership style thus becomes dysfunctional in situations of change. Since they are preoccupied with hidden motives, they often misread and distort the actions of others – finding ‘facts’ that confirm their worst expectations. This had also been found in previous studies (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991), concerning this behavioural style.

This study reveals that the affective dimension gravitates from suspicion to hostility when confronted with change. Typically the paranoid leadership style feels self doubt, and this remains the same even under conditions of change – although it may be somewhat intensified. They are also hypersensitive (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) and hyper-alert (APA, 1994). The affective dimension, it appears from this study, is less altered by change. However, these findings also suggest that the fear of change experienced by this leadership style makes him become frigid (standoffish and reserved) and in need of reassurance. The hostility demonstrated, however does not encourage any reassurance. The hostility which becomes evident during change is likely to be more of an interpersonal dimension than an affective dimension – since it demonstrates an acting out based on the distrust and perceived malevolence.

The paranoid leadership style is primarily motivated by a need to protect himself when threatened with change. Typically he is vigilant, expecting the worse (APA, 1994; Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) – and when ‘the worst’ comes (represented by change) he acts to protect himself from the ‘enemy’. He tends to, when confronted with change, to be rigid and seek structure. Furthermore findings indicate a tendency of this leadership style to become active in an effort for self-preservation when faced with change (a threat, real or perceived). However, his rigidity leads to a lack of creativity, thus rendering his activity ineffective for dealing with the new (change) – this is what



Confucius calls insanity: “Doing what you’ve always done and expecting it will bring about a different result”.

The interpersonal aspects are described to typically include mistrust, suspicion and blaming. This links with previous research (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 2001). When confronted with change however these aspects are generalised to everyone – everyone becomes the enemy and a potential threat to him. He is also destructive and rude towards others, breaking them down – this would represent the ‘attack’ of the ‘enemy’ that is at hand (or seen). Kets de Vries (2001) reported that the leader who feels persecuted may react with hostility towards his subordinates and may even harm or attack them, justifying his hostility by seeing the subordinate as malingerers or incompetents. His hostility is expressed either by imposing stringent controls, rules and harsh punishment, or by being overtly aggressive towards those who oppose or resist him (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). Thus one could infer that change makes the leader with a paranoid style feel persecuted. It appears, from the findings of this study, that destroying the ‘enemy’ is a means for him to deal with his own anxieties that may accompany change. This indicates that the interpersonal relationships (with the team) represent a means to his end – that the relationships he has exist to serve his own (dysfunctional) purpose. According to the DSM IV his combative nature may elicit a hostile response in others that serves to confirm his original suspicions and expectations (APA, 1994).

It is paradoxical that though he seeks reassurance and self-preservation, his actions and reactions result in hostile responses that leave him feeling less assured and less protected. He becomes his own worst enemy. The findings also suggest that he expects that the other party prove themselves trustworthy, while he does not act in a trusting or trustworthy manner towards them.

Unconsciously, this leader fits into a fight-flight basic assumption (baF) group description. Stokes (1994) described the role of the leader in baF groups as being the identification of an enemy either within or outside the group as well as leading the attack

or flight, which aligns to the findings of this study in relation to the paranoid leadership style. Stokes (1994) found that the feelings of leader of a baF group are aggression, suspicion, and a general preoccupation with rules and procedures. The leadership style of a baF group appears to fit the paranoid leadership style.

The paranoid leadership style also acts as an environmental scanner for the group and is often used by the group for this purpose. This represents the potential positive impact this leadership style has for the group – his hyper-alertness (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) acts to protect himself and by association those within his own boundaries. However, these findings also report a tendency to exaggerate the ‘enemy out there’ to create a firewall, thus suggesting that he creates a false sense of danger to get the team fighting his ‘enemy’, whether real or imagined. He thereby diverts the focus of the group to addressing his agenda by evoking what Bion (1962) referred to as ‘the common enemy’ as a unifying factor. This fits with Stokes’ (1994) description of the leader’s function within baF groups. Furthermore, these findings reveal that just as he works hard to keep the competition on the outside at bay, he works equally hard to keep those on the inside of the boundary at bay and in-check. He keeps them ‘small’ so that he can be ‘big’. During change, his team will generally feel insecure, uncontained, and scared and they tend to over-compensate to keep him assured of their loyalty and trustworthiness.

### **5.3.2 Schizoid leadership style**

Individuals with this leadership style fantasise that the outside world does not offer them any satisfaction (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). According to these findings, the schizoid leadership style is typically of the opinion that his view of the world is the only correct view and that the world is hostile. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) reported that studies have indicated this leadership style as having a preoccupation that interactions will eventually fail and cause them harm. When this ‘world’ threatens to enter his system, i.e. when confronted with change, he becomes unresponsive and isolates himself by hiding what he thinks. It would seem that the only way he is able to maintain a sense of cognitive stability is to ignore any interference or attempt to alter his cognition.

Thus by ignoring and not engaging with the other, he effectively hides what he is thinking. It seems that he avoids challenge of his cognitions by hiding his thoughts – ‘if no-one knows his thoughts, then they cannot challenge or attempt to change them’.

On an affective level he is typically emotionally detached. The DSM IV reported that the schizoid displays a ‘bland’ exterior without visible emotional reactivity, constricted affect, often appearing cold and aloof, and that he rarely experiences strong emotions (APA, 1994). Furthermore, the associated features of the disorder include an inability to express anger (APA, 1994). This study reveals that when confronted with change he tends towards becoming avoidant and absent. Change also makes him fearful – his fears centre around being ‘de-throned’ – thus indicating a sense of insecurity and a lack of self-belief or confidence. A lack of confidence is congruent with the APA (1994) reported tendency to isolate one’s self. It becomes evident that when faced with change the schizoid leadership style shifts from being emotionally detached to being completely disconnected with the world around him. This affective response to change also confirms his cognitive position: that the world is hostile, and thus that it is better to disconnect (be absent) from it. This describes a very lonely existence – withdrawing from a world that is considered hostile when that hostility is confirmed in the form of change – even when the change in itself is not necessarily hostile.

This study found that he is avoidant of work issues and that this is aggravated when change enters the system, to the extent that he abdicates his own responsibility. Kets de Vries (2001) and Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) report a pattern of non-involvement and withdrawal as being characteristic of this style. According to the DSM IV they are often directionless and ‘drift’ in their goals (APA, 1994). Thus, it appears that he, through his own action or lack thereof, realises his own fear of being de-throned – because of his own ineffectiveness.

Typically he is not very effective at an interpersonal level. He tends to be withdrawn, cold and uncommunicative. This study further reveals that when he is threatened, he tends to create splits in the group because he is more able to relate to individuals than to

groups and so that these individuals can, due to their isolation from others, be dependent on him. His isolation and insecurity is projected onto the group, and ultimately these feelings of isolation and insecurity are introjected by the individuals of the group. It is as though the schizoid leadership style begins to create the hostile environment which he cognitively perceived in an attempt to affirm himself and his thoughts. According to Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) and Kets de Vries (2001) the divided nature of the organisation has two effects, viz. it renders communication and coordination ineffective, and limits information about the external environment.

According to Czander (1993), Kets de Vries (2001) and Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) the characteristic pattern of withdrawal and indifference to others and their feelings and views, is often a defense against being hurt. Given the findings of this study, the paradox evident in this leadership style is that although it is characterised by emotional detachment and constriction – the affective dimension (emotion) is in fact the aspect that most determines cognitive, motivational and interpersonal functioning, and furthermore, that this is only exacerbated during times of anxiety as represented by change.

### **5.3.3 Depressive leadership style**

Typically the leader with a depressive leadership style is negative and is described by Kets de Vries (2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) as having the fantasy that it is hopeless to try to change the course of life and that one is not good enough. According to the DSM IV, the depressive person views the future as negatively as he views the present (APA, 1994). This study reveals that when faced with change he has paranoid thoughts and then avoids thinking about the change – either by denying it or by delaying thinking about it. Cognitively he shuts down and then the change becomes a rude awakening into histrionic behaviour. According to Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) these individuals lack imagination.

In terms of the affective dimension, the depressive leadership style displays sadness, insecurity, anger and low self esteem. According to DSM IV, the self concept of the

depressive person centres around beliefs of inadequacy, worthlessness, and low self-esteem (APA, 1994). These findings show that when confronted with change, these emotions are intensified – taking the individual (of this leadership style) to heightened levels of hopelessness and helplessness. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) reported that these individuals downgrade themselves, feel inferior to others and claim to lack ability and talent. In this study it is found that his low self esteem and feelings of helplessness is exacerbated by change (and / or anxiety) and he experiences greater levels of powerlessness, leading to even greater amounts of self anger, self guilt, and self-flogging under these conditions. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) suggested that it is his anger about his powerlessness that gives rise to feelings of guilt. These findings suggest that the anger experienced may result in hostility – but this hostility is turned inward. Hostility turned inward is referred to as moral masochism (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). Consequently defeat is seen as a just reward (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). However, the findings from this study also reveal that he could become manic, resulting in compulsive behaviour to cover or recover from feelings of self-loathing.

He is typically motivated by guilt and fear. However, when he experiences, during times of change, more guilt and more fear he becomes defeatist, he gives up and he lacks any motivation to act. According to Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) and Kets de Vries (2001) these individuals fail to take initiative, and fearing that success would lead to envy or hostility from others, they choose mediocrity above victory. This study shows that even in his manic state, where there is a lot of activity, this activity centres around compulsively doing and redoing small and insignificant tasks – doing that which will have no real influence. This reinforces what Kets de Vries (2001) and Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) report as the tendency to ‘not win’ but rather to remain mediocre.

At an interpersonal level this leadership style is typically defensive and according to DSM IV (APA, 1994) also negativistic, critical and judgemental of others. These findings also reveal that his depressive state is agitated into a passive-aggressive state when faced with change. Thus, during change, his defensiveness translates into being

demanding and tough on others and gives credence to the saying: “attack is the best form of defence”. His passive-aggressive state is lived out at an interpersonal level – thus indicating that his hostility is no longer turned inward, but rather starts to be projected onto others. Furthermore, by demanding and challenging others to do more he indirectly becomes more dependent on the group he is directing his hostility towards. In addition, when threatened by change he will hold others back, in an attempt to stay ahead of them – thus being competitive in a passive-aggressive manner.

He also projects his affective state of sadness onto others and this becomes introjected, resulting in the group becoming sad and depressed. “Misery seeks company” – best describes the interpersonal tendency and simplistically depicts the state created by this leadership style. This study concurs with the Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) study which found that this style creates a culture of pervasive futility, negativity and lethargy. Ultimately, they (1991) said, it leads to a lack of activity, a general lack of confidence, extreme conservatism, and insularity, with an atmosphere of passivity and purposelessness. These findings indicate that he plays a significant role in creating this timid self-image in the group by not acknowledging their strengths. However, Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) reported that these individuals have a need to idealise others with whom they have regular contact. Thus it appears, from these findings, that when confronted with change this need to idealise others is displaced by a passive-aggressive hostility and competitiveness towards the other.

As revealed by the findings, he will become demanding of his subordinates, and as indicated by Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) he will expect others to take the initiative. This is ironic, as these findings reveals that he in fact creates a climate of futility and passivity.

Anxiety often provokes a dependency reaction wherein individuals seek protection and direction from a ‘messiah’ (Bion, 1961). The findings reveal that he seeks this protection and care from his team, and thereby perverts the legitimate relationship of leadership. It

is ironic that he creates a team that is unable to look after him, when in fact he seeks to be nurtured and protected by the team.

#### **5.3.4 Compulsive leadership style**

The compulsive leadership style is typically pedantic, rigid in his thinking and indecisive. This is supported by the information offered by Fenichel (1945) and Shapiro (1965) as cited by Kets de Vries and Miller (1991). The DSM IV indicates that there is a preoccupation with orderliness and interpersonal control at the expense of flexibility and efficiency (APA, 1994). Compulsives are overly concerned about trivial detail, rules and procedures (APA, 1994; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991; Kets de Vries, 2001). He is not creative and according to Kets de Vries (2001) he lacks imagination. “The perfectionism and self imposed high standards of performance cause significant dysfunction and distress in these individuals” (APA, 1994, p. 669) and “interferes with their ability to see the whole picture” (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991, p. 255). The findings of this study reveal that when he is confronted with change his pedantic approach is intensified and he goes into even more detail. Furthermore, he deals with complexities and the emotional aspects by taking flight into structuring and restructuring in an attempt to order things.

He typically does not display emotion and avoids it by remaining engaged in repetitive activity. A key emotion is fear – fear of being at the mercy of events or people (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). However, when confronted with change, he feels sad and angry although continues to avoid dealing with the emotions of others.

He typically sets high standards and he is a hard task master. He is driven by a need to counteract his fear of being at the mercy of events (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991), but when faced with change, his fear of failure motivates him into a frenzy of activity. This study and others (Kets de Vries, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) suggest that he wants to be in control of everything, and what this study further reveals is that during change he even wants to control the change and fix everything, and in the process sets himself up for failure. His fear of making mistakes and being at the mercy of events

beyond his control (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991; citing Fenichel, 1945; Shapiro, 1965) leads him to wanting to be any expert and to be in control of the chaotic environment. He is generally competent with the task and not with emotional issues and so steers clear of the latter, focussing all his energies on the task. This study reveals his tendency to, during change, over-compensate, work harder at the task and expending excessive energy to no effect, which leads to burnout – he expends himself in an effort to ‘get it right’. Though the valence of the compulsive style is ‘getting it right’, this study reveals that he works harder not only for this reason, but also because he uses work (which he is good at) as a defense against anxiety.

He is typically distrusting of others and polices them, leading to dysfunctional interpersonal relationships. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) also indicated that a high level of mistrust is evident and a tendency to rely on formal controls and direct supervision as opposed to trusting the team and their capabilities. Interpersonal relationships of compulsives are strained due their distrusting nature. This study shows that when change is evident, he becomes overly rigid and even sadistic. The group is disempowered by his stifling and controlling behaviour. Furthermore, they feel that they are not good enough – which is likely an introjection. This establishes a rebellious culture within the group – the group will rebel against this leadership style during change. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) and Kets de Vries (2001) indicate that the suspicion and manipulation has the effect of removing the subordinates’ discretion, involvement and personal responsibility and ultimately leaves them without enthusiasm and initiative. This logically links with the tendency reported in the DSM IV to be reluctant to delegate tasks and to work with others, and to insist that others conform to his way of doing things (APA, 1994). Compulsives are described as ritualistic and as imposing controls designed to monitor internal operations, while in contrast paranoid styles monitor external conditions (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). Managing the boundaries and regulating the interaction between internal and external environments is defined by Rice (1963) as a key leadership function. This appears to be neglected during change by compulsives who focus primarily on internal control and monitoring, failing to be cognisant of external conditions – this during times of change is potentially harmful to all parties. This in part



explains why Kets de Vries and Miller (1991, p.257) said “change is difficult” in organisations where the compulsive style is the leader.

The compulsive leadership style attempts to reduce complexities into structure and thereby remove the need to deal with his own emotions and that of the group. His rigid cognitive style is exaggerated in interpersonal relationships and exerted onto the group. His increased desire for control during change creates interpersonal relationships that threaten to overthrow him – paradoxically placing him in a situation wherein he will be without any control. The paradox evident is as Schuitema (1998) said: the more controls you impose in the system, the less control you have. The most dramatic manifestation evident when change enters the system is seen in the motivational and interpersonal dimensions.

### **5.3.5 Histrionic leadership style**

According to the DSM IV the histrionic person is prone to excessive emotionality and attention seeking (APA, 1994). These individuals are also described as dramatic and grandiose, often driven by a need for excitement and stimulation (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991; Kets de Vries, 2001). These findings also report stunted cognitive functioning in the histrionic leadership style and that this remains the case even when confronted with change. According to Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) histrionics often have a poor capacity for concentration. These findings report that his thoughts are focussed primarily on himself and his own emotions. The most predominant dimension is the affective one. He is narcissistic (APA, 1994; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) and this is intensified when confronted with change. He exhibits his emotions and acts out impulsively (without thinking). He is selfish and shows no concern for the emotions of others when he feels threatened by change. Kernberg (1979, cited by Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991) reports a general lack of empathy and a tendency towards exploitativeness, and these findings show that this becomes even more apparent when he is threatened by change.

He is typically motivated by a need for attention (APA, 1994; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991; Kets de Vries, 2001) and this only intensifies when faced with change. During change he shares or exhibits his emotions freely so as to spread the anxiety and panic, since he is envious of others who cope with change and does not want them to be coping.

Being typically self-absorbed, his interpersonal relationships are unstable. When faced with change his interpersonal relationships may appear to be that of openness and sharing, but are in fact superficial and shallow. In fact, these findings show that he exhibits his emotions and anxieties in an effort to off-load them – possibly believing that a problem shared is a problem halved. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) also highlight this tendency to be superficially warm, and often lacking sincerity and real consideration for others. This lack of genuine concern for others is further highlighted by this study in that change evokes feelings of envy for those who cope with change and even actions (such as spreading the panic) to prohibit others from coping with change. Interpersonal relationships only serve his need for attention and limelight. When these do not afford him what he needs he inclines toward discrediting others or even taking credit for the work of others in order to look good. His narcissism takes on a sadistic nature. Kets de Vries and Miller (1991) reported the tendency to alternate between over-idealisation and devaluation – from these findings it appears to be an over-idealisation of those who serve his purpose and devaluation of those who do not.

Notably, this study reveals that he does not deal with change in an authentic manner, but rather manipulates it to his benefit – the benefit being securing attention. According to the DSM IV histrionics are prone to ‘playing the victim’ and being dependent on the one hand and simultaneously using emotional manipulation (APA, 1994). These findings also report quick action or reaction to change, with a lot of activity that does not result in movement. It is thus likely that change represents to him the opportunity to attract attention and sympathy from others, and that the activity he engages in focuses primarily on satisfying his need for attention and not to be effective.

The leader with a histrionic leadership style is emotionally explosive and narcissistic – everything revolves around how he feels. His thoughts, actions and interactions are in response to his emotions (affect).

#### **5.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP STYLES**

Most significantly the findings show a heightened level of reaction on the interpersonal dimension. In other words, the reaction to change manifests most in the manner in which the leader (regardless of leadership style) relates to his team.

In the paranoid leadership style, he responds to change with heightened suspicion, distrust and blaming. He projects fear and insecurity about the change onto and into the team and thus creates a team dynamic of over-compensating to convince the leader that they are 'good or good enough'.

In the schizoid leadership style, he becomes more distant, avoidant and withdrawn during times of change. He avoids contact and communication with the team, and keeps them in the dark as to what he is thinking. He introjects fear, mistrust and isolation into the team and into the individuals in the team. The team has to work hard to support the leader, but cannot identify with the leader because they are not aware of what he is thinking or feeling.

In the depressive leadership style, he becomes more helpless and hopeless when having to deal with change. He is de-motivated and does not see meaning or benefit in doing anything. When change intensifies, his reaction becomes manic but still ineffective, as he dives into the administrative tasks that are not significant. The team identifies with his hopelessness, helplessness, self-pity and lack of motivation and will also become sad and depressed.

In the compulsive leadership style, he will want to control and structure everything when confronted with change in order to feel safe. Simultaneously, he will avoid dealing with

the complexities of emotions and relationships that require attention during times of change. His attempts to simplify the complexities by structuring and controlling, stifles the team and their creativity and they feel locked into the leader's views.

In the histrionic leadership style, he is self-absorbed and becomes even more narcissistic when feeling unsettled by change. All efforts, by the team and the leader, are directed towards relieving the leader's anxieties and making him feel secure. He wants all the attention and limelight and he will even discredit his team in order to get credit for himself.

Even though the responses to change vary across the different leadership styles, it becomes evident that the leader's interpersonal behaviour, especially with his team, is intensified to cover himself (protectiveness) or to recover from the effects of change. For the leader, the team thus represents itself as a means through which he is able to cope with the change and to safeguard himself. Change evokes anxiety and because it inevitably dismantles social defenses, the team becomes the leader's social defense or at least a substitute. However, it is during times of change that the team would require the leader to contain anxieties on behalf of the system and provide direction (Cilliers, 2005) and the leader's inability to fulfil this creates a dysfunctional dynamic within the team. The team as social defense is not static, but dynamic, having its own responses to change and to the leader's attempts to use it as a social defense.

All five of the leadership styles are inclined to functioning within the paranoid-schizoid position when confronted with change, which would render their change efforts primitive. In the paranoid-schizoid mode, people cope with anxiety by relying on primitive processes, such as splitting, projective identification, and idealisation and this leads to scapegoating, persecution, grandiosity, inflexible thinking, difficulty to symbolise and distorted perceptions (Krantz, 1998). This way of coping with anxiety (change) is typical across all five leadership styles to varying degrees. During change the depressive leadership style is prone to idealisation, the paranoid style has distorted perceptions and is suspicious, while the histrionic is prone to grandiosity, the schizoid

style creates splits, and the compulsive is rigid and inflexible in his thinking. More sophisticated change efforts are associated with the depressive position wherein people are reflective, have the ability to think, and can collaborate meaningfully about concerns that go beyond survival and self-protection (Krantz, 1998). This mode is rarely static because when threatened by change people revert to primitive processes. However, it is the individual's capacity to recognise when he has reverted to primitive modes of operating and to recover from these reactions that is the predictor of successful change efforts (Krantz, 2005). Thus for any of the five leadership styles to shift from the paranoid-schizoid position to the depressive position, requires awareness and insight. It is not possible to draw conclusions about which of the leadership styles would be most successful in dealing with change at this stage. In order to do this one would have to determine which style is more prone to reflection and thus the depressive position. Furthermore, it could be that shifting along the continuum from the paranoid-schizoid position to the depressive position is a choice, much as Freud suggested mental health is a choice; a choice to release one's self from self-imposed prisons (Czander, 1993).

The findings of this research reinforce earlier findings which indicate the leader's role in defining organisational culture (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991; Kets de Vries, 2001) and furthermore highlight the impact of the leader response to change on the team's dynamic.

## **5.5 THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

The following research hypothesis about how the different leadership styles respond to and deal with change is presented:

Due to the inherent anxiety associated with change, the leader's typical cognitive, affective and motivational responses are intensified and become manifested in the way in which he relates to his team – his interpersonal behaviour.

The leader projects onto the team or introjects into the team his own inner world (real or fantasy) and entrenches it into the team by way of his established authority. This links

with the findings that leaders have a significant impact on defining organisational culture (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1991). The team becomes the container for his anxieties and as such serves as a substitute for dismantled social defenses.

Leaders functioning predominantly from any of the five leadership styles will create a dysfunctional dynamic in the team with regards to its capacity to deal with change. The team becomes focussed on dealing with the covert dynamic in the team, and is unable to attend to the primary task and thus delays or avoids implementing the change.

This leads to the question of how is that so many organisations undergo change successfully if this is the case. As has been indicated, organisational decline is far more dramatic and common than is often recognised (Kets de Vries, 1995, 2001), with organisations not lasting more than 40 years, and a third of them closing within 20 years. However, if we are to assume that some change does in fact happen successfully, we need to explore how this is possible. From these findings and existing research it is clear that behaviour is motivated by protection or survival, regardless of the leadership style. Ultimately the leader and the team recognise that their survival and protection is contingent on dealing with the change, and thus change happens.

## **5.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

This chapter firstly presented the findings of the research by establishing a baseline understanding of the different leadership styles. Secondly the findings relating to how the different leadership styles respond to change have been set forth. Thereafter an integration of findings is presented together with a comparison between the different leadership styles. The research hypothesis on how the different leadership styles respond to change is set forth.

The aim of this chapter was to present the findings relating to how the five leadership styles respond to change.