

**AN EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN LEADER AND FOLLOWER**

Jeffery Morse

Brandman University

Author Note

For correspondence concerning this paper Jeffery Morse can be reached at

[jmorse@mail.brandman.edu](mailto:jmorse@mail.brandman.edu)

### **AN EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN LEADER AND FOLLOWER**

Many times throughout history and even today many people give way to destructive commands from leaders with only self interest in mind. These destructive commands many times lead to a very negative outcome morally as well as corporately as a species. As a result, an exploration of the dynamics of the leader follower relationship is the first step to the path to enlightenment and preventative measures. A leader-follower relationship has two main subjects, namely the leader and the follower. As a result, we will review papers to show the dynamic of why people in the leader-follower relationship obey destructive commands, as well as why such leaders give destructive commands. The whole world is believing and following something. A breakdown of what people are believing goes something like this: Atheistic or Agnostic as 11% (Hemant Mehta, 2015), 32% Christian, 23% Muslim, 15% Hindu, 7% Buddhists, and .2% Jewish ((PRC, 2012). Why is this relevant? Because all these are some form of the leader/follower dynamic. Since Webster's defines the "truth" as "the state of being the case" (Websters, 2015). If an implied authority says that something is true should we follow blindly? Implied authority is one of the real dynamics that are at play when looking at the leader follower relationship. The idea that we must know the truth to place it in our foundation is a granted, but the issue of implied authority is a real part of our dynamic and therefore must be researched. Leader Follower Dynamic (LFD) research is especially helpful to one's ability to discern leaders. We would all like to believe that inside of our LFD with others that such things as honor, truth, and morality win out, however, this a naive notion. We can, if we want, know when we are being lied too. Lies have negative psychological, physiological and emotional effects (Chris Lliades, MD, 2010). Further supported by Dr. Yoshiaki Omura in his study on the physiological reactions to lying (Yoshiaki, O., Nihrane, A., Lu, D., Jones, M. K., Yasuhiro, S., & Motomu, O, 2015) the

revelation is that anytime that a person lies, counting even the smallest of white lies, there are recordable physical changes in the eye, nose, mouth lips etc. While the assertion of Bella DePaulo is supported from her paper in-which she asserts that people can be put into two categories: Those that lie and those that do not (Bella M. DePaulo, 1996). The truth is that the ratio of liars to non-liars is heavily weighted toward those that lie. In one study actual total honesty was found only in one of fifty people. It seems that if we are wanting honesty from our leaders, or even of our followers we are already portraying ourselves as a gullible target. Robert S. Feldman of the University of Massachusetts, the author of several papers reports that sixty percent of people cannot live ten minutes without lying (Tyler, J. M., Feldman, R. S., 2004). Our leaders lie to us. Next let us research implied authorities and destructive commands—lies from our leaders. We will present the review of 4 papers to show the real natures of this dynamic.

### **Migram's Study of Obedience.**

In the LFD Milgram's Study (Milgram, 1963) reveals why people follow questionable commands. In this famous study of obedience a surprising two thirds of people studied obeyed the directive to knowingly do harm to another simply if an implied authority gave a verbal command-- that they "had to do it" (Milgram, 1965). The directive being true had no bearing if it was followed or not. This was an astounding conclusion that was opposite the initial hypothesis. It was thought that as people were asked to increase the discomfort level on another person that people would refuse to comply—questioning authority. Though shouts and yells proceeded from the receiver to the pain (the student), the implementer (the teacher), proceeded to deliver electric shock in increased increments exceeding 400 volts. Unfortunately, ten years later little had changed when the study was repeated (Milgram, S. 1974). This is relevant to our discussion

because it tells us why people obey a directive when confronted with destructive commands from a leader although they may have moral objections. The implication that the “teacher” was someone of importance or respected position (Milgram, 1965, 1974) was all that was needed to comply. Basically, if one believes the leader is a person of influence or someone higher in social hierarchy than ones-self, one tends to believe the implied authorities commands to the point of action though one might consider those action to be non-humane or morally wrong or even a lie. Somehow humanity seems to be hard-wired for obedience. From a Christian stand point this is understood as the need for God. Obedience is hard-wired to enable one to choose God’s will over one’s own. As it turns out, this is a good thing as reported by the research of Tom Knox in the reporting of all the benefits of being faithful (Tom Knox, 2011). The problem is that there are just too many entities plying for the position of God. This thought of hard wired for obedience to God was tested in a further adjunct of Milgram’s study. In a study done by David C Bock and Neil Clark Warren entitled, “Religious as a factor to Obedience to Destructive Commands”. The Milgram study was extended to the religious forum. The results again did not line up with the beginning hypothesis. It was believed that as people who became more categorized into the religious right would become more susceptible to this idea of obedience to destructive commands by implied authority-as they are hard wired to obey God. However, the results did not support the hypotheses. Instead the results of the study revealed a bell curve. If a person was entirely humanist, and humanitarian, or if a person was very actively Christian they tended to question the authority of the person giving the destructive command and, as a result, tended to not perform them (David C. Bock, Neil Clark, 1972). Further, they found that those believers that were middle of the road or the “luke warm” believers or agnostics were much more at risk of following through with a destructive command from an implied authority. This was believed to

be true because of the indecision of “not knowing” or the questioning what one knows or believes. So the “luke warm” believer, which I am sorry to say is about 77% of believers (Caleb K. Bell, 2013), or the agnostic are given to surrendering their will instead of submitting to their moral conscience. Tendencies to forfeit ones will to any impending source of implied authority in the absence of cemented beliefs is preferable to the time and dedication it takes to cement one’s beliefs. So to sum it up, these papers show that in the absents of the definite conviction of firmly knowing what one believes and why, one is likely surrender one’s will to an implied authority whether that authority is giving destructive commands or not, and one is more likely to perform those commands despite of negative feeling in one’s own conscience. It seems people would rather be sheep than take the time to study and research what they believe. To do someone harm simply because of an implied authority could be curbed by simply questioning that authorities command when faced with moral objections, however, so few ever do. In Milgram’s study almost two thirds went all the way to the highest voltage. In the adjunct study everyone in the center of the curve followed through. Unfortunately as we have evolved into an instant gratification society this is more often the case than not. The next review shows how this may even be more the case in the U.S.A.

### **Believing in Economic Theory: Sex, Lies, Evidence, Trust and Ideology**

To further examine the idea of surrendering ones will to implied authority we must investigate how this applies in the governmental, political, and economic schools of thought. A study relevant to the LFD in that it is current to our political and governmental processes. Most of us in the U.S. are a currently interacting in a leader follower relationship between us and those that are elected over us; we tend to, as constituents, submit to our elected officials and or those in

control of our governments. In this study done by D. Andrew Austin and Nathaniel T. Wilcox (2004) some light is shed on the LFD. First off, the result of their study illustrates that whether conservative or liberal is of little consequence in the face of unconfirmed beliefs. It was found, that though optimism is more present with conservatives, at the end they both adopt the same conclusions in the absence of clear evidence. People form their prior convictions by depending on their ideology, but if implied autoreactive evidence is given, people ignore their priors and all end up with similar beliefs (D. Andrew et al, 2004). In otherward, we tend to surrender what we have learned just because an implied authority is presented as creditable. Doubt in what we know is questioned because belief is not concrete and weakly held prior beliefs are easily overwhelmed. Ideology simply acts as a replacement for firm belief. Also if an implied authority is seen to reflect ones ideology convictions are more readily and quickly surrendered. Those beliefs that are dissimilar take a back seat to the destructive commands if one's implied authority. Thus enters an avenue to deceive ourselves as a means of self-preservation.

Heterogeneity is the propensity for socially desirable responses. This may create a counterfeit relationship between beliefs and ideology (D. Andrew et al, 2004). More plainly, if a person believes that correct responses are desired by their implied authority, then they are at least partially motivated to please that authority and answer or perform against their own conscience. One just might lie to become acceptable or aligned with an implied authority. We may choose to lie in order to conform to the affiliations surrendering our moral conscience and implement and follow through on a destructive command. It is amazing that we will surrender to the lie so readily when our belief is not concrete even though such action may lead to comprising our own mental, emotional, spiritual and physical health (Chris Lliades, MD, 2010), (Adam Dachis,

2012), (Allison Kornet, 1997). The next study reveals why the follower deceives themselves and is not the only subject in the LFD that is given to lying

### ***People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil***

Let us explore this dynamic of why we choose to lie just to accommodate an implied authority. In the book *People of The Lie, The Hope for Healing Human Evil*, by M. Scott Peck, he defines “the lie” as a self-deception, and is the result of the “inability or unwillingness to tolerate the pain of self-reproach”. Implied authority with destructive commands or “evil” as he puts it originates in an effort to escape guilt (Peck, 1983). Sort of like Adam when God asked, “Have you eaten from the tree” and Adams response was, “The woman gave it to me”. Somehow lack of accountability is implied if we are just following orders. This brings to mind that Tom Cruise movie, *a few good men*, where the marines were on trial for following orders even though it resulted in the death of a fellow marine. They were convicted of misconduct because they should have questioned authority. The marines’ conclusion was, “we were supposed to be protecting him”. Peck states that this is “the pretense of blamelessness in today’s culture; e.g. everyone is a victim, no one is really at fault” (Peck, 1983), A pretense that aligns itself to the lack of accountability, and reveals that one should always question destructive commands, but does not because we deceive ourselves into believing that there is no accountability if one is following the orders of one’s implied authority. Self-deception is the integral part of behavior that allows one to sacrifice, harm, and even destroy others in order to preserve one’s own self-image. Peck names this trait “malignant narcissism” and states it to be the root of all evil (Peck, 1983). Congruently, he further implies that the authority giving destructive commands are always using lies to deceive also. In a review on the book Barbara

Buzzard (2010) points out that one's 'image,' or 'appearance', are critical in understanding the morality of those who are giving destructive commands. While motivation to be good is lacking, the desire to appear good is present. How clean should I 'appear' to be, certainly a dilemma of lawyers and clergy alike. These are 'The people of the lie.' So we have created a bridge from follower to Leader. So let us now focus in the next review as to why leaders give destructive commands.

### **The Dark Triad and The Dark Triad Returns**

In researching the motivations of implied authorities that give destructive commands hence forth known as "Evil" we begin to look at the personality types that assume those roles and why. In the Williams, Paulhus, and McAndrews paper on the "Dark Triad" and the "Hexaco" Model (2002). The "Hexaco Model" is a measure of the six major dimensions of the personality. Put simply it is a categorization of the underworld of personality types. The "Dark Triad" loosely refers to money, power, and sex as a major motivation for "Evil" to assume power (Williams, K. M., McAndrew, A., Learn, T., Harms, P., & Paulhus, D. L, 2001). Leaders whom attain power to satiate their need to achieve high status in either money, power, or fame. This paper points that such people usually fall into one of three personality constructs or sometimes a combinations of all three. We will research these as they show the LFD of leaders who tend to give destructive commands. The first, Machiavellianism, is a personality construct characterized by a cynical view of human nature combined with a deceitful and calculating interpersonal style (Christie. R., Geis, 1970). They use power to benefit themselves without having remorse about any collateral damage to those involved. The Psychopathy personality construct is a person who is characterized by grandiosity, has no empathy, a manipulative interpersonal style, as well as an



antisocial lifestyle.(Hare, 1991; Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989) Think of Hitler and you will be right on the money here. The third is Narcissism. This personality construct is characterized by exhibitionism, a sense of self-importance, interpersonal exploitation and an entitlement mind set. (Raskin & Hall, 1979; 1981). To define this look at most teenagers in the U.S. The entitlement mindset is running ramped. The tendency to manipulate individuals for selfish gain and to fraudulently misrepresent one's self with bad intentions even to the point of lying, cheating or theft to fulfil personal goals (Hodson, G., Hogg, S.M., & MacInnis, C. 2009). The study finds that with these personality constructs successfully predicting opportunistic behaviors for selfish gains or instant gratification is in the higher percentiles, and suggests that such people do not do well as team players but favor the between-group hierarchy (Hodson et al, 2009). They want to be the boss. Personality constructs that include a need to be at the forefront of the list. The death of followers is not to be of moral conflict as long as there is media coverage. In this world there is no shortage of such leaders. Basically if one achieves a prominent position at the top of a given hierarchy through other means than by hard work and selflessness then they are more than likely one of the dark triad personality constructs. This being the case we can expect that they are given to doing whatever it takes to get and retain a position with little or no moral conscience to the collateral damage on followers. They gain power, money, or success through sacrificing others while guarding their own conscience through self-deception, and their own image by deceiving their followers without remorse (Hodson et al, 2009; M., McAndrew et al, 2001). Unfortunately, combined with the fact that followers are so given to surrender their will and perform the destructive commands of an implied authority while deceiving themselves about any accountability for those actions gives us a very bleak prognosis (Milgram, S. 1963, 1965 1974). The elucidation, 'Lies are perhaps like a skin for you that keep you warm and safe in a world

where you feel you cannot trust anyone as the likely foundation of this article are as good as any when speaking of self-deception. So in support the article titled “the many faces of lying,” patients seek to control the other through the use of what Lemma defines as “sadistic lying” as a conscious victory to deceive or humiliate another (Lemma A, 2005). As if it were not bad enough. To further the displeasure of these truths we find that some leaders deceive, lie and manipulate just for the pure joy of it. This differs from self-preservative lying where the sadistic impulse is not utilized. Granted Lemma holds an equivocal outlook on lying, she summarizes its restorative and developmental uses quite well, but the worry is its sadistic uses in the control of a leader who elicits one of the dark triad personality constructs.

## **In Conclusion**

What have we uncovered in our reviews concerning the Leader/Follower Dynamic? Destructive commands are made and obeyed. They are completed by followers though they may have moral conscionable objections to such commands. Leaders who willfully rise to the top ordering such commands usually fall under one or more of the “Dark Triad” of personality constructs. Of these construct none take the welfare of the follower as an item of concern. Generally speaking they are self-serving, non-empathetic people who have little or no moral cares about hurting or causing the hurt of others, even their own followers, and worse, in some cases do harm and manipulate just for the pure joy of it. These people generally employ self-deception as means to create a positive self-image and then portray that imagined self-image to their followers through lies and deception, while attaining to gain wealth, power, or the spotlight to satisfying their own insatiable self-centered needs. To add to this, a follower who is un-cemented in their beliefs, one who is not stable in what they believe and why they believe it,

have more than a sixty percent chance of surrendering their will to this implied authority.

Believing the manipulation that such implied authorities send forth and then lying to themselves as to bare no accountability of their actions—“they were just following orders”. This explains so much of the horror and tragedy of the world. Still there is one light at the end of the tunnel. One can ground their beliefs, through study, research exterminating the manipulations and lies of “Evil” and begin to live without dishonesty becoming a member of the world’s population of honest people--one of the two percent. “And the Truth shall make you free” (Bible, KJV).

## References

Adam Dachis, (2012) *What Lying Actually Does to Your Brain and Body Every Day*

<http://lifehacker.com/5968613/what-lying-actually-does-to-your-brain-and-body-every-day>

Allison Kornet, (1997) *The Truth about*

*lying* <https://www.psychologytoday.com/articles/199704/the-truth-about-lying>

Barbara Buzzard (2010) *Review People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*

M. Scott Peck, M.D. [http://www.21stcr.org/multimedia-2012/1-articles/bb-people\\_of\\_the\\_lie.html](http://www.21stcr.org/multimedia-2012/1-articles/bb-people_of_the_lie.html)

Bella M. DePaulo, PhD (The Social Psychology of Good and Evil. New York:

Guilford Press.2004) *The Many Faces of Lies* Chapter 12, pp. 303-326

<http://smg.media.mit.edu/library/DePaulo.ManyFacesOfLies.pdf>

Caleb K. Bell Religion News service. (April 4, 2013 ) Poll: *Americans love the Bible but don't*

*read it much.* <http://www.religionnews.com/2013/04/04/poll-americans-love-the-bible-but-dont-read-it-much/>

Chris Lliades, MD(2010) *The Truth about Lies* Deirdre Lee Fitzgerald, PhD,

Assistant Professor of Psychology at Eastern Connecticut State University in

Willimantic.<http://www.everydayhealth.com/longevity/truth-about-lies-and-longevity.aspx>

Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press

D. Andrew Austin (CERGE-EI, Prague) and Nathaniel T. Wilcox (University of Houston)

(2004) *Believing in Economic Theory: Sex, Lies, Evidence, Trust and Ideology*

<https://www.cerge-ei.cz/pdf/wp/Wp238.pdf>

David C. Bock and Neil Clark Warren Source: Review of Religious Research, Vol. 13, No. 3,

Denominational and Interdenominational Studies (Spring, 1972) *Religious Belief as a Factor in Obedience to Destructive Commands* pp. 185-191

Delroy L. Paulhus, and Kevin M. Williams Department of Psychology (2002) *The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy*, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver V6T 1Z4, Canada

[http://members.shaw.ca/ssucur/materials/02\\_selected\\_notes/06\\_tempest/03\\_PaulhusWilliams.pdf](http://members.shaw.ca/ssucur/materials/02_selected_notes/06_tempest/03_PaulhusWilliams.pdf)

Hare, R. D., Hart, S. D., & Harpur, T. J. (1991). *Psychopathy and the DSM-IV criteria for antisocial personality disorder*. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100, 391–398.

Hodson, G., Hogg, S.M., & MacInnis, C. (2009). *The role of “dark personalities” (Narcissism, Machiavellianism, Psychopathy), Big Five personality factors, and ideology in explaining prejudice*. Journal of Research in Personality, 43, 686–690.

Lemma A (2005) *The many faces of lying*. Int J Psychoanal. Tavistock Clinic, 120 Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5BA, UK. lemma@dircon.co.uk

Milgram, Stanley (The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol 67(4), Oct 1963)

*Behavioral Study of obedience*, pp 371-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0040525>

Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. Human Relations, 18, 57–76.

Milgram, S. (1974). Obedience to authority: An experimental view. New York: Harper & Row.

Peck, M. (1983) *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*. New York: Simon and Schuster,.

Power Research Center (PRC, 2012) *The Global Religious Landscape*

<http://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/18/global-religious-landscape-exec/>

Raskin, R. N. & Hall, C. S. (1979). *A narcissistic personal inventor*, Psychological Reports. 45. 590.

Raskin, R. N. & Hall, C. S. (1981). *The Narcissistic Personality Inventory Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity*. Journal of Personality Assessment. 45. 159-162.

Robert D. Hare, Timothy J. Harpur, A. R. Hakstian, Adelle E. Forth and Stephen D. (1989) *The Revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and Factor Structure* Hart University of British Columbia Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<http://psych.wisc.edu/newman/SecurePDF/Hareetal1990.pdf>

Tyler, J. M., & Feldman, R. S. (2004). *Truth, lies, and self-presentation: How gender and anticipated future interaction relate to deceptive behavior*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34, 2602-2615.

Tom Knox(2011) *The tantalizing proof that belief in God makes you happier and*

*healthier* <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-1358421/The-tantalising-proof-belief-God-makes-happier-healthier.html#ixzz3wzvqXqjE>

Webster's Dictionary <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/truth>

Williams, K. M., McAndrew, A., Learn, T., Harms, P., & Paulhus, D. L. (2001). The dark triad returns: Entertainment preferences and anti-social behavior among narcissists, Machiavellians, and psychopaths. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.452.3138&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Yoshiaki, O., Nihrane, A., Lu, D., Jones, M. K., Yasuhiro, S., & Motomu, O. (2015). *Simple New Method of Detecting Lies By Identifying Invisible Unique Physiological Reflex Response Appearing Often Less Than 10-15 Seconds on the Specific Parts of Face of Lying Person; Quick Screening of Potential Murderers & Problematic Persons*. *Acupuncture & Electro-Therapeutics Research*, *40*(2), 101-136.