



## Exploring Why Managing Followers Resist New Senior Leadership in High Senior Leader Turnover Environments

---

April E. Briant  
*Regent University*  
*Roundtable: Organizational Leadership*

### Abstract

---

Followers with managerial responsibility, referred to as managing followers, often resist, work against, or wait out their senior leaders in environments with frequent turnover of the senior leaders. This phenomenon results in diminished performance and difficulty in implementing important initiatives. Research as to the cause of this phenomenon is largely absent (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Gartner & Gartner, 2025, p. 1; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134). Learning the cause of this phenomenon will impact sectors prone to high senior leader turnover many of which are responsible for the well-being of society, including technology, non-profits, retail, healthcare, military, public education, and some industry (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Gartner & Gartner, 2025, p. 1; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134). Qualitative research conducted on six participants from the United States via Zoom regarding their experiences in a wide range of private, public, and government sectors of all sizes that demonstrated root causes of this phenomenon have strong connections to Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model stages of grief, the implicit leadership theory's prototype of leadership (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397), and the leader-member exchange dyadic working relationship (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413). Further research is recommended.

*Keywords:* leader-member exchange dyadic relationship, grief, implicit leadership theory

---

Followers with managerial responsibility, referred to as managing followers, have often been observed to resist, work against, or wait out their senior leaders in organizations with frequent turnover among senior leaders. This phenomenon results in lack of performance and difficulty in implementing important initiatives for the organization, yet there is a lack of decisive research on the cause of this phenomenon or the specific phenomenon itself (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134). This phenomenon demands research as a

number of sectors are prone to senior leader turnover who have vital work to accomplish for the well-being of society, technology, non-profits, retail, healthcare, military, public education, churches, and some industry (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Gartner & Gartner, 2025, p. 1; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134).

Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model outlines the common stages of grief individuals go through as they experience significant life change, such as managing followers may be processing due to loss of the outgoing senior leader. The implicit leadership theory (ILTL) explores the "lay images of leadership" or prototype of senior leaders managing followers formed in the environment of high senior management turnover, which may be impacting their willingness to follow the current senior leader (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397). The leader-member exchange (LMX) measures the quality of the dyadic working relationship between the current senior leader and managing follower and explores potential causes for the same (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413). The research question for this study is: Why do manager followers in organizations with high turnover of senior leadership often resist, work against, or wait out the incoming or current senior leader?

## **Literature Review**

Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model helps us explore why a managing follower may be acting from a place of unprocessed grief and the emotions associated with that, which are interruptive to their followership of the incoming senior leader (Tyrrell et al., 2024, p. 1). ILT allows the study to explore the preconceived ideas that managing followers formed of the senior leader, why those prototypes were formed within the managing follower, and the impact that those expectations have on their willingness to follow the leadership of the incoming senior leader (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397). LMX measures the quality of the current dyadic relationships that develop between the leader and each managing follower, helping discover the reason and impact of the current LMX (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413).

### **Exploring how Managing Followers may be Acting From a Place of Unprocessed Grief**

When followers lose their senior leader, depending on the attachment each follower has to that senior leader, a change with varying degrees of grief occurs for those managing followers. The managing followers may be experiencing grief even if they questioned the leader's ability or qualifications, as attachments occur from that senior leader being the one who was present during a crucial time in their life. The Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model is a tool for "understanding the psychological reaction to imminent death" that she observed in her patients (Tyrrell et al., 2024, p. 1). This model identifies

denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance as the five stages of grief, which are normal to experience as one processes a significant life change, such as the turnover of senior leaders may have on managing followers (Tyrrell et al., 2024, p. 1). Kubler-Ross and Kessler (2005) contended that these stages of grief are not always experienced in a linear fashion (p. 7). The Kubler-Ross change curve helped the study explore the potential emotional state of managing followers grieving the changes that occurred when the previous senior leader left, which may contribute to their resistance to following the incoming or current senior leader. This literature on the Kubler-Ross change curve and the research question led to the following interview question for participants:

IQ1: How does the arrival of the current senior leader bring up feelings you may have about the last senior leader leaving in a way that either increases or decreases your willingness to follow their leadership?

Since being published in 1969, the change curve has been shown by Kubler-Ross and others to be applicable whenever grief is experienced due to significant change; therefore, it has become a useful instrument in change management (Shoolin, 2010, p. 286; Tyrrell et al., 2024, p. 1). Kubler-Ross passionately emphasized the benefit of those impacted by the loss of being allowed to discuss and participate in preparation for the loss (Forward).

Criticism of the change curve model points out that there are multiple ways for people to process change (Avis et al., 2021, p. 1). Tyrrell et al. (2024) detailed four other models of processing grief that have emerged—each of which includes elements of Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve (p. 1). Research needs to be conducted exploring the factors that connect people to one another and to circumstances that contribute to the varying levels of grief they experience when they experience loss of those people or those circumstances (e.g., connection to their own identity). Additional research is needed to discover why the loss of senior leaders results in varying levels of grief for followers and the impact this has on the organization, the followers, and the outgoing and incoming senior leaders. More studies need to be conducted that explore the impact of opportunities for followers to face and process grief regarding changes within the organization hosted by the organization and the negative consequences of followers not processing their grief. The literature on the Kubler-Ross change curve method, considering the research question, prompted the following interview question asked of the participants:

IQ2: How were you given the opportunity to process your grief about the previous senior leader leaving in a way that either increased or decreased your willingness and ability to follow the incoming senior leader?

## **Exploring the Impact of Preconceived Prototypes of Leaders Managing Followers Develop**

The preconceived ideas that managing followers have of the senior leader prototype may influence the level at which they are willing to support and follow the incoming senior leader. ILT explores the “lay images of leadership” that are created through individual experiences as well as social conditioning (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397). When an individual is perceived as a leader, as well as the type of leader that individual is believed to be, it influences results for the “individual, the team,” and the “organizational outputs” (Lord et al., 2020, p. 50). There are “variations” in the “implicit ways” that followers perceive leaders (Offermann et al., 1994, p. 43). Hogan et al. (1990) demonstrated that “certain kinds of people” who have “identifiable personality characteristics” that are harmful often work their way up to leadership within an organization (p. 343). Offermann et al. (1994) examined various stimuli and factors that contribute to perceptions that followers have of leaders (p. 43). Bryman (1987) studied the cultural implications of ILT, which confirm ILT’s generalizability (p. 129). Schyns et al. (2011) called for future discovery to better understand how leader and follower prototypes are shaped and what their implications are (p. 397).

Offermann et al. (1994), Hogan et al. (1990), Bryman (1987), Schyns et al. (2011), and Lord et al. (2020) explored how the characteristics of an individual and the influence of society contribute to the follower’s perception of the leader and vice versa, but more research needs done on how the experienced historical behaviors, decisions, and cultures of the individual organization and any systems of authority under which that individual organization positions itself impact ILT. This literature review on ILT, coupled with the research question, led the researcher to ask the following interview question of the participants:

IQ3: How did the preconceived ideas that you have of senior leaders increase or decrease the level at which you were willing to support and follow the incoming senior leader?

## **The Quality of the Working Relationship Between Managing Follower and Current Senior Leader and Potential Reasons for the Same**

Determining the quality of the relationship between the managing follower and the current senior leader, as well as potentially discovering some of the causes and consequences of that relationship, is possible through the application of LMX. LMX measures the quality of the dyadic relationships that leaders develop with each follower “based on trust, respect, and obligation” (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413). The individual relationship managing follower/senior leader relationship will need to be studied per research conducted by Graen and Cashman (1975), demonstrating that a

leader develops different relationships of varying “depths of quality” with different followers (p. 47).

The study of relationship-forming and relationship-maintaining interactions that helps us measure the quality of the relationship between managing followers and the current senior leader is first recorded in research by Weber (1921-1922, 2002, p. XIII). Weber (2002) focused on “social associations” and “ideal-typical forms of socialization” (p. XIII). The study of leadership-related relationships grew to be more systematic as exemplified in the research of the “description and measurement” of “leader behavior” conducted by Stogdill and Coons (1957, abstract). LMX, first referred to as the “vertical dyad linkage model,” is the most influential way to systematically analyze the “vertical dyad over time during role making activity” (Dansereau et al., 1975, p. 46). LMX focuses on the quality of the dyadic relationship that develops between leader and follower – a focus that continues to be a significant topic of interest, including in this study (Schyns & Day, 2010, p. 3). Understanding the quality of the relationship between managing followers and senior leaders may help explain why managing followers often are unwilling to follow the current senior leader.

Stepanek and Paul (2022) detailed research from Dienesch and Liden (1986) (pp. 624-626) and Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), which demonstrated the key “four dimensions” of “affect,” “loyalty,” “contribution,” and “professional respect” used to measure LMX (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 43). Dienesch and Liden found that the level of “perceived contribution” holds the most sway (p. 625). When the managing follower perceives a lack of quality in these dimensions, it impacts how they function and feel about the quality of their relationship with the current senior leader, as these dimensions function as “currency” in the relationship (Dienesch & Liden, 1986, p. 625).

Traditional leadership approaches stress the role of the leader in forming the LMX relationship; however, the managing follower’s actions and attitude also influence the “quality” of “LMX relationships” (Dulebohn et al., 2012, p. 5; Engle & Lord, 1997, p. 988). Therefore, the focus of this study is rightly on managing followers. As senior leaders and managing followers depend on one another to move the organization toward its goals, they are compelled to “assess” and “evaluate” one another’s intelligence and competence throughout their working relationship (Dulebohn et al., 2012, p. 5; Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 27). Due to the importance of the results of these “evaluations,” what a dyadic partner believes the other partner “feels about them” also influences the quality of the LMX relationship (Snodgrass et al., 1998, p. 238).

LMX shows that followers will not usually come to a consensus about their experience of the leader because every relationship is different (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 227; Schyns & Day, 2010, p. 5). That is partly because every follower may be in a different stage of relationship development of LMX. The four stages were used for coding the

data to better understand which stage of the relationship development each participant was in. The stages are described as role taking (where roles are assigned), role making (where roles are secured through trustworthy performance and followers earn being in the in-group), leadership making (those in the in-group receive development), and team making or the leadership network (the trust formed among the leadership team (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 239). LMX demonstrates that as relationships move through these stages, the most effective LMX begins with the transactional style of leadership and progresses to a more transformational approach (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 239).

A number of factors, such as the managing follower and the senior leader's first interaction (Dienesch & Liden, 1986, p. 626), the level of individualism and power distance (Dulebohn et al., 2012, p. 1), the managing follower judging the senior leader based on one attribute they connected to "preexisting beliefs about various personality types" (Cantor & Mischel, 1979, p. 187), and whether managing followers perceive themselves to have been placed in the senior leader's in-group or out-group (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 219) may be influencing the LMX. Given this literature, participants were asked the following question to explore why managing followers often resist the leadership of incoming senior leaders in environments of high turnover of senior leaders:

- IQ4: How does your level of perceived contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect for the current senior leader increase or decrease your willingness to follow their leadership?
- IQ5: How does what you believe the senior leader thinks about your level of perceived contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect either increase or decrease your willingness to follow their leadership?

Additional theories are used to explore why managing followers have difficulty following incoming senior leaders in settings with high senior leader turnover, as Erdogan and Bauer (2015) cautioned that LMX should not be used as the sole measure because current LMX research lacks objectivity and longevity (p. 413). LMX research has focused on the characteristics connected to the current leader and the current follower's exchanges and considerations regarding one another (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 227; Megheirkouni, 2017, p. 246; Schyns & Day, 2010, p. 5). There is a need for research that considers elements beyond that specific leader and follower and their relationship to the extenuating factors that influence that relationship, some of which may predate that follower and leader. Such elements include emotional well-being, mental health, emotional intelligence, previous positive and negative experiences of both the leader and the follower, the organizational history, practices, and culture experienced by both the leader and the follower. Drawing from

the literature review on LMX and the research question, the following research questions were asked of the participants:

- IQ6: How has the effect the senior leader has had on you increased or decreased your trust, respect, and obligation toward them?
- IQ7: How have you perceived the effect you have on the senior leader to have increased or decreased their trust, respect, and obligation toward you?

## **Methods and Procedures**

### **The Interview Questions**

- IQ1: How does the arrival of the current senior leader bring up feelings you may have about the last senior leader leaving in a way that either increases or decreases your willingness to follow their leadership?
- IQ2: How were you given the opportunity to process your grief about the previous senior leader leaving in a way that either increased or decreased your willingness and ability to follow the incoming senior leader?
- IQ3: How did the preconceived ideas that you have of senior leaders increase or decrease the level at which you were willing to support and follow the incoming senior leader?
- IQ4: How does your level of perceived contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect for the current senior leader increase or decrease your willingness to follow their leadership?
- IQ5: How does what you believe the senior leader thinks about your level of perceived contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect either increase or decrease your willingness to follow their leadership?
- IQ6: How has the effect the senior leader has had on you increased or decreased your trust, respect, and obligation toward them?
- IQ7: How have you perceived the effect you have on the senior leader to have increased or decreased their trust, respect, and obligation toward you?

### **Design**

The methodologies of this study concentrate on a qualitative case study method and content analysis to best answer the research question through interview questions. The qualitative case study method allows the researcher to use interview questions to

discover the intimate emotions and mindset of managing followers in organizations with high turnover of senior leadership to better understand why they often resist, work against, or wait out the incoming or current senior leader. Case study research allows the interview to be conducted in a setting that is most comfortable to the participant so that they can honestly provide their responses to the interview questions, sharing their lived experience as to if and to what degree their thoughts and emotional processing toward the incoming senior leader was impacted by unprocessed grief, preconceived prototypes of leaders that managing followers develop, or the quality of the working relationship between the managing follower and the current senior leader along with the potential reasons for the state of that working relationship.

Participants in this study were followers who currently or at some time had some managerial responsibility in an organization that experienced frequent turnover of the senior leader who acknowledge they had at some point resisted, worked against, or waited out the incoming senior leader rather than follow their leadership. The researcher looked for participants from four to six organizations of varying sizes that were known to have high senior leader turnover from a variety of ages and locations within the United States. The researcher posted a notice about the study on social media with their contact information, inviting those who met the criteria and wished to participate to email or text them. The researcher sent an email to those who responded to the invitation, which detailed that participants could respond with full details about the study, including a note that they could answer regarding an organization from their past or one they are currently connected to.

Six interviews were completed by participants ranging from 28 to 81 years old who responded to the interview questions in regards to their time employed in the following sectors and sizes: state government (medium-size facility), churches (small and medium locations within a large world-wide nonprofit organization), state government public schools (a medium school and a large school), manufacturing (small for-profit private), food service (small location within a large for-profit corporation), and federal government prison (large). All respondents were citizens of the United States from a variety of states. Respondents were 83.3% female and 16.7% male. Respondents were 50% aged 50 or below and 50% aged 51 or above.

## **Data Collection and Analysis**

Data were collected through semistructured interviews. Participants who responded positively to either a post listing the participant qualifications or a phone call inviting them to participate were sent an email that asked them to confirm they met the qualifications to be a participant, express their willingness to contribute to the research, and reply to schedule the interview time. The email included the content of the contract, including the purpose of the research, the time required of them should they



participate, that they were free to exit the study at any time they wished, that they could request a review of the process or their role or treatment at any time during the study, that they would have the opportunity to give final approval to the transcripts of their interview, that they would be able to view the final work if they wished, that the name and unique identifying markers of the organization they answer questions about will not be divulged, and the interview questions to be asked of them in the Zoom interview. The participants' time investment was estimated to be 20 minutes (5 minutes to read and respond to the email, 10 minutes for the interview via Zoom, 3 minutes reviewing the transcript, and 2 minutes for the logistics of setting up the Zoom).

The interview questions were each derived from the literature. The data gathered from the interview questions were coded according to the area it related to for proper analysis, with key phrases noted to identify commonalities that were used to determine and adjust themes. When several participants from a variety of ages and organization types completed the interviews, the data reached data saturation given the insight gathered to discover why managing followers often resist the leadership of incoming senior leaders due to unprocessed grief, preconceived prototypes of leaders which managing followers develop, or the quality of the working relationship between the managing follower and the current senior leader along with the potential reasons for the state of that working relationship.

The interviews were conducted through Zoom. The audio from the Zoom video calls were recorded with all the information, including the purpose of the research and their rights as participants where each participants was asked to verbalize their approval for the interview to be recorded for research purposes. The transcribed interviews were emailed to participants to make amendments, if any, which were incorporated before analysis. All participants were interviewed via Zoom during nonwork hours. All participants were willing and understood the purpose of the study. Transcripts were scrubbed and uploaded to Intellectus Qualitative (2025) for analysis and recommendations regarding coding and themes.

## **Results**

The themes below are derived from the coded transcripts and answer the research question, Why do manager followers in organizations with high turnover of senior leadership often resist, work against, or wait out the incoming or current senior leader?

### **Leadership Transition Expectations**

The theme of leadership transition expectations helps answer the research question by illustrating how managers' previous experiences with leadership turnover create anticipatory frameworks that influence their current behavior. When organizations

have high senior leadership turnover, managers develop expectations based on past transitions – often characterized by short tenures or failed change initiatives – leading them to view new leaders as temporary. These historically shaped expectations prompt resistance behaviors as a rational response: Why invest in relationships or changes that experience suggests will be short-lived? Rather than seeing resistance as mere obstinacy, this theme reveals it as a learned adaptive strategy based on organizational history and pattern recognition.

**Table 1: Number of Excerpts by Code for Leadership Transition Expectations**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Leadership Stability Expectations	2

### Unaddressed Leadership Transition Grief

This theme helps answer the research question by revealing how emotional processing deficits contribute to resistance behaviors. When organizations fail to acknowledge the emotional impact of leadership transitions, manager followers experience unresolved grief that manifests as resistance. Without structured opportunities to process these feelings, they adopt coping mechanisms like waiting out new leadership or working against them as a displaced expression of their unaddressed emotional responses. This pattern suggests resistance behaviors may be symptomatic of institutional failure to support healthy emotional transitions rather than mere opposition to change.

**Table 2: Number of Excerpts by Code for Unaddressed Leadership Transition Grief**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Unsupported Grief Processing	3
AI: Lack of Grief Processing	1

### Trust Dynamics in Leadership Relationships

This theme helps answer the research question by illuminating how the constant turnover of senior leadership disrupts the natural trust-building process that requires consistency and time to develop. When managers repeatedly experience leadership changes, they become hesitant to invest emotionally and professionally in new relationships that may prove temporary, leading to resistance behaviors. The cycle of building and losing trust with successive leaders creates a self-protective mechanism where waiting out becomes a rational response to avoid the vulnerability associated with trust that has been repeatedly broken. This pattern of deteriorating trust dynamics

explains why manager followers develop resistance strategies rather than engage with new senior leaders.

**Table 3: Number of Excerpts by Code for Trust Dynamics in Leadership Relationships**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Breakdown of Trust	2
AI: Trust Develops Over Time	2
AI: Decreased Trust	3
AI: Distrust of Leadership	5

### **Defensive Adaptation Mechanisms**

The theme of defensive adaptation mechanisms helps answer the research question by revealing how manager followers develop self-protective responses to cope with the instability caused by frequent leadership changes. When faced with recurring turnover at senior levels, these individuals create defensive routines – such as documenting interactions, bypassing authority, or maintaining low engagement – as rational adaptations to preserve their professional standing and psychological well-being. This pattern of behavior reflects not mere resistance but a strategic coping mechanism that emerges from the experience of repeatedly investing in relationships with leaders who subsequently depart, creating a self-protective cycle that manifests as waiting out the current leadership.

**Table 4: Number of Excerpts by Code for Defensive Adaptation Mechanisms**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Self-Protection Strategies	4

### **Sustained Psychological Damage From Poor Leadership**

This theme illuminates how repeated exposure to poor leadership creates lasting psychological wounds that influence followers' resistance behaviors. Managers who have experienced multiple leadership transitions with inadequate leaders develop protective mechanisms like skepticism and disengagement that persist when new leaders arrive. These psychological effects – diminished trust, emotional exhaustion, and learned helplessness – directly contribute to their tendency to wait out or undermine new leadership, as they have internalized expectations of eventual

leadership failure based on past trauma. The sustained nature of this damage explains why resistance persists even when new leadership may be competent.

**Table 5: Number of Excerpts by Code for Sustained Psychological Damage From Poor Leadership**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Long-Term Psychological Impact	1
AI: Declining Morale and Confidence	3

### Leadership Style Dissonance

Leadership style dissonance addresses the research question by highlighting how resistance emerges when new senior leaders fail to align their approach with organizational expectations. When incoming leaders display disrespectful attitudes, openly criticize previous leadership, or implement abrupt changes without respecting established practices, managers develop active resistance strategies. This misalignment between expected leadership behaviors and actual practices creates legitimate gaps that prompt followers to wait out leaders they perceive as temporary or misguided, rather than investing in relationships they believe will ultimately fail due to this fundamental disconnect.

**Table 6: Number of Excerpts by Code for Leadership Style Dissonance**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Disrespectful Leadership Style	4
AI: Unmet Leadership Expectations	2

### Fear-Based Compliance

This theme reveals that resistance to new senior leadership is rooted in a dysfunctional compliance mechanism where managers follow directives solely out of fear rather than genuine buy-in. When compliance is fear-based, managers are more likely to engage in minimum effort compliance or passive resistance, waiting out the leader until they inevitably depart. In organizations with high leadership turnover, this fear-based dynamic is particularly counterproductive as managers learn that superficial compliance while avoiding meaningful change is a safer strategy than authentic engagement with leaders who may not remain long enough to cement their initiatives.

**Table 7: Number of Excerpts by Code for Fear-Based Compliance**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Fear-Based Compliance	5

### **Deteriorating Professional Trust**

The theme of deteriorating professional trust helps answer why managers resist new senior leadership during high turnover periods, because it reveals how repeated leadership changes erode foundational professional relationships. As managers experience a succession of short-term leaders, each transition chips away at their willingness to invest emotionally and professionally in new directives. This cumulative breakdown of trust creates a self-protective stance where waiting out the current leader becomes a rational response to what experience has taught them will be another temporary relationship, making resistance a natural consequence of fractured professional trust rather than mere insubordination.

Table 8: Number of Excerpts by Code for Deteriorating Professional Trust

Code	Excerpts
AI: Deteriorating Professional Relationship	2

### **Diminished Professional Value**

The theme of diminished professional value helps answer the research question because when managers consistently experience devaluation of their contributions and professional standing with each leadership change, they develop resistance mechanisms as a form of self-preservation. This theme reveals that manager followers who feel dismissed or disrespected by incoming senior leaders may intentionally disengage or resist directives as a way to maintain their sense of professional worth. Their decision to wait out transient leadership stems from previous experiences where their expertise was overlooked, creating a protective response to avoid repeated professional devaluation during high turnover cycles.

Table 9: Number of Excerpts by Code for Diminished Professional Value

Code	Excerpts
AI: Perceived Insignificance	1
AI: Perceived Lack of Respect	2

## Technological or Process Change-Induced Workplace Distress

The theme of technological or process change-induced workplace distress helps answer the research question by highlighting how technological or process change disruption creates an environment of perpetual job insecurity and toxic workplace dynamics that motivate middle managers to resist new leadership. When managers have previously experienced psychological harm from technological or process change implementations overseen by senior leaders, they may adopt defensive postures against incoming leadership who might introduce further technological or process changes. These managers may wait out new senior leaders, believing from past experience that technological or process change disruptions under changing leadership create vulnerability rather than opportunity, thus explaining their resistance as a self-preservation strategy in environments where leadership turnover coincides with technological or process transformation.

**Table 10: Number of Excerpts by Code for Technological or Process Change-Induced Workplace Distress**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Toxic Work Environment	1
AI: Job Insecurity	2

## Institutional Void in Leadership Transition Support

The theme of institutional void in leadership transition support helps answer the research question by revealing how organizational failures to provide structured transition support creates conditions for resistance. When formal mechanisms for processing change and establishing new working relationships are absent, manager followers are left without guidance or emotional support during leadership transitions. This institutional void forces them to develop their own coping strategies, which often manifest as resistance or waiting out the new leader. The lack of clear direction and support during transitions essentially legitimizes passive resistance as employees default to informal, often self-protective behaviors in the absence of organizational scaffolding for adapting to new leadership.

**Table 11: Number of Excerpts by Code for Institutional Void in Leadership Transition Support**

Code	Excerpts
AI: Lack of Support and Guidance	3

AI: Lack of Formal Transition Support	1
AI: Lack of Transition Process	1
AI: Absence of Transition Process	1

### **Followerhip Based on Authority Perception**

This theme helps answer the research question by highlighting how manager followers assess and grant authority based on perception rather than position alone. In organizations with high leadership turnover, managers may resist new leaders because they have developed an assessment process that evaluates leadership competence and knowledge before granting followership. When faced with yet another leadership change, these managers are not automatically deferring to positional authority but rather waiting out the new leader until they have demonstrated sufficient competence to earn their followership – similar to how followership relationships with AI systems evolve based on demonstrated capabilities rather than assigned authority.

**Table 12: Number of Excerpts by Code for Followership Based on Authority Perception**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Excerpts</b>
AI: Conditional Initial Followership	1
AI: Leadership Competence Impacts Followership	3

### **Leadership Legitimacy and Professional Respect**

The theme of leadership legitimacy and professional respect helps answer the research question by highlighting how managers resist leaders they do not professionally respect or view as legitimate. When experiencing high leadership turnover, managers evaluate each new senior leader's competence and communication style before committing their support. Without demonstrated expertise or ethical consistency, managers may withhold their engagement, choosing instead to wait out what they perceive as temporary or undeserving leadership. This resistance stems from a fundamental need for professional respect and legitimacy validation before authentic followership can be established in unstable leadership environments.

**Table 13: Number of Excerpts by Code for Leadership Legitimacy and Professional Respect**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Excerpts</b>
AI: Professional Recognition Matters	2

---

AI: First Impressions and Communication Style	1
AI: Professional Respect	2
AI: Ethical Conflict	2

---

## Leadership Disruption and Instability

The theme of leadership disruption and instability addresses the research question by revealing how frequent leadership turnover creates an environment where manager followers develop resistance as a coping mechanism. When organizations experience a revolving door of senior leaders, it prevents the formation of meaningful trust relationships between leaders and their teams, fostering a culture where waiting out the current leader becomes a rational response. This pattern of disruption creates organizational uncertainty that manager followers attempt to mitigate by maintaining the status quo rather than investing in potentially short-lived change initiatives, effectively explaining why they might resist or work against incoming leaders they perceive as merely temporary fixtures in an unstable leadership landscape.

**Table 14: Number of Excerpts by Code for Leadership Disruption and Instability**

---

Code	Excerpts
AI: Abrupt Leadership Transition	3
AI: Leadership Turnover	1
AI: High Leadership Turnover	5

---

## Discussion

The research question explored why following managers often resist, work against, or wait out the incoming or current senior leader in environments with high senior leader turnover. The study demonstrated that following managers in environments with high senior leader turnover often resist, work against, or wait out the incoming or current senior leader due to leadership transition expectations, unaddressed leadership transition grief, trust dynamics in leadership relationships, as a defensive adaptation mechanism, sustained psychological damage from poor leadership, leadership style dissonance, fear-based compliance, deteriorating professional trust, deteriorating professional relationship, technological and process changes workplace distress, lack of reciprocal respect formation, an institutional void in leadership transition support, followership based on authority perception, questions about leadership legitimacy and professional respect, and leadership disruption and instability.



## **Contribution to the Scholarly Literature**

The findings of this study contribute to the scholarly literature by providing data that go beyond previous research, which noted the phenomenon in lack of performance and difficulty implementing important initiatives (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134) to provide data that explain why the phenomenon occurs. The findings also further scholarly literature by demonstrating the overlap and workplace application of Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model stages of grief, the ILT's prototype of leadership (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397), and the LMX dyadic working relationship (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413). The findings of this study further the scholarly literature on LMX by going beyond the research studies of Erdogan and Bauer (2015), Megheirkouni (2017), Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), and Schyns and Day (2010) to consider the elements beyond a specific current leader, their follower, and their relationship to the extenuating factors that influence that relationship, some of which may predate that particular follower and leader.

## **Contribution to the Practitioner Literature**

The findings of this study contribute to the practitioner literature by highlighting the reasons for a phenomenon that costs organizations a great deal of time, energy, and effectiveness while also pointing to the starting place for implementing corrective measures for the same. The results of this study not only identify multiple root causes that lead to the disruptive phenomenon, but show how they are each connected to a theory that informs as to corrective measures that the organizational leadership may implement.

## **Weaknesses of the Study**

This study did not include any minority participants. The study participants were all natural citizens of the United States. Due to the demographics of the participants, the generalizability of the results of this study may be limited.

## **Recommended Future Research**

Further research should be conducted on participants employed in high senior turnover environments in other cultures and other countries to determine if there is any variance in root causes based on culture. Further research should be conducted on minority participants employed in high senior turnover environments to determine if there is any variance in root causes based on that status. Further research should be conducted as to the effectiveness of measures that could be implemented that would address or treat the root causes for the phenomenon and how they could be implemented within each industry where high turnover of senior leadership has already been noted to be a

common occurrence such as technology, non-profits, retail, healthcare, military, public education, and some industry (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Gartner & Gartner, 2025, p. 1; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134).

## Conclusion

Followers with managerial responsibility, referred to as managing followers, often resist, work against, or wait out senior leaders in environments with frequent turnover of the senior leaders. This phenomenon has proven to result in diminished performance and difficulty in implementing important initiatives research as to the cause of this phenomenon is largely absent (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013). Research as to the cause of this phenomenon will impact sectors prone to high senior leader turnover many of whom are responsible for the well-being of society including technology, non-profits, retail, healthcare, military, public education, and some industry (Clinger, 2016, p. 1; Duffield et al., 2011, p. 503; Gartner & Gartner, 2025, p. 1; Lokke & Sorensen, 2021, p. 723; Mosadeghrad et al., 2013, p. 134).

Qualitative research was conducted on six participants from the United States who were interviewed via Zoom, providing data regarding their experiences in a wide range of private, public, and government sectors of all sizes. Root causes of this phenomenon were found to include fear-based compliance, lack of processes and communication around senior leader transitions, sustained psychological damage from poor leadership, leadership style dissonance, deteriorating professional trust, deteriorating professional relationship, technological and process changes workplace distress, lack of reciprocal respect formation, an institutional void in leadership transition support, followership based on authority perception, questions about leadership legitimacy and professional respect, and leadership disruption and instability.

The findings of this study provide data that demonstrate the root causes of this phenomenon to have strong connections to Kubler-Ross' (1969) change curve model stages of grief, the ILT's prototype of leadership (Schyns et al., 2011, p. 397), and the LMX dyadic working relationship (Erdogan & Bauer, 2015, p. 413). Further research is recommended to be conducted on participants in a variety of cultures and countries, as well as minority participants, and it could be expanded to test the effectiveness and implementation of measures developed in the future to correct the root causes of the phenomenon.

---

## About the Author

April Briant is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership at Regent University. She is an ordained elder in the Global Methodist Church, serving as Associate Minister at Commerce First Methodist Church in Commerce, Georgia. She

---

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 477-507

© 2025 Regent University School of Business & Leadership

ISSN 2993-589X

also owns and operates a teaching nonprofit farm ministry called Mountain Fortress Miracle Farms, hosts a podcast called Unshakable, and instructs GED and ESL adult education at Lanier Technical College. In her pastorate, April Briant has been pastor in charge, Communications and Operations Pastor, and Executive Pastor. Prior to earning her M.Div., she was blessed to have successful careers in corporate meeting planning, executive assistance, litigation paralegal, and legal support. April is a proud mom to Hope (26) and Faith (20) and Mimi to Iris (3) and Malik (1). By God's grace, April is a strong transformational leader in the communities she serves, calling, equipping, and mobilizing others to be servant leaders in the community alongside her. During her pastorate, she designed a literary analysis approach for interactive Bible study, wrote multiple Bible studies, designed and co-led a 5-month annual workshop teaching laity how to speak the name of Jesus called the Go Beyond Academy, led many women's retreats, and wrote and facilitated Grief Recovery Workshops and Forgiveness and Emotional Intelligence Workshops. April's mailing address is 4165 Prather Bridge Road in Toccoa, GA 30577. She may be reached at [apribr5@mail.regent.edu](mailto:apribr5@mail.regent.edu).

---

## References

- Avis, K. A., Stroebe, M., & Schut, H. (2021). Stages of grief portrayed on the Internet: A systematic analysis and critical appraisal. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 772696.
- Bryman, A. (1987). The generalizability of implicit leadership theory. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*(2), 129-41.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypicality and personality: Effects on free recall and personality impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality, 13*(2), 187-205.
- Clinger, J. C. (2016). Farazmand, A. (Eds.), Turnover at the top: Causes and consequences of leadership. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, 1-6*. Springer International Publishing.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 13*(1), 46-78.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *The Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.
- Duffield, C., Roche, M., Blay, N., Thoms, D., & Stasa, H. (2011). The consequences of executive turnover. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 16*(6), 503-514.

- Dulebohn, J., Bommer, W., Liden, R., Brouer, R., & Ferris, G. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1715–1759.
- Engle, E. M., & Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(4), 988–1010.
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2015). Leader-member exchange theory: A glimpse into the future. In T. N. Bauer & B. Erdogan (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of leader-member exchange* (pp. 413–421). Oxford University Press.
- Gartner, M. B., & Gartner, G. W. (2025, February 5). Gartner HR Survey Reveals More Than Half of C-Suite Leaders Are Likely to Leave Over the Next Two Years; 27% Likely to Leave Within Six Months. *Gartner*.  
<https://gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2025-02-05-gartner-hr-survey-reveals-more-than-half-of-csuite-leaders-are-likely-to-leave-over-the-next-2-years>
- Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 38, 46–78.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995, Summer). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership*, 343–354. Leadership Library of America.
- Intellectus Qualitative* [Online computer software]. (2025). Intellectus360.  
<https://qualitative.intellectus360.com>
- Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On death and dying*. The Macmillan Company.
- Kubler-Ross, E., & Kessler, D. (2005). *On grief and grieving: Finding the meaning of grief through the five stages of loss*. Simon and Schuster.
- Liden, R., & Maslyn, J. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43–72.

- Lokke, A.-K., & Sorensen, K. L. (2021). Top management turnover and its effect on employee absenteeism: Understanding the process of change. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(4), 723–746.
- Lord, R. G., Epitropaki, O., Foti, R. J., & Hansbrough, T. K. (2020). Implicit leadership theories, implicit followership theories, and dynamic processing of leadership information. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7(1), 49–74.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Unwin Hyman.
- Megheirkouni, M. (2017). Revisiting leader–member exchange theory: Insights into stadia management. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 8, 244–260.
- Mosadeghrad, A. M., Ferdosi, M., Afshar, H., & Hosseini-Nejhad, S. M. (2013). The impact of top management turnover on quality management implementation. *Medical Archives*, 67(2), 134.
- Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43–58.
- Schyns, B., & Day, D. (2010). Critique and review of leader–member exchange theory: Issues of agreement, consensus, and excellence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(1), 1–29.
- Schyns, B., Kiefer, T., Kerschreiter, R., & Tymon, A. (2011). Teaching implicit leadership theories to develop leaders and leadership: How and why it can make a difference. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10, 397–4008.
- Shoolin, J. S. (2010). Change management – Recommendations for successful electronic medical records implementation. *Applied Clinical Informatics*, 1(3), 286–292.
- Snodgrass, S. E., Hecht, M. A., & Ploutz-Snyder, R. (1998). Interpersonal sensitivity: Expressivity or perceptivity? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 238–239.
- Stepanek, S., & Paul, M. (2022). *Umbrella summary: Leader–member exchange*. Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Ohio State University, Bureau of Business.

- Tyrrell, P., Harberger, S., Schoo, C., & Siddiqui, W. (2024). *Kubler-Ross stages of dying and subsequent models of grief*. StatPearls Publishing.
- Weber, M. (1921-1922). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* [Economy and Society]. Mohr.
- Weber, M. (2002). *Economy and society: The floor plan of understanding sociology* (J. Winckelmann, Ed.). Mohr Siebeck.

## Appendix: Excerpts List

Subject 5: My understanding of what the role of a senior leader should be increased my ability to follow the leadership of the new senior leader because I was able to not react to her whole attitude because I was there to do my job as the assistant manager which I cared about doing well. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The new senior leader's lack of experience quickly became a problem because they didn't have the answers that the other leader did. The previous senior leader left a lot up to us but if I had a question they could answer it. This new senior leader would answer questions with wrong information and when I ask again, they would tell me to figure it out myself. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

We didn't see the new senior leader every day - we were left on our own devices. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 3: My preconceived ideas about senior leaders increased the level at which I was willing and able to support and follow the new senior leader at least at first. I was trained that you should follow that person. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: They both thought I had valuable contributions which helped increase my ability to follow them just a little bit. I think that they thought I was loyal because I stayed with them. I was more influenced by their loyalty to me. I did what I was going to do, what I wanted to do, and what I knew was the right thing to do for the job. One senior leader told me several times that they thought I had a good impact on things, and they promoted me, so I think that did help me to follow them better. The first senior leader had no impact. The second senior leader, it did help me follow her to a degree. I think she I thought I had a good reputation in court, and a good reputation within the agency, and I would equate that with professionalism and how I handled myself. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: A way was provided to process the grief of one senior leader leaving and a new senior leader starting via employee services, but it was not a safe way so it therefore it went unused which ultimately decreased my ability to follow the new senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I was paranoid in the high turnover environment. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The senior leader's contributions, loyalty, and professional respect were all put towards advancing their own career. Senior leaders avoided putting things they were telling us

to do in writing so they couldn't be held accountable later. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: There was very little warning about the past 2 leaders leaving; we were not prepared even after they left there was very little explanation about why they left and because of that (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: I perceive the affect I had on the new senior manager increased their trust, respect, and obligation towards me. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I believe the goal is they wanted you to be in fear of your job being in jeopardy; they could make your life harder with bad comments on your annual reviews if you didn't word your reports just right. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I did have one new senior leader that was quite responsive and positive with me and cared about the clients. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: There was no official way. I just did it with my colleagues, and my peers talked about it with them just to commiserate. There was no official way from the Administration to do that. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I think I am fine in the establishment, that my job is safe – but it never really is. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

That created a problem because I had to tell the people looking at me for the answer that we had to figure it out, which wasn't what they wanted to hear. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

With the previous senior leader, I would get the correct answer. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 4: I expected the senior leader to be somebody I could go to, somebody to back us up, and somebody we had confidence in. And I wanted more of that from the new senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I have to be respectful in front of people as far as my personal respect for him, but I didn't feel like he respected me or anybody else, or the company which decreased my willingness to follow him. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I felt like I was betraying my previous senior leader because I stayed working with the new senior leader, but I was glad I did as it helped me get a manager job at another location. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)



Subject 4: We really didn't have a way to process it. There was no human resource department. There was just the owner. I always feel you should follow your leader; no matter what as they are your superior. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

With the second senior leader, her loyalty was probably questionable, but her knowledge and understanding of the work was there, so that was enough respect from me to follow that person for a while. Over time both had a terrible affect on the agency, and then my desire to follow them decreased. My perception of their professional respect for others decreased my willingness to follow them. But that wasn't obvious at the very beginning. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 4: At first, I thought the new senior leader would be better than the one leaving because they had better skills - they could run more equipment, were younger, and able to do the job more. I was really excited about the new senior leader to start with. It didn't take long to find out that younger people wasn't necessarily better because they didn't have the experience that the previous senior leader did. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

He really wasn't a good leader, because part of the game for him to be a leader of all of us who are working for him, he was supposed to please the one above him. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I just ripped everything out of the basement without help and I had 5 inch nails in the wall. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

One senior leader told me several times that they thought I had a good impact on things, and they promoted me, so I think that did help me to follow them better. The first senior leader had no impact. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 5: The affect that the new senior leader had on me decreased the trust, respect, and obligation I felt towards them. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Senior leaders avoided putting things they were telling us to do in writing so they couldn't be held accountable later. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: I'm thinking of 2 specific transitions. One was from a very steady, long term leader to just a very flaky person who ended up not even being there that long. And then the other transition I'm thinking of is the last one which was after a series of senior leader turnovers. This person that was in place was very difficult. And then this new person I had no idea, but they ended up being a lot more stable but in both of those transitions I had no idea what was going to happen. I had frustrations with the one per

this last transition and all I hoped was that that person wasn't as bad as person who left. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Both senior leaders trusted me as a person and respected me, and I think it increased their trust in me. When I told her the second one, I was leaving, she cried, which surprised me as she was very unemotional. I perceived she respected me, and I think that increased over time, even when I got my new job at the place where she used to work, she called that boss and told them really good things about me which was huge because credibility in that arena was really important and that gave me instant credibility. The affect I had on the first senior leader was to intimidate her because I knew the job better than her which decreased her obligation toward me. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The rules are very strict there about not talking about anything private or personal. Somebody wrote a letter to the editor once and the department got a hold of that and the young man suddenly no longer worked in the office. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I perceived senior leaders didn't have any loyalty to us employees in most cases as we had to be able to protect ourselves in case something went wrong. Their loyalty was to the higher ups. I had very little respect for any of them. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

With one senior leader it got to the place where he would say no to something, and I would just send a note to the judge (an outside authority over him) who would say yes in a month. I had to be defiant in doing things if I was trying to do something for somebody and the senior leader always would say, "No, you can't do that." I went just around the new senior leader because I know it needed to be done. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I am glad I got out of the toxic system that was this work environment. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: They both thought I had valuable contributions which helped increase my ability to follow them just a little bit. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: I perceived the new senior leader's contribution, their loyalty, their affect, and their professional respect to be for their own career and their own bosses which decreased my ability to fully follow them as a leader though I had to follow them to a certain extent to keep my job through compliance with the rules and regulations about my behavior. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I think sometimes they thought my loyalty had to be limited because I do believe they viewed me as insufficient person to be there to do the job because I am a woman. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I serve churches and in this particular church that I was serving on this particular time we had a turnover of 2 senior leaders, one left in the middle of the year and the next one that served left within about 6 months because he had aging parents that he needed to care for then we were going to get the third one in a very short time. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I kept going because I needed my job, but it did get to a point where it was just too much. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The previous senior leader stayed there day and night sometimes and they just fired her and gave her no explanation and brought that new senior leader in with the terrible attitude which caused me to lose a lot of respect for that for the district manager who above the new senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Her contribution was to get rid of all the old workers and bring in new workers and to do everything the way she had done it at a previous store which decreased my willingness to follow her. It seemed like she loved her title because she could tell everybody else what to do, and she was coming to a new store that she didn't know nothing or nobody there. She didn't know our customers like we did. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

It wasn't long before he started firing the staff. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: The preconceived ideas I had about senior leaders were that they mostly were not to be trusted and were looking out only for themselves which decreased my ability to follow the leadership of the new senior leader significantly. I had some previous senior leaders that were really good but normally they were just in it for themselves to step up their career and didn't care who they stepped on, or who they burnt to dust. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: The preconceived ideas I had of senior leaders before the new senior leader got there decreased my ability to trust or to follow the new senior leader because I believed a person in that leadership position should lead and believe and demonstrate perseverance, more steadfastness, more engagement with the people so, I was very disappointed when none of those preconceived expectations were met which made it more difficult to follow the new senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: My perception of their contribution, their loyalty, their affect, and their professional respect decreased my willingness to follow their leadership. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: It is not feelings about the old person as much as it is how the new person presents themselves such as how much they want to change, or if they bad mouth the old person, then I have felt like I need to be defensive and sort of protective of the old person. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 1: The first one totally decreased. I wasn't following that person anywhere. The new senior leader had no loyalty and didn't know what they were doing so I'm not following that person. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

There are a few things that shine through that weren't like on the loyalty spectrum that did get the affect both senior leaders had on me to decrease my trust toward them. The affect the first senior leader had on me decreased my respect toward her. I still have respect for the second senior leader so for that senior leader the affect they had on me maintained or increased my respect toward them. The affects that the first senior leader had on me decreased my sense of obligation toward them however, I still did my job because I had loyalty and obligation to the work but not to that senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 3: My perception of the new senior leader's contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect decreased my willingness to follow them as a leader. I think that they did not respect me as the person and the job that I held. They were very loyal to their job and did what they thought was best, even if it meant hurting others along the way. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

When the new senior leader came, I was hopeful, and I had asked my people to trust this person. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

It was a shock. I think I am fine in the establishment, that my job is safe – but it never really is. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

But I just kept working. I kept doing my job, and I got out there as soon as I could. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

He dismissed my contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect as unimportant often threatening myself and other staff by saying things like, "If you can't do it, I'll find somebody that can." He acted like a dictator more than anything. Everything he said had the tone of belittling me and the staff. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

And there were a lot of people who got burnt in the dust by senior leaders, so you had to keep all your information and everything you did. I had boxes at home in case there was any question about anything I did. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I did what I had to do to meet all the criteria of the policies, but it didn't go beyond that as I didn't respect hardly any of them. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 4: The affect the new senior leader had on me decreased my trust, my respect, and my obligation toward him. I couldn't trust him as he would say one thing and do another. He would take credit for our work that went well and no credit for anything that didn't go well. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The affect he had was to cause me to feel tension like I was walking a tightrope or walking on eggshells because I wanted to say one thing but couldn't because I can't respect myself after I say certain things. The main thing is trust; if I can't trust somebody I work for or work with pretty much everything else goes by the wayside. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 3: The affect that the new senior leader had on me significantly decreased my trust, respect, and obligation towards them. The way conversations went with them time and time again still affect how I deal with senior managers, coworkers, and people I manage today. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: The affect that the new senior leader had on me decreased my trust, my respect, and my obligation toward the new senior leader. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 2's iPhone: The affect that senior leader had on me neither increased or decreased my feelings of obligation towards the new senior leader. I had certain obligations to that senior leader to produce for them paperwork and reports, and provide leadership and I took seriously my obligations. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 5: She did not consider the affect I was having there. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The staff couldn't take somebody telling them to do this and that while the senior leader does nothing to help them succeed. What I perceived of his professional respect definitely decreased my willingness to follow his leadership. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

We had a lot of temporary senior leaders who are generally very difficult to please because a lot of times we didn't have interactions with them face to face and they each wanted reporting done a different way. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: I perceived the affect that I had on the new senior leader to be non-existent and therefore to have decreased his trust, respect, and obligation towards me. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 3: We did have reviews, and my perception of how the new senior leader viewed my contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect made me decrease my willingness to follow them. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 5: There was no opportunity to process grief about the previous senior leader leaving which decreased my ability to follow the leadership of the new senior leader and gave me major trust issues with the owners and higher management of the organization. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: The affect that the senior leader had on me is to let me know they cannot be trusted and they do not value me, so it has decreased my trust, my respect, and my obligation toward them. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 3: The affect I had on the new senior leader decreased their trust, respect, and obligation towards me. I don't think they think about me for a second now. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

That didn't come to fruition exactly so but the transition from the really stable person. There weren't really expectations except maybe, that it would be as good as that person, because that person really had a good handle on things and gave everybody a voice and so I guess didn't realize how good I had it with that person. I don't know what I expected. I guess I expected the same, but I was very disappointed in that transition. Their planning was pretty different. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 1 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 5: I had this experience where the previous senior leader got fired - she walked in that morning, and they just told her turn in her keys and then they brought the new senior leader in at the same time. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

It drained my emotions and my confidence. It killed my confidence. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The affect the new senior leader had definitely decreased my willingness to follow his leadership and the same with much of the staff. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 4 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

Subject 6: The arrival of the new senior leader brought up concerns about how they wanted things done compared to the last senior leader which increased my willingness to follow their leadership because I needed to keep my job and get good reviews to survive. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

There was one senior leader who was trying to do the right thing and that increased my trust, respect, and obligation toward him, but he wasn't there long. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 6 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I think that they did not respect me as the person and the job that I held. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 3 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

I think they appreciated my leadership. I think they respected me as a professional comrade, or co-worker, and since I was under their leadership. I did have reviews with the senior leaders, and they made good comments about me, so I think they respected me, my role, and my accomplishments. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 2 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)

The new senior leader just kept on bossing everybody around comparing the way she wanted things done to the wrong way the previous senior leader had done things. I was the assistant manager at the time and the way upper management brought in the new senior leader and fired the previous senior leader without considering anyone else's feelings made it very hard for me to follow the new senior leader's leadership. (25SU LPHD757 Subject 5 Transcript Scrubbed.docx)