

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ENNEAGRAM TYPE AND KAREN HORNEY'S INTERPERSONAL TRENDS MEASURED AS COMPLIANCE, AGGRESSION AND DETACHMENT

Raymond W Nettmann and Vasi van Deventer Ph.D.

Fauvre's (2000) premise that the Enneagram typology is 'neither random nor arbitrary, but rather maintains a quality and elegance in its inherent symmetry' motivated this researcher to examine if there was indeed such a symmetry especially in relation to the various Enneagram triads and Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. In an article *Karen Horney Meets the Enneagram*, Wagner (2001) offers a very detailed synthesis of some Enneagram authors' approaches to the interconnection between various triadic arrangements of the Enneagram Types and Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends. He concludes his article by throwing down a gauntlet to "start down the yellow brick road of research" (Pg. 12). He recommends using the Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI) (Coolidge, 2004) to determine if there is indeed a relationship between the two systems.

Claudio Naranjo was the first to integrate Karen Horney's theories and the Enneagram (Maitri, 2000). Karen Horney (1946) developed a theory of different interpersonal styles that people use to maintain social security. These are defined as: moving toward people, moving against people and moving away from people. Each group's behavior is characterized by compliance, aggression and withdrawal or detachment respectively. The integration of Horney's three interpersonal trends into the Enneagram has great appeal because the Enneagram types can also be divided into different sets of three, or triads.

However, different authors have formed their own configurations between the nine personality types and Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends. Each author has emphasized different aspects of the two theories to form different categories. In the article already mentioned, Wagner (2001) shows how various authors correlate the Enneagram with Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. Jerome Wagner, Tad Dunne, Maria Beesing, Bob Nogosek, and Pat O'Leary and Thomas Chou all accept that Enneagram types Two, Six and Seven correlate with Horney's compliant type, that type One, Three and Eight correlate with Horney's aggressive type and that type Four, Five and Nine correlate with Horney's withdrawn type. Thomas Chou suggests however, that at a deeper level the types use different tactics to achieve their goals. At this deeper level type Two, Five and Eight are aggressive, type Seven, Four and One are withdrawn and type Three, Six and Nine are compliant. In contrast, Riso and Hudson (1999), divide the nine Enneagram types into three groups ensuring each of the thinking, feeling and instinctive triads are represented in the Horney Groups. In terms of this model, Enneagram type One is a compliant type and Enneagram type Seven is an aggressive type. Kathy Hurley and Ted Donson agree with Riso and Hudson's

structure but their defining categories are based on either expansive, enlightened or temperate solutions to life's problems. In their understanding an expansive solution is due to the suppression of the emotional center which results in aggression, the enlightened solution is due to the suppression of the instinctive center which results in withdrawal and isolation and the temperate solution is due to the suppression of the mental center which results in compliance. Lastly, Janet Levine groups the nine Enneagram types according to the three centers; body, mental and emotional. Therefore, Eight, Nine and One are aggressive, Two, Three and Four are compliant and Five, Six and Seven are withdrawn (cited in Wagner, 2001).

The different theoretical understandings of the relationship between the two systems present an opportunity to engage in empirical research to substantiate some of the theoretical postulations. The intent behind this study was therefore, to contribute to this discourse by empirically investigating the relationship between Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and the nine Enneagram types. So the purpose of the study was twofold, first to see whether there is in fact a relationship between the two systems and second, to investigate the nature of the relationship. In particular the study inquires into the correlations that exist among the nine Enneagram types and Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends in terms of moving towards, against and away from people.

Method

Overview

Employing a quasi-experimental cross-sectional design, the Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI) was emailed to randomly selected members of an Enneagram Facebook Group who had self-identified their Enneagram Type. Data concerning participant demographics were also collected. A one-way between group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyse the data. Ad hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test were used to determine how the three Karen Horney groups differed in regard to the nine Enneagram types.

Procedure

The data for the present study were obtained from revisiting a sample used for another study. The original sample consisted of 255 participants. When revisited 125 participants responded. The sample for the first study was recruited from May to October 2010. Invitations to participate were sent to a random sample of 1014 members of the 5063 members of the Enneagram Group on Face Book. Of the original 520 respondents 255 returned their completed questionnaires. When these participants were revisited from March to September 2012 with requests to complete the HCTI 125 responded.

Participants

The demographic data from the 125 respondents were as follows: Females comprised 56 % of respondents; males 44%. The majority of the respondents were from the United States (49.6%). South Africa, Canada and the United Kingdom each comprised 7.2% of the sample. The remaining 23.2% were from 23 other countries. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents reported speaking English as a first language and 76.8% had a tertiary education. Just on 40% were single, while the remaining 60% were in committed relationships being either married, cohabiting or going steady. The mean age in the sample was 38.8 years, the minimum and maximum age being 16 and 71 years with a standard deviation of 12.

The 125 self-selected Enneagram types consisted of 11 Reformers, 8 Helpers, 14 Achievers, 13 Individualists, 23 Investigators, 13 Loyalists, 14 Enthusiasts, 11 Challengers and 18 Peacemakers (using the Riso/Hudson type names for Types One through Nine respectively). The majority of the participants reported they had identified their type through Enneagram workshops (35.2%), followed by books (24.8%) and then by completing the Full RHETI (18.4%). To the question, "have you ever changed your mind about your type?" 74% said no. Eighty percent reported the stability of their selected type to be up to two years and beyond. Lastly, 81% indicated that knowledge of their Enneagram type influenced their daily living.

Questionnaire

The Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI) measures Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends of moving towards, against and away in terms of Compliant, Aggressive and Detached levels (Coolidge, Moor, Tomoko, Stewart, & Segal, 2001). The 19 items for each of the trends are scored on a four point Likert scale. The HCTI was normed on a group of 630 normal adults, 315 males, 315 females, ages 16 to 93 ($M=21$). The Cronbach Alphas were 0.80 for Compliance, 0.82 for Aggression and 0.83 for Detachment. Test-retest (1-week interval) reliabilities were Compliance = 0.92, Aggression = 0.92 and Detachment = 0.91. Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation established three facets for each of the three interpersonal trends. These are altruism, need for relationships and self-abasement for the compliance scale; malevolence, power and strength for the aggression scale; and need for aloneness, avoidance and self-sufficiency on the detached scale (Coolidge et al., 2001).

Results

Sex difference

The Cross tab between gender and Enneagram Type resulted in the Chi-square test results that demonstrated a significant difference: $\chi^2 (8, n = 254) = 27.77, p = .001, \phi = .331$. It was therefore decided to perform an ANOVA to explore the relationship between gender and Enneagram type in terms of the dependent variables measured by the HCTI. As can be seen from Table 1 there

was a significant difference between males and females on the HCTI aggressive scale. This confirms previous reports of lower levels of aggression in females than males by other researchers (Coolidge et al., 2001; Shatz, 2004).

Table 1
Means and standard deviations on all measures by sex

Variable	<u>Male (n = 55)</u>		<u>Female (n = 70)</u>		<u>F</u>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
HCTI Compliant	3.870	.171	3.900	.158	1.076
HCTI Aggressive	3.720	.186	3.650	.187	3.971*
HCTI Detached	3.730	.194	3.690	.174	1.768

HCTI = Horney-Coolidge Type Inventory. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate the Enneagram type difference in terms of the three HCTI groups, Compliant, Aggressive and Detached. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. Means and standard deviations are reflected in Table 2.

There was a statistically significant difference between Enneagram types on the combined dependent variables, $F(3, 24) = 5.1$, $p = .000$; Wilks' Lambda = .401; partial eta squared = .262. A significant difference between Enneagram types existed for each of the HCTI groups. Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .01 the results were:

- Compliance, $F(8, 116) = 9.95$, $p = .000$, partial eta squared = .407
- Aggression, $F(8, 116) = 3.25$, $p = .002$, partial eta squared = .183
- Detachment, $F(8, 116) = 4.27$, $p = .000$, partial eta squared = .227.

One-way between group analysis of variance conducted on each of these variables, revealed more information about the differences between Enneagram types at $p < .01$.

Compliance

A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and a large effect size of 0.64 and $N = 125$. Further post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for compliance for the Investigator, ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .114$) had the lowest levels of compliance. The greatest mean difference occurred between the Investigator and

the Helper, ($M = 4.06$, $SD = .109$) indicating significant higher levels of compliance for the Helper when compared to the Investigator. The Reformer, ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .136$), the Peacemaker, ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .120$), the Achiever, ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .069$), the Enthusiast, ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .150$) and the Loyalist, ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .144$) all scored significantly higher on compliance when compared with the Investigator. Another notable significant difference was between the Helper and the Challenger, ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .184$) indicating that the mean scores for compliance for the Helper were higher than that of the Challenger.

Table 2
Means and standard deviations of the Nine Enneagram Types by HCTI scales

Enneagram Type	<u>Compliant</u>		<u>Aggression</u>		<u>Detachment</u>		<i>n</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1: Reformer*	3.97	.136	3.67	.099	3.70	.164	11
2: Helper	<u>4.06</u>	.109	3.55	.167	3.56	.121	8
3: Achiever	3.95	.069	3.73	.200	3.72	.164	14
3: Individualist	3.89	.141	3.72	.208	3.74	.179	13
5: Investigator	3.70	.114	3.67	.163	<u>3.86</u>	.171	23
6: Loyalist	3.90	.144	3.76	.157	3.72	.164	13
7: Enthusiast	3.89	.150	3.62	.193	3.62	.128	14
8: Challenger	3.80	.184	<u>3.85</u>	.116	3.66	.193	11
9: Peacemaker	3.97	.120	3.59	.214	3.65	.183	18
Total	3.88	.164	3.68	.189	3.71	.183	125

HCTI = Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory. **Enneagram Type names from Riso and Hudson (1999).*

The Moving Towards group need affection and approval which manifests in various ways, some in the group may need intimacy and others may need to belong to a group or organisation. Their self-esteem depends on the approval of others and they are often devastated by rejection. To avoid rejection they often subordinate themselves, and unlike the Against group, leave the limelight to others or take second place (Horney, 1946). So they avoid confrontation and conflict. Riso and Hudson describe these moving towards people as Compliant

because they are compliant to the demands of others. They are also described as 'responsible' people, always ensuring the correct course of action is followed. Most importantly, the Towards group may not necessarily be compliant to everyone all the time, but they are compliant to the demands of their superegos (Riso & Hudson, 1999).

All of the three types assigned to the Towards group had significant differences with at least one other Enneagram type in levels of compliance. The Reformer had higher levels of compliance than the Investigator. The Investigator pride themselves on their original thinking and have been described as iconoclasts. In contrast, the Reformer is determined to represent information perfectly and accurately which often stifles their creativity. The Helper scored higher in levels of compliance than both the Individualist and the Challenger. The Challenger moves against people and by definition is not compliant. This difference validates both the Helper and Challenger's respective position in their categories.

Notably, it was only in levels of compliance that the Loyalist was significantly different to any of the other Enneagram types in any of the measures. In this case the Loyalist was higher in compliance than the Individualist. Enneagram authors often describe the Loyalist as ambivalent because in any description of the of the Loyalist, it is said, the opposite description is equally true (Riso & Hudson, 1999; Palmer, 1988; Rohr & Ebert, 2001). For example, the Loyalist demonstrates high levels of compliance by wanting to belong to a group or organisation but at the same time mistrust their own judgement about their ability to discern if the group is worthy of their loyalty. They can be passive and accommodating but if feel they are to be betrayed, can become quite aggressive and conflictual. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Loyalist did not score significantly differently from the other Enneagram types except from the most detached type, the Individualist.

Of the three in this group, the Helper is the quintessential expression of the Towards group. The Helper is a 'heart' person priding themselves on their ability to love another despite any obstacles or challenge. They move towards people to comfort, help and support them. The Helper in this study scored the highest in compliance ($M = 4.06$). Moreover, they scored the lowest of all the Enneagram types in detachment ($M = 3.56$) and aggression ($M = 3.55$).

Aggression

A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 79% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and a large effect size of 0.42 and $N = 125$. Further post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for aggression for the Challenger, ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .116$) had the highest mean score. The greatest mean difference occurred between the Challenger and the Helper, ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .167$) indicating significant lower levels of aggression for the Helper when compared to the Challenger. The Peacemaker, ($M = 3.59$, $SD = .214$) as would be expected, was also significantly lower than the Challenger in levels of

aggression. Lastly, the Enthusiast, ($M = 3.62$, $SD = .193$) and the Challenger had the least mean difference in levels of aggression but these were significant indicating lower levels of aggression for the Enthusiast.

The Challenger is the most dominant and aggressive of all the Enneagram types. They despise weakness and exert control over all they come into contact with. Horney describes the type that moves against people as having a Darwinian world view where only the fittest survive. They have "a strong need to exploit others, to outsmart them, to make them of use to [them] selves (Horney, 1946. Pg. 65). The results highlighted the Challenger as the exemplar of the Against group.

Consistent with theory, the Challenger was significantly different to the Helper and the Peacemaker in levels of aggression. In fact, the Challenger and Helper's score had the greatest mean difference in levels of aggression, which confirms Horney's (1946) position that the aggressive and compliant groups are diametrically opposed. The next greatest mean difference in aggression was between the Peacemaker and the Challenger. As the most striking quality of the Peacemaker is to avoid confrontation at all costs this significant difference was expected. Lastly, the significant difference in aggression between the Enthusiast and the Challenger is notable because it undermines Riso-Hudson's model that suggests there should be no difference between these two as they are both Against types. This result points to the alternative grouping of Enneagram types where the Enthusiast may belong to the Towards group.

Detachment

A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 90% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and a large effect size of 0.47 and $N = 125$. Further post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for detachment for the Investigator ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .171$) was not only the highest but also significantly different from four of the Enneagram types. With their means arranged in descending order, the Challenger, ($M = 3.66$, $SD = .193$) the Peacemaker, ($M = 3.65$, $SD = .183$) the Enthusiast, ($M = 3.62$, $SD = .128$) and the Helper, ($M = 3.56$, $SD = .121$) all differed significantly different from the Investigator type. These results confirm the position of the Investigator in relation to the Challenger, the Enthusiast and the Helper as the most withdrawn type but counters the postulation that the Peacemaker is a withdrawn type.

Descriptions of the Investigator captures most perfectly the qualities of moving away from people that Karen Horney describes. They have a capacity to observe themselves with a level of detachment and so what is crucial to them is their "inner need to put emotional distance between themselves and others" (Horney, pg. 75). They have a great need for privacy and may become extremely irritated if others violate their privacy. They maintain a complete independence through self-sufficiency (Horney, 1965). It is not surprising then, that the Investigator had the highest mean score for detachment of all the Enneagram types. Moreover, there was the greatest difference between themselves and the

Helper, the most affectionate and compliant of the Enneagram types. That the Enthusiast is not a withdrawn type and belongs to either the Assertive or Towards group is confirmed by this significant difference between them and the Investigator.

Limitations and Further Research

The major challenge to the reliability of the study was the self-identification of Enneagram type by the respondents. This challenge has been faced by other researchers trying to build a sample of participants who know their Enneagram Type. Other attempts to counter the shortcomings of this approach have been to compare results of Enneagram naïve and Enneagram knowledgeable participants (Scott, 2010), to use Enneagram experts to determine the Enneagram type of participants (Whillans, 2009), to draw the sample from a population of experts in the Enneagram field (Hebenstreit, 2008) or to use tools designed to measure Enneagram Type (Wagner, 2009) [2].

This study attempted to determine the impact of Enneagram self-identification by asking respondents if they had ever changed their mind about being a particular Enneagram Type and how long they felt they were a particular type. Unfortunately, chi-square tests used to determine independence of Enneagram type were not conclusive because the variables violated the assumption that the lowest expected frequency in any cell should be greater than 5. Visual inspection of the frequencies however, did indicate that the reliability of self-identification of Enneagram type was credible. Only 25% of the participants reported changing their minds about which type they were and 82% reported the stability of their selected type to be up to two years and beyond.

Moreover, there was the potential of endorsement bias because respondents may have suspected certain items were measuring their self-identified Enneagram type and answered accordingly. More alarming though, is a comment by Riso (1994) cited by Dameyer (2001), that respondents' answers may reflect their idealised type they wish to be rather than in terms of their true personality characteristics. The study may have been contaminated further by responses that were socially desirability and not completely honest because the Enneagram system promotes self awareness and personality development so respondents may have under-reported their 'negative' tendencies towards aggression, compliance and withdrawal because these do not reflect 'self-actualization'.

An observation by Brown and Bartram (2005), Giordano (2008) and Thrasher (1994) that some Enneagram types will be more attracted not only to the Enneagram system and that certain types may be more likely to respond to a request to participate in Enneagram research was a concern also of this present study. For example, the Individualist, the Enneagram type reported to be the most interested in establishing a sense of identity made up 20% of the sample. The Helper, the Enneagram type least focussed on self, made up only 7% of the sample. There is therefore a possibility that the composition of the sample did not reflect the general population.

This also makes it difficult to predict the incidence of the different Enneagram types in the general population. Further research is needed to answer the question about the occurrence of each Enneagram type in the population at large. Moreover, power of the statistical tests used was influenced by the unequal numbers within the nine Enneagram types. Research on type incidence may demonstrate that unequal groups is in fact a function of the actual distribution of Enneagram type in the general population.

Approximately 57% of the participants were female, which may imply that the results of this study may not be applicable to males. However, the gender composition of this study did improve on the gender compositions of other studies. In the studies of Giordano (2008), Newgent (2000) and Wagner (1981) approximately 80% of the participants were women. In Warling's (1995) sample 73% were female. The increased number of male participants in this study may have been due to drawing the sample from the Enneagram Group on Facebook, which may be more representative of gender distribution in the general population.

Another limitation of a web based study was that only people who had access to computers and the internet took part in the study. Not only did this exclude people from the socio-economic bracket who cannot access this technology, it may have resulted in a sample skewed in favour of highly educated individuals. Eighty percent of the sample were either in tertiary education or involved in post graduate studies. In future research, a design that attempts to include a greater variation of educational levels would lead to more generalizable results.

This study has challenged the neat arrangement of the three by three arrangement of the Enneagram Types into Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. It has demonstrated however, that there is a strong relationship between at least one Enneagram type within each Horney group which acts as the exemplar of that group. The arrangement is therefore useful at the conceptual level but further research needs to be done to explore how each type manifests their particular way of going against, away and towards. A second area of research is to determine which group the Enthusiast and Reformer belong to. The position of the Peacemaker as a withdrawn type has also been challenged. This is important because the Enneagram is promoted as a map to transformation and healing. If the map is even slightly incorrect its directions may increase a person's struggle to understand their behaviour in terms of Karen Horney's interpersonal trend.

Conclusion

The present study explored the relationship between Enneagram types and Horney's three groups. The hypothesis was that the Enneagram types could be differentiated and clustered in terms of Horney's Moving Towards, Moving Against and Moving Away from people as measured by the HCTI. The study did support a relationship between Karen Horney's groups and the Enneagram. More specifically, it showed that in each of the HCTI groups there was a particular Enneagram type that could be used as an exemplar or benchmark for the group.

Type Twos, Type Eights and Type Fives were shown to be the exemplar of the Moving Towards, Against and Away group respectively. Results did not allow for any conclusions to be drawn regarding the position of type Sevens in relation to Type Ones. Also, the position of Type 9 as a withdrawn type is questionable because it appears to be more of a compliant type than a withdrawn type. With regard to the theoretical approaches mentioned at the beginning of this article: The present results do not offer sufficient information to allow one to support one theoretical position rather than another.

References

Coolidge, F. L. (2004). Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory: Manual.

Coolidge, F. L., Moor, C. J., G, T., Stewart, S. E., & Segal, D. L. (2001). On the relationship between Karen Horney's tripartite neurotic type theory and personality disorder features. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(8), 1387–1400.

Fauvre, K. C. (2000). Karen Horney and the Enneagram. Retrieved August 11, 2010, from <http://www.enneagram.net/articles.html>

Horney, K. (1945). *Our Inner Conflicts. A Constructive Theory of Neurosis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul / London and Henley.

Maitri, S. (2000). *The Spiritual Dimension of the Enneagram* (2001). New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/ Putnam.

Riso, D., & Hudson, H. (1999). *The wisdom of the Enneagram: The complete guide to the psychological and spiritual growth for the nine personality types*. New York, NY: Bantaan Books.

Shatz, S. (2004). The relationship between Horney's three neurotic types and Eysenck's PEN model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(6), 1255–1261. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2003.12.009

Wagner, J. P. (Loyola U. O. C. (2001). Karen Horney Meets the Enneagram. *Enneagram Monthly*, April, 1–13.