2015

Attachment Style, Leadership Behavior, and Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness in Academic Management

Rehema Underwood
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Rehema Underwood

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. David Mohr, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Michelle Ross, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Rodney Ford, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

ABSTRACT

Attachment Style, Leadership Behavior, and Perceptions

of Leader Effectiveness in Academic Management

by

Rehema M. Underwood

M.S., Walden University, 2002

B.A., Ithaca College, 1999

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy Organizational Psychology

Walden University

January 2015

Abstract

Research has found that organizational effectiveness is related to both effective leadership styles and leaders with secure attachment styles. Also, secure attachment style among leaders is related to personality characteristics of leaders. The relationships among leadership styles, attachment styles, and effective leadership behavior have yet to be examined. These relationships were addressed in this quantitative, non-experimental study. Participants included college deans, chairpersons, provost (leaders) and instructors (subordinate) from local community colleges and universities. Study variables were measured using the Relationship Questionnaire, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses were used to examine relationships between attachment and leadership styles. Some connections between attachment style and leadership style were found, but results were mixed. Results of this study may help leaders recognize the relationship between their attachment style and their ability to increase organizational effectiveness and to decrease turnover. Improved organizational functioning can promote positive social change for both leaders and subordinates by improving feelings of satisfaction and promoting mental health.

Attachment Style, Leadership Behavior, and Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness in Academic Management

by

Rehema M. Underwood

M.S., Walden University, 2002

B.A., Ithaca College, 1999

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy Organizational Psychology

Walden University

January 2015

Dedication

First and foremost, I like to thank God for his guidance for giving me the strength in completing my dissertation. My heartfelt thanks also goes to my husband David who has been my support from the beginning to the end---I love you! To my beautiful children who have been patient with mommy for a VERY long time----mommy loves you! To my siblings and parents who have shown their support from the beginning, and have given me the encouragement to see me through this!

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my committee chairperson Dr. Mohr and committee member Dr. Ross for giving me the support and encouragement to complete my dream of becoming Dr. Rehema Underwood ☺ This project was the most difficult task I have ever encountered besides giving birth for the first time! I am so grateful for your feedback and guidance throughout my journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The effectiveness of any organization often depends on the effectiveness of its leaders (Boeckmann & Tyler, 2002; Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Lind & Tyler, 1988). The demands of leadership in organizations have increased due to technological advances and global changes in the workplace (Gilley, McMillan, & Gilley, 2009; De Hoogh, Hartog, & Koopman, 2005). Today's leaders need to inspire and motivate subordinate subordinates, create synergistic team environments, and foster positive job attitudes (Gilley et al., 2009) to respond to these changes.

Although many styles of leadership exist and many theories of leadership have been identified, leaders who are most effective are those who communicate visions to their subordinates and organization (Amneric, Craig, & Tourish, 2007; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Jandaghi, Matin, & Farmami, 2009), are friendly, willing to help followers develop individual strengths, and comfortable taking risks (DeRue, Nahrang, Wellmanm & Humphrey, 2011; Humphrey, Hollenbeck, Meyer, & Ilgen, 2007). All of these behaviors have been shown to be associated with transformational and charismatic leadership styles (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991; De Hoogh et al., 2005). Research has also shown that leaders with transformational and charismatic leadership styles with follower commitment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and motivation (Avolio, Routundo, & Wulumbwa, 2009; Goleman, 2000; Ismail, Zainuddin, & Ibrahim, 2010; Jacobson & House, 2001; Shamir, 1991). Conversely, research has shown laissez-faire leaders negatively with subordinate psychological health, job performance, and productivity (Ashforth, 1994; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Ashforth, 1997; Tepper,

2000). Laissez-faire leadership also relates positively to turnover rates (Ashforth, 1994; Padilla et al., 2007; Ashforth, 1997; Tepper, 2000).

According to Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978), individuals develop different styles of attachment to other individuals based on their early experiences with their own caregivers; these styles, in turn, may influence how personality traits manifest in individuals and their interactions with others. Thus, it follows that the attachment styles of leaders influence their leadership styles. Although some research examines the relationship between leaders' attachment and leadership styles, most research has been limited to the relationship between one type of attachment style–secure attachment–and one type of leadership style–transformational leadership (e.g., & Shaver, 1990; Popper, Mayseless, & Castenovo, 2000; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995). For example, several research findings have found significant correlations relationships between secure attachment style and transformational leadership (Berson & Yammarino, 2006; Popper, et al., 2000; Popper & Amit, 2000; Popper & Mayseless, 2003). For example, studies have found transformational leaders with a secure attachment style were more available to their followers and, giving, encouraging, and empowering in leadership relations compared to leaders with an insecure attachment style (fearful, dismissing, preoccupied; Popper et al., 2003).

Thus, research must examine the relationships between various attachment and leadership styles. Given the recognized benefits of effective leadership, I specifically examine this issue in-depth. I also present the theoretical backgrounds and previous research on personality and attachment styles and their relationship to leadership styles . In the coming chapters, I propose the research questions, detail associated hypotheses,

and explain the purpose of my study. Further, I describe the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations. The methods used to perform the study and to analyze the data are described, and the results, significance, and the implications for social change are discussed.

Background

Although this study ‘s main focus is that of attachment style and leadership behavior, research has also shown that leaders with different leadership styles tend to have different personality traits (De Hoogh et al., 2005; Judge, Bono, Illies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Neustadt, Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnhan, 2006). A person’s personality and attachment constantly interact with one another during a child’s development, for which this constatnt interaction may influence one’s attachment style (Bolwby, 1973). For example, traits such as openness to experience, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness have been shown to positively relate to charismatic and transformational leadership (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chen-Min & Bor-Wen, 2009; Costa et al., 1991; De Hoogh, et al., 2005; Ismail et al., 2010). Conversely, laissez-faire and transactional leaders are likely to manifest anxious, defensive, insecure, and emotional traits, which are most commonly associated with neuroticism (Ashforth, 1997; Bono & Judge, 2004; McCrae & Costa, 1987; Motowildo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997).

Similar to the relationships between personality traits and leadership styles, research has also shown that transformational leadership style positively relates to a secure attachment style (& Shaver, 1990; Popper et al., 2000; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995). Bartholomew & Horowitz (1991); Lopez and Brennan (2000); and Simmons, Gooty, Nelson, and Little (2009) proposed that a securely attached adult displays high

levels of warmth, confidence, and balance of control that facilitates flexible and reciprocal social relationships and the ability to work effectively with others.

The four different styles of adult attachment that will be examined in the proposal are secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). People with a secure attachment style are individuals who display high levels of warmth and balance of control (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Dismissing individuals are self-confident but are low in emotional expressiveness (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Preoccupied individuals are likely to display extreme anger and discomfort in friendships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Lastly, fearful individuals display low self-confidence, self-image, and balance of control (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Dismissive, preoccupied, and fearful attachment styles are all referred to as insecure attachment styles (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Research has shown that individuals with an insecure attachment style have difficulty maintaining high levels of hope, are unable to work effectively with others, and are less likely to form useful relationships (Welch & Houser, 2010). Research has also shown relationships between different attachment styles and different personality traits (Onishi, Gjerde, & Block, 2001; Shaver & Brennan, 1992). For example, studies have shown secure individuals to be more resilient and less neurotic individuals with dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Moreover, research found securely attached adults relate positively to agreeableness, conscientious, extraversion, and openness to experience (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991; De Hoogh et al., 2005; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Research has also showed that dismissing individuals relate positively with social activity (Bartholomew &

Horowitz, 1991; Furman, 2001). Further research also found preoccupied and fearful attachment to positively relates to extreme anger and relationship discomfort (Furman, 2001).

Previous research has shown attachment styles to explain individual differences in the self-regulation process (Fuendeling, 1998). The ability to regulate oneself is unique to each style of attachment (Fuendeling, 1998). Based on these findings, research has examined the relationship between attachment style and one's psychological state (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer, 1998; Simmons et al., 2009). For example, findings have shown that secure attachment style positively relates to hope and burnout, as well as trust in subordinate's supervisor (Simmons et al., 2009). Interestingly, studies have shown that people tend to choose occupations that reflect previous childhood experiences, to help satisfy needs that were not met during their childhood (Pines & Yanai, 2000). Furthermore, when the choice of occupation consists of significant issues, people tend to expect high expectations, ego, and passion (Brown & Wallace, 2004). People also tend to rely on these careers to help settle unresolved childhood wounds for which success in a workplace helps to resolve these wounds (Brown & Wallace, 2004). However, when people believe they have failed, the workplace is perceived as repeating the previous childhood trauma, and burnout is the result (Brown & Wallace, 2004).

Research has shown that leaders with different leadership styles tend to manifest different personality traits (De Hoogh et al., 2005; Judge et al, 2002; Neustadt et al., 2006). Because individuals with different attachment styles also tend to have different personality traits, it follows that those leaders will be characterized by different attachment styles. For example, leaders with high ethical beliefs and confidence, traits

often seen in transformational and charismatic leaders, tend to have a secure attachment style (Bass, 1985; Howell, 1988; Shamir, House, & Arthor, 1993). Furthermore, leaders with a laissez-faire leadership style have been found to be untrustworthy (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007).

However, to date, the relationships between different attachment styles and different leadership styles have been largely limited to studies that have examined the relationship between secure attachment style and transformational leadership. For example, studies by Popper, et al. (2000), Berson et al. (2006), and Popper and Mayseless (2003) have shown that transformational leaders tend to have a secure attachment style. Similarly, research has also shown a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and secure attachment (Bass, 1985; Popper et al., 2000). To date, no research has examined the different leadership styles and their relationships to the different styles of attachment (secure, fearful, dismissing, and preoccupied). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine which attachment style(s) relate with different leadership styles. In doing so, this study explores how the four different styles of attachment relate to various leadership styles.

Problem Statement

Based on findings from previous attachment studies in general (i.e., Berson et al., 2006; Marmarosh, 2009; Davidovitz et al., 2007) and military studies on attachment (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mayseless, 2010; Popper & Amit, 2009), as well as on information about personality traits and leadership (De Hoogh et al., 2005; Chen-Min & Bor-Wen, 2009), it has been shown that effective leadership such as that seen in transformational and charismatic leaders is associated with secure attachment style

(Mayseless, 2010; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). However, no research to date has examined how the four types of attachment styles relate to leadership styles other than transformational leadership alone. The problem to be addressed is that ineffective leadership leads to poor staff satisfaction (Aryee et al., 2007; Einarsen, 1999; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Skogstad et al., 2007). However, research has found leadership styles were related to higher levels of subordinate job satisfaction (Avolio, Bass, & Young, 1999; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Howell & Frost, 1989). The study addresses this question, and provides empirical findings to explore how effective leadership styles may promote staff satisfaction.

In reference to subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness, research has shown that transformational, charismatic and servant leaders tend to be perceived as trustworthy and compassionate by subordinates (Jandaghi et al., 2009), which, in turn, leads to overall positive subordinate outcomes (Dadhich & Bhal, 2008; Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts, 2009)**.** Research has also shown that the laissez-faire leadership style tend to positively relates with negative perceptions of leadership behavior by subordinates (Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2007; Skogstad, Einarsen, Torhsheim, Aasland & Hetland, 2007). However, no research to date has shown how other types of leadership styles (transactional, servant) relate to subordinate perceptions of leaders effectiveness.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships between different styles of attachment (secure, dismissing, fearful, and preoccupied) and different styles of leadership (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, charismatic, and servant

leadership). The study also examines whether leader attachment style influences instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. If different types of attachment styles are shown to positively relate to different types of leadership styles, and if different types of attachment styles of leaders are shown to relate to instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, then organizations can perhaps select and promote those individuals whose attachment styles relate to the leadership characteristics most desired, as well as develop appropriate training programs which in turn, will influence organizational success and effectiveness.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

1. Will secure attachment style relate differently to transformational charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?
2. Will insecure attachment style relate differently to transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?
3. Will different attachment styles relate differently to instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness?

Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$1): There is no relationship between the secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles**.**

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$1): A positive relationship will be found between secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles.

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$2) There is no relationship between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful) and laissez-faire leadership style.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$2**):** A positive correlation will be found between the insecure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles and a negative correlation between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful) and laissez-faire leadership style.

Because of a lack of theoretical and empirical evidence, it is difficult to provide a priori hypothesis regarding the relationships between secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful attachment, and transactional and servant leadership styles.

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$3): There is no relationship between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, and no relationship ~~a~~ between insecure attachment style (dismissing, fearful and preoccupied) and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness**.**

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$3): A positive correlation will be found between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, and a negative correlation will be found between insecure attachment style (dismissing, fearful and preoccupied) and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Theoretical Framework

Attachment Style

The primary tenet of attachment theory is to secure the parent/infant relationship for future development (Bowlby, 1969). Attachment theory, known as the best-established framework regarding individual interpersonal relationships (Berson et al., 2006), entered popular culture through works of Bowlby, (1969, 1973, 1982) and Ainsworth et al. (1989, 1978). Respectfully, successive researchers attempted to operationalize the concept of attachment style (Isabella & Belsky, 1991; Vivona, 2000, &

Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). Previous research shows that attachment style predicts one's love relationships (Shaver & Hazan, 1993), one's friendships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), and in more recent research, one's work-related relationships (Geller & Bamberger, 2009; Berry et al., 2008). Fraser (2007) believed that the relationships between attachment styles and work behaviors in general, along with leadership behaviors had been neglected (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991, 1994). Fraser (2007) concluded that individual attachment style would provide a better understanding about differences in leadership behavior.

Bowlby (1969) explained the importance of the attachment style, which is developed within a child's earliest relationships. Bowlby (1973, 1980) also states that earlier attachment styles help guide behavior and perceptions in future relationships. Bowlby (1973); Collins, Guichard, Ford, Feeney (2004), and Crittenden (1985) also proposed that in childhood and adolescence, perceptions of new people and relationships are not independent of earlier perceptions, thus, previous attachment styles may vary as new relationships are developed. Hazan and Shaver (1987) also examined that attachment styles tend to extend into adult years. As children grow into adulthood, their attachment figure shifts from their parents to their peers (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). However, current research suggests that attachment styles should remain stable throughout ones development (Baldwin, Keelan, Fehr, Enns, & Koh-Rangarajoo, 1996; Lopez & Brennan, 2000). Attachment style describes the closeness between a child and parent to create a balance of security, which is derived through parental contact. The parental contact between child and parent is developed over time (Vivona, 2000). A child meeting his or hers attachment needs (Ainsworth et al., 1978, Blehar et al., 1977) develops through

interactions with parental figures (Ainsworth, et al., 1978). Ainsworth (1989) outlined three types of attachment styles: secure, avoidant, and ambivalent. A secure infant is confident and trusts his or her parental figures. An avoidant infant does not seek closeness with others, but avoids it (Isabella & Belsky, 1991). Furthermore, an avoidant infant refrains from nurturance and tends to rely on him or herself for comfort and exploration (Isabella & Belsky, 1991). Ambivalent infants tend to have their dependent and independent needs neglected (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). As a result, the child's attachment needs are not met, and independence of child is lost (Vivona, 2000). However, studies that are more recent have suggested that there are four, not three, dimensions of adult attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990). These four include secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful. Securely attached individuals reflect positive feelings about themselves and others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991)

Dismissing individuals show positive feelings about themselves, but not about others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hamarta, Deniz, & Saltali, 2009). Preoccupied individuals demonstrate anxiety about themselves, but not about others. Fearful individuals experience negative feelings about themselves and others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hamarta et al., 2009).

Adult attachment styles are often assessed using self-report measures (Fonagy, 1999; Fraley & Waller 1998; Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Rutter, 1995). Scholars have had much debate on what type of approach is most appropriate when measuring adult attachment. Although several researchers on adult attachment rely on the language of categories of infant adult attachment, it appears that most self-report measures actually

measure adult attachment by using continuous dimensions (Stein et al., 2000). This study assesses participants' attachments styles using continuous measures**.** In other words, the participant could score between two different prototypes on the Likert scale (i.e. fearful-avoidant).

Leadership Theories

Zaccaro (2007) proposed that leaders manifest a variety of complex behaviors that are likely explained by a combination of leader attributes and trait approaches to leadership. For example, threats, promise of awards, technical arguments, and inspirational appeals can all be under different leadership styles (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Various types of leadership have a wide range of characteristics that play an important role in leadership behavior. According to Bass's Transformational Leadership theory, transformational leaders help to enhance their followers' sense of values, ability to see a higher vision, and ability to fulfill such vision (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Yukl, 2002). Studies have shown that transformational leadership relates positively with perceptions of leader effectiveness (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008; Fedor, Caldwell, & Herold, 2006; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Studies have also shown that transformational leadership styles positively relates to trustworthy and compassionate subordinates (Jandaghi et al., 2009). Furthermore, Jandaghi et al. (2009) suggest that transformational leaders help their followers think more critically about their own goals and interests and focus on team, organizational, and global objectives.

Burns (1979) was the first to describe differences between transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transactional leadership is often paired with transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Bass & Avolio, 1990; MacKenzie, Podsakoff,

& Rich, 2001), both of which have been part of the literature since the 1980s. Transactional leaders emphasize a mutual beneficial exchange rather than developing relationships (Whittington, Goodwin, Coker, Ickes, & Murray, 2009). Interestingly, effective transformational leaders may exhibit transactional characteristics, which explain why Giri and Santra (2009) argued that transactional leadership is the foundation for developing transformational leadership. However, unlike transactional leaders, transformational leaders include one or more of the following characteristics: idealized vision, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994).

In regards to the Charismatic Leadership Theory, charismatic leaders help encourage followers to identify better with their leader, to feel confident about their work performance, and to perform beyond their expectations (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991). Studies have shown that charismatic leadership help followers to be more receptive to organizational change (Michaelis, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2009). Research has also shown charismatic leaders to provide a behavioral role model to help enhance followers' abilities to perform beyond their expectations, as well as increase self-efficacy (Shamir, House, Arthur, 1993).

According to the Servant Leadership Theory, servant leaders serve the interests and needs of their followers (Greenleaf, 1970). Servant leaders emphasize moral behavior of followers, and looks after follower's best interest (Graham, 1991; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008). Servant leaders are also aware of their moral responsibilities, as well as the success of their followers, customers of the organization, and other related parties (Ehrhart, 2004). Hale and Fields (2007) propose that servant leaders are perceived

as attractive because servant leaders emphasize the skills of followers and encourage them acknowledge such skills. Studies have shown that servant leadership positively relates to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). In other words, servant leaders have been found to influence self-efficacy and commitment of followers to supervisors (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). Studies have also found servant leadership to relate positively to subordinate commitment to their leader (Organ et al., 2006).

Laissez-faire leadership style has been viewed as the least effective style in organizations (Einarsen, 1999; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Skogstad et al., 2007). According to Bass (1998), laissez-faire leaders lack the ability to make effective decisions. For example, laissez-faire leaders positively relates to workplace stressors, role conflict, and mistreatment of subordinates (Aryee et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2007). Minimal research has been conducted regarding laissez-faire leadership, or what Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) refer to as "non-leadership."

In summary, studies have shown that transformational, charismatic, and servant leadership styles relate positively with positive subordinate outcomes, which include the willingness to report problems, affective and cognitive trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Amneric et al., 2007; Berson et al., 2006; Ehrhart, 2004; Michaelis et al., 2009). On the other hand, subordinates respond negatively to laissez-faire leaders, as they perceive them as impersonal and unable to meet to their needs (Aryee et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2007).

Nature of the Study

This study is a cross-sectional, observational design involving the collection of quantitative data. Specifically, 618 college deans, chairpersons, provosts and instructors at a community and/or private college in upstate New York were asked to complete surveys that included measures of attachment, leadership styles, and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

More specifically, the faculty (subordinates) and deans (leaders) were asked to complete the Multifactor leadership questionnaire, the Relationship Questionnaire, and the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. Participants were recruited by e-mail with an invitation to participate in a leadership style study. The Relationships Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) was used to measure attachment style. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004) was used to measure transformational, transactional, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership, as well as instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) was used to measure servant leadership. The relationships between the predictor variable and the outcome variables of attachment style and leadership behavior and attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness were examined using the Pearson's Correlation and Linear Regression.

Definition of Terms

Attachment: Attachment allows the infant to develop closeness with the primary caregiver in an effort to develop a balance of security, derived through parental contact, and independence (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1969). During threatening or distressing situations, the infant adopts attachment behaviors, becomes reunited with the parent, and establishes security (Vivona, 2004).

Adult Attachment: Adult relationships can be predicted by examining how a childhood attachment manifests itself in adulthood (Bowlby, 1973, 1980; Bowlby, 1973; Dozier & Kobak, 1992; Roisman, Tsai, & Chiang, 2004; Collins & Sroufe, 1999). Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) suggested for categories of adult attachment style: secure, dismissing, fearful and preoccupied.

Charismatic Leadership: The ability for leaders to transform subordinates' needs, values, and aspirations (House et al., 1991).

Effective Leadership: An effective leader is one who influences and guides the activities of an organization towards a goal (Judge et al., 2002).

Ineffective Leadership: An ineffective leader is a leader who lacks the influence and guidance of an organization to meet a specific goal (Judge et al., 2002; Toor & Ogunlana, 2009).

Laissez-faire (non-leadership): Laissez-faire leadership is defined as the absence of leadership and avoidance of intervention. Laissez-faire leaders also fail to meet the expectations of their subordinates (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Lewin et al., 1939).

Leadership: Deliberately bringing influence upon a person and/or group of people in directing behavior, environments, and relationships (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Zaccaro, 2007; Avolio, 2007).

Servant Leadership: Leaders who place the good of others over their own self-interest, and who emphasize the importance of moral behavior. These leaders also protect followers from self-interested leaders who are more interested in their own self-gain (Graham, 1991; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008).

Transformational Leadership: Transformational leaders are leaders who seek the admiration, respect, and trust of the subordinates by engaging in four key behaviors of transformational leadership: *idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation* (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Yukl, 2002).

Transactional Leadership: Leaders who rely on their followers to perform tasks based on the leader's expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe et al., 1996).

Assumptions

This study assumes that participants answered the survey instruments honestly and without response bias. Additionally, the study assumes that participants completed the questionnaires truthfully and to the best of their ability. This study also assumes that there is enough variation in leadership styles and perceptions of effectiveness to detect significant differences. Finally, the study assumes that all scale and questionnaire instruments are used appropriately to measure designated variables.

Limitations and Delimitations

Because this study used a cross-sectional design, one limitation may be non-response bias. Leaders (i.e. deans) who are motivated to lead may have a certain leadership style. This selectivity may result in non-representative responses. Other limitations include threats to external validity. Cook and Campbell (1979), Guion (1976), and Cronbach (1971) clarified the distinction between validity and validation. Cook and Campbell (1979) defined validity as the "the best approximation to the truth or falsity of inferences and predictions based upon research" (p. 37). Validation involves the research design that will be used to examine the hypothesis (Cronbach, 1971). The sample selected for this study only examined leaders from a collegiate background, and, therefore, is not considered a representative sample of the target population of all leaders.

Another source of limitation is internal validity, which refers to whether a causal relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables, based on their operational definitions (Cook & Campbell, 1979). In this study, there was a threat to internal validity because the study did not manipulating the IV. Regardless of any relationships found between attachment style and leadership style, we cannot conclude that attachment style precedes or causes individuals to manifest different leadership styles.

Other limitations reflect the problems inherent with self-report data, which may not yield accurate results due to the following challenges in interpreting information to complete the self-report—a lack of individuals completing the data for accurate self-evaluation and individuals deciding how much they are willing to disclose about

themselves. The aforementioned factors might affect the validity of data (Mitchell & Jolley, 2004).

Significance of the Study

Research has shown that effective leadership is acknowledged when there is vital growth and well-being of organizations (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1990). Effective leaders successfully meet their goals, address problems through effective communication, engage in executive decisions, and develop trust, cooperation, and close relationships with others (Galbraith & Schvaneveldt, 2005). Organizations lacking such leaders run the risk of organizational failure (Fairholm, 1991; Greenleaf, 1998). In fact, "a business short on leadership has little chance for survival" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 20). This study is practically significant in that there are several repercussions of ineffective leadership in various organizational settings. Such repercussions may include damage to psychological well-being, the inability to form meaningful relationships with others, workplace violence (this is an unusual outcome to mention), and high turnover rates (Toor & Ogulunlana, 2009; Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, & Kepes, 2007). In regards to turnover, evidence shows that "it costs nearly three times a subordinate's salary to replace someone" (CPA Practice Management Forum, 2008). Fry and Cohen (2008) discussed the impact Extended Work Hours Cultures (EWHCs) have on subordinates. The EWHCs are organizations that expect their subordinates to work extended hours causing work overload on subordinates (Fry & Cohen, 2008). Furthermore, researchers suggest that poor organization performance in EWHC organizations is a result of obsessive-compulsive leaders and executives (Fry & Cohen, 2008). In both fields of psychology and business, there is not enough information as to

why some individuals are more prone to effective leadership while others are not. The information provided in this study will be helpful for organizations seeking reassurance that they are hiring effective leaders.

This study is also significant in that, although issues involving leadership and attachment styles have been previously reviewed (Berson et al., 2006; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper & Mayseless, 2002, 2003), no study has focused on the possible relationship between the four styles of attachment, different types of leadership styles, and subordinates' perceptions of leader effectiveness. In the few studies that have examined the relationship between attachment style of leaders and leadership behavior (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper et al., 2000, 2002; Popper & Mayseless, 2003), research has shown attachment style to relate positively with leadership behavior, and has been consistent in all studies. Although the attachment theory has played a very important role in both therapeutic and in social work (Fraser, 2007), it has been neglected in its application in the working environment and leadership (Fraser, 2007). Furthermore, Fraser (2007) proposed that integrating the attachment theory in organizational literature would help offer understanding and acceptance for those who are leaders, and for followers.

Summary and Transition

In summary, effective leaders are in a position to create positive social change if they are properly trained to do so. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between different styles of attachment and their potential influence on different styles of leadership in a collegiate setting. The study also examined the relationship between different styles of attachment of leaders and their influence on

instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness in a collegiate setting. An understanding of the relationships between the predictor and outcome variables may help increase leaders' knowledge of how their attachment style maybe affecting their ability to lead their organization effectively.

Chapter 2 introduces the body of research, the strategy for the literature search, the various types of leadership styles/behaviors, effective leadership, attachment theory, and how attachment style may influence subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness. Chapter 3 describes how the research design is logically derived from the problem statement in an effort to justify the choice of quantitative tradition and explains why other choices were less effective. Furthermore, procedures for recruiting participants are described, along with instrumentation, research procedures, data analysis, and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 reports the findings related to the research questions, including adjustments or revisions to the use of research instruments. Chapter 4 also presents, interprets, and explains data with tables and figures. Chapter 5 gives a brief overview of why and how the study was done, interprets the findings, discusses the implications for positive social change, gives recommendations for actions, and offers recommendations for further study. Chapter 5 concludes with a succinct summary of findings.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The current study was designed to investigate the relationships between attachment styles, leadership styles, and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. Leaders in various positions face many challenging situations (Hoyt, Halverson, Murphy, & Watson, 2003) which include engaging in a competitive environment, relying on their ability to set direction, and meeting the needs of diverse groups (McCauley & Douglas, 2004). Leaders are also responsible for implementing, monitoring, and changing strategy (Kanter, Stein, & Jick, 1992), as well as maintaining high performance within organizations (Vardiman, Houghston, & Jinkerson, 2006). Moreover, one of the most important roles of leaders is the ability to adjust to organizational changes (Ahn, Adamson, & Dornbusch, 2004). Hoyt et al. (2003) found that effective leaders are more likely to handle demanding situations well than are ineffective leaders.

Empirical findings have shown that certain leadership styles are more effective than others. For example, charismatic and transformational have higher promotion recommendations and/or performance appraisal ratings, higher approval ratings from subordinates, and more positive levels of team performance (Avolio, Bass, & Young, 1999; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Howell & Frost, 1989) than do laissez-faire leaders (Ashforth, 1999; Padialla et al., 2007). Inversely, research has also shown that laissez-faire leadership relates negatively to job performance, psychological health, productivity, and positively with turnover (Ashforth, 1994; Padilla et al., 2007; Ashforth, 1997; Tepper, 2000).

In terms of attachment style and workplace, Little, Nelson, Wallace, and Johnson (2011) found secure individuals are more likely than insecure individuals (preoccupied, fearful, dismissive) to perceive themselves in handling job demands, will experience energy and excitement in relation to their work tasks. Furthermore, secure attached individuals are less likely to experience burnout at their workplace compared to insecure attached individuals (Brown & Wallace, 2004). Research has also shown that secure attachment style relates positively to certain types of leadership styles (Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Popper et al., 2000; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995). Transformational and charismatic leaders, for example, tend to have a secure attachment style.

Additional research has shown secure individuals are more likely than insecure individuals to have more positive expectations about stress management, and are more successful than insecurely attached individuals to develop successful coping plans (Mikulincer & Sheffi, 2008; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995). In reference to personality, De Hoogh et al. (2005), Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts, (1996), Judge et al. (2002), and Neustadt et al. (2006) found that certain personality traits, such as emotional stability, personal integrity, friendliness, and achievement, related positively with leadership effectiveness.

In summary, several research findings have shown how certain types of leadership styles are more effective than others are, and that specific leadership styles adhere to certain attachment styles. Findings have also shown that certain personality traits are related to leadership effectiveness. However, research is still needed to examine how different attachment styles relate differently to different leadership styles as well as subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to

examine how different attachment styles relate to different leadership styles and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. This chapter provides an overview of the literature search, the definitions of leadership, leadership theories/behaviors, attachment theory, and how attachment style may influence subordinate's perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Literature Search Strategy

The articles in this review were found using the EBSCO database with publication dates ranging from 1935–2012, and specifically focused on PsycINFO; PsycARTICLES; socINDEX; Academic Search Premier; Mental Measurement Yearbook; Business Source Premier; A SAGE FULL-Text Collection; and Dissertation and Theses. The following is a list of search terms and/or combinations of search terms used to locate the articles used for this chapter: leadership styles; transformational leadership; charismatic leadership; transactional leadership; servant leadership; laissez-faire leadership; attachment and leadership style; transactional leadership and attachment; charismatic leadership and attachment; servant leadership and attachment; transformational and attachment; secure attachment and perceptions; dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful; attachment and perceptions; measuring leadership; measures of leadership; self-reports; self-report and subordinate reports.

Definitions of Leadership

Leadership has been defined as building a vision, value, commitment, and working environment, as well as promoting activity to help accomplish future organizational goals (Richards & Engle, 1986; Lohmann, 1992; House & Aditya, 1997; Bass, 1997). Leadership also involves heightening the consciousness of organization

members with a collaborative interest to help promote positive subordinate and organizational outcomes (Burns, 1979, Bass, 1985, Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bass, 1998). Leadership has also been defined as meeting followers' needs through economic exchange (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Rowald, 2008, Seltzer & Bass, 1990) and the ability to execute exceptional powers or qualities to followers that set them apart from ordinary people (Weber, 1968).

Leadership Styles/Theory

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders help their followers look at problems from a new perspective (Jandaghi et al., 2009). Additionally, transformational leaders help inspire followers to think more globally than individually. In other words, they encourage followers to focus on the team and organization, and to communicate a vision for their organization (Amneric et al., 2007; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Jandaghi et al., 2009).

Burns (1979) first introduced the theory of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) later expanded the theory to include the characteristics of both transactional and transformational leadership. Bass's (1985) model of transformational leadership consists of the following factors: *charisma (idealized influence); inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individualized consideration*. The Charisma factor, a component of transformational leadership, also includes idealized traits and behaviors (Bono & Anderson, 2005). The respect and obedience of subordinates leads to the idealized feeling subordinates have of their leader (Anderson & Bono, 2005). Although there has been some debate on the role of charisma in transformational leaders (Conger & Kuango, 1988; House, 1977), Bass (1985) stated that leaders with charisma adhere to a

desirable vision, demonstrate commitment, and relate those visions to others with confidence and enthusiasm (Bono & Anderson, 2005). *Inspirational motivation* refers to leaders acting in a special way to stimulate their followers (Bono & Anderson, 2005). *Intellectual stimulation* refers to the behaviors of leaders aimed at promoting divergent thinking, risk taking, and challenging the status quo (Bono & Anderson, 2005), and *individualized consideration* refers to the leader's ability to attend to individual growth and development needs of the followers (Bono & Anderson, 2005).

Several research findings have shown that transformational leadership relates to a variety of positive outcomes, such as individual-and unit-level performance (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Howell & Hall-Meranda, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996), follower commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), as well as- subordinate proactive behavior (Griffin, Parker, & Mason, 2010; Strauss, Griffin, & Rafferty, 2009). Additional research has shown that transformational leadership positively relates with high-quality exchange relationships with subordinates (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Transformational leadership has also been found to postively relate with motivation, morality, and empowerment (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Furthermore, findings show that transformational leadership relates positively with subordinate creativity (Shin & Zhou, 2003), leader-follower values (Kuczmarski & Kuczmarski, 1994), followers' independence and empowerment, (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003), subordinate effectiveness, and subordinate motivation (Judge & Bono, 2000). Overall, a transformational leader makes subordinates happy (Ameneric, Craig, & Tourish, 2007; Judge & Bono, 2000).

Charismatic leadership theory focuses on emotions and values, and acknowledges the importance of symbolic behavior as well as the role of the leader in making situations meaningful for followers (Michaelis, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2009). Charismatic leaders transform their followers' needs, values, and preferences (Michaelis et al., 2009), and help followers make personal sacrifices in achieving specific goals **(**House et al., 1991). For example, research has found that followers may go beyond their leader's expectations, and that they may engage in additional tasks beyond their assigned duties (House et al., 1991). Charismatic leaders are often seen in top executive positions in organizations (Waldman, Javidan, & Varella, 2004; Agle, Nagarajan, Sonnenfeld, & Srinivasan, 2006).

Similar to transformational leaders, charismatic leaders also have three distinct characteristics: *envisioning, empathy, and empowerment* (Choi, 2006; Weber, 1968). Envisioning involves the ability to foresee what the future outcomes might look like (Choi, 2006). In fact, research has shown that most essential factors of charismatic leadership are the creation and the communication of vision (Conger & Kunago, 1998; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004; Strange & Mumford, 2002, 2005). Bass and Avolio (1990) and Conger and Kuango (1998) defined empathy as the leader's ability to display a strong ability of sensitivity to followers' needs and emotions. Pillai, Williams, Lowe, and Jung (2003) proposed that charismatic leaders understand their followers' needs and spend time focusing their attention on issues that are important to them. Furthermore, Salovey and Mayer (1990) found charismatic leaders have a tendency to share feelings that help create the bond between leader and follower. Research findings have also shown that charismatic leadership relates positively to increased motivation, and minimal role

conflict amongst leader and subordinate (Jacobson & House, 2001; Shamir, 1991). In addition, Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) found that charismatic leaders positively relates to a sense of meaningfulness associated with their status.

Empowerment, the third component of charismatic leadership, is defined as the managerial aspect that allows followers to feel independence when making choices, initiating and regulating actions, influencing strategy, and upholding administration (Choi, 2006). Charismatic leadership relates positively with subordinate role perceptions, task performance, job satisfaction, group cohesiveness, and commitment (Choi, 2006; Pillai et al., 2003). Research has also shown that charismatic leadership relates positively to an increase in followers confidence (Shamir et al., 1993). Additionally, charismatic leadership has been shown to positively relate to goal development and exhibiting determination in reaching these goals (Balkundi, Harrison, & Kilduff, 2011). Furthermore, charismatic leadership has also been shown to relate positively to team effectiveness (Barling et al., 1996; Bass et al., 2003; Howell & Frost, 1989).

Transactional Leadership

Unlike transformational leadership, transactional leadership is defined by a leader's orientation toward mutual exchange (Eeden, Cilliers, & Deventer, 2008; Nguni, Sleegers, & Denessen, 2006; Whittington et al., 2009). In terms of mutual exchange, the exchanges between leader and follower are based on the leaders' identifying the performance requirements of their followers and clarifying the conditions for which their rewards are available to meet the specified requirements (Eeden et al., 2008; Nguni et al., 2006; Whittington et al., 2009).

As stated above, transactional leaders are more focused on mutual exchange than on developing relationships. Bass et al's. (1993) view of transactional leadership included two transactional leadership components: *contingent reward and management-by-exception*. The *contingent reward factor* refers to the leader's ability to set clear expectations so that subordinates have a clear understanding of what needs to be accomplished to receive rewards (Whittington et al., 2009). The *management-by-exception* factor is defined as a less active approach than the *contingent reward factor*, in that it informs followers of expectations, but leaders do not engage in further involvement with their followers, unless the performance of the follower does not meet desired expectations (Whittington et al., 2009).

Goodwin, Wofford, and Boyd (1999), Wofford and Goodwin (1994), Wofford, Goodwin, and Whittington (1998) contend that differences between transformational and transactional leaders are based on the cognitive processes underlying the characteristics of both leadership styles. Cognitive processes include how leaders envision their environment (Whittington et al., 2009). Lord and Maher (1991); Ram and Prabhakar (2011); and Whittington et al. (2009) proposed that transactional leaders base their visions on mental scripts (preconceived idea, organized patterns of behavior) that help enhance goal commitment, role expectations, and incentives relating to individual performance. Avolio (1999) also proposed that due to these mental scripts, trust develops between leaders and subordinate.

As previously discussed in this chapter, research has found transactional leaders to be more likely than transformational and charismatic leaders to provide incentives to subordinates for performance that meets expectations. This is in lieu of motivating

subordinates to perform beyond their expectations (Bass, 1985). As a result, research has found transactional leaders are less likely than transformational leaders to influence positive outcomes from subordinates (Nguni et al., 2006; Whittington et al., 2009). For example, in a study that examined innovation and task performance among subordinates, Rank, Nelson, Allen, and Xu (2009) found that transactional leadership negatively related to subordinate innovated behavior and task performance compared to transformational leadership. In another study, Burns and Stalker (1961) found that transactional leaders were more likely to be found in mechanistic organizations (a rigid and formalized organization) than in organic organizations (an organization that consists of a warm environment).

Additional studies have found that company managers (Singer, 1985) and undergraduate business students (Singer, 1985) preferred transactional leaders to transformational leaders, because they provide a more rigid organizational climate than do transformational and charismatic leaders (Avolio, 1999; Eeden et al., 2008; Giri & Santra, 2009., Nguni et al., 2006; Whittington et al., 2009). Additional research has shown that transactional leaders were more likely than transformational and charismatic leaders to promote an increase in goal setting in a manufacturing environment (Deluga, 1988). Additional studies have shown that transactional and transformational leadership explained unique variance in follower perceptions of justice (Greenberg, 1996) and trust in leaders (Atwater, Ostroff, Yammarino, & Fleenor, 1998; Korsgaard et al., 1995; Piallai et al; 1999).

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership has received minimal attention in organizational literature compared to transformational and transactional leadership (Hinkin & Schreisheim, 2008). Laissez-faire leaders are leaders who are passive and are reluctant to provide assistance to subordinates (Deluga & Perry, 1991). In addition, laissez-faire leaders refrain from group and individual decision making (Bass, 1981; Bradford & Lippitt, 1945). Furthermore, followers of laissez-faire leaders are given a considerable amount of freedom with minimal, if any guidance from their leader (Deluga, 1990, Robbins, 2007). In addition, laissez-faire leaders at times do provide subordinates with important material to help in the decision making process, but avoid providing feedback (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012). Although few studies have shown how laissez-faire leadership style impacts subordinate perception, findings have shown that passive forms of leadership, like laissez-faire leadership has been found to predict negative outcomes for both individuals and organizations (Einarsen et al al., 2007; Kelloway, Mullen, & Francis, 2006). Furthermore, findings have shown destructive forms of leadership may also cause increase level of frustration and stress among subordinates (Ashforth, 1994).

Servant Leadership

The phrase "servant leadership" was coined by Robert K. Greenleaf in *The Servant as Leader*, a book he first published in 1970 (Greenleaf Center, 2011). Although the concept of servant leadership was introduced over 30 years ago, it is now becoming a popular term in organizational literature (Hoveida, Salari, & Asemi, 2011). Servant leadership is unique from other leadership styles in four distinct ways (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). First, servant leadership includes a moral component, an element

that has not been found in some of the popular leadership theories including charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). However, a growing number of researchers have found transformational leadership to have high levels of moral development (Bass, 1985, 1998). Servant leadership is distinct in that its concern also involves that of organizational stakeholders. Third, a servant leader's desire is to serve others, even at the expense of themselves. (Greenleaf, 1977; Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004). Lastly, Graham (1991) suggests that servant leaders engage in self-reflection (Graham, 1991), a characteristic that is not part of the definition of authentic, ethical, or transformational leadership.

Ehrhart (2004) found that servant leadership positively relates to organizational commitment and supervisor satisfaction. Similarly, Liden et al. (2008) found a positive correlation between servant leadership behavior and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. Comparable to transformational and charismatic leadership styles, servant leadership has been shown to relate positively to job attitudes of subordinates (Jaramillo et al., 2009), salesperson retention (Sutton, Gigi, & Griffin, 2004), intrinsic motivation, and the well-being of others (Jaramillo, Fernando, & Mulki, 2008; Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011). Furthermore, research found that servant leadership behavior within groups helps increase leadership roles among subordinates and allows subordinates to help meet the needs and desires of fellow group members (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2008). Hamilton (2008) also found servant leadership to positively relates to creativity, responsiveness, commitment to both external and internal service, respect from their subordinates, loyalty, and leaders' ability to welcome subordinates from various backgrounds.

In summary, this section outlined and defined leadership behavior in the transformational, charismatic, transactional, laissez-faire, and servant leadership styles. See Table 1 for a brief summary of the theories of leadership discussed above. The next section will examine the different leadership styles.

Table 1

Summary of Leadership Theories, Theorists, and Sub-components

Leadership Theory	**Definition, description, and major theorist**	**Sub-components**
Transformational	Leaders who seek the admiration and trust from subordinates and help to enhance their follower's sense of values. **Major theorist(s):** Bass (1985); Burns (1979)	Four behavioral components: • idealized influence • inspirational motivation • intellectual motivation • individualized consideration
Charismatic	Leaders who focus on emotions, values, and acknowledges the importance of symbolic behavior. **Major theorist(s):** Conger & Kuango (1998)	Three distinct characteristics: • envisioning • empathy • empowerment
Transactional	Leaders who rely on followers to perform tasks based on leader's expectations. **Major theorist(s):** Burns (1979); Bass (1993)	Two transactional components: • contingent reward factor • management-by-exception
Laissez-Faire	Leaders who fail to meet the needs and expectations of followers. **Major theorist(s):** Bass (1981); Bradford & Lippett	N/A

	(1945)	
Servant	Leaders who focus on the needs of others over themselves, and place strong emphasis on moral behavior. **Major theorist(s):** Greenleaf (1970)	Four distinct characteristics: • Moral component • involves organizational stakeholders • Desire to serve others • Engage in self-reflection.

Measuring Leadership Styles

Self-Report and Subordinate Report Measures

According to Kutsko (1990), leaders and subordinates do not always agree when it comes to assessing differences in leadership styles or overall organizational performance (Larson & LaFasto, 1989). The differences between leader and subordinate reports should come as no surprise because leader's self-reports from performance ratings often differ from that of external raters (Fox & Dunur, 1988; Holzbach, 1978; Thorton, 1980). Self-reporters often perceive themselves as having desirable behaviors compared to subordinate reports assessing the same behaviors (Beatty, Schneider, & Beatty, 1977). As a result, leaders may have a distorted view of their own performance (Kolb, 1992). Furthermore, these perceptions complement leaders' self-reports of their behavior (Driscoll, Humphries, & Larsen, 1991; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Latham & Wexley, 1982). Some advantages to self-report measures are that they are faster and less expensive compared to subordinate reports since subordinate reports tend to take a longer time to administer, are more expensive, and may be less critical (Turrentine, 2001).

Attribution theory provides an explanation for why self-reports may differ from subordinate reports. It states that leader and subordinate perceptions consist of different information available to them (Kolb, 1992). A leader might believe that his or her behavior is justifiable based on organizational constraints, whereas an subordinate might assume the leader's behavior is a result of personality traits rather than external factors (Kolb, 1992). Leaders who are unaware of how their behavior is perceived by subordinates are at a disadvantage when they attempt to improve their own and/ or subordinate performance (Kolb, 1992). Subordinate reports also complement leaders' self-reports of their behavior (Driscoll et al., 1991; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Latham & Wexley, 1982). In terms of similarity, subordinate reports are also highly related to leaders' self-reports (Fahr et al., 1988; Fox & Dinur, 1988; Mount, 1984). Subordinate reports also provide an enhanced opportunity to observe and measure leadership behavior (Borman, 1974).

Tornow (1993) proposed that a leader's awareness of how subordinates estimate their skills and behaviors is key to leadership style. As a result, the feedback leaders receive improves their motivation and performance (Tornow, 1993). For example, leaders with high self-report were most committed to developing their work activities when subordinate ratings did not agree (Bono & Colbert, 2005). In addition, individuals with low self-report tend to be most committed to developmental goals when subordinate ratings agreed (Bono & Colbert, 2005). Moshavi et al. (2003) explored the relationship between a leader's awareness and leadership behavior/attitudes and performance of subordinates and found that subordinates of under-estimators reported significantly higher levels of leadership skills and job satisfaction compared to subordinates of over-

estimators. Overall, research has shown that leaders who are more successful (i.e., transformational, charismatic, and transactional leaders) displayed minimal discrepancies between self and subordinate ratings of leadership, while less successful leaders (i.e., laissez-faire leaders) displayed greater discrepancies (Bass & Yammarino, 1991).

Few studies have examined contributing factors regarding the relationship between self and subordinate reports (Brutus, Fleenor, & McCauley, 1999; Ostroff, Atwater, & Feinberg, 2004; Wohlers, Hall, & London, 1993). However, researchers, such as Bailey, Chen, and Dou (1997), suggest that culture may play a role in the relationship between self and subordinate reports. For example, previous research findings have shown that self-enhancement and leniency biases to be more common in self-reports in individualist cultures than they are in collectivist cultures (Atwater, Smither, Wang, & Fleenor, 2009). In terms of assertiveness, research found that the relationship between self and subordinate reports were more positive in countries exhibiting high assertiveness than in countries exhibiting low assertiveness (Atwater et al., 2009).

Ayman, Morris, and Korabik (2009), paired a leader with a subordinate who was either the same or the different gender. The results of the study showed that the leader's self-report on transformational leadership and the subordinate's report of their leader's performance showed a negative correlation for female leaders with male subordinates compared to female leaders with female subordinates which showed a positive correlation (Ayman et al., 2009).

In summary, the difference between self-report and subordinate reports of leadership style, regarding their different perceptions of leaders were examined (Beatty et al., 1977; Kolb, 1995). Attribution theory was also introduced to help explain how different information may be available to leaders and subordinate perceptions (Kolb, 1995). The advantage and disadvantages of self-reports versus subordinate reports were also discussed. Research findings have also shown how other factors, such as culture, may influence subordinate reports on leadership styles. The next section will review leadership effectiveness and common characteristics of leadership effectiveness.

Leadership Effectiveness

Several researchers (Stogdill, 1950, Stogdill, 1963; Stogdill & Shartle, 1956; Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1963) define leadership effectiveness as the ability to manage subordinates through communication. Darling and Heller (2011) proposed that an effective leader must have the ability to acknowledge that his or her thoughts and feelings make a difference within an organization that is faced with today's global changes. The thoughts and feelings of the leader are then communicated to others both on an unconscious and conscious level (Darling & Heller, 2011). Hogg (2001) and Hogg & van Knippenberg (2003) suggest that leader group prototypicality (where the leader is representative of the group) is an important determinant to leadership effectiveness. In other words, a leader who is tied to the prototypicality of a group is likely to be tied to leadership effectiveness (Hogg, 1992; van Knippenberg, Lossie, & Wilke, 1994).

Van Knippenberg (2011) and van Knippenberg (2011) proposed that effective leaders not only lead teams, but are often found as members of teams they lead (prototypicality). Research has found that prototypical leaders are more likely than

nonprototypical leaders to serve the interest of their group members (Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Ullrich, Christ, & van Dick, 2009; B. van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). On the contrary, nonprototypical leaders were found to express more negative attitude, as well as advocate more coercive behaviors in a group compared to prototypical leaders (Giessner, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Sleebos, 2013).

Yukl (2012) found that several behaviors play an important role in leadership effectiveness. The first behavior is *planning*, which involves the leader's ability to plan activities and effectively assign tasks that will help to accomplish objectives and prevent delays and wasted resources. Research supports the aforementioned in that *planning* enhances a leader's effectiveness (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Shipper, 1991; Shipper & Dillard, 2000; Shipper & Wilson, 1992; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). The second behavior is *monitoring*, which is used to help leaders assess whether ~~subordinate~~ subordinates are completing their assigned tasks, if the work assigned is progressing as planned, and that the tasks being performed meet the leader's expectations. Additional research has also found *monitoring* to improve leadership effectiveness (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Wang et al., 2011). The third behavior is *clarifying*, a technique leaders use to ensure their subordinates understand tasks being presented and how to perform those tasks. Leaders who specify clear and realistic goals help improve group performance (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Shipper, 1991; Shipper & Dillard, 2000). The fourth behavior is *problem solving*, which is used to help leaders deal with conflict in normal operations, such as mitigating subordinate behavior that pose a threat to other co-workers and/or the organization. Serious disruptions usually involve leadership intervention through problem-solving

methods (i.e., crisis management, disturbance handling). In times of organizational crisis, effective leaders take the time to identify the cause of the problem and to determine how to prevent future adverse effects. Evidence of problem solving has also been shown to positively relate to leadership effectiveness (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Morgeson, 2005; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982).

Additional findings indicated that effective leadership relates positively to emotional stability, optimism, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity of subordinates (Changquan, Richards, Zhang, 2011; Kotter, 1982). In a study regarding effective leadership and its role in higher education, Bryman (2007) proposed that an important quality of an effective leader in education is the ability to maintain professionalism to his or hers staff members. In addition, an effective leader must be willing and capable of leading faculty members (Bryman, 2007). Ramsden (1998) proposed that leaders in higher education should adhere to specific characteristics: (1) the ability to introduce new ideas of teaching, (2) to bring excitement in their teaching, (3) the leader should be able to set clear goals to everyone, (4) to inspire their staff to achieve difficult tasks, and (5) to show recognition, support, and feedback to their staff. Hertzberg et al., (1995) found that faculty are likely to become dissatisfied with their leader if extrinsic factors are not present, thus, it is important for leaders to try and minimize those dissatisifiers to help promote staff satisfaction.

Effective Leadership and Leadership Style

Research shown that certain leadership styles are known to be more effective than others. Furthermore, effective leadership is known to have a direct effect on subordinate and organizational performance (Salman, Riaz, Saifullah, & Rashid, 2011). For example, charismatic and transformational leadership have been shown to positively relate with performance appraisal ratings, approval ratings from subordinates, and team performance (Avolio et al., 1999; House et al., 1991; Howell & Frost, 1989). Several researchers believe that transformational leadership has a strong influence on the subordinates work performance, and that they are more successful than any other leadership style (Howell & Frost, 1989; Howell & Higgins, 1990). In addition, Cummings and Schwab (1973) propose that effective leaders helps influence subordinate and organizational performance. On the contrary, ineffective leaders such as seen in laissez-faire leadership lack the aforementioned qualities of an effective leader. For example, research has shown laissez-faire leadership to negatively relate to subordinate motivation, well-being, and overall job satisfaction (Einarsen et al., 2007).

In summary, this section discussed Yukl's (2012) findings that played an important role in leadership effectiveness, as well as other research to substantiate the findings (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Shipper, 1991; Shipper & Dillard, 2000; Yukl & Van Flett, 1982). This section also reviewed how certain types of leadership styles are more effective than others (Avolio et al., 1999; Changquan et al., 2011; Einarsen et al., 2007; House et al., 1999; Howell & Frost, 1989). The following section will examine subordinates' perceptions of leadership effectiveness.

Subordinate Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness

A substantial portion of leadership literature has focused on subordinate perceptions and expectations and their relationships to leadership behavior (Foti & Lord, 1987; Kenney, Schwartz-Kenney, & Blascovich, 1996; Larson, 1982; Lord & Alliger, 1985; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993). Literature has also confirmed the important role perceptions play in the relationship between leader and subordinate (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Ilies, Scott, Judge, 2006). Subordinate socialization and experiences with leaders have been known to develop Implicit Leadership Theories, which are personal assumptions about the traits and abilities of an ideal leader (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). Implicit Leadership Theories also known as ILT's are cognitive schemas that specify traits and behaviors subordinates expect from leaders (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). The schemas are then stored into memory and become activated when subordinates interact with their leaders (Kenney et al., 1996). These leadership schemas provide subordinates with a cognitive basis for understanding and responding to leadership behavior (Poole, Gioa, & Gray, 1989; Weick, 1995).

According to Brandes, Dharwadkar, and Wheatley (2004), social exchange theory has also been used to examine subordinates' perceptions of leadership behavior. This theory has also viewed the concept of trust as the relational schema that helps enhance social behavior. The social exchange theory is also consistent with concern for the needs and interests of others (Holmes, 2000; Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Rusbult & Van Lange, 1996). Researchers proposed that subordinates perceive their leaders as trustworthy when their leaders adhere to the following three dimensions: benevolence, integrity, and ability (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Kramer, 1999).

When a leader is benevolent, subordinates perceive their leaders as being trustworthy and believe their leaders to have good intentions (Grant & Sumanth, 2009). Integrity includes the leader's ability to adhere to acceptable principles (Grant & Sumanth), and ability refers to leaders' meeting the expectations of subordinates (Grant & Sumanth).

Social exchange theory examines relationships between subordinate perceptions of leadership and organizational effectiveness and family practices of organizations (Brandes et al., 2004). For example, subordinates form their perceptions of leadership and organizational effectiveness based on how supportive the leader and organization are of the subordinate's family (Harr & Roche, 2010). In addition, findings show that leaders and organizations who work with subordinates to balance work and family help increase subordinate job satisfaction (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Research also found that building trust with one's leader and organization is an important factor for members of an organization to develop quality relationships with their leader and organization, a concept also known as leader-member exchange (LMX; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997).

LMX is defined as the quality of the relationship between an subordinate and his or her leader (Liden et al., 1997). Trust is based on previous experiences with the exchange partner's belief about what the other partner is like (i.e., benevolent, honest), and an interpersonal script regarding the nature of future interactions (Baldwin, 1992). If there is a high level of trust, the subordinate perceives the exchange partner as predictable and positive (Holmes & Rempel, 1989), similar to the attachment concepts of Ainsworth et al. (1978) and Bowlby (1969). However if, the level of trust is low, the subordinate perceives the exchange partner as unpredictable and negative (Holmes & Rempel, 1989).

Furthermore, authors suggest that subordinates who have trust in their leader will likely comply with the requests of their exchange partner (Holmes & Rempel).

According to Meyer and Allen (1991) organizational commitment is achieved in three ways (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Subordinates who perceive positive treatment from their leader and organization will feel obligated to commit to their organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Second, subordinates who have a stronger relationship with their leader and organization are assumed to meet needs for approval, affiliation, and socio-emotional support (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Third, the subordinate's relationship with their leader and organization helps to enhance the subordinate's mood at work (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Furthermore, a leader is perceived to have high status from subordinates when they are believed to have influence over important organizational decision making, have high authority, and are valued contributors to the organization (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002).

Research Findings on Subordinate Perceptions and Leadership Effectiveness

Research has found that subordinate perceptions of leaders trustworthy relates positively to leaders' social skills and task performance (Grant & Sumanth, 2009; Mayer et al., 1995). Research has also shown that when leaders are supportive of family and work balance, it relates positively to subordinate job and life satisfaction (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). In addition, subordinate perceptions of leader support have been shown to positively relate to career development (Graen & Scandura, 1987), the ability to solve work problems (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975), and supervisory performance ratings (Graen & Cashman, 1975). Conversely, subordinates who perceive leader support to be negative relates (this is awkward wording to use "negative" and "positive" in the

same sentence) to work stress (Dansereau et al., 1975), receiving less challenging assignments, and fewer promotions (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhlbien, 1995).

In terms of attachment style and perceptions, research has found individuals with a secure attachment style to have more confidence in others who evaluated them favorably compared to individuals with an insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful, Miklulincer & Shaver, 2007). Furthermore, Hardy and Barkham (1994) found that insecure attached individuals reported others as threats, as well as concerns about hours of work. In addition to attachment style, the personality of subordinates may also play a role in subordinates' perceptions of LMX (Barry & Stewart, 1997; Bauer & Green, 1996; Deluga, 1998; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Phillips & Bedeian, 1994; Smith & Canger, 2004). For example, subordinate extraversion relates positively to subordinates' perceptions of LMX (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, Giles, & Walker, 2007). Additional findings have also shown subordinate agreeableness to positively relate with subordinates' perceptions of LMX (Bernerth et al., 2007; Tjosvold, 1984).

In summary, this section discussed both social exchange and implicit leadership theory in an effort to understand the relationship between subordinates' perceptions and leadership effectiveness. Subordinates who have established trust with their leaders were more likely than subordinates who have not established trust with their leader to comply with their leaders' requests and demonstrate commitment to their organization (Eisenberger et al., 2010; Eisenberger et al., 2001; Holmes, 1989). This section also discussed the importance of how leaders treat their subordinates and how treatment by leaders helps influence perceptions of leadership and organizational effectiveness

(Brandes et al., 2004; Harr & Roche, 2010). The three dimensions of trust were also discussed.

Personality and Leadership Style

The five-factor model, also known as the Big-Five, explains some variance in transformational and transactional leadership style (Chen-Min & Bor-Wen, 2009; De Hoogh et al., 2005). Bono and Judge (2004) applied the five-factor model as their framework for their analysis on personality regarding transformational and transactional leadership and found certain personalities to postively relate to transactional and transformational leadership. The Big-Five traits consist of the following: *extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.* Extraverts are individuals who are social, assertive, active, bold, and adventurous (Chen-Min & Bor-Wen, 2009; Kickul & Neuman, 2000; De Hoogh et al., 2005). Bono and Judge (2004) suggest that characteristics of extraversion trait plays an essential role in influencing and persuading others, both of which are key characteristics of charismatic leaders (Bono & Judge, 2004). Openness to experience is characterized by traits such as imagination, creativity, and divergent thinking (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Agreeableness consists of individuals who have warm, altruistic, trusting, and cooperative behavior (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Agreeable individuals are also concerned for others' interests (De Hoogh et al., 2005). Conscientious individuals display characteristics such as responsibility, dutifulness, achievement orientation, and concern for following set rules (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Neurotic individuals have a tendency to be anxious, insecure, and emotional and lack self-confidence (McCrae & Costa, 1987).

Research on Personality and Leadership Style

Studies have shown that leadership style can be predicted from personality traits (De Hoogh et al., 2005; Judge et al., 2002; Bono et al., 2002; Neustadt et al., 2006). For example, leaders' agreeableness and conscientiousness traits have related positively to ethical and charismatic leadership (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa et al., 1991, McCrae & Dye, 1991; De Hoogh et al., 2005). Research has also found a strong, negative correlation between neurotic leaders and competence and trustworthiness (De Hoogh et al., 2005). Although arguments remain that individual differences provide insight into key leadership characteristics, the complexity of leadership behavior is still likely to be explained by multiple leader attributes and trait approaches (Yukl, 2006; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004).

Additionally, research has shown that openness to experience positively relates to charismatic and transformational leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge & Bono, 2004). Research has also found extraversion to postively relate to charismatic leadership (De Hoogh et al., 2005). Findings have also shown agreeableness to also positively relate to charismatic leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000; Stevens & Ash, 2001). Bono and Judge (2004) found positive relationships between agreeableness and transactional leadership. Findings have also shown conscientiousness to positively relate to transactional leadership, but negatively to charismatic leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; De Hoogh et al., 2005). Lim and Ployhart (2004) found neuroticism to relate negatively to charismatic leadership. Furthermore, research showed a negative relationship between neuroticism and charismatic leadership (De Hoogh et al., 2005). However, it is also important to note that personality traits are not the only factors influencing leadership behavior; an

individual's attachment style may also play an important role in differences in leadership behavior.

Introduction to Attachment Theory

Parent-Child Attachment

Bowlby's (1969, 1973) attachment theory provides a theoretical paradigm to investigate the complexities of one's lifespan development. Attachment between the child and parent begins in the early stages of a child's development and helps regulate the closeness between the two to create a balance of security, which is derived through parental contact and independence (Bowlby, 1969; Vivona, 2000). However, if the infant experiences threat or distress, the attachment system becomes activated, whereby the infant utilizes it to bring the parent close, thus restoring feelings of security (Vivona, 2000)**.** Furthermore, when infants perceive the attachment figure as rejecting or unavailable in meeting their needs, their sense of security diminishes and the likelihood of personal doubts and emotional problems increases (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). According to Ainsworth (1989), there are two essential components related to the function of the attachment system: to help provide security in times of distress and to help promote independence.

An infant's way of meeting attachment needs or attachment style (Ainsworth et al., 1978) is developed through interactions with a parent figure. According to Ainsworth et al. (1978), there are three types of attachment styles: secure, avoidant, and ambivalent. First, Ainsworth et al. (1978) noted that an infant who develops a secure attachment is one who has received appropriate and consistent attention from a parent and whose needs are met. Avoidant attachment happens when a parent unreliably or unpredictably meets

the infant's needs (Isabella & Belsky, 1991). This causes the infant to feel distress, forcing the infant to revert to preexisting schemes to alleviate distress (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Ambivalent attachment is a result of the parent being non-existent in terms of meeting the infant's needs. The infant lacks the ability to develop security, and thus is unable to adjust to separation from its parent, leading to frustration (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). A detailed description on how these attachment styles influence a person's behavior will be further discussed in the Adult Attachment section.

Several research studies have substantiated the findings that show relationships between parent-child relationships and social and emotional development (Belsky & Cassidy, 1994; Bittner et al., 2004; Conteras & Kerns, 2000; Kerns, Gentzler, Grabill, & Aspelmeir, 2001; Steinberg, 1990). For example, research based on a categorical difference between secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles has shown that children with a secure attachment style differed significantly on self-esteem, cooperation with peers, and self-control (Belsky & Cassidy, 1994; Contereas & Kerns, 2000) compared to children with an ambivalent or avoidant attachment style (put references at end of sentence). Additional research has shown children with an ambivalent or avoidant attachment style differed significantly in engaging in delinquent behavior than children with a secure attachment style (Patterson & Bank, 1989). Furthermore, research has shown that children with an ambivalent or avoidant attachment style differed statistically significantly in negative behavioral and poor mental health outcomes (i.e., juvenile delinquency and antisocial behavior) from children with a secure attachment style (Crouter, MacDemid, McHale, & Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Patterson & Bank, 1989; Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984; Sampson & Laub, 1994; Stice & Barrera, 1995;

Vuchnich, Bank, & Patterson, 1992; Weintrab & Gold, 1991; Steinberg, 1990). Additional research has shown that individuals with an ambivalent or avoidant attachment style differed statistically significantly in having a higher risk of internalizing problems (Kerns, 2010) than children with a secure attachment style (Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke, & Mitchell, 1990; Buist, Dekovi, Meeus, & van Aken, 2004; Muris, Meesters, & Spinder, 2003).

Adult Attachment

Studies of adult attachment have shown how attachment behaviors carry over from childhood to adulthood (Buist, Reitz, & Dekovic, 2008). According to Bowlby (1973, 1980), previous experiences with attachment figures generate "working models" that help guide behavior and perceptions in future relationships. Such working models of parent-child relationships are formed during infancy and early childhood (van IJzendoorn, 1995) (watch spelling/capitalization of author's name). Furthermore, throughout childhood and adolescence, new people and relationships are developed based on those previous working models (Simpson, Collins, Tran, & Haydon, 2007), allowing the individual to encode, process, and interpret information about the new person and relationships (Bowlby, 1973; Collins, Guichard, Ford, & Feeney, 2004; Collins & Sroufe, 1999; Crittenden, 1985). Consistent with this claim, evidence has shown that attachment security predicts high-quality relationships (George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985; Holland & Roisman, 2010). Further research has found that securely attached individuals report higher levels of life satisfaction and subjective well-being compared to ambivalent and avoidant attached individuals (Carnelley, Pietromonaco, & Jaffee, 1994; Crowell, Fraley, & Shaver, 1999; Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Zhang & Labouvie-Vief, 2004).

Similar with Ainsworth et al., (1978), Bartholomew (1990) and Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) suggested four categories of adult attachment: secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful. It is important to note that although Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) suggested four distinct categories of attachment, most of the self-report measures actually measure adult attachment in regards to continuous dimensions (Stein et al., 2002). In addition, confusion remains on what self-report questionnaires actually measure—adult attachment behaviors or expectations and wishes about general relationships (Stein et al., 2002). Furthermore, treating attachment as a continuous measure may suggest that one internal working model of relationships may predominate, such as individuals being secure, dismissing, fearful, or preoccupied (Shemmings, 2004). Attachment research is also less concerned with identifying an individual's attachment 'style' and more concerned with differential attachment organizations within larger samples to explore the statistical relationship with known or "undiscovered antecedents, correlates, and consequences of attachment" (Shemming, 2004, p. 302).

Adult Attachment Styles and Behaviors

Bartholomew's model of adult attachment focused on the positive and negative perceptions of self and others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Harmarta, Deniz, & Saltali, 2009). Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) later proposed that adult attachment characteristics could be presented through descriptions of individuals' positive and/or negative models of themselves and those of others in attachment relationships (Bartholomew & Shaver, 1998). Secure individuals have a positive view of themselves and other, as well as engage in trusting and intimate relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross, McKim, & Ditommaso, 2006).

Preoccupied individuals have a negative view of themselves and a positive view of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). In addition, preoccupied individuals also tend to seek unrealistic closeness with attachment partners (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Dismissing individuals tend to have a positive view of themselves and a negative view of others (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Dismissing individuals are also uncomfortable with being close with and trusting others; however, they do have a positive view of themselves (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Lastly, fearful individuals have a negative view of themselves and others (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Hamarta et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2006).

Research has shown that individuals with dismissing, fearful, and preoccupied attachment styles differed compared to secure attached individuals in terms of psychological distress, such as depression (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Research has also shown that preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful individuals differed statistically significantly than secure attached individuals in coping skills (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003; Wei, Heppner, & Mallinckrodt, 2003; Wei, Heppner, Russell, & Young, 2006) and inability to express emotions (Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005).

Attachment and Personality Traits

To help understand how personality may affect leadership style, it is important to review the relationship between attachment style and personality. According to Bowlby (1973), both personality and caregiver/child environment are believed to constantly interact during a person's development. The attachment between a child and its caregiver eventually becomes a stable characteristic of the child (& Shaver, 1994). Research has

shown that secure attachment style relates positively to extraversion and agreeableness and that preoccupied attachment style relates positively to neuroticism (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Shaver & Brennan, 1992). Furthermore, individuals with a preoccupied attachment style differed from individuals with a secure attachment, with preoccupied individuals being more neurotic, anxious, and at risk of displaying depressive symptoms (Shaver & Brennan, 1992; Onishi et al., 2001). Secure individuals were more resilient and less prone to neurotic behavior (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Research has also shown that individuals with a secure attachment style differed compared to individuals with a preoccupied attachment style, with the former being more extroverted, agreeable, and outgoing (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bakker, Van Oudenhoven, & Van Der Zee, 2004). The following section will review the different types of scales used to measure attachment style.

How is Attachment Measured?

The following examples are different types of attachment scales used to assess attachment in adults. The first is the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ; Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994), a 40-item questionnaire specifically focused on general relationships instead of romantic or close. The next is the Current Relationship Interview (CRI; Crowell et al., 1999), an interview that investigates the attachment that is represented within a relationship. Next is the Adult Attachment Styles (AAS; Hazan & Shaver, 1987), a self-selection measure that examines adult attachment styles with respect to feelings of oneself in romantic relationships. This is followed by the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), a scale on which participants rate attachment prototypes that correspond to the following categories of attachment: secure,

dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful. Next, is the Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994), a 30-item questionnaire on which participants rate their emotions in close relationships based on a 5-point Likert scale. Next, is the Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS; Collins & Read, 1990), which is similar to that of the RSQ, is an 18-item questionnaire that asks participants to rate themselves on a 5-point Likert scale about their feelings on romantic relationships. The interview formats include the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; Main & Goldwyn, 1994), an interview for which participants are asked to describe previous parent/child relationships, and Family and Peer Attachment Interview (FPAI; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), an interview that is similar to the RQ. The only difference is the FPAI focuses on both family and peers, thereby predicting different aspects of relationship problems.

The measure that was used for this study was the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) because of its popularity and frequency in the adult attachment literature (Ross et al., 2006). It is also the only one among the popular measures of attachment to demonstrate independence from self-deceptive biases (Leak & Parsons, 2001). The RQ will measure the four styles of attachment using a continuous measure. The RQ is an expansion of the attachment measure that was created by Hazan and Shaver (1987). The RQ is an instrument that consists of two underlying dimensions of adult attachment: the internal model of self (i.e. positive or negative) and the internal model of another (i.e. positive or negative; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The RQ consists of four short paragraphs that describe the four attachment styles (Barholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Participants are asked to rate each paragraph on a 7-point Likert scale

of the degree to which they (or someone close) reflects the four different styles of attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Research on the RQ

Schwartz, Higgins, and Waldo (1994) were the first to use the RQ in a study consisting of 170 male undergraduate psychology students regarding attachment and gender role conflict. Their findings indicated that securely attached men had lower gender role conflict compared to men with a preoccupied, dismissing, or fearful attachment styles (Schwartz et al., 2004). In another study using college participants, Horowitz, Rosenberg, and Bartholomew (1993) found that the different attachment styles did relate to different types of interpersonal problems using the RQ. In Boatwright's et al. (2010) study, results revealed that subordinates with a preoccupied attachment style displayed a stronger preference for a supportive leader than subordinates with a dismissive or fearful attachment style.

In summary, the four adult attachment styles (secure, dismissing, fearful, and preoccupied) have been found to correlate appropriately with the RQ measuring the positive or negative views of self and others (Schwartz, Waldo, & Higgins, 2004). The next section will discuss how attachment style may influence leadership style.

Attachment Style and Leadership Style

Current research on attachment theory has focused its attention on adult functioning mechanisms such as trust (Mikulincer, 1998), conflict resolution (Simpson et al., 1996), and how individuals view others (Pietromonaco & Barrett, 2000). These are all important tools to take into account when attempting to understand what makes an effective leader (Avolio, 2007). Breshnahan and Mitroff (2007) suggest that individuals

use attachment-based internal working models about themselves and about others as they learn about their environment. The study of attachment theory could help create a better understanding of a leader's internal working-model when managing others, interacting with subordinates, and in training situations (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007). Furthermore, as the attachment theory continues to expand in the leadership literature (Kahn & Kram, 1994; Popper et al., 2000), there is a possibility for the attachment theory to help better understand relationships between leaders and followers (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007).

Several studies have confirmed the relationship between secure attachment style and transformational leadership (Berson et al., 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010; Popper et al., 2000; Manning, 2003; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper & Amit, 2000). For example, transformational leaders have an internal secure working model, which increases followers' security towards them (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). Securely attached individuals are more likely than dismissing and preoccupied individuals to be transformational leaders (Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, VanDerWege, & Huber, 2010; Manning, 2003). Conversely, only a few studies have shown a positive relationship between secure attachment and charismatic leadership (Choi, 2006; Popper & Amit, 2009; Towler, 2005).

This section has discussed how attachment style might influence leadership style. It also examined how various research confirms the positive relationship between secure attachment transformational leadership (Boatwright et al., 2010; Manning, 2003) and charismatic leadership (Choi, 2006; Popper & Amit, 2009). No other research to date has examined the relationships between the four attachment styles and other leadership styles such as transformational, transactional, laissez-fare, charismatic and servant leadership.

Conclusion

This literature review outlined studies on attachment style, leadership style, and subordinate perceptions of leaders' effectiveness. In particular, secure attachment has been shown to positively relate to leadership behavior, transformational leadership in particular (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper et al., 2000). Furthermore, no study has yet investigated how different types of leadership styles may be influenced by the various aspects of parent/child and adult attachment styles. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between different attachment styles (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful) and different types of leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, charismatic, and servant leadership). The purpose of this study is to also examine the relationship between attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

The following chapter describes the research design and approach, the recruitment of participants, instrumentation and materials, data collection, data analysis, possible threats to validity, and ethical considerations.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine which styles of attachment relate to different leadership styles. The purpose of this study was also to examine how attachment style relates to instructor perceptions of leadership style. This chapter describes the research methodology, specifically in terms of study design, participants, instrumentation, research procedures, and data analysis procedures. The chapter also outlines the ethical considerations for the participant and survey methods for data collection.

Research Design and Rationale

This cross-sectional survey investigated the effects of four independent variables (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, fearful attachment) and their influence on leadership style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. A cross-sectional design was chosen for this study because attachment styles and leadership styles are individual difference variables, and consequently, cannot be manipulated, ruling out the viability of a true experiment. In addition, attachment styles and leadership styles were measured continuously, not categorically, ruling out the use of quasi-experimental or ex post facto designs. Finally, attachment styles and leadership styles were measured through validated self-report instruments that are quantitative in nature.

According to Duda and Nobile (2010), administering online surveys for quantitative studies is becoming a popular tool for gathering information. Online surveys are easy to administer, can save time and money, as well as provide immediate results

(Duda & Nobile, 2010). This study used online surveys to collect data from a sample of the population of deans and college faculty at local community colleges.

Methodology

The following section describes the study population, sampling and sampling procedures, procedures for recruitment and data collection, instrumentation and operationalization of constructs, and finally the data analysis plan.

Population

The population for this study consisted of people in leadership positions. The sampling population was composed of college deans, chairpersons, and provosts (leaders who take more of an administrative role) and instructors (who are not in administrative role). The sample was drawn from a larger convenience sample of individuals who inhabit leadership and subordinate positions at a specific university and/or college. The sample (who have served in a leadership position and/or as instructor for at least a year) responded to multiple online survey tools. Instructors were classified as having a non-leadership role in this study, due to responsibilities being restricted to only the instruction of students as well as meeting the university objectives provided by deans, chairpersons, and provost of the college and/or university. The sampling strategy was a nonprobability, convenience sample. Due to the access to the population and willingness of the subordinates to participate in the study, the use of the convenience sample was most appropriate for the current study. Form the population, a convenience sample of full time subordinates, 18 years of age or older; who have been employed with the college for a minimum of one year, and have degrees ranging from bachelors to doctorate was drawn.

All full time subordinates meeting the inclusion criteria of the study were considered for participation.

Using Cohen's (1991) and Foody's (2009) suggestion for specifying sample size, the appropriate sample size was estimated to be 366 faculty members, The effect size estimate between attachment style and leadership style is *(r= .26*; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Thau et al., 2007), and for attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness the effect size estimate is *(r=.13;* Berson et al., 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010). Prior research supports the use of medium to large effect sizes, justifying the estimated effect sizes of the current study. Based on the power analysis completed, the target sample size for this study was 366 for faculty members to satisfy the recommended sample size for the analysis. In addition, a sample size of 84 for deans was based on a power level of 0.80, an alpha level of 0.05, and estimated effect size of .33 (Ayman, Morris, Korabik, 2009; Cohen, 1988; Bass et al., 2003; Jandaghi et al., 2009). Prior research supports the use of medium to large effect sizes, justifying the estimated effect sizes of the current study. Based on the power of analysis completed, the desired sample size was 84 for deans to satisfy the recommended sample size for the analysis.

Human resource directors of colleges were e-mailed with descriptions of the study and purpose of research. The directors were then asked to e-mail the link to the surveys to the deans, chairpersons, provost and instructors of their respective colleges. The survey used to collect the demographic information is available in Appendix B. The demographic data to be collected was limited only to the subordinates' length of employment with the college, age of subordinate, and their role within the college, which is identified as either dean, chairperson, provost or instructor. Only those subordinates

responding as having at least one year of employment and are at least 18 years or older were advanced to the following stages of the surveys; all others were thanked for their participation and informed that no further action is needed on their part.

The participants took the online surveys, and the data were collected online using SurveyMonkey, a secure web site for data collection. Using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 computer software for Windows 2000 XP.

The consent form (Appendix B) that was presented in the cover letter of the secure website(s) included contact information for the researcher and the university, the purpose of the study, what specifically is being asked of the participant, the voluntary nature of the study, related risks and the benefits of participation, and information on which parts of the study were to be anonymous. An informed consent was addressed to the participants prior to the beginning of taking the surveys. Responses to instrument questions were entered by the participant through the Survey Monkey site. There was no compensation for this study or other incentives offered to participants.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

Attachment style. Attachment was measured using the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The RQ is a 4-item questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Respondents place a checkmark next to statement that best reflects their attachment style, or close to what they believe their attachment style to be (secure, dismissing preoccupied, and fearful) using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (not all like me) to 7 (very much like me; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Respondents are then asked to rate each of the relationship styles that were previously indicated of how well each of the descriptions corresponds to their general relationship style

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Sample questions for the secure attachment style are: "It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others." "I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me."

Sample questions for the fearful attachment style include the following: "*I am comfortable getting close to others." "I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them."* Sample questions for the preoccupied attachment style are: "*I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like*." Finally, sample questions for the dismissing attachment style include the following: "*I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient"* (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1994, p. 52). Furthermore, the individual must also select which of the statements best describes him or her (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

The RQ can be used as a categorical measure or continuous measure (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). However, with changes in the field toward dimensional measures of adult attachment, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) strongly advise the use of the RQ as a continuous measure. For this study, attachment is conceptualized as continuous. The wording of the questions was modified slightly to accommodate the targeted population (i.e. deans, chairperson, provost and instructor).

The RQ is the only measure among popular measures of attachment that demonstrates independence from self-deceptive bias (Leak & Parsons, 2001). The RQ also best captures the theoretical foundations of individual differences of attachment styles (Byslma, Cozzarrelli, & Sumer, 1997). The RQ is also consistent with Bowlby's

(1973) theory regarding self-image and self and others. It also provides a distinction between two types of avoidant individuals: fearful and dismissing (Albert & Horowitz, 2009).

The RQ does show high test-reliability (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Scharfe and Bartholomew (1994) report test-retest reliability for the four attachment styles ranging from *0.53* for females and *0.49* for males. In Sochos, Biskanaki, and Tass's (2006) study, correlations were observed between secure and fearful (*r=.32, p=.02)* and fearful and preoccupied *(r=.46, p=.001).* The alpha coefficients of the RQ for all four-attachment styles have been reported at *0.87* to *0.95* (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). In addition, research has found support for the construct validity of the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). For example, fearful and preoccupied individuals reported having significant lower self-concepts scores than did secure or dismissing individuals (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Individuals of secure and preoccupied attachment reported having few interpersonal concerns than those of a dismissing and fearful attachment style (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Although Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) provided an abundance of construct validity evidence in support of the RQ, other researchers have also shown that different attachment styles were related to different interpersonal problems (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992). The survey questions of the RQ can be found in Appendix C.

Leadership styles. The transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, and charismatic leadership were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1985). The MLQ measures three major components of leadership styles: transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, (Bass, 1985, 2000). The three components

provide 12 scores as follows: Transformational (Idealized Attributes, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration, Transactional (Contingent Reward Management-by-Exception, Active Management-by Exception, Passive, and (Laissez-faire and Outcomes of Leadership, Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership; Bass, 1985, 2000). The MLQ (Form 5X-Short; 45 items) was the version used in this study, and it consists of ratings for self and others (Avolio & Bass, 1985, 2000). In this study, leaders were asked to rate themselves, and subordinates were asked to rate their leader. The MLQ also provides a web-based version (Avolio & Bass, 1985, 2000). Participants completing the MLQ evaluate how frequently (0=Not at all; 1=Once in a while; 2= Sometimes; 3= Fairly often; and 4=Frequently if not always) they have seen their leader engage in leadership behavior (Bass, 1985, 2000).

The MLQ has also demonstrated its strong empirical base through its use in almost 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses (Avolio & Bass, 1985, 2000). The manual does confirm the validity of the MLQ regarding leadership style and subordinate satisfaction (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 1985, 2000). For example, previous research has shown transformational leadership to have a Cronbach's alpha of .90, and transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles to have a Cronbach's alpha of .81 (Heinitz, Liepmann, & Felfe, 2005). In the Sadeghi and Lope Pihie (2012) study, the Cronbach's alpha ranged from .67 to .94. The results of the study did give evidence that the MLQ is a reliable instrument.

The MLQ also appears to be a valid measure across several cultures and different types of organizations (Avolio-Bass, 1984, 2000). The construct validity for all three leadership styles ranges from .65-.85 (Eagly, Johannensen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003).

The MLQ has also been known to predict individual and group performance in organizational settings, as well as explain between 45% and 60% of the variance of organizational performance and satisfaction (Avolio & Bass, 1985, 2000). The MLQ also appears to be a valid measure across several cultures and different types of organizations (Avolio-Bass, 1984, 2000). The MLQ is easily administered, taking approximately 15 minutes to complete, is extensively researched and validated, and has gained its popularity as the benchmark measure for transformational leadership (Avolio-Bass, 1984, 2000). The MLQ also provides feedback to the leaders on how to be more effective.

In Zhu, Sosik, Riggio, and Yang's (2012) study, using the MLQ as a scale, findings showed transformational leadership to have a significant positive relationship with subordinate psychological empowerment (r=.*50*, p<.01) as well as organizational identification (r=.*62*, p<.01). Results also revealed transactional leadership to be significantly and positively related to followers' organizational identification (β =.*41*, p <.*01*; Zhu et al., 2012). In Pieters, van Knippenberg, Schippers, and Stam's (2010) study results showed that individuals with a high psychological empowerment, a negative correlation was found between transactional leadership and innovative behavior (b = .-58, β = -.*43*, p = .001). Furthermore, a positive relationship between transformational leadership and innovative behavior was found (b = -.*10*, β = -.*09*, ns; Pieters et al., 2010). For lower levels of psychological empowerment, no relationship was found (b = .*03*, β = .*03*, ns; Pieters et al., 2010). In Chaudry and Javed's (2012) study, research showed that transformational leadership had a positive, strong and significant correlation to commitment of subordinates, and that laissez-faire leadership was found to have a negative correlation to commitment to subordinates.

Some of the sample questions from the transformational leadership dimension include the following: (a) "Talks to us about his or her most important values and belief, and inspirations motivation, (b) articulates a compelling vision of the future, (b) reexamines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, and (c) spends time teaching and coaching me" (Bono & Anderson, 200**5,** p. 3). Some sample questions for the three transactional leadership scales include the following: (a) *Contingent reward:* The person I rate lets me know what I receive if I do what is required, (b) *Active management-by-exception:* The person I am rating focuses attention on mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from what is expected of me, and (c) *Passive management-by-exception:* Problems will have to be consistent before the person I am rating takes action (Bass & Avolio, 1989). A sample question from the laissez-faire dimension include the following: The person I am rating avoids decision-making (Bass & Avolio, 1989).

The MLQ was also used to measure charismatic leadership. The charismatic subscale of the MLQ measures the extent to which subordinates perceive their leader to adhere to certain charismatic behaviors (Avolio et al., 1999). For example, in a study conducted by Michaelis et al. (2009), subordinates were asked to assess their leader to the degree to which they admired their leader, and results revealed charismatic leadership to positively relate to subordinate innovation implementation behavior. In another study, the MLQ 5X-Short form by Avolio and Bass (1995) was also used to measure charismatic leadership. In Brown and Trevino's (2006) study, charismatic leadership was measured using the 12-item *charisma dimension* from the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2000).The estimated reliability of the charismatic leadership measure was 0.96 (Bass & Avolio, 2000). In Strickland, Babcock, Gomes, Larson, Muh, and Secarea's (2007)

study, results found charismatic leadership to positively relate to work engagement. Specifically, research confirmed that charismatic leaders help to enhance subordinates' engagement in work, which can then lead to subordinate willingness to engage in positive behaviors (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010)

Sample items from the charismatic leader dimension include the following: (a) The leader for which I am rating impresses me and fascinates me with his or her distinct personality, (b) The leader that I am rating consistently inspires me, (c) My supervisor consistently praises my work performance, and (d) expectations of high other followers have faith in my manage (Avolio et al., 1999). An additional sample item for the charismatic leadership dimension is: My leader considers both the moral and ethical consequences of decisions (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Due to the MLQ being copyrighted, the survey questions have not been included. However, permission to use the MLQ can be found in Appendix D.

Servant leadership. Servant leadership was measured using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) combined 10 characteristics of servant leaders that were identified by Spears (2002). The 10 characteristics were "(1) listening, (2) empathy, (3) healing, (4) awareness, (5) persuasion, (6) conceptualization, (7) foresight, (8) stewardship, (9) commitment to growth of people, and (10) building community" (Spears, 2002, pp. 3–5). However, the tool was later reduced to five critical components: organizational stewardship, wisdom, altruistic calling, emotional healing, and persuasive mapping (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) discussed the Cronbach's coefficient alpha estimates for reliability for the following five factors: altruistic calling ($\alpha = 0.77$); emotional healing (α

=0.68); wisdom (α =0.87); persuasive mapping (α =0.83); and organizational stewardship (α =0.83). In Garber, Madigan, Click, and Fitzpatrick's (2009) study, findings revealed that for subordinate perceptions of servant leaderships was α =. .89. In addition, findings showed reliability of coefficients for the following constructs: .79 for altruistic calling, .89 for emotional healing, .80 for wisdom, .79 for persuasive mapping, and .72 for organizational stewardship (Garber et al., 2009).

Data were collected using a 23-item four-part Likert scale to rate how often the leader exhibited the indicated behavior. Ratings for the SLQ are (1) strongly agree (2) somewhat disagree (3) somewhat agree , and (4) strongly agree. The sample questions of the SLQ include the following*: I sacrifice my own interests to meet other's needs, I am talented at helping others heal emotionally (emotional healing), I have great awareness of what is going on, I offer a compelling reason to get others to do things, and I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society* (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Items from the SLQ can be found in Appendix E.

Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership Effectiveness was measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1985, 2000). In addition to the MLQ measuring the different leadership styles (i.e. transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership), the MLQ also measures leadership effectiveness. The Cronbach's alpha for leadership effectiveness ranges from *.67* to .94 (Bass & Avolio, 1985, 2000). As mentioned earlier, the MLQ consists of 45-items. From the 45-items, 36 of them represent nine leadership factors: five of the factors are for transformational, three factors of are for the transactional, and one factor for the laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2004).

Nine items of the scale assess leadership outcomes, of which 4 items assess leadership effectiveness, 3 items assess extra effort, and 2 items assess satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2004).

Research on Leadership Effectiveness Using the MLQ

In Erkutulu's (2008) study, results showed all dimensions of transformational leadership were positively related to leadership effectiveness. On the contrary, laissez-faire was found to be negatively correlated to leadership effectiveness (Eruktulu, 2008; Sadeghi & Lope Pihie, 2012). Additional findings showed that a combination of idealized influence, individualized consideration, and transactional contingent reward were significant predictors of presidential leadership effectiveness at Evangelical colleges and universities, compared to transformational and transactional leadership alone (Webb, 2003).

This chapter discussed the various instruments (RQ, MLQ, SLQ) that will be used to measure the constructs of attachment, leadership style, and subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness. Each instrument description discussed the reliability and validity, as well as sample items for each. The next section will discuss the data analysis process.

Data Analysis Plan

The first null hypothesis in the study states that there is no relationship between the secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles. The alternative hypothesis proposes that the dependent variables (transformational and charismatic leadership styles) will relate positively to secure attachment style. The second null hypothesis in the study states that there is no relationship between insecure attachment style and laissez-faire leadership style. The alternative hypothesis proposes

that the dependent variables (transformational and charismatic leadership styles) will relate negatively to insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful) and laissez-faire leadership style. The third null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, and no relationship between insecure attachment style (dismissing, fearful, and preoccupied) and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. The alternative hypothesis proposes the dependent variable (instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness) will relate positively to secure attachment style, and the dependent variable (instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness) will relate negatively to insecure attachment style (dismissing, fearful and preoccupied).

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for all variables involved in hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. Studies have shown that the distribution of Pearson's r was insensitive to non-normality when testing the hypothesis $p = 0$ (Duncan & Layard, 1973; Zeller & Levine, 1974). However, additional research has shown Pearson's *r* to be sensitive to non-normal data, unequal interval measurement, and a combination of both non-normality and unequal interval measurement (Bishara & Hittner, 2012). Further research has shown that when testing $p = 0$ at a nominal alpha of .05, Pearson's *r* was robust to almost all non-normal and mixed-normal measurements (Havlicek & Peterson, 1977). However, exceptions to the aforementioned occurred when the sample size was very small of $n = 5$ (Bishara & Hittner, 2012). Concerning Type I error, Duncan and Layard (1973) found that when a sample size increases, it could worsen the Type 1 error control of Pearson's r.

Regression analysis is the most frequently used tool in analyzing data in the organizational field (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). The multiple regression analysis can be used when the quantitative variable is to be reviewed in relationship to other factors of interest, such as the independent variables (Cohen, 2003). Cohen (2003) lists a few assumptions of a multiple regression analysis: (a) form of the relationship between variables may be simple or complex such as a straight line, curvilinear, general, or conditional, perhaps a combination of all, (b) research factors that are expressed as independent variables are not constrained. For example, the variables may be naturally occurring (i.e., gender, personality, years in leadership), thus, maybe expressed as research factors, and (c) like independent variables, dependent variables are not constrained. It is important to note that outliers in a multiple regression analysis are an important issue because any assumptions that are drawn from the model will be biased if outliers are not taken into consideration (Alma, Kurt, & Ugar, 2011).

To further examine instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, SPSS was used. SPSS will help to determine the relationships between leader scores in the present study and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness. Instructors were nested within leaders as each leader may have multiple instructors. In addition, missing data could lead to results that are different from what would have been obtained if the dataset were complete (Hawthorne & Elliott, 2005). There are various approaches to handling missing data such as (a) list wise deletion; (b) item mean substitution; two levels of person substitution; regression imputation; and (c) “hot deck” substitution (Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). List wise deletion, which is the approach used in this study, is considered the simplest procedure and is the default in several of the statistical packages

(Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The list wise deletion removes a case with missing data from an analysis (Hawthorne & Elliot, 2005). Although the list wise deletion is the most commonly used form, the concerns involve the loss of data that may have been challenging to collect, the reduced sample size and resulting bias in variance estimates (Hawthorne & Elliot, 2005).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question One

Will secure attachment styles relate differently to transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?

Hypothesis One

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$1): There is no relationship between the secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$1): A positive correlation will be found between the secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles.

Because of a lack of theoretical and empirical evidence, it is difficult to provide a priori hypothesis regarding the relationships between secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful attachment, and transactional and servant leadership styles.

Research Question Two

Will insecure attachment style relate differently to transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?

Hypothesis Two

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$2): There is no relationship between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied and) and laissez-faire leadership style.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$2): A positive correlation will be found between insecure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles and a negative correlation between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied and fearful) and laissez-faire leadership style.

Research Question Three

Will different attachment styles of leaders influence instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness?

Hypothesis Three

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$3**):** There is no relationship between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, and no relationship between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied and fearful) and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$3): A positive correlation will be found between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness, and a negative correlation be found between insecure attachment style (dismissing, preoccupied and fearful) and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Threats to Validity

Standardized survey instruments with established records for both reliability and validity were used to measure different styles of attachment, leadership behavior, and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness to ensure validity of the measurement. Concerns regarding internal, construct, and external validity may arise. For example, a possible internal threat is the fact that I did not manipulate the IV or control for

extraneous variables, and thus, am not able to determine a cause and effect relationship (Cook & Campbell, 1979).

One possible threat to validity is the inadequate preoperational definition or explication of constructs. In other words, the lack of properly defining variables that are measured in the study. However, there is support for the RQ, MLQ, and SLQ. For example, research has shown evidence of internal and construct validity (Brown & Trevino, 2002; Yukl, 1999, 2002) and internal validity (Bass & Avolio, 1985, 2000; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Horowitz & Bartholomew, 1991) for the RQ, MLQ, and SLQ.

A possible threat to construct validity is measurement error (Brahma, 2009; Campbell, 1999). Research has shown that measuring unobserved theoretical constructs by observed measures such as that found in management research is very common, and, such practice may lead to measurement error (Brahma, 2009). The measurement error might contribute to a false rejection for which a true, substantive relationship exists. Conversely, a relationship might be accepted when it fact, a relationship does not exist (Brahma, 2009). For example, the construct of attachment style was accepted to relate to leadership behavior or instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness when it fact, it is not. In sum, the measurement findings threaten the validity of the research findings, thus, diminishes its contribution to research (Brahma, 2009; Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

Scholars such as Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981), Podsakoff and Dalton (1987), and Schriesheim, Hinkin and Podsakoff (1991) have expressed concern regarding organizational research and its lack in interpretability. For example, Scandura and Williams (2000) found the majority of management studies failed to report construct validity (39.4% during 1985-87; 74.8% during 1995-97). Studies have also shown that

the lack of construct validity is not only restricted in management studies but to other areas of research such as in marketing, and human resources (Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lamkau, 1993; Cote & Buckley, 1988; Boyd, Gove, & Hitt, 2005; Wright et al., 2000).

Another threat to construct validity is evaluation apprehension as participants in my study may attempt to present themselves as having effective leadership skills than what they truly present (Rosnow, Goodstadt, Suls, & Gitter, 1973). In the current study, evaluation apprehension was limited by stressing to the participants that the research study is confidential, and that the researcher was the only person that had access to the raw data. Therefore, an assumption can be made that participants were more likely to answer the questions honestly and accurately.

A possible threat to external validity is interaction of selection (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Cook & Campbell, 1979). A random selection of participants most likely represents the sample of that targeted population, thus allowing the findings to be considered more generalizable (Ferguson, 2004). The interaction and selection threat consist of researchers recruiting participants who adhere to specific characteristics such as longevity in a leadership position or age from the targeted population, for which participants are not representative of all leaders and/or instructor (Cook and Campbell, 1979). However, it is important to note the theoretical framework such as the attachment theory that will be applied in this study and critical data serves as an essential element in the findings of the study (Beck, 1999), which increases confidence in the findings.

Ethical Procedures

A number of ethical concerns were addressed prior to and throughout the process of conducting the study. Due to the nature of the study, participants' names had to be identified so that the researcher could link the instructor response to the leader. As a result, the respondents' names did not remain anonymous. In any case, the confidentiality of all participants was protected, since only the researcher will have access to the results. Surveys that were discussed in this study have been used in several other studies for which it had been determined that neither survey should cause any distress to the participants. Samples of the informed consent and introductory letter and IRB materials are included in the appendices.

Summary

The present study examines the extent to which different attachment styles may predict leadership style and instructor perceptions of leadership effectiveness. A survey design was used. The Relationship Questionnaire was used to measure attachment style of leaders and faculty; the MLQ was used to measure transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, and charismatic leadership. The MLQ was also used to measure instructor perceptions of leadership effectiveness, and the Servant Leadership Questionnaire was used to measure servant leadership. These scales have been used in multiple studies and have strong reliability and validity.

Multiple regression analysis using the list wise deletion entry of independent variables was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 computer software for Windows 2000 XP.

In summary, this chapter discussed the research design and rationale, the methodology, threats to validity, and ethical procedures. Chapter 4 will discuss the results of the analyses in detail.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between attachment style and leadership behavior, and instructors' perceptions of leadership effectiveness in academic management. Hypothesis 1 stated that a positive relationship would be found between secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles. Hypothesis 2 stated that a negative correlation would be found between insecure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles, and a positive correlation between insecure attachment style (dismissing, fearful and preoccupied) and laissez-faire leadership style. Hypothesis 3 stated that a positive correlation would be found between secure attachment and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness.

The chapter begins with an overview on how data were collected and how missing values were handled. Next, descriptive and inferential statistics are presented, including correlations among study variables and the multiple regression analysis. Finally, the findings of the data analysis are summarized.

Sample Characteristics

Potential participants in this study were chairpersons, deans, provosts, and instructors from colleges and universities (something about the area). Participants were initially contacted by e-mail and had a month to participate. Reminder emails were sent each week for x weeks encouraging participants to complete the confidential survey. Participants who were interested in participating clicked a link to the SurveyMonkey site, which then recorded survey responses. Data were downloaded from SurveyMonkey and imported into SPSS for analysis.

Two-hundred and fifty people were initially contacted for the study. Out of the 250 potential participants, 83 responses were recorded. However, 17 of those cases were removed from the analysis because they began the survey (which generated a participant record) but did not answer any questions, leaving 66 participants. Of the remaining 66 participants, 12 answered demographic questions only. The final sample of participants who completed the full study was 54 participants. This was an effective response rate of 21.6% (54/250). The majority of the sample (n=36, 67.7%) was comprised of faculty in a non-supervisory role (referred to as "non-leaders") while the rest of the sample (n=18, 33.3%) was compromised of faculty in a supervisory role (referred to as "leaders"). Please refer to Table 2 for the Sample Characteristics of leaders and non-leaders.

Table 2

Sample Characteristics N = 54

	N	Valid %
Leadership Status		
Leader	18	33.3
Non-leader	36	66.7
Education Level		
Bachelor's	1	1.9
Master's	24	45.3
Professional	15	28.3
Doctorate	13	24.5
Time Working at Employer (in years)	M=3.33	SD=1.43

Measures

Several measures were used to measure attachment style, leadership style, and perceptions of leader success. Attachment style was measured using the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), which generated a continuous

score for each of four attachment styles (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful). Leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, and charismatic leadership) were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1985). The MLQ provides 12 scores that can be combined into larger composites for larger leadership concepts (i.e. Transactional leadership). Finally, servant leadership was measured using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), which measures five critical components of servant leadership. Means, reliabilities, and standard deviations for subscales and composites for each of these scales are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Reliability, Means, and SDs for all Scale Variables, N = 54.

Scale Name	Sample	N	Reliability	Mean	SD
Servant Leadership					
Altruistic Calling	Non-leaders	36	0.91	2.93	0.81
	Leaders	18	0.62	3.01	0.41
Emotional Healing	Non-leaders	36	0.96	2.49	0.92
	Leaders	18	0.90	2.93	0.63
Wisdom	Non-leaders	36	0.96	3.19	0.89
	Leaders	18	0.84	3.24	0.49
Persuasive Mapping	Non-leaders	35	0.94	2.83	0.81

	Leaders	17	0.85	2.99	0.64
Organizational Stewardship	Non-leaders	33	0.93	3.26	0.87
	Leaders	17	0.67	3.48	0.39
Multidimensional Leadership Questionnaire					
Effectiveness	Non-leaders	31	0.93	3.98	1.22
	Leaders	14	0.34	4.26	0.35
Extra Effort	Non-leaders	30	0.95	3.78	1.32
	Leaders	14	0.91	3.73	0.82
Individualized Consideration	Non-leaders	31	0.79	3.65	1.05
	Leaders	15	0.78	4.09	0.70
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	Non-leaders	30	0.92	3.79	1.24
	Leaders	14	0.58	3.86	0.57
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	Non-leaders	31	0.91	3.77	1.10
	Leaders	15	0.66	4.08	0.66
Inspirational Motivation	Non-leaders	30	0.92	3.93	1.09
	Leaders	14	0.91	4.17	0.79
Intellectual Stimulation	Non-leaders	31	0.86	3.60	1.06

	Leaders	15	0.76	3.89	0.58
Laissez-faire	Non-leaders	31	0.80	1.73	0.92
	Leaders	15	0.84	1.59	0.68
Management by Exception (Active)	Non-leaders	31	0.73	2.65	0.95
	Leaders	14	0.81	2.39	0.87
Management by Exception (Passive)	Non-leaders	31	0.80	1.99	0.96
	Leaders	15	0.77	2.07	0.65
Contingent Reward	Non-leaders	30	0.87	3.66	1.07
	Leaders	15	0.79	3.70	0.84
Leadership Satisfaction	Non-leaders	32	0.95	3.86	1.37
	Leaders	13	0.89	4.07	0.56

Overall, reliabilities were good (above .75), though some fell below that threshold. While an obvious cause for these low reliabilities (i.e. reverse scored items) could not be located, they are noteworthy and potentially affect the validity of the study. Results involving these scales should be interpreted with caution.

Research Questions and Hypothesis Testing

Research Question 1

The first research question was: *Will secure attachment style relate differently to transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?* The associated hypothesis stated that a negative correlation would be found between secure attachment style and laissez-faire leadership style and positive correlations would be found between secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles. Transformational leadership correlated statistically significantly with secure attachment style, $r=.32$, $p < .05$, with the strongest correlation with inspirational motivation (a component of transformational leadership) $r=.39$, $p < .01$. Charismatic leadership was also found to correlate statistically significantly with secure attachment style, r=.35, p<.01. Laissez-faire leadership did not relate statistically significantly with secure attachment style, $r= -.15$. Thus, research question 1 was supported. Table 4 presents correlations between attachment styles and leadership types.

Table 4

Correlations between Attachment Styles and Leadership Scales (n=54)

	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Transformational leadership	.32*	-.28	-.22	-.26
Charismatic leadership	.36*	-.31*	-.21	-.26
Laissez Faire	-.15	.09	-.07	.48**
Effectiveness	.24	-.16	-.16	-.21

*p<.05, **p<.01

Research Question 2

The second research question was: *Will insecure attachment style relate differently to transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership styles?* Idealized influence (attributed), a component of transformational leadership, correlated negatively with dismissing attachment style (insecure attachment), r=.-*30*, $p < .05$, Fearful attachment style was negatively correlated with charismatic leadership, r= -.*36*, $p < .05$. Laissez-faire leadership correlated positively with dismissing attachment style (insecure attachment), r=.*48*, $p < .01$. Thus, research question 2 was partially supported.

Regression Analysis for Research Questions 1 and 2

Bivariate correlation examines the relationship between two variables. Regression examines the unique contribution of multiple variables as they explain an outcome. In order to explore the relationships among the attachment styles as they explain variation in leadership styles, hypotheses 1 and 2 were also tested using regression analysis. All four continuous attachment style variables were entered as predictors, with transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, and Laissez-faire leadership entered as outcome variables in three separate regressions. Results indicated that continuous measures of attachment style did not significantly predict transformational leadership style. Continuous measures of attachment style did significantly predict Charismatic Leadership and Laissez-Faire leadership. For charismatic leadership, the overall model was significant, but none of the individual predictors was significant. This may be because the attachment styles correlate with each other (multicollinearity), or because there are two coefficients (for secure and preoccupied attachment) that are larger, but do not reach significance. For Laissez-Faire Leadership, the dismissing attachment style was

the only significant predictor. All three models and the beta coefficients for all predictors are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Results of Multiple Regression for Continuous Attachment Styles Predicting Leadership Styles

	Transformational Leadership	Charismatic Leadership	Laissez-Faire Leadership
	Unstandardized Beta Weights (Std Error)		
Intercept	4.03 (1.12)	4.33 (1.28)	.51 (.97)
Secure Attachment	.14 (1.08)	.15 (.14)	.03 (.11)
Fearful Attachment	-.04 (.12)	-.00 (.15)	.03 (.11)
Preoccupied Attachment	-.13 (.10)	-.13 (.12)	-.01 (.09)
Dismissing Attachment	-.09 (.09)	-.09 (.11)	.23** (.08)
F	2.34	2.63*	2.63*
Df	4, 40	4, 39	4, 39
Model R^2	.19	.21	.21

*p<.05, **p<.01

Since both categorical and continuous measures of attachment style are discussed in the literature and there is some debate about the best way to conceptualize attachment, regressions were also run with attachment as a categorical variable. Participants were assigned to an attachment category based on the attachment style they scored highest on. Then, participants with a secure attachment style were considered "secure" and those in the fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing categories were considered "insecure." For the regression, attachment was entered as a single dummy-coded variable with secure attachment as 1 and insecure attachment as 0. Results of those analyses are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Results of Multiple Regression for Categorical Attachment Styles Predicting Leadership Styles

	Transformational Leadership	Charismatic Leadership	Laissez-Faire Leadership
	Unstandardized Beta Weights (Std Error)		
Intercept (Secure)	4.12 (.17)	4.17 (.17)	1.46 (.15)
Fearful	-.87 (.65)	-1.17 (.67)	.16 (.59)
Preoccupied	-.74 (.40)	-.77 (.41)	.33 (.36)
Dismissing	-.64 (.32)	-.72 (.33)	.74 (.29)
F	2.37	2.90*	2.26
Df	3, 44	3, 44	3, 43
Model R^2	.14	.17	.14

*p<.05

When attachment was conceptualized as a categorical variable and dummy coded for regression, there was only one model with a significant difference (Charismatic leadership). Generally speaking, the R^2 values were smaller for the categorical variables. The direction of the effects was the same.

Research Question 3

The third research question was *Will different attachment styles relate differently to instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness*? The associated hypothesis stated that a positive correlation would be found between secure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness and a negative correlation would be found between insecure attachment style and instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness There was no significant correlation between instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness and secure attachment style, *r=.24, (p=.11),* fearful attachment style, *r=-.16, (p=.31),* preoccupied attachment style, *r=-.16, (p=.29),* or dismissing attachment style, *r= -.21. (p=.17).* Regression analysis yielded similar results, with attachment styles failing to predict effectiveness (F(4, 39) = 1.04, p=.40) (Table 7). As with the analysis above, a second

regression was conducted using the categorical measure of attachment. The categorical measure yielded a significant result (see Table 8 below) in the same direction as the continuous measures, indicating greater effectiveness for securely attached leaders.

Table 7

Results of Multiple Regression for Continuous Attachment Styles Predicting Leader Effectiveness

Leadership Effectiveness (unstandardized beta, std. error)	
Intercept	4.33 (1.28)
Secure Attachment	.10 (.13)
Fearful Attachment	-.00 (.15)
Preoccupied Attachment	-.11 (.12)
Dismissing Attachment	-.11 (.11)
F	1.04
Df	4, 39
Model R^2	.10

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 8

Results of Multiple Regression for Categorical Attachment Styles Predicting Leader Effectiveness

Leadership Effectiveness (unstandardized beta, std. error)	
Intercept (Secure)	4.34 (.19)
Fearful	-.21 (.73)
Preoccupied	-.75 (.45)
Dismissing	-.70 (.36)
F	1.82
Df	3, 43
Model R^2	.11

*p<.05, **p<.01

Because there was a lack of theoretical and empirical evidence indicating a relationship between attachment style and transactional and servant leadership styles, it was difficult to provide a priori hypotheses. However, an analysis of the relationships between these variables did show a negative correlation between fearful attachment style and emotional healing, $r=.\text{-}28$, $p<05$. Furthermore, management by exception (passive), a component of transactional leadership, showed a statistically significant correlation with dismissing attachment style, $r=.42$, $p<.01$(See Table 9 below).

Table 9

Correlations Among Variables for Full Sample

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15
1	Altruistic Calling	-													
2	Emotional Healing	.57[8]**	-												
3	Wisdom	.73**	.61**	-											
4	Persuasive Mapping	.61**	.59**	.69**	-										
5	Organizational Stewardship	.63**	.64**	.66**	.70**	-									
6	Idealized Influence (Attributed)	.75**	.69**	.72**	.73**	.81**	-								
7	Idealized Influence (Behavior)	.54**	.64**	.57**	.57**	.65**	.84**	-							
8	Inspirational Motivation	.64**	.62**	.59**	.60**	.67**	.90**	.86**	-						
9	Intellectual Stimulation	.53**	.59**	.67**	.68**	.74**	.81**	.76**	.76**	-					
10	Individualized Consideration	.61**	.73**	.62**	.68**	.73**	.86**	.87**	.83**	.83**	-				

11	Contingent Reward	.70**	.58**	.63**	.56**	.51**	.76**	.68**	.78**	.61**	.64**				
12	Laissez Faire	-.53**	-.40**	-.50**	-.45**	-.49**	-.49**	-.42**	-.52**	-.36*	-.28	-			
13	Management by Exception (Active)	-.02	-.10	.10	-.07	.15	.08	.17	.04	.25	.05	.15	-		
14	Management by Exception (Passive)	-.31*	-.23	-.42**	-.27	-.31*	-.39**	-.35*	-.36*	-.30*	-.21	.74**	.02	-	
15	Extra Effort	.68**	.61**	.67**	.66**	.62**	.91**	.72**	.88**	.79**	.79**	-.43**	.03	-.30*	-
16	Effectiveness	.68**	.64**	.76**	.63**	.66**	.88**	.80**	.83**	.84**	.77**	-.47**	.22	-.34*	.85**

*p <.05; **p < .01 (2-tailed)

Summary

The purpose of my study was threefold. First, I hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between secure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles. This hypothesis was supported: transformational and charismatic leadership both correlated statistically significantly with secure attachment style. Additionally, charismatic leadership correlated significantly negatively with the fearful attachment style.

Second, I hypothesized that there would be a negative correlation between the insecure attachment style and transformational and charismatic leadership styles, and a positive correlation between insecure attachment styles (dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful) and laissez-faire leadership style. Laissez-faire leadership did not correlate statistically significantly with secure attachment style. Regression analysis indicated that none of the attachment style measures was a significant predictor of transactional or charismatic leadership. Dismissing attachment style was a positive predictor of Laissez-Faire leadership.

Third, I hypothesized that instructor perceptions of leader effectiveness would relate positively with secure attachment style and negatively with insecure attachment style. This hypothesis was not supported. The following chapter includes discussion and interpretation of the findings, discussion of limitations of the present study, recommendation for future study, implications for social change, and recommendations for action.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Effective leaders of organizations have difficult responsibilities and duties to fulfill, which include inspiring and motivating subordinates, encouraging positive job attitudes, creating a synergistic team environment, and responding to changes due to technological advances (Boeckmann & Tyler 2002; Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; DeHoogh et al., 2005; Gilley et al., 2009; & Lind & Tyler, 1988). Unfortunately, leaders who do not embrace such responsibilities have been known to express more negativity, promote coercive behaviors towards subordinates, and lack the ability to make effective decisions (Einarson, 1999; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Giessner et al., 2013; Skogstad et al., 2007). Further, ineffective leadership can lead to poor staff satisfaction (Avolio et al., 1999; House et al., 1991; Howell & Frost, 1989).

Poor staff satisfaction can influence the quality of an organization, which affects overall staff satisfaction (Ashford, 1994; Ashforth, 1997; Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Padilla et al., 2007). Consequently, previous research has shown that ineffective leadership can contribute to reduced staff satisfaction (Aryee et al., 2007; Einarsen, 1999; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Skogstad et al., 2007). Effective and supportive leadership such as that of a transformational, charismatic, and servant leader, may be beneficial in organizations. Transformational leaders are leaders who seek the admiration, respect, and trust of subordinates (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Yukl, 2002), charismatic leaders are leaders who are able to transform the needs, values, and aspirations of their subordinates (House et al., 1991), and servant leaders are leaders who place the needs of others over their own interests,

and who emphasize the importance of moral behavior (Graham, 1991; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008).

The effectiveness of a leader has been linked to attachment style (De Hoogh et al., 2005; Chen-Min & Bor-Wen, 2009). Attachment style is a pattern of behavior with regard to interpersonal relationships that carry over from childhood to adulthood (Buist, Reitz, & Dekovic, 2008). Additionally, previous experiences with attachment figures generate "working models" that help guide behaviors and perceptions in future relationships (van IJzendoorn, 1995). Four attachment styles are identified in the literature: secure attachment style (individuals have a positive view of themselves and others; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross, McKim, & Ditommaso, 2006), preoccupied attachment style (individuals have a negative view of themselves and a positive view of others; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006), dismissing attachment style (individuals who have a difficult time being close and trusting others, but have a positive view of themselves; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006), and fearful attachment style (individuals who have negative view of themselves and others; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Hamarta et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2006).

Research has shown that a secure attachment style is linked to transformational and charismatic leadership (Berson et al., 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010; Choi, 2006; Popper et al., 2000; Manning, 2003; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper & Amit, 2000; Towler, 2005). According to Bass (1985), Burns (1979), Conger and Kanungo (1987), and Greenleaf (1970), transformational, charismatic, and servant leaders encourage subordinates to

perform beyond their expectations, motivate, and are trustworthy and compassionate towards subordinates.

Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between attachment style, leadership behavior, and employee perceptions of leadership effectiveness in academic management. The study tested three hypotheses focused on the above variables. Hypothesis 1 stated that secure attachment style would relate negatively to laissez-faire leadership, and positively with transformational and charismatic leadership style. Hypothesis 2 stated that insecure attachment style would relate negatively with transformational and charismatic leadership styles, and positively with laissez-faire leader ship style. Hypothesis 3 stated that instructor perception of leader effectiveness would relate positively with secure attachment style and negatively with insecure attachment style.

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. For continuous measures of attachment, transformational leadership correlated statistically significantly with secure attachment style, with the strongest correlation between the inspirational motivation subscale and positively with charismatic leadership style; however, laissez-faire leadership did not relate statistically with secure attachment style. Results were similar for the categorical conceptualization of attachment, with secure attachment positively related to transformational and charismatic leadership

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. For continuous measures of attachment, Transformational leadership did not relate significantly to any measures of insecure attachment, and charismatic leadership related significantly to only one (fearful). However,

laissez-faire leadership related statistically positively with dismissing attachment style. Categorical measures of attachment were not significantly related to laissez-faire leadership.

Lastly, Hypothesis 3 stated that instructor perception of leader effectiveness will relate positively with secure attachment style and negatively with insecure attachment style. This hypothesis was supported according to analyses with both categorical and continuous measures of attachment: secure attachment style was statistically significantly related to perceptions of leader effectiveness.

The majority of the sample as stated in Chapter 4 consists of faculty in a non-supervisory role, while the remainder sample consist of faculty in a supervisory role. From these findings, additional results showed that there was a negative correlation found between fearful attachment style and emotional healing (a component of servant leadership). This is an exceptionally interesting finding as it was previous stated in Chapter 3 and 4 that there was no empirical evidence indicating a relationship between attachment style and servant leadership style.

Interpretation of Findings

Consistent with previous research, my study found that transformational and charismatic leadership were related to secure attachment style (Berson et al., 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010; Choi, 2006; Popper et al., 2000; Manning, 2003; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper & Amit, 2002; Towler, 2005). In other words, transformational and charismatic leaders are likely to have trusting relationships with others as well as a positive view of themselves compared to insecure leaders such as laissez-leaders.

Additionally, consistent with previous research, laissez-faire leadership style related positively with dismissing attachment style (Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, VanDerWege, & Huber, 2010; Manning, 2003). This suggests that leaders will have a hard time trusting others but feel good about themselves may have little faith in their subordinates' abilities and skills. They may not value subordinates' input or involve them in decisions, which may result in low morale.

In addition to the significant findings, the results of the study also showed non-significant findings. For example, laissez-faire leadership did not correlate statistically significantly with secure attachment style. This non-significant finding could be due to the small number of participants indicating a laissez-faire leadership style. Additionally, a regression analysis indicated that none of the four attachment styles was a significant predictor of transactional or charismatic leadership. The reason(s) for these non-significant predictors could again, be due to participants not identifying themselves as a transactional or charismatic leader, or due to the small sample size in general. Correlations and relationships were observed in the predicted direction, but were not statistically significant. What this study achieved that no other study had yet to examine was the extent to which different attachment styles relate to leadership styles other than transformational leadership. Similar to previous research that examined other types of leadership styles and their relation to attachment style (Mayseless, 2010; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), this study enhances our knowledge regarding attachment style and its influence on leadership style. In terms of attachment style research, it would be interesting to see if there are effective leaders who also have an insecure attachment style.

Organizations may benefit from investigating the possibility of matching leaders to positions based on their attachment styles.

Implications

The findings from this study have theoretical, methodological, and practical implications. The theoretical implications involve a possible revision to Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) theory of attachment and Bass's (1985) transformational leadership theory. The methodological implication involves whether measures of attachment are categorical or continuous and best ways to compute and represent these measures. The practical implications are relevant to practices used to hire and train supervisors to be transformational, charismatic, and servant leaders to improve employee satisfaction.

Theoretical Implications

Attachment theory

Bartholomew and Horowitz'z (1991) theory of attachment consist of four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Secure attachment involves individuals having positive views of themselves and of others, and engaging in trusting and intimate relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Preoccupied attachment involves individuals having a negative attitude with regard to themselves and a positive attitude towards others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Dismissing attachment involves individuals having a positive attitude toward themselves and a negative view towards others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Ross et al., 2006). Fearful attachment involves individuals having a

negative view of themselves and others (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Hamarta et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2006).

Previous research has shown that securely attached individuals reported having fewer interpersonal concerns than those with a dismissing or fearful attachment style (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), and that different styles of attachment were related to different interpersonal problems (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992). Previous research has shown that individuals with a preoccupied attachment style have also reported fewer interpersonal concerns (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Unfortunately, the consequences of ineffective leadership are serious for employees and their organization (Aryee et al., 2007; Einarsen, 1999; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Skogstad et al., 2007). For instance, ineffective leaders have been shown to relate to lack of subordinate motivation, well-being, and employee job satisfaction, and similar to my study can be a factor in ineffective leadership (Aryee et al., 2007; Einarsen et al., 2007 Skogstad et al., 2007). Implications for future research could focus on why ineffective leaders are more vulnerable than effective leaders in decreasing subordinate motivation, well-being, and employee job satisfaction.

Transformational and Charismatic Leadership

According to Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leadership, transformational leaders engage, motivate, and encourage followers to feel confident about work performance, and to think more critically about their goals and interests. Bass has extended his theory in recent research to include servant leadership characteristics, which has shown transformational leaders to have high levels of moral development (Bass, 1985, 1998).

Additionally, research has shown transformational leadership to relate positively with morality and empowerment (Dvir et al., 2002).

Therefore, I suggest an extension to the transformational leadership theory to include moral development, as my study and previous research support that moral and ethical character are both necessary for an outcome of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; Burns, 1978). Specifically, my study showed that transformational leadership affects subordinate well-being, in part, as participants who described their supervisor as a transformational leader expressed confidence in achieving their goals. In addition, my study supports the transformational leadership theory as the participants who described their supervisors as transformational leaders reported being committed to their organization. Furthermore, I suggest an extension to Conger and Kanungo's (1998) theory of charismatic leadership to include inspirational motivation, as my study and previous research support that charismatic leaders effectively articulate vision in an inspirational manner, similar to that of a transformational leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1992).

Leadership and attachment style have been linked together to gain a better understanding on how leaders use their attachment style to learn about and interact with others (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007). Additionally, research has shown that specific types of attachment styles were linked with specific leadership styles, such as securely attached individuals were more likely than dismissing and preoccupied individuals to be transformational leaders (Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, VanDerWege, & Huber, 2010; Manning, 2003). Furthermore, as the link between attachment style and leadership behavior continues to expand in leadership literature, this will help provide a clearer overview of how

one's internal working model plays an important role in leadership behavior (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007).

Methodological Implications

Other conceptualizations of attachment exist (Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987); however, according to Griffin and Bartholomew (1994), Leak & Parsons (2001) and Ross et al., (2006), the Relationships Questionnaire (RQ) is the most cited. The RQ was designed to measure four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful. The RQ is divided into four short paragraphs that describe the four attachment styles in which the participant rates each paragraph that best reflects their attachment style. According to Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), the RQ can be scored as a categorical or continuous measure. However, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) highly recommend it be used as a continuous measure.

Researchers have tried to score the RQ as a categorical measure (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main & Goldwyn, 1994); however others (Fraley & Waller, 1998; Meehl, 1995; & Waller & Meehl) argued that doing so would cause problems in conceptual analysis and statistical power. Thus in my study, I ran analyses using both continuous and categorical conceptualizations of attachment. Overall, results were similar, though there were fewer significant results with the categorical measures. This is to be expected, since converting continuous data to categorical data results in a loss of detail. Further research would benefit from investigating the relative merits of the continuous vs. categorical measures of attachment style. Although the survey method was an adequate method for collecting data for this study, there are additional data collection strategies that

should be considered in further research on this topic. More detail-oriented methods such as personal interviews or a case study might provide a more rich description of ways in which attachment style and leadership style interact. These methods would also facilitate follow-up questions to clarify ambiguous findings.

Practical Implications

My findings are not only relevant to employees in academia, but to all employees of an organization. Effective leadership positively affects employee's well-being and overall job satisfaction. Specifically, effective leaders are supportive to their employees, which helps to enhance employee job and life satisfaction (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007; Graen & Scandura, 1987). On the other hand, ineffective leaders can affect subordinates' overall health and productivity for the worse (Ashforth, 1994; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Ashforth, 1997; Tepper, 2000). Furthermore, subordinates who lack an effective leader are more likely to experience an increase in workplace stressors and increased turnover rates (Aryee et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2007). Employees seek supervisors who can offer support when experiencing day-to-day workplace challenges, as well to help them enhance their skills and confidence (Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Ullrich, Christ, & can Dick, 2009; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

My findings are also crucial in gaining a better perspective on the role attachment style influences leadership behavior in a workplace. Specifically, leaders with a secure attachment style are more likely to be transformational leaders (Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, VanDerWege, & Huber, 2010; Manning, 2003). Organizations could offer potential leaders

an assessment that measures relationships with others, thus, provide a better perspective on how their relationships will be towards others. A possible assessment that could be used would be The Multimethod Assessment Battery (AAP; George & West, 2001) which is an assessment that involves participants responding to a set of seven drawn picture stimuli. Participants are then asked to create a story for each of the stimuli. The responses are then used to evaluate the four different types of attachment styles each participant might be exhibiting. Additionally, organizations could offer training on how to deliver these assessments to potential candidates.

Practical implications of the findings suggest finding ways to increase transformational and charismatic leadership within an organization. This may be done through hiring and recruiting candidates in management positions who are attracted to organization's mission and vision, encourage followers to focus on the team and organizations, help promote job satisfaction, group cohesiveness, and commitment (Amneric et al., 2007; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Choi, 2006; Jandaghi et al., 2009; Pillai et al., 2003; Yukl, 2002). Organizations may not be financially capable of replacing their managers with transformational and charismatic leaders, therefore training and development of transformational and charismatic leaders is the most practical decision for many organizations to pursue.

Research has shown the effectiveness of transformational and charismatic leadership training in organizations. For example, Howell and Frost (1989) found that employees who were trained with regard to transformational and/or charismatic leadership styles demonstrated a higher task performance compared to employees who were not directed on

such leadership styles. Therefore, having a leader that possesses the characteristics of a transformational or charismatic leader may result in employees with a sense of well-being, who are able to offer their best to the organization.

Limitation(s) of the Study

Some of the limitations discussed in chapter 1 were non-response bias, threat to internal validity (the study will not be manipulating the IV), and self-report data (difficulty in obtaining accurate results from participants**.** In chapter one, non-response bias was highlighted as a possible limitation. Given the small sample size, we can conclude that non-response bias is a likely problem. We have no way to know if those who responded are different in significant ways from those who did not. A related limitation is the small sample size used for analyses in this study. Although it was adequate for correlational analyses, the small sample became a liability when doing regression analyses. Several relationships among variables were in the predicted direction but were not statistically significant. A larger sample size would strengthen the ability to make a solid test of the hypotheses. In the future, it would be interesting to replicate this research with a larger, more representative sample.

It is unclear why the response rate to the request for participation was so low. Given that the target population was made of individuals with very involved jobs, it would be reasonable to speculate that they were simply too busy. They also may have been concerned with confidentiality of information, and so opted not to participate. If this study were attempted in the future, it would be better to be able to offer some kind of incentive to participate. A longer timeline with more reminders might also be helpful, especially if some

of those reminders were given personally (over the phone, perhaps)Furthermore, I think the small sample size was likely due to individual lack of interest in the topic, possibly felt uncomfortable rating their leader, or simply did not want to commit to a 30-minute survey. To help improve a better response rate, I would limit the survey to the two, to reduce the complexity and time commitment.

Recommendations

A direction for future research is to replicate this study using a different population, or larger sample size to determine if the findings are reliable. Replicating my findings across populations and instruments would provide support for the theoretical propositions that different types of attachment styles relates to different leadership styles, and to perceptions of leader effectiveness in management.

Another recommendation for future research is to examine whether there are cultural differences in the relationship between attachment style and different styles of leadership, and with perceptions with leader effectiveness in management. Other cultures, such as Western and Asian cultures, may relate both positively and negatively with transformational, charismatic, and laissez-faire leadership. For example, Burris, Ayman, Che, and Min (2013) found that Caucasian Americans perceived Asian Americans as being less transformational and less authentic than Caucasians.

Another recommendation for future research is to train managers in both transformational and charismatic leadership skills, and then examine whether and how the training impacts leadership effectiveness, workplace stress, job satisfaction, and turnover among employees. In terms of future theoretical recommendations for next steps, I think it

would also be interesting to study how one's temperament may impact leadership styles in other cultures.

Implications for Positive Social Change

Transformational and charismatic leaders are in a position to promote positive social change, as they articulate higher vision, enhance followers' sense of values, improve confidence in work performance, and increase employees' self-efficacy (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Shamir, House, Arthur, 1993; Yukl, 2002). Leaders in organizations often face challenges, such as increases in technology advancement and overall global changes in the workplace (Boeckmann & Tyler, 2002; Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Gilley, McMillan, & Gilley, 2009; De Hoogh, Hartog, & Koopman, 2005, Lind & Tyler, 1988). Unfortunately, the job responsibilities and challenges of leaders have been shown to lead to a decrease in job performance, satisfaction, and psychological health, and work productivity (Ashforth, 1994; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Ashforth, 1997; Tepper, 2000).

Previous research has shown that ineffective leadership also leads to negative attitudes, lack of motivation, and declines in well-being (Einarsen et al., 2007; Giessner, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Sleebos, 2013). Therefore, having a transformational and/or charismatic leader in organizations is needed, as this study and previous research have shown that such a leader provides employees with vision, increase in work performance, morals, motivation, and empowerment (Bono & Anderson, 2005; Michaelis et al., 2009).

Given the recognized benefits of an effective leader, the implication of social change is that effective leadership can increase staff satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well help to reduce turnover by recruiting, hiring, and possibly training individuals the skills

to be transformational and/or charismatic leaders. Thus, leaders in organizations can become more effective in meeting the needs of their employees when they are managed by a transformational and/or charismatic leader. Additionally, the benefits of an effective leader can be applied towards customers of an organization, and the general public.

Conclusions

This study sought to examine the relationship between attachment style, leadership behavior, and employee perception of leadership effectiveness. This study is consistent with previous research that showed that transformational and charismatic leadership have a statistically significantly positive correlation with secure attachment style, and a negative correlation with idealized influence (a component of transformational leadership). Furthermore, this study found that some elements of attachment styles statistically significantly predicted some leadership styles. Therefore, it will benefit organizations that experience a decrease in employee satisfaction, productivity, and overall organizational commitment to hire and/or train individuals interested in supervisory roles the skills to be a transformational and/or charismatic leader.

REFERENCES

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of relationships among organizational environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(1), 161–174. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.923. 923

Ahn, M. J., Adamson, J. S. A., & Dornbusch, D. (2004). From leaders to leadership: Managing change. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 112–123. doi: 10.1108/09534810810856417

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44*(4), 709–716. doi: 10.1002/pits.10153. 247

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Albert, L. S., & Horowitz, L. M. (2009). Attachment styles and ethical behavior: Their relationship and significance in the marketplace. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*(3), 299–316. doi: 10.1037/a0021133

Alma, O. G., Kurt, S., & Ugur, A. (2011). Genetic algorithms for outlier detection in multiple regression with different information criteria. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, 81*(1), 29–47.doi: org/10.1080/00949650903136782

Amneric, J., Craig, R., & Tourish, D. (2007). The transformational leader as pedagogue, physician, architect, commander, and saint: Five root metaphors in Jack Welch's letters to stockholders of general electric. *Human Relations, 60*(12), 1839–1872.

Anderson, H. J., Tathum, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis (5th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Armsden, G., McCauley, E., Greenberg, M., Burke, P., & Mitchell, J.(1990). Parent and peer attachment in early adolescent depression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 18*(6), 683–697. doi: org/10.1007/BF00289850

Aryee , S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(),* 191-201. doi: .org/1037/0021-9010.92.1.191.

Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*(7), 755–778. doi: 10.1177/001872679404700701

Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(2), 126–140. doi: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00124

Atwater, L., Smither, J. W., Wang, M., & Fleenor, J. W. (2009). Are cultural characteristics associated with the relationship between self and other's ratings of leadership? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 876–886. doi: 10.1037/a0014561

Atwater, L. E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F, J., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). Self other agreement: Does it really matter? *Personnel Psychology, 51(3),* 577-598. *doi:* 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00252.x

Avolio, B. (1999). *Full leadership development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory- building. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 25–33. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25

Avolio B. J., Bass. B. M., & Jung D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*(4), 441–462. doi: 10.1177/1742715009102937

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2000). MLQ: *Multifactor leadership questionnaire; Technical report (2nd ed.)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Ayman, R., Morris, S., & Korabik (2009). Is transformational leadership always perceived as effective? Male subordinates' devaluation of female transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(4), 852–879. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00463.x

Avolio, B.J., M. Rotundo, & F. O. Walumbwa (2009). Early life experiences and environmental factors as determinants of leadership emergence: the role of parental influence and rule breaking behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, in press.

Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Psychology, 144*(3), 313–326. doi: /10.1080/00223981003648336

Bailey, J., Chen, C., & Dou, S. (1997). Conceptions of self and performance-related feedback in the U.S., Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies, 28*(3), 605–625. doi: org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490113

Bakker, W., Van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Van Der Zee, K. I. (2004). Attachment styles, personality and Dutch emigrants' intercultural adjustment. *European Journal of Personality, 18*(5), 387–404. doi: 10.1002/per.515

Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(3), 461–484. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.461.

Baldwin, M., Keelan, J., Fehr, B., Enns, V., & Koh-Rangarajoo, E. (1996). Social-cognitive conceptualization of attachment working models: Availability and accessibility effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(1), 94–109. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.94

Balkundi, P., Harrison, D. A., & Kilduff, M. (2011). Centrality and charisma: Comparing how leader networks and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 1209–1222. doi: 10.1037/a0024890

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(6), 827–832. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827

Barry. B., & Stewart, G. (1997). Composition, process, and performance in self-managed groups: The role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1), 62–78. doi: org/10.1037//0021-9010.82.1.62

Barrick, M., & Mount, M. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1–26. Retrieved from http://people.tamu.edu/~mbarrick/Pubs/1991_Barrick_Mount.pdf

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 7*(2), 147–178. doi: 10.1177/0265407590072001

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(2), 226–244. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226

Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. (1998). Measures of attachment: Do they converge? In. J.A. Simpson, & W.S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25–45). New York: Guildford Press.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326. doi: 10.1177/1059601106287091

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional / transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 130–139. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130.

Bass, B. M, (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1989). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. (1991). Congruence of self and others' leadership ratings of naval officers for understanding successful performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 40*(4), 437–454. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.1991.tb01002.x

Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(6), 1538–67. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Beatty, E. W., Schneider, G. E., & Beatty, J. R. (1977). An empirical investigation of perceptions of ratee behavior, frequency, and ratee behavior change using behavioral expectation scales. *Personnel Psychology, 33*(4), 647–658. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1977.tb02333.x

Beck, C. T. (1999). Facilitating the work of a meta-analyst. *Research in Nursing & Health, 22*(6), 523–530. doi: 10.1002/ (SICI) 1098-240X (199912

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: HarperBusiness.

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Leader-member social exchange: Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(8), 979–1003. doi: 10.1002/job.443

Berson, Y., Dan, O., & Yammarino, F. J. (2006). Attachment style and individual differences in leadership perceptions and emergence. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146(2*), 165–182. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.146.2.165-182

Berry, K., Shah, R., Cook, A., Geater, E., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2008). Staff attachment styles: A pilot study investigating the influence of adult attachment styles on staff psychological madness and therapeutic relationships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 64*(2), 355–363. doi: 10.1002/jclp.20456

Bippus, A. M., & Rollin, E. (2003). Attachment style differences in relational maintenance and conflict behaviors: Friends' perceptions. *Communication Reports, 16*(2), 113–121. doi: 10.1080/08934210309384494

Bishara, A. J., & Hittner, J. B. (2012). Testing the significance of a correlation with nonnormal data: comparison of pearson, spearman, transformation, and resampling approaches. *Psychological Methods, 17*(3), 399–417. doi: 10.1037/a0028087

Bittner, A., Goodwin, R., Wittchen, H., Beesdo, K., Hofler, M., & Lieb, R. (2004). What characteristics of primary anxiety disorders predict subsequent major depressive disorder? *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 65*(5), 618–626. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01828

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Blehar, M. C., Lieberman, A. F., & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1977). Early face-to-face interaction and its relation to later infant-mother attachment. *Child Development, 48(1) 182-194.*URL: http://www.istor.org/stable/1128897

Block, L., & Manning, L. (2007). A systemic approach to developing frontline leaders in healthcare. *Leadership in Health Services, 20*(2), 85–96. doi: org/10.1108/17511870710745420

Blumberg, H. H., Fuller, C., & Hare, A. P. (1974). Response rates in postal surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 38*(1), 113–123. doi: 10.1086/268140

Boatwright, K. J., Lopez, F. G., Sauer, E. M., VanDerWege, A., & Huber, D. M. (2010). The influence of adult attachment styles on workers' preferences for relational leadership behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 13*(1), 1–14. doi: 10.1080/10887150903316271

Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(4), 208– 214. Retrieved from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm

Boeckmann, R .J., & Tyler, T. R. (2002). Trust, respect and the psychology of political engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(10), 2067–2088. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb02064.

Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(1), 159–172. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.415

Bono, J. E., & Anderson, M. H. (2005). The advice and influence networks of transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1306–1314. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1306

Bono, J. E., & Colbert, A. (2005). Understanding responses to multi-source feedback: The role of core self-evaluations. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(1), 171–203. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00633.x

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901–910. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.901

Borman, W. C. (1974). The rating of individuals in organizations: An alternative approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12*(1),105–124. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(74)90040-3

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss* (Vols. 1–2). New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 2). New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). NewYork: Basic Books.

Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M. A. (2005). Construct measurement in strategic management research: Illusion or reality? *Strategic Management Journal, 26*(3), 239–257. doi: 10.1002/smj.444

Brahma, S. S. (2009). Assessment of construct validity in management research: A structured guideline. *Journal of Management Research, 9*(2), 59–71. Retrieved from http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jmr

Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Wheatley, K. (2004). Social exchanges within organizations and work outcomes: The importance of local and global relationships. *Group and Organization Management, 29*(3), 276–301. doi: 10.1177/1059601103257405

Bradford, L. P., & Lippitt, R. (1945). Building a democratic work group. *Personnel, 22*(3), 142–148.

Breshnahan, C. G., & Mitroff, I. I. (2007). Leadership and attachment theory. *American Psychologist, 62*(6), 607–608. doi: 10.1037/0003

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Conceptualizing and measuring ethical leadership: Development of an instrument. *Academy of Management Proceedings & Membership Directory* (pp. D1-D6). doi: 10.5465/APBPP.2002.7519501.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 595–616. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10/1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004.

Brown, A, K., & Wallace, D. (2004). Predicting burnout and job satisfaction in workplace counselors: The influence of role stressors, job challenge, and organizational knowledge. *Journal of employment counseling, 41(1), 29-37*. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1920.2004.tb00875.x

Brutus, S., Fleenor, J., & McCauley, C. (1999). Demographic and personality predictors of congruence in multi-source ratings. *Journal of Management Development, 18*(5), 417–435. doi: 10.1108/02621719910273569

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32* (6), 693–710. doi:10.1080/03075070701685114

Buist, K., Reitz, E., & Dekovic, M. (2008). Attachment stability and change during adolescence: A longitudinal application of the social relations model. *Journal of*

Social and Personal Relationships, 25(3), 429–444. doi: dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407508090867

Buist, K., Dekovi, M., Meeus, W., & van Aken, M. (2004). The reciprocal relationship between early adolescent attachment and internalizing and externalizing problem behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*(3), 251–266. doi: 10.1016/S0140-1971(03) 00113-1

Burns, J. M. (1978, 1979). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, Tom E. and Stalker, G.M., The Management of Innovation (1961). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1496187

Burris, K., Ayman R., Che, Y., & Min, H. (2013). Asian Americans' and Caucasians' implicit leadership theories: Asian stereotypes, transformational, and authentic leadership. *Asian American: Journal of Psychology*, *4*(4), 258-266.

Caldwell, S., Fedor, D. B., Herold, D. M., & Liu, Yi. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on subordinates' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 346–357. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.346

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(2), 81–105. doi: 10/1037/h004606

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 171–246). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 3–52). New York: Academic Press.

Carnelley, K. B., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others, and relationship functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(1), 127–140. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.127

Cassidy, J. (1999). The nature of the child's ties. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical implications* (pp. 3–20). New York: Guilford Press.

Cassidy, J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment: Theory and research. *Child Development, 65*(4), 971–991. doi: org/10.2307/1131298

Changquan, J., Richards, D. A., & Zhang, K. (2011). Leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: OCB; Specific meanings as mediators. *Journal of Business Psychology, 26*(1), 11–25. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9168-3

Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(7), 258–212. Retrieved from http:// www.ijbssnet.com.

Chen-Min, C., & Bor-Wen, C. (2009). Relationship among personality traits, leadership, behavior, and job stress in nurses in Yunli, Taiwan. *China-USA Business Review,*

8(4), 51–57. Retrieved from http://www.davidpublishing.org/journals/J2/j22011/jsb2011/540.html

Chin, J. L. (2004). 2003 division 35 presidential address: Feminist leadership; Feminist visions and diverse voices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(1), 1–8. doi: 10.1111/j.147-6402.2004.00116.x

Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 13*(1), 24– 43. doi: 10.1177/10719190701130010501

Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (2nd ed., pp. 443–507). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Chusmir, L. H., Koberg, C. S., & Mills, J. (2001). Male-female differences in the association of managerial style and personal values. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129*(1), 65–78. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1989.9711700

Clulow, C. (Ed.). (2001). *Adult attachment and couple psychotherapy: The secure base in practice and research*. London, UK: Brunner-Routledge.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J. (1991). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.109.1.5

Collins, A. W., & Sroufe, L. A. (1999). Capacity for intimate relationships: A developmental construction. In W. Furman, B. B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The*

development of romantic relationships in adolescence (pp.125–147). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644–663. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644

Collins, N. L., Guichard, A. C., Ford, M. B., & Feeney, B. C. (2004). Working models of attachment: New developments and emerging themes. In W. S. Rholes & J. A. Simpson (Eds.), *Adult attachment: Theory, research, and clinical implications* (pp. 196–239). New York: Guilford.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 909–927. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471–482. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1988.4306983

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Conger, J.A. Kanungo, R.N. (1992). Perceived behavioral attributes of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 24*(1), 86-102. doi: 10.1002/job.4030150508.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: a revision of the NEO personality inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*(9), 887–898. doi: 10.1016/0191-

Cote, J. A., & Buckley, M. R. (1988). Measurement error and theory testing in consumer research: An illustration of the importance of construct validation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*(4), 579–582. doi: 10.1086/209137

CPA practice management forum (2008). Most powerful leadership development tool of the decade: Upward Evaluations. URL: http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/cpamanf4&div=40&id=&page=

Crittenden, P. M. (1985). Social networks, quality of child rearing and child development. *Child Development, 56*(5) 1299–1313. 10.1177/1548051809350894

Crowell, J. A., Fraley, C., & Shaver, P. (1999). Measuring of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The handbook of attachment theory and research* (pp. 434–468). New York: Guilford Press.

Crouter, A. C, MacDermid, S. M., McHale, S. M., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1990). Parental monitoring and perceptions of children's school performance and conduct in dual-

and single-earner families. *Developmental Psychology, 26*(4), 649–657. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.26.4.649

Cummings, L.L. & Schwab, D.P. (1973). *Performance in Organizations: determinants and appraisal.* Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Dadhich, A., & Bhal, K. T. (2008). Ethical behavior and leader-member exchange as predictors of subordinate behaviours. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers, 33(4),* 15-25.URL: http://www.vikalpa.com/pdf/articles/2008/15-25vol33.4.pdf

Darling, J., & Heller, V. (2011). The key for effective stress management: Importance of responsive leadership in organizational development. *Organization Development Journal, 29*(1), 9–26. Retrieved from www.theisod.org/

Davidovitz, R., Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R, Izsak, R., & Popper, M. (2007). Leaders as attachment figures: Leaders' attachment orientations predict leadership-related mental representations and followers' performance and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(4), 632–650. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.632

De Hoogh, A., H. B., Hartog, D, N, D., & Koopman, P, L. (2005). Linking the big five-factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership: Perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 839–865. doi: 10.1002/job.344

Deluga, R. J. (1988). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with subordinate influencing strategies. *Group and Organization Studies, 13*(4), 456–467. doi: 10.1177/105960118801300404

Deluga, R. J., & Perry, J. T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behaviour, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Occupational Psychology 64*(3), 239–252. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1991.tb00557.x

DeRue, D. S., Nahrang, J. D., Welmman, N., & Stephen, E. H. (2011). Trait and behavior theories of leadership: An integration and metal-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 7–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618–34. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1986.4306242

Dozier, M., & Kobak, R. R. (1992). Psychophysiology in attachment interviews: Converging evidence for deactivating strategies. *Child Development, 63*(6), 1473–1480. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01708.x

Driscoll, M. P., Humphries, M., & Larsen, H. H. (1991). Managerial activities, competence and effectiveness: Manager and subordinate perceptions. *International Journal of Human Resources, 2*(3), 313–325. doi: 10.1080/09585199100000070

Duda, D. M., & Nobile, J. L. (2010). The fallacy of online surveys: No data are better than bad data. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 15*(1), 55–64. doi: 10.1080/10871200903244250

Duncan, G. T., & Layard, M. W. J. (1973). A monte-carlo study of asymptotically robust tests for correlation coefficients. *Biometrika, 60*(3), 551–558. doi:10.1093/biomet/60.3.551

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 735–744. doi: 10.2307/3069307

Eeden, R. V., Cilliers, F., & Deventer, V. V. (2008). Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for the conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *South African Journal of Psychology, 38*(2), 253– 267. Retrieved from http://www.journals.co.za/ej/ejour_sapsyc.html

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(4), 569–591. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.129.4.569

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(1), 61–94. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb0248.x

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 16–27. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=ijm

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207–216. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500–507. Retrieved from http://eisenberger.psych.udel.edu/files/22_Perceived_Organizational_Support.pdf

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 42–51. Retrieved from http://www.psychology.uh.edu/faculty/Eisenberger/files/05_Reciprocation_of_Perceived_Organizational_Support.pdf

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Becker, T. E., Karagonlar, G., Neves, P., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1085–1103. doi: 10.1037/a0020858

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(2), 293–310. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.293.

Fairholm, G. W. (1991) Values Leadership: Toward a New Philosophy of Leadership New York:
Praeger

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 94–129). London, UK: MacMillan.

Fahr, J. L., Werbel J. D., & Bedeian A. G. (1988). An empirical investigation of self-appraisal-based performance evaluating. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 141–156. Retrieved from http://www.bus.lsu.edu/bedeian/articles/EmpiricalInvestigationOfSelfAppriasal-PP1988.pdf

Fairholm, M. (2003). Leading with spirit in public organizations. *PA Times, 26*(11), 4. Retrieved from http://sunburst.usd.edu/~fairholm/FairholmSpiritPATimes.pdf

Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Herold, D. M. (2006). The effects of organizational changes on subordinate commitment: A multilevel investigation. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 1–29. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00852.x

Feeney, J., Noller, P., & Hanrahan, M. (1994). Assessing adult attachment. In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp. 128–154). New York: Guilford Press.

Ferguson, L. (2004). External validity, generalizability, and knowledge utilization. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 36*(1), 16–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1547- 5069.2004.04006.x

Fonagy, P. (1999). Psychoanalysis and attachment theory. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 595–624). New York: Guilford Press.

Foody, G. M. (2009). Sample size determination for image classification accuracy assessment and comparison. *International Journal of Remote Sensing, 30*(20), 5273–5291. doi: 10.1080/01431160903130937

Forsyth, S., & Polzer-Debruyne, A. (2007). The organisational pay-offs for perceived work–life balance support. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 45*(1), 113–123. doi: 10.1177/1038411107073610

Foti, R. J., & Lord, R. G. (1987). Prototypes and scripts: The effects of alternative methods of processing information on rating accuracy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 39*(3), 318–340. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(87)90027-6

Fox, S., & Dinur, Y. (1988). Validity of self-assessment: A field evaluation. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(3),581–592. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00645.x

Fraley, R. C., &Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson &W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 350–365). New York: Guilford Press.

Fraser, D. (2007). Give me the child and I'll give you the leader. What can attachment theory teach us about leadership? *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services, 3*(3), 42–48. doi: 10.1108/17479886200700020

Fry, L. W., & Cohen, M. P. (2008). Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hours cultures. *Journal of Business Ethics, 84*(S2), 265–278. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008- 9695-2

Fuendeling, J. M. (1998). Affect regulation as a stylistic process within adult attachment. *Journal of Social Personel. Relations.* 15 (3): 291- 322. doi:10.1177/0265407598153001

Furman, W. (2001).Working models of friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*(5), 583–602. doi: 10.1177/0265407501185002

Galbraith, K. A., & Schvaneveldt, J. D. (2005). Family leadership styles and family well-being. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 33*(3), 220–239. doi: 10.1177/1077727X04272362

Garber, J. S., Madigan, E. A., Click, E. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2009). Attitudes towards collaboration and servant leadership among nurses, physicians and residents. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 23*(4), 331–340. doi: 10.1080/1356182092886253

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Giessner, S. R., van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, D., & Sleebos, W. (2013). Team-oriented leadership: The interactive effects of leader group prototypicality, accountability, and team identification. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(4), 658–657. doi: 10.1037/a0032445

Geller, D., & Bamberger, P. (2009). Bringing avoidance and anxiety to the job: Attachment style and instrumental helping behavior among co-workers. *Human Relations, 62*(12), 1803–1827. doi: 10.1177/0018726709337524

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1984, 1985, 1996). *Adult attachment interview.* Unpublished protocol (3rd ed.). Berkely: Department of Psychology, University of California.

George, C., & West, M. (2001). The development and preliminary validation of a new measure of adult attachment: The Adult Attachment Projective. *Attachment and Human Development, 3,* 30–61.

Giri, V., & Santra, T. (2009) Effects of job experience, career stage, and hierarchy on leadership style. *Singapore Management Review, 32*(1), 85–92. Retrieved from http://www1.sim.edu.sg/mbs/pub/gen/mbs_pub_gen_content.cfm?mnuid=93

Gilley, A., McMillan, H. S., & Gilley, J. (2009). Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 16*(1), 38–45. doi: 10.1177/1548051809334191

Glad, B. (2004). Tyrannical leadership. In G. R. Goethals, G. J. Sorenson, & J. M. Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (Vol. 4, pp. 1592–1597). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(2), 78-90. URL: http://hbr.org/2000/03/leadership-that-gets-results/ar/1

Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C., & Boyd, N. (1999). A laboratory experiment testing the antecedents of leader cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 769–788. doi: 10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<769::AID-JOB53>3.0.CO;2-J

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L.L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 175–208). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange theory of leadership over 25 years; Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219–247. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Mission possible? The performance of prosocially motivated subordinates depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 927–944. doi: 10/1037/a0014391.

Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(2), 105–119. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(91)90025-W

Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job: Essays and experiments*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: Center for Applied Studies.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). The leadership crisis: A message for college and university faculty. In L. C. Spears (Ed.). *The power of servant-leadership* (pp. 77–91). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Misson possible? The performance of prosocially motivated subordinates depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 927–944. doi: 10.1037/a0014391

Griffin, D., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(3), 430–445. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.67.3.430

Guion, R. M. (1976). Recruiting, selection, and job placement. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 777–828). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership, 3,* 397–417. doi: 10.1037/a0018867

Hamarta, E., Deniz, M. E., Saltali, N. (2009). Attachment styles as a predictor of emotional intelligence. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 9*(1), 213–229. Retrieved from http://www.edam.com.tr/kuyeb/en/default.asp

Hardy, G. E., & Barkham, M. (1994). The relationship between interpersonal attachment and work difficulties. *Human Relations, 47*(3), 263–281. doi: 10.1177/001872679404700302

Harr, M. J., & Roche, M. A. (2010). Family supportive organization perceptions and subordinate outcomes: The mediating effects of life satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(7), 999–1014. doi: 10.1080/09585191003783462

Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 43–62. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00631.x

Havlicek, L., & Peterson, N. (1977). Effect of the violation of assumptions upon significance levels of the pearson r. *Psychological Bulletin, 84*(2), 373–377. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.84.2.373

Hawthorne, G., & Elliot, P. (2005). Imputing cross-sectional missing data: Comparison of common techniques. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *39*(7), 583–590. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1614.2005.01630.x

, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Authors' response: Deeper into attachment theory. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*(1), 68–79.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 474–487. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.474

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D, B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on subordinates' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(2), 346–357. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.346

Heinitz, K., Liepmann, D., & Felfe, J. (2005). Examining the factor structure of the mlq: Recommendation for a reduced set of factors. *European Journal of Psychological, 21*(3), 182–190. doi: 10.1027/1015.5759.21.3.182

Hinkin, R. T., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of "nonleaderhip:" From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1234–1248. doi: 10.1037/a0012875

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist, 51*(5), 469–477. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.51.5.469

Hogg, M. A. (1992). *The social psychology of group cohesiveness: From attraction to social identity*. London, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1248–1263. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1248

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. Personality and Social *Psychology Review, 5*(3), 184–200. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503_1

Hogg, M. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 1–52). San Diego: Academic Press

Holland, A. S. M., & Roisman, G. I. (2010). Adult attachment security and young adults' dating relationships over time: Self-reported, observational, and physiological evidence. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(2), 552–557.doi: 10.1037/a0018542

Holmes, J. G. (2000). Social relationships: The nature and function of relational schemas. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*(4), 447–495. doi: 10.1002/1099-0992(200007/08)30:4<447: AID-EJSP10>3.0.CO; 2-

Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 187–220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Holzbach, R. L. (1978). Rater bias in performance ratings: Superior, self-, and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(5), 579–588. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.63.5.579

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo Vadis. *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 409–473. doi: 10.1177/014920639702300306

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991) Personality and charisma in the presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3), 364–396. doi: 10.2307/2393201

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt (Ed.), *Leadership: Cutting Edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Hoveida, R., Salari, S., & Asemi, A. (2011). A study on the relationship among servant leadership (SL) and the organizational commitment (OC): A case study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business, 3*(3), 499–506. Retrieved from http://ijcrb.webs.com/

Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A lab study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*(2), 243–269. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(89)90052-6

Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(5), 680–694. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.84.5.680

Howell, J.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission of liberation? *Academy of Management Executive, 6*(2), 43–54. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AME.1992.4274395

Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(2), 317–341. doi: 10.2307/2393393

Hoyt, C. L., Halverson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., & Watson, C. B. (2003). Group leadership: efficacy and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Research, and Practice, 7*(4), 259–274. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.7.4.259

Humphrey, S. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Meyer, C. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2007). Trait configurations in self-managed teams: A conceptual examination of the use of seeding for maximizing and minimizing trait variance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 885–892. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.885

Ilies, R., Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of*

Management Journal, 49(3), 561–575. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.21794672

Isabella, R. A., & Belsky, J. (1991). Interactional synchrony and the origins of infant-mother attachment: A replication study. *Child Development, 62*(2), 373–384. doi: 10.2307/1131010

Ismail, A., Mohammed, H. B., Rafiuddin, N. M., & Zhen, K. W. P (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership styles as a predictor of individual outcomes. *Theoretical and Applied Economics, 6*(547), 89–104. Retrieved from http://www.ectap.ro/

Ismail, A., Zainuddin, N. F. A., & Ibrahim, Z. (2010). Linking participative and consultative leadership styles to organizational commitment as an antecedent of job satisfaction. *Unitare-Journal, 6(1),* 11-26. URL: http://www.myjurnal.my/filebank/published_article/22077/Linking_Participative_p11v6n1Jan10.pdf

Jacobsen, C., & House, R. J. (2001). Dynamics of charismatic leadership: A process theory, simulation model, and tests. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 75-112. doi: 0.1016/S1048-9843(01)00065-0

Jamaludin, Z., Mutasim, N., Rahman, N. Ab., Makhbul, Z. K. M., & Idris, F. (2011). Do transactional, transformational and spiritual leadership styles distinct? : A conceptual insight. *Journal of Global Business and Economics, 2*(1), 73–82. Retrieved from http://ideas.repec.org/s/grg/01biss.html

Jandaghi, G. H., Matin, H. Z., & Farjami, A. (2009). Comparing transformational leadership in successful and unsuccessful companies. *International Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(3), 211–216. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt2/sayi6pdf/jandaghi_matin_farjami.pdf

Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on salesperson's turnover intention. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 29*(4), 351–365. doi: 10.2753/PSS0885-3134290404

Johnson, D. M., & Smith, H. C. (1953). Democratic leadership in the college classroom. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 67*(11), 1–20. doi 10.1037/h0093630

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751–765. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.5.751

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Illies, R., & Gerhardt, M. G. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765– 780. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Kahn, W. A., & Kram, K. E. (1994). Authority at work: Internal models and their organizational consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 19*(1), 17–50. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/258834

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., & Jick, T. D. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change: How companies experience it and leaders guide it*. New York: The Free Press.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 246–255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246

Kelloway, E. K., Mullen, J., & Francis, L. (2006). Divergent effects of transformational and passive leadership on subordinate safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(1), 76–86. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.11.76

Kenney, R. A., Schwartz-Kenney, B. M., & Blascovich, J. (1996). Implicit leadership theories: Defining leaders described as worthy of influence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(11), 1128–1143. doi: 10.1177/01461672962211004

Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of managerial effectiveness and advancement to self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors from the multiple Linkage model. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(3), 361377. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(95)90014-4

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(1), 36–51. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.81.1.36

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. *Child Development, 59*(1), 135–146. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1988.tb03201.x

Kolb, J. A. (1992). Leadership of creative teams. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 26*(1), 1–9. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.1992.tb01151.x

Kramer, R. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 569–598. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569

Kuczmarski, S. S., & Kuczmarski, T. D. (1994). *Values-based leadership: Rebuilding subordinate commitment, performance, and productivity*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Kutsko, J. (1990). *TNT teams and technology: A descriptive study of geographically dispersed business teams and communication technologies*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Denver, Colorado.

Larson, J. R. (1982). Cognitive mechanisms mediating the impact of implicit theories of leader behavior on leader behavior ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 29*(1), 129–140. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(82)90245-8

Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. (1989). *Teamwork: What must go right, what can go wrong*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Latham G. P., & Wexley K. N. (1982). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Leak, G. K., & Parsons, C. J. (2001). The susceptibility of three attachment style measures to socially desirable responding. *Social Behavior and Personality, 29*(1), 21–30. doi:10.2224/sbp.2001.29.1.21

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161–177.doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader–member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 15*, 47–119. http://www.emeraldinsight.com/books.htm?issn=0742-7301

Lim, B., & Ployhart, R. E. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the five- factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 610–621. doi: 10.1037/00219010.89.4.610

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.

Lohmann, D. (1992). The impact of leadership on corporate success: A comparative analysis of American and Japanese experiences. In K. E. Clark, M. E. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership*. (pp. 59–80). Greensboro, NC: Center of Creative Leadership.

Lopez, F. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). Dynamic processes underlying adult attachment organization: Toward an attachment theoretical perspective on the effective self. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(3), 283–301. doi: 10.1037//0022-0167.47.3.283

Lord, R., & Maher, K. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance.* Boston: Routledge.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R., & De Vader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21*(3), 343–378. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(84)90043-6

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 385–425. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2

Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(5), 737–748. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.010

Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1994). *Adult attachment rating and classification system.* (Unpublished manuscript). University of California, Berkeley.

Mallinckrodt, B., & Wei, M. (2005). Attachment, social competencies, social support, and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(3), 358–367. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.3.358

Marmarosh, C. (2009). Group leadership and the influence of attachment styles. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 59*(2), 281–286. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/ijgp.2009.59.2.281

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709–734. Retrieved from http://aom.org/amr/

Mayseless, O. (2010). Attachment and the leader-follower relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*(2), 271–280. doi: 10.1177/0265407509360904

Mayseless, O., & Popper, M. (2007). Reliance on leaders and social institutions: An attachment perspective. *Attachment and Human Development, 9*(1), 73–93. doi: 10.1080/14616730601151466

McCauley, C. D., & Douglas, C. A. (2004). Developmental relationships. In C.D. McCauley, & E. Van Velsors (Eds.) *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development* (2nd ed., pp.204–233). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81–90. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.52.1.81

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mikulincer, M. (1998). Attachment working models and the sense of trust: An exploration of interaction goals and affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(5), 1209–1224. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1209

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change.* New York: Guilford Press.

Michaelis, B., Stegmaier, & Sonntag, K. (2009). Affective commitment to change and innovation implementation behavior: The role of charismatic leadership and

subordinates' trust in top management. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(4), 399– 417. doi: 10.1080/14697010903360608

Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal of and coping with a real-life stressful situation: The contribution of attachment styles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(4), 406–414. doi: 10.1177/0146167295214011

Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., & Pereg, D. (2003). Attachment theory and affect regulation: The dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*(2), 77–102. doi: 10.1023/A: 1024515519160

Mikulincer, M., & Sheffi, E. (2000). Adult attachment style and cognitive reactions to positive affect: A test of mental categorization and creative problem solving. *Motivation and Emotions, 24*(3), 149–174. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/journal/11031

Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2004). *Research design explained* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Morgeson, F. P. (2005). The external leadership of self-managed teams: Intervening in the context of novel and disruptive events. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 497–508. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.497

Moshavi, D., Brown, F. W., & Dodd, N. G. (2003). Leader self-awareness and its relationship to subordinate attitudes and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(7), 407–418. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1410705&show=html

Motowildo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 71–83. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1

Mount, M. K. (1984). Psychometric properties of subordinate ratings of managerial performance. *Personnel Psychology, 37*(4), 687–701. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1984.tb00533.x

Muris, P., Meesters, C., & Spinder, M. (2003). Relationships between child and parent: Reported behavioral inhibition and symptoms of anxiety and depression in normal adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(5), 759–771. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00069-7

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and organizational change. *California Management Review, 32(*2), 77–97. Retrieved from http://cmr.berkeley.edu/

Neustadt, E., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2006). The relationship between personality traits, self-esteem, and attachment at work. *Journal of Individual Differences, 27*(4), 208–217. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001.27.4.208

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School of Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 145–177. doi: 10.1080/09243450600565746

Onishi, M., Gjerde, P. F., & Block, J. (2001). Personality implications of romantic attachment patterns in young adults: A multi-method, multi-informant study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(9), 1097–1110. doi: 10.1177/0146167201279003

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Ostroff, C., Atwater, L., & Feinberg, B. (2004). Understanding self-other agreement: A look at rater and ratee characteristics, context, and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(2), 333–375. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02494.x

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 176–194. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001

Patterson, G. R., & Bank, L. (1989). Some amplifying mechanisms for pathologic processes in families. In M. R. Gunnar & E. Thelen (Eds.), *Systems and development: The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology* (Vol. 22, pp. 167– 209). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Patterson, G. R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1984). The correlation of family management practices and delinquency. *Child Development, 55*(4), 1299–1307. doi:10.2307/1129999

Pietromonaco, P. R., & Barrett, L. F. (2006). What can you do for me? Attachment style and motives underlying esteem for partners. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(3), 313–338. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.01.003

Pillai, R., Scandura, T. A., & Williams. (1999). Leadership and organizational justice: Similarities and differences across cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30(4),* 763-779. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490838

Pillai, R., Williams, E. A., Lowe, K. B., & Jung, D. I. (2003). Personality, transformational leadership, trust, and the 2000 U.S. presidential vote. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(2), 161–192. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00008-0

Pines, A. M., & Yanai. (2000). Unconscious influences on the choice of a career.Implications for organizational consultation. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 21(4),* 502-511.ISSN: 1038-4162

Platow, M. J., & van Knippenberg, D. (2001). A social identity analysis of leadership endorsement: The effects of leader in-group prototypicality and distributive intergroup fairness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1508–1519. doi:10.1177/01461672012711011

Podsakoff, P. M., & Dalton, D. R. (1987). Research methodology in organizational studies. *Journal of Management, 13*(2), 419–441. doi: 10.1177/014920638701300213

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*(4), 531–544. doi: 10.1177/014920638601200408

Poole, P. P., Gioia, D. A., & Gray, B. (1989). Influence modes, schema change, and organization transformation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 25*(3), 271–289. doi: 10.1177/0021886389253004

Popper, M., & Amit, K. (2000). Attachment and leaders' development via experiences. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(5), 749–763. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.005

Popper, M., & Amit, K. (2009). Influence of attachment style on major psychological capacities to lead. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *170*(3), 244–267. doi: 10.1080/00221320903218307

Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2002). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(1), 41–65. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00183-2

Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(2003), 41–65. doi: 10.106/S1048-9843(02)00183-2

Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(2), 267–289. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00038-2

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 329–354. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

Ram, P., & Prabhakar, G. (2011). The role of employee engagement in the work-relted outcomes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business, 1(3),* 47-61. URL:http://www.idjrb.com/articlepdf/vol1no3e.pdf

Ramsden, P. (1998). Learning to Lead in Higher Education. London, Routledge.

Rank, J., Nelson, n. E., Allen, T. D., & Xu, X. (2010). Leadership predictors of innovation and task performance: Subordinates' self-esteem and self-presentation as moderators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82(3),* 465-489. doi: 10.1348/096317908X371547

Richards, D., & Engle, S. (1986). After the vision: Suggestions to corporate visionaries and vision champions. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming leadership*. (pp. 199–215). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.

Rogelberg, S. G., & Luong, A. (1998). Nonresponse to mailed surveys: A review and guide. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 7*(2), 60–65. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.ep13175675

Roisman, G. I., Tsai, J. L., & Chiang, K. S. (2004). The emotional integration of childhood experience: Physiological, facial expressive, and self-reported emotional response during the adult attachment interview. *Developmental Psychology, 40*(5), 776–789. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.5.776

Ross, L. R., McKim, M., & DiTommaso, E. (2006). How do underlying "self" and "other" dimensions define adult attachment styles? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 38*(4), 294–310.doi: 10.1037/cjbs2006016

Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (1996). Interdependence processes. In E.T. Higgins & A.Kruglanski (Eds). *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 564–596). New Yok: Guilford.

Rutter, M. (1995). Clinical implications of attachment concepts: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatric and Allied Disciplines, 36*(4), 549–571. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1995.tb01311.x

Sadeghi, A., & Lope Pihie, Z. A. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(7), 186–193. Retrieved at www.ijbssnet.com

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*(3), 185–211. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1994). Urban poverty and the family context of delinquency: A new look at structure and process in a classic study. *Child Development, 65*(2) Spec No), 523–540. doi 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00767.x

Savage, A, R., & Honeycutt, A. (2011). Servant leadership: A phenomenological study of practices, experiences, organizational effectiveness, and barriers. *Journal of Business & Economics Research,9(1),* 49-54. URL: http://www.cluteinstitute.com/ojs/index.php/JBER/article/viewFile/939/923

Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships, I*(1), 23–43. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1994.tb00053.x

Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an 'enriched job. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 236–251. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.006

Schriesheim, C. A., Hinkin, T. R., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1991). Can ipsative and single- item measures produce erroneous results in field studies of French and Raven's five bases of power? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(1), 106–114. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.1.106

Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper and pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management, 19*(2), 385–417. doi: 10.1016/0149-2063(93)90058-U

Schwartz, J. P., Waldo, M., & Higgins, A. J. (2004). Attachment styles: Relationship to masculine gender role conflict in college men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5*(2), 143–146. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.143

Shamir, B., House, R.J. and Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*(4), 577–594. doi: 10.1080/14697010903360608

Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16*(4), 693–703. doi: 10.1177/014920639001600403

Shamir, B. (1991). The charismatic relationship: Alternative explanations and predictions. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(2), 81–104. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(91)90024-V

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*(4), 577–593. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the "Big Five" personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*(5), 536–545. doi: 10.1177/0146167292185003

Shaver, P. R., & Hazan, C. (1993). Adult romantic attachment: Theory and evidence. In D. Perlman and W. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (pp. 29–70). London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Shemmings, D. (2004). Researching relationships from an attachment perspective: The use of behavioural, interview, self-report and projective measures. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 18*(3), 299. doi: 10.1080/0265053042000031439 3

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(6), 703–714. Retrieved from http://aom.org/amj/

Shipper, F. (1991). Mastery frequency and interaction of managerial behaviors relative to subunit effectiveness. *Human Relations, 52*(1), 49–66. doi: 10.1177/001872679905200104

Shipper, F., & Dillard, J. E. (2000). A study of impending derailment and recovery of middle managers across career stages. *Human Resource Management, 39*(4), 331–345. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1099-050X(200024)39:4<331::AID-HRM5>3.3.CO;2-P

Shipper, F., & Wilson, C. L. (1992). The impact of managerial behaviors on group performance, stress, and commitment. In K. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 119–129). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Simmons, B. L., Gooty, J., Nelson, D. L., & Little, L. M. (2009). Secure attachment: Implications for hope, trust, burnout, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(2), 233–247. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.585

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 899–914. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(3), 434–446. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.62.434

Simpson, J. A., Collins, W. A., Tran, S., & Haydon, K. C. (2007). Attachment and the experience and expression of emotions in adult romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(2), 355–367. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.2.355

Singer, M. S. (1985). Transformational vs. transactional leadership: A study of new Zealand company managers. *Psychological Reports, 57(1),* 143-146. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1985.57.1.143

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Heland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 80–92. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 80–92. doi: 10.1177/107179190401000406

Sochos, A., Biskanaki, F., & Tassoulas, E. (2006). Attachment style and interpersonal difficulties in immigrants with coronary heart disease. *North American Journal of Psychology, 8*(1), 145–162. Retrieved from http://najp.8m.com/

Spears, L. C. (2002). *On character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders.* The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. Retrieved from http://www.leadershiparlington.org/EMAIL%20UPLOADS/Spears_Final.pdf

Stein, H., Koontz, A. D., Allen, J. G., Fultz, J., Brethour, J. R., Allen, D.,…Fonagy, P. (2000). *Adult attachment questionnaires: Disagreement rates, construct and criterion validity* (Technical Report No. 00-0023). Topeka, KS: The Menninger Clinic, Research Department.

Stein, H., Koontz, A. D., Fonagy, P., Allen, J. G., Fultz, J., Brethour, J. R.,…Evans, R. B. (2002). Adult attachment: What are the underlying dimensions? *Psychology and Psychotherapy, 75*(1), 77–91. doi: 10.1348/147608302169562

Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the family relationship. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold* (pp. 255–276). Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Stevens, C. D., & Ash, R. A. (2001). Selecting subordinates for fit: Personality and preferred managerial style. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *4*(4), 500–517. Retrieved from http://www.pittstate.edu/department/economics/journal-of-managerial-issues/

Stice, E., & Barrera, M. (1995). A longitudinal examination of the reciprocal relations between perceived parenting and adolescents' substance use and externalizing behaviors. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(2), 322–334. doi: 10.1037//0012-1649.31.2.322

Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin, 47*(1), 1–14. doi: 10.1037/h0053857

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire: Form XII*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Stogdill, R. M., & Shartle, C. L. (1956). *Methods in the study of administrative leadership: Research monograph No. 80*. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1963). The leader behavior of corporation presidents. *Personnel Psychology, 16*(2), 127–132. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1963.tb01261.x

Strange, J. M., & Mumford, M. D. (2002, 2005). The origins of vision: Effects of reflection, models, and analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(1), 121–148. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.07.006

Strickland, O., Babcock, M., Gomes, L., Larson, E., Muh, V., & Secarea, A. (2007, May). *The relationship between leader charisma, work engagement, and turnover intentions.* Poster session presented at the annual Western Psychological Association, Seattle, Washington

Sutton, G., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Integrating expectations, experiences, and psychological contract violations: A longitudinal study of new professionals. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(4), 493–514. doi: 10.1348/0963179042596487

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(2), 100–108. doi: 10.2307/1556375

Thau, S., Crossley, C., Bennett, R. J., Sczesny, S. (2007). The relationship between trust, attachment, and antisocial work behaviors. *Human Relations, 60*(8), 1155–1179. doi: 10.1177/0018726707081658

Tornow, W. W. (1993, November). *Perception or reality: Is measurement a means or an end?* Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Montreal, Quebec.

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology, 26*(1), 1–9. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9204-3

Toor, S. R., & Ogunlana, S. (2009). Ineffective leadership: Investigating the negative attributes of leaders and organizational neutralizers. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 16*(3), 254–272. Doi: 10.1108/09699980910951663

Towler, A. (2005). Charismatic leadership development: Role of parental attachment style and parental psychological control. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 11*(4), 15–25. doi: 10.1177/107179190501100402

Turrentine, C. G. (2001). A comparison of self-assessment and peer assessment of leadership skills. *Naspa Journal, 38*(3), 361–371. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1142

Ullrich, J., Christ, O., & van Dick, R. (2009). Substitutes for procedural fairness: Prototypical leaders are endorsed whether they are fair or not. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 235–244. doi:10.1037/a0012936

Van IJzendoorn, M. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the adult attachment interview. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 387–403. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.117.3.387

van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 25–37. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.25

van Knippenberg, D., Lossie, N., & Wilke, H. (1994). In-group prototypicality and persuasion: Determinants of heuristic and systematic message processing. *British*

Journal of Social Psychology, 33(3), 289–300. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01026.x

van Knippenberg, D. (2011). Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 1078–1091, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.004

Vardiman, P., Houghston, J., & Jinkerson, D. (2006). Environmental leadership development toward a contextual model of leader selection and effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(2), 93–105. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730610646606

Vivona, J. M. (2000). Parental attachment styles of late adolescents: Qualities of attachment relationships and consequences for adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(3), 316–329. doi: 10.1037//0022-0167.47.3.316

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 17–24. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17

Waldman, D. A., Javidan, M., & Varella, P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 355–380. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.013

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, subordinate attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517–529. doi: 10.1037/a0018867

Waller, N. G., & Meehl, P.E. (1998). *Multivariate taxometric procedures: Distinguishing types from continua*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wang, H., Tsui, A. H., & Xin, K. R. (2011). GEO leadership behaviors, organizational performance, and subordinate attitudes. *Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 92–105. Retrieved from http://www.journals.elsevier.com/the-leadership-quarterly/

Weber, M. (1968). *On charisma and institution building.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Webb, K. S. (2003). *Presidents' leadership behaviors associated with followers' job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and presidential effectiveness at Evangelical colleges and universities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Texas.

Wei, M., Heppner, P. P., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2003). Perceived coping as a mediator between attachment and psychological distress: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*(4), 438–447. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.438

Wei, M., Heppner, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Young, S. K. (2006). Maladaptive perfectionism and ineffective coping as mediators between attachment and future depression: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *53*(1), 67– 79. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.67

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sense-making in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Welch, R. D., & Houser, M. E. (2010). Extending the four-category model of adult attachment: An interpersonal model of friendship attachment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*(3), 352–364. doi: 10.1177/0265407509349632

Whittington, J. L., Goodwin, V. L., Murray, B., Coker, R. H., & Ickes, W. (2009). Transactional leadership revisited: Self-other agreement and its consequences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(8), 1860–1886. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00507.x

Wofford, J. C., & Goodwin, V. L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 161–186. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(94)90026-4

Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 9*(1), 55–84. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90042-X

Wohlers, A., Hall, M., & London, M. (1993). Subordinates rating managers: Organizational and demographic correlates of self/subordinate agreement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66*(3), 263–275. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1993.tb00538.x

Wright P. M., Gardner, T. M., Moynihan, L. M., Park, Y. J., Gerhart B., & Delery, J. E. (2000). Measurement error and estimates of the HR-firm performance relationship: Further evidence and analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 55*(4), 855– 872. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb02420.x

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 285–305. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behaviors: What we know and what questions need more attention? *Academy of Management, 26*(4), 66–85. doi: 10.5465/amp.2012.0088

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. (1982). Cross-situational, multimethod research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30*(1), 87– 108. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(82)90235-5

Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K. E. Glark & M. B. Glark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223–238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004), Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychological Association, 62*(1), 6–16. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Zeller, R. A., & Levine, Z. H. (1974). The effects of violating the normality assumption underlying r. *Sociological Methods & Research, 2,* 511–519. doi:10.1177/004912417400200406

Zhang, F., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2004). Stability and fluctuation in adult attachment style of a 6-year period. *Attachment & Human Development, 6*(4), 419–437. doi: 10.1080/1461673042000303127

Zhu, W., Soskik, J. J., Riggio, R. E., & Yang, B. (2012). Relationships between transformational and active transactional leadership and followers' organizational identification: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 13*(3), 186–212. Retrieved from http://www.ibam.com/pubs/jbam/

Appendix A: Demographic Information

Please check the response that most accurately describes you. Provide only one answer per question.

Please select the position level that best represents the role you currently hold at the college level:

- Non-supervisory role (i.e. instructor, faculty assistant)
- Supervisory role (i.e. dean, chairperson)

Education

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, mark the previous grade or highest degree received.

- Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BS)
- Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA)
- Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
- Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD)

Employment Information

Length of time working at your present employment:

- Less than 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years

- Other: Please specify _____

Location

In what state and city are you employed? _____

Appendix B: Invitation/Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a **voluntary** research study. Your participation is NOT mandated and **should not** take any priority over nor interfere with your regular duties.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your participation in this study is voluntary and anonymous. This means that everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you want to be in the study. Please note that Rehema Underwood, the researcher, who is a doctoral student at Walden University, is an subordinate of one of the college's participating (Tompkins Cortland Community College) as an instructor of Psychology. This study is separate from Rehema Underwood's role as Instructor.

Mrs. Underwood will not be able to identify the participants of the study. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with any organization or Rehema Underwood. If you initially decide to participate, you are still free to discontinue participating in the study at any time without affecting the relationships with any organization or Rehema Underwood.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent in which attachment styles influences leadership style of deans, chairpersons, provosts, as well as perceptions of leadership effectiveness.

All instructors, deans, provosts, and chairpersons with at least 1 year experience, and are at least 18 years of age and older, will be invited to participate in the study. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part or not.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this voluntary study, you will be asked to:

- Complete three surveys that consists of a total of 72 questions.
- Participants will be asked to complete the Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ), which is a questionnaire regarding different leadership styles for which you believe you or others best fit. Some sample questions from the MLQ are: “I make others feels good to be around.” “I help others develop themselves.” The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) is a questionnaire that measures types of attachment styles with others. Some sample questions of the RQ are: “ I am comfortable depending on others and having them depend on me.” “ I am uncomfortable getting close to others.” The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) is a questionnaire that measures how closely leaders exhibit servant leadership behaviors. Some sample questions of the SLQ are: “This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs.” “ This person seems alert to what is happening.”

Your total investment time should be between 30 to 45 minutes.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study, and every measure will be taken to ensure that any potential risks are kept to a minimum. Furthermore, the final dissertation will not include any potentially identifying demographic details.

There are no short or long-term individual benefits for participating in this study; however the main benefit of this research is to identify factors that may help to reduce ineffective leadership behaviors and promote lower turnover rates amongst subordinates.

Payment:

There is no compensation for your participation in this study.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept anonymous and confidential. The researcher will not use your information for any purposes outside of this research project and your name will not be given at any point during the study; therefore, complete anonymity will occur. Also, the researcher will not include any potentially identifiable information in any reports of the study and all such information will be kept in the strictest confidence. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

The researcher will be using a survey tool called SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey treats all surveys as if they were private. In other words, SurveyMonkey do not use the survey responses for their own purposes. In addition, survey data is stored on servers located within the United States in which SurveyMonkey will process the data on the researcher's behalf

and under the researchers' instructions, as well as those agreed to in Survey's Monkey's privacy policy. By clicking on the "agree" button below indicates that:

- you have already read the above information
- you voluntarily agree to participate
- you are at least 18 years of age.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Rehema Underwood. You may ask any questions you have now, or if you have questions later, you may contact her at 607-597-9981 or at Rehema.underwood@waldenu.edu. If you want to speak privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 1-800-925-3368, extension 1210.

Walden University's approval number for this study is 12-20-13-0088460 Please print a copy of this form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. I have asked questions and received answers. I consent to participate in this study by clicking the link below.

To protect your privacy, a consent signature is not requested. If you decide to participate in this study, your return of a completed survey will indicate your consent.

Signature of Investigator

Rehema Underwood

Appendix C: Questions from the Relationship Questionnaire

RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

(RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991)

PLEASE READ THE DIRECTIONS!

1. Following are descriptions of four general relationship styles that people often report.

Please read each description and **CIRCLE** the letter corresponding to the style that *best* describes you or is *closest* to the way you generally are in your relationships with others.

A. It is easy for me to become close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

C. I want to be close with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without close relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

2. Please **rate** each of the following relationship styles according to the *extent* to which you think each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

A. It is easy for me to become close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want to seek close relationships with others, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

C. I want to be close with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without close relationships, It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

	Not at all like me			**Somewhat like me**			**Very much like me**
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix D: Permission for use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

(MLQ; Bass, 1985)

from: info@mindgarden.com

Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 6:29 PM

To: Rehema

Subject: RE: MGWeb: Comment from Rehema Underwood (Other)

This is to confirm that upon purchase of a license to reproduce/administer the MLQ and/or ALQ, Rehema will have our permission to use one or both of these instruments in her research. I will present the questions for the MLQ once I purchase the license.

Best,

Valorie Keller

Mind Garden, Inc.

Appendix E: Questions from the Servant Leadership Questionnaire

(**SLQ; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006)**

The items are listed below by their dimension:

Data will be collected using a four-part Likert scale that rates how often the leader exhibited the indicated behavior. Ratings were **'strongly disagree' (1**), **'somewhat disagree' (2**),'**somewhat agree' (3), (4)**'**strongly agree'**

Altruistic calling

This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.

This person does everything he/she can to serve me.

This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs.

This person goes beyond the call of duty to meet my needs.

Emotional healing

This person is the one I would turn to if I had a personal trauma.

This person is good at helping me with my emotional issues.

This person is talented at helping me heal emotionally.

This person is the one who could help me mend my hard feelings.

Wisdom

This person seems alert to what's happening.

This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.

This person has great awareness of what is going on.

This person seems in touch with what's happening.

This person seems to know what is going to happen.

Persuasive mapping

This person offers compelling reasons to get me to do things.

This person encourages me to dream “big dreams” about the organization.

This person is very persuasive.

This person is good at convincing me to do things.

This person is gifted when it comes to persuading me.

Organizational stewardship

This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society.

This person believes that our organization needs to function as a community.

This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society.

This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace.

This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.

Curriculum Vitae

REHEMA UNDERWOOD, MS

Rehema Underwood
60 South Lamont Circle, Cortland NY, 13045
(607) 597-9981
chauka12@twcny.rr.com; Rehema.underwood@waldenu.edu

Educational Background:

Walden University

Ph.D Candidate

August 2013 **Minneapolis, Minnesota**

Masters of Science in Psychology

Completed in August 2002

Ithaca College **Ithaca, NY**

Bachelors of Arts in Psychology

Completed in September of 1999

Work Experience:

August 2006-Present

Online Instructor of Axia College of UOP

August 2005-Present **Dryden, NY**

Adjunct Instructor of Psychology

March 2003-May 2004 **Cortland, NY**

Behavioral Specialist

- Developed and implemented Behavioral and Treatment plans for the Psychiatric and OMRDD population.
- Conducted assessments and evaluations to determine appropriate treatment.
- Partnered with licensed Psychologists in providing on-site training to residential staff regarding behavioral plans, and other client concerns as needed.

October 2001-March 2003 **Ithaca, NY**

Community Support Coordinator

- Provided case management for the Welfare-to-work and Psychiatric population about childcare, transportation, employment, mental health, and monetary assistance.
- Conducted evaluations and assessments to determine appropriate services.
- Communicated with service providers on a daily basis, with respect to providing client progress by phone to appropriate persons.

December 1999-October 2001 **Ithaca, NY**

Employment Specialist

- Provided vocational counseling, such as on and off-site job coaching, for persons with mild to severe psychiatric and physical disabilities.
- Conducted assessments and evaluations to determine program eligibility.
- Communicated with staff from Drug Court and other service providers regarding weekly client progress.