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Abstract

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationships between the attachment orientations of workplace leaders, their displays of authentic leadership behaviours and the work experiences of both themselves and their followers, measured in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intent. Sourced from a national Australian retail company, 249 adults (152 women, 97 men; age range 18-62 years; $M = 36$ years; $SD = 11$ years) voluntarily completed the first of two online surveys, and approximately six months later, 162 of the volunteers (92 women, 70 men; age range 19-62 years; $M = 38$ years; $SD = 10$ years) also completed the second survey. Both surveys gathered self-perceptions about a variety of concepts, but in particular attachment orientations, job satisfaction levels, and turnover intentions. Both surveys also gathered perceptions of leaders’ use of the authentic leadership style, from both their own and their followers’ perspectives. As predicted, a negative association was shown between leaders’ perceptions of their attachment avoidance and their views of themselves as authentic leaders. The more strongly a leader viewed him- or herself as having an attachment avoidant orientation, the less strongly the leader saw him- or herself as displaying the authentic leadership style. Interestingly, and counter to that predicted, no such association was found when leaders’ authentic leadership behaviours were judged instead by followers. Further, no associations were shown between leaders’ attachment anxiety orientations and their use of the authentic leadership style, when the latter was judged from either their own perspective or from that of their followers. Leaders’ attachment orientations were also not shown to be associated with followers’ job satisfaction levels or their turnover intentions. Instead, follower age, extraversion, neuroticism, and relationship quality contributed to followers’ job satisfaction levels, and follower age, extraversion, relationship quality, and
duration of reporting to the leader, contributed to followers’ turnover intentions. This study also investigated the extent to which followers’ own attachment orientations may have moderated the relationship between their job satisfaction levels and their perceptions of their leaders’ authentic leadership behaviours. Examination of such a moderating affect, however, revealed none. Finally, the study examined the effects of a short-term psycho-educational intervention upon leaders’ attachment orientations, leaders’ use of the authentic leadership style, and both leaders’ and followers’ work experiences. The intervention involved leaders attending a half-day workshop that aimed to influence leaders’ attachment orientations and their adoption of authentic leadership behaviours. During the workshop, leaders received confidential feedback on their results from the first survey, which included aggregated follower data. Over the five months between the workshop and the second survey, leaders received four sets of self-paced learning activities that encouraged them to apply the attachment and authentic leadership concepts in the workplace and beyond. After comparing responses to the two surveys, no significant changes were found in leaders’ self-perceptions of their attachment orientations, authentic leadership behaviours, job satisfaction levels, or turnover intentions. Similarly, no significant changes were found in self-perceptions of job satisfaction levels, turnover intentions, or relationship quality amongst followers whose leaders had participated in the psycho-educational intervention. Further still, no significant changes were found in these followers’ views of their leaders’ displays of authentic leadership behaviours. The results of the present study are discussed in light of current research and recommendations are made for future studies.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Warren Bennis (2007) wrote that the critical importance of leadership is often forgotten in good times but that during bad times, when “twisted leaders” (p. 2) have caused more death than plague, its importance becomes painfully apparent. Yet despite its importance and decades of research, the concept of leadership remains elusive (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007). In an attempt to better understand what differentiates effective leaders from those deemed less effective, researchers have begun to turn their attention toward attachment theory. The hope is that leaders’ attachment orientations will prove to be one of the defining concepts that distinguish effective leaders from ineffective ones and as such, support leaders to create positive outcomes for themselves and for their followers. Although the research efforts to uncover the role and importance of leader attachment orientation are relatively sparse, the findings to this point are certainly promising.

Attachment theory was originally developed by John Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) in an attempt to explain the emotional attachment that develops between infants and their caregivers. Bowlby argued that a hard-wired attachment behavioural system causes infants to form an attachment bond with caregivers who, as attachment figures, provide infants with safe havens and secure bases that protect them from harm and enable them to explore their environments, knowing that protection is at hand. Bowlby argued that when separated from their attachment figure, infants experience separation anxiety and react in ways such as protesting and crying, that in the normal course of events would cause the attachment figure to return and enable security to be established once more. Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) found that for many infants this was indeed the pattern of events that transpired. However, they also found that for some, the interplay between infants and their caregivers resulted in unsatisfactory patterns of attachment. These infants
struggled to reconnect with and be comforted by their caregivers following times of separation and developed compensatory responses in an attempt to self-regulate their anxiety levels.

Bowlby and subsequently others proposed that attachment experiences during infancy influence how the attachment system operates throughout the remainder of an individual’s lifetime. Hazen and Shaver (1987) were amongst the first researchers to systematically explore adult attachments when they examined adult romantic relationships using a three factor measure of adult attachment. Others (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan & Shaver, 1995) subsequently expanded upon their work to the point where adult attachment is now conceptualised as an interplay between two attachment dimensions, named anxiety and avoidance, and that low levels of both give rise to attachment security whereas high levels of either give rise to attachment insecurity. In addition, adult attachment has since been explored beyond romantic relationships to include many different relationship types and contexts, including work relationships and a variety of work-related factors such as job satisfaction, job performance, burnout and overload (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

More specifically, attachment has offered valuable insights toward our understanding of leadership and leader-follower relationships, particularly from the perspectives of transactional and transformational leadership theories (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011). Transactional leadership theories hold that followers are motivated by their self-interests and that leaders implement reward and punishment systems to garner follower motivation. Transformational leadership theories, on the other hand, hold that followers are motivated by leaders who set challenging goals for them and who inspire them to go beyond what is ordinarily expected, for the greater good (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Research has indicated that secure attachment is associated more with
transformational than with transactional leadership styles and that follower outcomes, such as positive mental health, confidence, and group cohesion, are positively linked to leaders’ attachment security and negatively linked to leaders’ attachment insecurity (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Initial evidence has also indicated that follower attachment may mediate the impact of leaders’ attachment orientations upon followers’ experiences (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007). Taken together, the research to date indicates that leader-follower relationships constitute attachment relationships.

Conceptualisations about leadership have developed over the years to the point where researchers today see leadership in terms that are very different to those proposed nearly a century ago. The theory of authentic leadership is a modern conceptualisation of leadership, and although much research has progressed thinking and acceptance of the model, as yet, little is known about it from an attachment perspective. Authentic leadership is defined as:

a pattern of leader behaviour that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008, p. 94).

Authentic leadership shares similarities with transformational leadership and although it is argued that there are enough differences between the two to warrant them being considered different leadership styles, there is also enough overlap between them to suggest that the connections between transformational leadership and attachment may be similar to those between authentic leadership and attachment.
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With this in mind, the present study was designed to explore four research aims. The first aim was to examine the relationship between leaders’ attachment orientations and leaders’ use of the authentic leadership style. The second aim was to examine the impact of leaders’ attachment orientations upon followers’ work experiences. The third aim was to examine the extent to which followers’ attachment orientations moderate followers’ job satisfaction levels and perceptions of authentic leadership. And the fourth and final aim was to examine the effects of a short-term psycho-educational intervention upon leaders’ attachment orientations, leaders’ use of the authentic leadership style, and both leaders’ and followers’ work experiences. The present study also set out to achieve three context and sample aims. The first was to position the research within an in situ context, the second was to target a context typical of many workers, and the third was to ensure a balanced representation of women to men in the study sample.

To this end, this paper reports the present study across a series of chapters. In Chapter 2, attachment theory and its underlying concepts are examined. More specifically, the chapter provides an overview of adult attachment in terms of the relationships in which attachment dynamics are thought to be present, the stability of attachment orientations over the life course, the consistency of attachment orientations across relationships, and finally the measurement of attachment. Chapter 3 examines leadership theory and in particular, outlines authentic leadership and how it relates to transformational leadership and transactional leadership, two leadership models that have been used to examine the links between leadership and attachment. Chapter 4 examines what is known about attachment in the workplace. In particular, the chapter presents research concerning leadership and leader-follower relationships that has taken into account the attachment orientations of both leaders and followers. The chapter then goes on to talk about the attachment orientations of individuals who practise authentic leadership and the implications of this
for followers’ work experiences. With this context as a backdrop, Chapter 5 describes the study’s aims, research questions, and hypotheses. Chapter 6 explains the method used in the present study, followed by a detailed description of the study’s procedures, the participants, and the measures employed. The results of the study are presented in Chapter 7, including details regarding the data collected and the statistical analyses that were conducted. In Chapter 8, the results of the study are discussed in light of both the present study’s aims and past research regarding attachment and its links with leadership, leader-follower relationships, and followers’ work experiences. Also presented in this chapter are suggestions regarding the implications of the present study’s outcomes, together with possible limitations and directions for future research. Chapter 9 then provides some final remarks that conclude the discussion of the present research. Lastly, this paper lists the academic references drawn upon throughout and concludes with a number of appendices that contain information that supports and supplements that presented in the main chapters.
Chapter 2: Attachment Theory

2.1 Chapter Overview

One of the most significant contributions to our understanding of human psychological functioning comes from John Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980), a British child psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, who between 1940 and 1990 formulated and developed his theory of attachment. Although Bowlby was primarily focussed on explaining how infants become emotionally attached to their primary caregivers, researchers after Bowlby have elaborated on his theory to describe attachments formed in adulthood and across a variety of contextual settings. This chapter summarises the key aspects of attachment theory by examining research concerned with attachments formed between infants and their caregivers. The chapter then goes on to review the key concepts that underpin Bowlby’s formulation of the theory and then presents research that attempts to explain attachment processes in adulthood. Finally, the chapter summarises research regarding the measurement of adult attachment, which in turn reflects how attachment theory is conceptualised today.

2.2 Attachment in Infants and the Young

Bowlby’s ideas about attachment first grew from observations of maladjusted and delinquent children, most of whom had experienced what he called maternal deprivation, that is, loss of their mother, repeated separations from their mother, or frequent changes in foster mothers (Holmes, 1993; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Influenced by the imprinting process observed in numerous animal species whereby immature animals develop ties to their mothers (Holmes, 1993), Bowlby (1958) proposed that “the child’s tie to his mother” (p. 4), was the result of a fundamental instinctual behavioural system. He held that this
system has evolved in humans due to the prolonged helplessness of infants who, in the face of danger, are unable to defend themselves (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). He believed this inability caused infants to be both physically reliant upon and emotionally bonded with their mothers. Bowlby (1977) proposed that humans have an innate propensity to achieve or retain “proximity to some other differentiated and preferred individual, who is usually conceived as stronger and/or wiser” (p. 203). Bowlby referred to such targets as attachment figures and to the resulting affectional tie as an attachment bond. He suggested that a baby forms an instinctual attachment bond with his or her primary caregiver and that over time, the growing child develops an attachment template that describes how far that child can separate from his or her attachment figure, such as the child’s mother, without losing the constancy of the attachment (Biringen, 1994). Attachment figures theoretically serve three purposes: they (a) are a target for proximity seeking, (b) reliably provide protection, comfort, support, and relief—a safe haven in times of need, and (c) provide a secure base from which the individual can explore his or her environment (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). A fourth definitional element is that the real or anticipated loss of an attachment figure will bring on separation distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), an intense reaction to the real or perceived unwanted separation from an attachment figure. Bowlby maintained that all anxiety experiences have their roots in separation distress (Byng-Hall, 1995).

A key collaborator in the development of attachment theory was Mary Ainsworth, who is best known for her systematic study of infant-parent separations and her development of a taxonomy for attachment (Fraley, 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Her work involved extensive home observations of infants during their first year of life, together with observations of them in a laboratory procedure known as the Strange Situation (Ainsworth et al., 1978). The procedure, designed to activate the attachment
Attachment Theory

systems of 12-month old infants, involved observing each infant’s reactions following his or her mother’s brief departure from and subsequent return to the unfamiliar laboratory setting. The observers were interested in the extent to which the infant sought closeness and proximity from the mother, the reactions of the mother to any infant distress, and the tendency of the infant to explore the environment in the presence of the mother.

Ainsworth et al. (1978) delineated three patterns or types of attachment, often referred to as secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant. Ainsworth and her colleagues observed that some infants explored the laboratory when the mother was in the room, became upset following the mother’s departure, and upon her return, sought her out and were easily comforted by her. Infants who displayed this set of behaviours were categorised as having a secure attachment style. Other infants were observed to be ill-at-ease initially, even when the mother was in the room, and to become extremely distressed upon separation. Following the mother’s return, these infants exhibited conflicting behaviours whereby they wanted to be comforted by her and yet resisted physical contact and interaction. Infants who displayed this set of behaviours, similar to what Bowlby called protest behaviours (Bowlby, 1969; Hazan & Shaver, 1987), were categorised as having an anxious/ambivalent attachment style (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Other infants were observed to appear detached from the mother while she was in the room and relatively unconcerned by her departure. Upon reunion, these infants avoided contact with the mother and sometimes turned their attention to toys in the laboratory, ignoring her altogether. Infants who displayed this set of behaviours, similar to what Bowlby called detachment/compulsive self-reliance behaviours (Bowlby, 1969; Hazan & Shaver, 1987), were categorised as having an avoidant attachment style (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Ainsworth and her colleagues also observed many infants whom they found difficult to categorise because the infants exhibited mixed and unpredictable behaviours during their
separation from and reunion with the mother (Ainsworth, Bell, & Stayton, 1973). In time, a fourth attachment style category was created (Main & Solomon, 1990) to account for such infants, called disorganised/disorientated. This style, together with the anxious/ambivalent and avoidant styles, has come to be categorised as insecure.

In addition to developing a taxonomy for infant attachment, Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth, 1979; Stayton & Ainsworth, 1973) found a relationship between the attachment style developed by infants and the responsiveness of primary caregivers. Based upon their home-visit observations, the researchers discovered that mothers who were sensitive and responsive to their infants’ signals were associated with infants who developed a secure attachment relationship. The researchers also found that mothers who responded slowly or inconsistently to their infants, or mothers who regularly intruded upon their infants’ activities, say to force affection upon their infants, were associated with infants categorised as anxiously attached. Further, mothers who consistently rebuffed or rejected their infants’ attempts to establish contact were found by the researchers to be associated with infants categorised as avoidantly attached. Later research showed that the infants categorised as having a disorganised/disorientated attachment style were associated with primary caregivers who were psychologically disturbed, neglectful, or abusive (Main & Solomon, 1990), or who had unresolved grief from their own loss of an attachment figure, often when the caregivers themselves were quite young (Ainsworth & Eichberg, 1991).

Attachment theory holds that individuals may have numerous attachment figures that arise from the individual’s various relationships. Much of the early research on infant attachment was a product of its time and saw the mother as the primary caregiver and therefore the primary attachment figure too. Today, researchers conceptualise attachment figures to be select individuals to whom an individual turns for support and protection,
typically parents, grandparents, older siblings, and day-care workers when the individual is young, and relatives, teachers, close friends, romantic partners, and context specific people, such as therapists and managers/leaders, when the individual is older (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). This view is consistent with Bowlby’s original formulation that infants have a hierarchy of attachment figures, whereby some figures are more important than others (Bowlby, 1969). That said, not all interactions with such figures constitute an attachment interaction. Many interactions with attachment figures will simply be ordinary interactions without the attachment behavioural system being activated or the attachment bond being evident (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

2.3 Attachment Theory Underpinnings

Attachment theory explains both normative aspects of attachment processes—features observable in all people—and individual aspects of attachment processes that operate differently from person to person. Considering first the normative aspects, Bowlby (1969) proposed that attachment behaviours, such as vocalising distress, seeking proximity, and relaxing upon the provision of closeness and support, arise from an underlying hard-wired attachment behavioural system, just as caregivers’ reactions result from an innate caregiving behavioural system. He held that this motivational attachment behavioural system serves the specific biological function of protecting the individual, especially an infant, from danger and predators, thereby increasing the likelihood of the individual’s survival. More broadly, Bowlby believed that the attachment behavioural system serves an evolutionary role in the survival of the human species. Bowlby suggested that the attachment behavioural system remains active over the lifespan and that when threatened, adult humans, just like infants, will naturally seek to establish proximity to and contact with affectionate, trusted, and supportive attachment figures. He also proposed
that the loss of such proximity to be a natural source of distress and psychological
dysfunction. Bowlby held that environmental threats activate the system and that in the
absence of such threats, the system remains inactive. He also proposed that the attachment
behavioural system is triggered by natural clues to danger, that is, non-dangerous stimuli
such as darkness or loud noises, as well as attachment-related threats, such as the
anticipated loss of or the lack of access to an attachment figure. Bowlby believed
proximity seeking to be the natural and primary attachment strategy employed by
individuals when the attachment behavioural system has been activated and that the
strategy may comprise a variety of behaviours that each attempt to achieve or maintain
proximity to the attachment figure in response to a real or perceived threat. He believed
that individuals have a repertoire of such behaviours from which they derive the best
means of attaining protection or comfort given the specific situation. In infancy, such
proximity seeking behaviours are largely innate and include, for example, crying when
scared. In childhood, as relationships become more complex and varied, children learn to
use more sophisticated strategies, such as sharing their needs and feelings in an attempt to
have their attachment needs met. In adulthood, such strategies can further evolve to
include using mental representations of effective attachment figures to serve as symbolic
protection during times of danger. Bowlby held that all such behaviours aim to achieve a
sense of protection or security following a threat or distress, so that the attachment
behavioural system can be deactivated and the individual can turn his or her focus onto
other activities and interests (Bowlby, 1969). In this way, when an attachment relationship
works well, an individual learns that autonomy and relatedness are compatible states
(Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Bowlby (1969) also proposed that the cognitive data of the
attachment behavioural system comprises stored mental representations of both the self
and others, which he called working models. He held that working models enable
individuals to simulate and predict the likely outcomes from the various attachment
behaviours within their behavioural repertoire (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). The working
models reflect how people habitually see and deal with their relational world. They are not
simply copies of reality but are symbolic representations formulated over time on the basis
of adaptive significance (M. Cortina, 2001).

In addition to explaining normative features of the attachment system, Bowlby
(1969) also attempted to explain how individuals’ attachment systems come to be different.
Attachment theory assumes an inner organisation that is presumed to be rooted in
neurophysiological processes (Ainsworth, 1989). Bowlby held that this inner organisation
is changeable over time (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), being sensitive to environmental
influences, and that as a result, outwardly observable behavioural manifestations of the
system also change in the course of development (Ainsworth, 1989). In this way, although
nearly all children are born with a normal attachment system (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007),
the quality of their interactions with attachment figures during times of need becomes a
major source of individual difference in attachment system functioning (Mikulincer &
Shaver, 2007). When an individual’s proximity seeking results in felt security, the
individual’s secure base script, being that the world is generally safe, is upheld. However,
if an individual’s proximity seeking does not result in felt security, then the goal of the
system is not achieved. In such circumstances, the operating parameters of the system
must be adjusted and secondary attachment strategies may be adopted, such as
hyperactivation and deactivation of the attachment behavioural system (Main, 1990).
Hyperactivation strategies tend to be used by individuals whose attachment figures have
been unreliable and only intermittently responsive, and so these individuals have learned
that persistence occasionally pays off. This pattern can reinforce the intensity of the
individual’s proximity seeking such that the heightened level of demand can become both
natural and necessary from the individual’s perspective. In contrast, deactivation strategies tend to be used by individuals whose attachment figures have disapproved of or punished needs for proximity and closeness, and so these individuals have learned to expect better outcomes if they hide or suppress their proximity seeking signals. This pattern can suppress the individual’s proximity needs, resulting in a curbing of the attachment system in order to avoid the distress that results from attachment figure unavailability (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Bowlby (1969) believed that the responsiveness of relationship partners not only causes variations in current and recent interactions and but also enduring changes in the functioning of the attachment behavioural system. The working models, although based upon past proximity seeking efforts, also bias the information stored as subsequent attachment interactions unfold. As a result, working models are amalgams of accurate information related to attachment relationships and subjective distortions due to defensive exclusion, a process designed to protect the individual from hurt and pain (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Bowlby (1973) held that working models are “tolerably accurate reflections of the experiences…individual’s have actually had” (p. 202). He believed that consistent experiences with attachment figures in infancy and childhood result in certain working models being activated more often than other working models, such that over time, the working models most prototypical of individuals’ interactions come to function automatically and beyond conscious awareness. He believed that as a result of their dominance, these particular working models are rolled out and applied to new relationships, at times despite evidence to the contrary, which in turn affects how these relationships unfold. He believed that in this way, individuals’ established expectations of how well or how poorly attachment needs are met become reinforced over time and that as
a result, individuals’ working models of attachment become resistant to change (Bowlby, 1979; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007)

2.4 Attachment Beyond Infancy

Although Bowlby’s primary focus was to explain the attachment of infants to their primary caregivers, he wrote that “attachment behaviour is held to characterize human beings from the cradle to the grave” (Bowlby, 1977, p. 203). In support of this, evidence is building to suggest that attachment processes do occur in relationships beyond infancy and into adulthood. That said, key differences are also held to exist between infant and adult attachment processes (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth et al. (1978) proposed that the attachment bond between infants and caregivers developed from infancy into childhood through four phases, and that the particular bond developed was influenced by the availability of the primary caregiver involved. Using the terminology of Ainsworth et al., infants in the pre-attachment phase, which occurs between birth and approximately two to three months of age, are without discrimination and willing to be soothed by almost anyone. Once able to discriminate amongst people, infants, typically aged between approximately two to six months, have moved into the attachment-in-the-making phase, which sees them begin to show preferences for receiving comfort from certain people over others. By around six to seven months of age, infants move into the clear-cut attachment phase, during which they direct their attachment preferences to select primary caregivers. Finally, when about two years old (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007) but possibly as old as three to four years (Ainsworth, 1989; Ainsworth et al., 1978), children move into the goal-corrected partnership phase, which sees them able to view things from their attachment figure’s point of view and thereby modify their attachment requests to account for caregivers’
availability. This fourth phase also sees infants able to endure longer periods of separation than they were able to endure in the prior three phases. Together, the four phases accompany growth in developmental processes such as speech, locomotion, and cognition, and as these processes mature, the child’s ability to venture farther away from his or her secure base also grows (Ainsworth, 1989).

A major shift in attachment is thought to take place at the onset of adulthood when young adults begin to seek out an age peer with whom they can form a romantic relationship (Ainsworth, 1989). Hazen and Shaver (1987), amongst the first researchers to explore attachment processes in adult romantic relationships, reported common features between infant-caregiver and romantic partner dyads, such as feeling safe when the other is nearby and insecure when the other is inaccessible, and proposed the attachment behavioural system to be a component of the emotional bond between romantic partners. They applied the three-category typology developed by Ainsworth et al. (1978) to adult romantic partners and found that people grouped by attachment style experienced romantic love in predictably similar ways. They also found that the representation of the typology categories approximated the frequencies found amongst infants (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Such findings led Hazen and Shaver to suggest that adult romantic relationships do indeed represent attachment relationships, a concept that has been well supported by subsequent research (e.g., Doherty & Feeney, 2004; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Shaver & Hazan, 1988; Zeifman & Hazan, 2008).

Although young adults may achieve new attachments and autonomy from parents when they form romantic relationships, their attachments to their parents, and possibly to their mothers in particular, do not disappear. The continued meaningful contact between adults and their parents and the level of grief experienced by adults following a parent’s death suggest that some level of attachment remains over the lifespan (Ainsworth, 1989;
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Cicirelli, 1983, 1995, 2010). Indeed, mothers in particular may remain as unique and irreplaceable attachment figures during adulthood (Cicirelli, 2004). Antonucci, Akiyama, and Takahashi (2004), using representative samples of individuals from both America and Japan, showed that individuals aged 21-39 years nominated their closest relationship to be that with their mother and their second closest to be that with their spouse, and that it was not until individuals were aged 40 years or more that they nominated their closest relationship to be that with their spouse. Their findings also showed that mothers continued to be nominated amongst the closest of relationships for individuals up to 59 years of age. Beyond this age, the importance of mothers fell away which, the researchers speculated, was likely due to the mothers having passed away. Such an ongoing attachment, when adults have likely moved out of home and established families of their own, may in part be due to adults’ capacities to develop symbolic attachment representations that enable them to maintain closeness with the mother, even when she is no longer a day-to-day presence (Cicirelli, 2004). The continued significance of the attachment to parents, despite the presence of a spouse or partner, may differ for individuals depending upon their attachment orientations. For example, Mayseless and Danieli (1996) found that college students with a secure attachment orientation appeared to better accomplish the task of separating from their parents and developing a significant romantic relationship than did students with an insecure attachment orientation.

In addition to romantic relationships and the continued attachments of adults to their parents, a number of other relationships are believed to constitute adult attachment relationships. These include sibling relationships (Doherty & Feeney, 2003; Fraley & Tancredy, 2012; Tancredy & Fraley, 2006), therapeutic relationships (Biringen, 1994; Bowlby, 1978; Byng-Hall, 1990; Meyer & Pilkonis, 2001) and leader-follower relationships in work-based contexts (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mayseless, 2010; Popper &
Mayseless, 2003). In addition, there is also evidence to support the existence of symbolically-based adult attachment relationships with unobservable abstract entities such as God (Cicirelli, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 1998) and, at least amongst adults suffering Alzheimer’s disease, deceased parents (Miesen, 1993). Finally, there is also evidence to suggest that for some adults, their relationships with their pet dogs (Kurdek, 2008, 2009) and assistance dogs (Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011) constitute attachment relationships. Researchers have also proposed that attachment processes influence a variety of adult experiences including bereavement (Parkes, 1991; Stroebe, Schut, & Stroebe, 2005) and adjustment to marital divorce (Yánoz-Yaben, 2010). Taken together, the idea that the attachment behavioural system operates beyond childhood into adulthood is well supported.

Although the attachment system operates similarly in adulthood as in childhood, infant and adult attachments are thought to differ in several ways. Infant attachments are uni-directional, in that the attachment figure provides security for the child but the child does not provide security for the attachment figure. In contrast, adult attachment relationships are typically reciprocal (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), although some leader-follower relationships, and certainly therapeutic relationships and abstract attachment relationships with entities such as God, are notable exceptions. Further, in childhood, attachment patterns are invariably visible, in that the interaction involves physical proximity or contact between the child and the attachment figure. In adulthood, however, attachment patterns can be representational, in that felt security can come from knowing that the attachment figure is accessible or from symbolically bringing the attachment figure to mind. Another difference is that in childhood, the attachment figure is invariably a parent, whereas in adulthood the attachment figure is invariably a peer (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), although again, exceptions exist.
2.5 Attachment Style Stability and Consistency

Although it is relatively well accepted that early attachment experiences influence adult attachment relationships, it is not as well accepted that an individual’s attachment orientation in adulthood mirrors that of infancy (Fraley, 2010). In other words, some researchers suspect that attachment orientation may not be stable over the life course or consistent across relationships. There are at least two areas of consideration. The first is whether people have the same attachment orientation over time in the course of any one relationship and the second is whether people have the same attachment orientation at any point in time across different relationships. Examining the first of these considerations, Bowlby (1973) believed that attachment continuity was primarily the result of persistent working models in the context of a fairly stable setting, the implication being that context instability may result in attachment orientation change. Fraley (2002) found a moderate degree of stability in attachment security across the first 19 years of life. Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, and Stenberg (1983) drew upon seven child development studies to suggest that on average, 32% of the children involved in the studies showed a change in attachment classification over time. Baldwin and Fehr (1995), using undergraduate student data from nine different samples, found that 30% of the data reflected a change in self-report attachment classification over a time span ranging from one week to several months. An interesting aspect of their findings was that classification change differed across attachment orientation groups. Specifically, students who classified themselves as having a secure orientation showed a 17% change, those who classified themselves as having an avoidant orientation showed a 34% change, and those who classified themselves as having an anxious-ambivalent orientation showed a 55% change. Considering older adults, Zhang and Labouvie-Vief (2004), using data from 370 relatively affluent individuals ranging in age from 15 to 87 years, found that attachment orientation was relatively stable over a
6-year period, but also that over time there was a significant age effect whereby older individuals became either more secure or in combination, more attachment-avoidant and less attachment-anxious, than did younger individuals. Consedine and Magai (2006, as cited in Magai, 2008), using data collected from 415 less affluent 72 year old adults, also found relatively stable attachment classifications, whereby 81.4% of individuals reported the same attachment classification over a 6-year period. However, in contrast to the results of Zhang and Labouvie-Vief (2004), they found a decrease in both attachment security and attachment avoidance over time. Magai (2008) speculated that the contrasting findings regarding attachment security and attachment avoidance may have been due to demographic and age range differences between the study samples and to the researchers having used different attachment measures. Other researchers have examined attachment stability by looking retrospectively over time. In this fashion, securely attached adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and undergraduates (Feeney & Noller, 1990) have been shown to have positive perceptions about their childhood relationships with their parents and their families. In addition, avoidantly attached undergraduates have been shown to be more likely to report separations from their mothers when young, whereas anxious-ambivalent undergraduates have been shown to be more likely to report a lack of independence when young (Feeney & Noller, 1990). Such results suggested that the individuals had attachment orientations later in life that were consistent with their experiences in childhood. Although such studies reflect a degree of attachment stability, some also reflect fluctuation, suggesting that under certain circumstances, change may occur (McConnell & Moss, 2011). A point in case for example, is the finding of Cozzarelli, Karafa, Collins, and Tagler (2003), that adult women suffering distress following an abortion procedure showed attachment orientation change rates as high as 46% over a 2-year period. Taken together,
such findings suggest that although attachment orientation appears to be relatively stable in adulthood, factors such as stress and age may influence its change over time.

The second aspect of attachment stability to consider is whether people have the same orientation across different relationships. Baldwin, Keelan, Fehr, Enns, and Koh-Rangarajoo (1996) have shown adults to hold relational schemas that represented a variety of attachment orientations. Consistent with this, Klohnen, Weller, Luo, and Choe (2005), using a sample of college-educated middle-class young adults, found that relationship-specific and general (i.e., non-relationship specific) attachment models shared between 34% and 65% of the variance in attachment orientation. Although this finding suggested consistency between relationship-specific and general internal working models of attachment representations, the findings also highlighted a substantial portion of variance that was not shared, in turn suggesting that the individuals had somewhat different attachment orientations for their different types of attachment relationships. Similarly, Fraley, Heffernan, Vicary, and Brumbaugh (2011), using an internet-sourced sample of over 21,000 individuals, found only moderate positive correlations between self-reported orientations on the attachment dimension of anxiety and separately on the attachment dimension of avoidance across the four relationship domains of mother, father, partner, and friend. In other words, individuals who reported avoidant attachment orientations with, for example their mothers, were only moderately as likely to report the same in the other three relationship domains. The researchers suggested that although common themes appeared to exist across individuals’ relationships, there were reasonable amounts of within-person variation.

On the one hand, it seems that attachment orientations may be reasonably stable over time and that people develop themes to their orientations. On the other hand, it appears that people may also develop different attachment orientations in different contexts.
or in response to various circumstances (Cozzarelli et al., 2003). In other words, although internal working models are considered resistant to change (Bowlby, 1979), they may be open to modification under certain circumstances (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), at least to the point where an individual may develop somewhat different working models for different contexts (Fraley et al., 2011). As with any cognitive structure, the usefulness of working models relies upon them being both stable and plastic. Stability enables working models to be used to predict likely outcomes while plasticity enables working models to be used to assimilate new information, the latter being essential if working models are to remain adaptive and useful (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). On the basis that the set goal of the attachment behavioural system is to achieve proximity and security, then the integration of information that moves individuals closer to this seems sensible. Bowlby (1973) proposed that the ability to think about and reflect upon one’s working models and the experience of a corrective relationship, one that provides consistent and reliable proximity and security, are conditions under which working models may change and attachment orientations may begin to diverge from those developed early in life. However, Fraley (2002) has suggested that a prototypic rather than revisionist perspective of attachment may better explain attachment orientations over the life course. The former holds that internal working models developed early in life, despite being updated by new events, remain relatively unchanged and continue to shape interpersonal dynamics throughout the lifespan. The latter holds that internal working models are revised over time such that later-life representations may or may not match those formed early in life. Therefore, from a prototypic perspective, although the attachment behavioural system may contain a variety of different internal working models that represent different attachment orientations within different contexts, these internal working models retain the hallmarks of those formed early in life (Fraley et al., 2011). In this way, although internal working models may be
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2.6 Self-Report Measurement of Adult Attachment

As the present study makes use of a self-report measure of adult attachment, the review of research presented here focuses on self-report measures rather than the two other methods commonly used to measure attachment, namely, narrative and interview techniques. For an overview of narrative and interview measures of adult attachment, see Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) and Cassidy and Shaver (2008).

The first measurement of individual differences in attachment began with Ainsworth and her use of a coding system for infant attachment. Many other measures of infant and child attachment followed that involved both categorisation of infant behaviour and self-report questionnaires for older children, all along the lines of Ainsworth’s three-category typology (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Hazen and Shaver (1987) were two of the first researchers to examine measurement of adult attachment and similarly used Ainsworth’s three-category typology. They developed a three-item self-report inventory where each statement represented one of Ainsworth’s three attachment categories—secure, avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent—and asked respondents to select the statement that best reflected their feelings and behaviours in relation to a romantic partner. The researchers found significant support for the applicability of Ainsworth’s three-category model to adult romantic relationships. However, they also acknowledged that their measure was psychometrically limited. Other researchers (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Simpson, 1990) attempted to improve on the Hazen and Shaver scale by developing instruments that, for example, increased the number of items by deconstructing the three used by Hazen and Shaver, added new items built from Bowlby’s and Ainsworth’s original formulations (Fraley, 2002).
formulations, or reduced the emphasis on romantic relationships. All succeeded in
developing scales that improved on the one developed by Hazen and Shaver.

The emphasis up to this point on Ainsworth’s categories had led researchers to
view attachment processes in terms of a typology, even though Bowlby had not formulated
attachment theory as such (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Bartholomew (1990) argued that
researchers had lost sight of Bowlby’s original formulation, being that working models
differ in terms of image of self and image of others, and proposed that both working
models could be viewed in terms of positive and negative levels. She proposed that the
working model of the self could represent oneself as either worthy of love (i.e., positive
self) or unworthy of love (i.e., negative self), and that the working model of others could
represent others as either trustworthy and available (i.e., positive other) or unreliable and
rejecting (i.e., negative other). She highlighted that combining the two levels of each
working model or dimension would result in four categories. She called these categories
secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful, and proposed that each represented a
theoretical prototype. Her model is depicted in Figure 1. The first prototype, secure,
indicated a sense of worthiness together with expectations that others are generally
accepting and responsive. The second prototype, preoccupied, reflected a sense of
personal unworthiness combined with a positive view that others are responsive, a
combination that would lead individuals to strive for self-acceptance by gaining the
acceptance of others. The third, fearful, also indicated a sense of personal unworthiness,
but was here combined with a negative view that others are untrustworthy and rejecting, a
combination that would lead individuals to avoid close relationships in order to avoid
being hurt from others’ rejections. The fourth and final prototype, dismissing, indicated a
sense of personal worthiness combined with the negative view that others are
untrustworthy and rejecting, a combination that would lead individuals to avoid close
relationships and to protect themselves from disappointment by maintaining a sense of independence from others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The latter three categories, that is, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful, have come to be referred to collectively as insecure.

Along with the use of an interview process, the four-item Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) was developed to test Bartholomew’s (1990) model. The researchers showed that the models of self and others varied independently. The two groups with negative models of self, that is, preoccupied and fearful, were similar on measures of personal insecurity but differed on measures indicating readiness for intimacy and reliance upon others. Conversely, the two groups with negative models of other, that is, dismissing and fearful, were similar on measures of being close to and relying upon others, but differed on measures indicating self-worth. It is noteworthy that the researchers also found that subjects reported a mix of tendencies across
time, both within and across relationships, and that many showed elements of two, three, and occasionally all four of the attachment categories. The individual variability amongst subjects led the researchers to suggest that future studies investigate the value of measuring attachment patterns not only in terms of the four categorical prototypes but also in terms of two continuous dimensions, and that these dimensions be conceptualised as the two axes that respectively represent dependency upon intimacy and avoidance of intimacy (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) argued that the four categories, despite having fuzzy boundaries, were important predictors of relationship outcomes that added to the predictive power of the two dimensions. However, Fraley and Waller (1998), using taxometric techniques, suggested that differences in adult attachment are best understood in terms of dimensions alone.

One of the first attempts to measure attachment using dimensions came from Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998). They combined a variety of then current self-report measures and distilled two continuous attachment dimension scales, which together they called the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECR). They proposed that the two 18-item scales, which they called anxiety and avoidance, were analogous to the two discriminant functions originally proposed by Ainsworth. They also allowed that attachment patterns could be defined in terms of a two-dimensional space that resulted in four attachment categories. However, they cautioned that power and precision were lost when using categories over continuous scales and that it was difficult to justify the use of categories when Fraley and Waller’s (1998) taxometric analyses showed no evidence to support their use. It has elsewhere been argued that the four attachment categories can easily be conceptualised as additive linear combinations of the two dimensions with no loss of conceptual precision (Fraley, Garner, & Shaver, 2000).
The ECR was further improved using item response theory. Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) found the sensitivity of discriminations across the full ranges of the two scales to be unequal, particularly at the secure ends of the two scales. To address this, they substituted some items with others taken from Brennan et al.’s (1998) large item pool and created the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R). The model underlying the measure, depicted in Figure 2, comprises four categories, namely, secure, preoccupied, dismissing-avoidant, and fearful-avoidant, that vary along two dimensions, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley, Waller, et al., 2000). The ECR-R comprises two 18-item scales that measure attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance in adults with items such as “I’m afraid that I will lose my partner’s

*Figure 2. Spatial representation of the two-dimensional space defined by attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Fraley, 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).*
love” in the case of anxiety and “I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down” in the case of avoidance. In terms of Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) regional model, the anxiety dimension relates to the model of self and the avoidance dimension relates to the model of others. Adults with high scores on the ECR-R anxiety scale are seen to worry about whether their partner is available, responsive, or attentive, whereas people with low scores are seen to feel more secure in relation to their partner’s responsiveness. Adults with high scores on the ECR-R avoidance scale are seen to prefer not to rely upon or open up to others, while those with low scores are seen as more comfortable being intimate with and depending upon others, and having others depend upon them. Adults with low scores on both these dimensions are seen to be secure in their attachments and are referred to as having secure attachment orientations or as being attachment-secure, whereas people with high scores on either dimension are seen to be insecure in their attachments and are referred to as having insecure attachment orientations or as being attachment-insecure (Fraley, Waller, et al., 2000).

There is now general consensus regarding the utility and structure of self-report measures of romantic attachment employing a dimensional approach (Feeney, 2008). The ECR-R is one such measure that has been both widely used in the context of romantic relationships and adapted for use in a variety of non-romantic relationship contexts (Fraley et al., 2011). Indeed, a recent derivation of the measure, the Experiences in Close Relationships–Relationship Structures questionnaire (ECR-RS; Fraley et al., 2011), has been developed to assess attachment orientations in specific, nominated relationships, such as those with one’s mother, father, partner, and best friend. The authors propose that the common trait-like approach to measuring attachment, whereby working models are assumed to be relatively influential across a wide array of relational contexts, may not
account for subtle differences in attachment orientation across contexts, and that the ECR-RS enables any such differences to be revealed.

Despite their popularity, the ECR family of questionnaires are not without their shortcomings or critics. The ECR and its derivations, like other self-report measures of attachment, have been criticised for their tendencies to be good at discriminating between people on the insecure end of each dimension but not those on the secure end of each dimension. The ECR-R’s focus on anxiety and avoidance may mean that attachment security is only discerned as the vague absence of the two factors (Fraley, Garner, et al., 2000; Fraley et al., 2011). In addition, Fossati et al. (2003) have shown using the Attachment Styles Questionnaire (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994) that in some contexts, five factors provide more complete information than the primary two. The researchers argue that although the two dimensions have provided a common base upon which to position research, the usefulness of more complex structures should not be ignored.

Having examined the concept of attachment from a variety of perspectives, the next chapter briefly introduces the concept of leadership. This then paves the way for the two concepts, attachment and leadership, to be brought together in the chapter thereafter.
Chapter 3: Leadership Theory

3.1 Chapter Overview

Having studied the concept of leadership for over six decades, Warren Bennis (2007) wrote that the topic remained “vast, amorphous [and] slippery” (p. 2), and that he was struck by how little of the amassed knowledge he felt sure about. He noted that a broader range of ideas was needed to augment understanding of leadership, and in response to this, Bresnahan and Mitroff (2007) proposed that leadership theories would be strengthened as a whole by the inclusion of attachment theory. In particular, they suggested that attachment theory’s formulation of internal working models (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000) would strengthen the theoretical footing of the leadership concept by furthering understanding of leaders’ internal processes (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007). To this end, an increasing number of research efforts have investigated leadership through the lens of attachment theory, with a particular emphasis on how attachment is associated with different leadership styles and in turn with various follower outcomes. However, almost as many definitions of leadership exist as there are scholars to propose them (Ancona, Kochan, Scully, Van Maanen, & Westney, 2005) and so before reviewing these efforts to broaden understanding of leadership using attachment theory, it is first appropriate to review the leadership theories that have been used in such studies.

To this end, this chapter briefly reviews the evolution of leadership theory and examines authentic leadership in particular, the leadership model employed in the present study. Given that authentic leadership is a relatively new leadership model, no research is known that has attempted to link it with attachment theory. For this reason, the chapter then compares authentic leadership with two other positive leadership models, transactional leadership and transformational leadership, both of which have been used
when examining the application of attachment theory to the leadership domain. This brief chapter, therefore, aims to introduce the leadership concept in preparation for the next chapter, which examines how leadership research has been augmented by attachment theory.

### 3.2 A Brief History of Leadership Theory Development

Despite decades of study, there is no grand unifying theory of leadership (Bennis, 2007). Instead, its evolution has seen key trends and prominent theories plot the course of its development. Leadership theory started with an emphasis on traits, upholding the idea that the makeup of the leader is of greatest importance to leadership. Up until the late 1940s, leadership research was dominated by work on physical traits, abilities, and personality characteristics (e.g., Hanawalt & Richardson, 1944; Richardson, 1948). Despite traits being important, they were also revealed as insufficient predictors of leadership effectiveness (Ancona et al., 2005). As a result, researchers shifted their interest onto leadership behaviours and styles in an attempt to explain how leaders influence the attitudes and performance of individual followers (Yukl, 2012). This included, for example, looking at task-orientation versus relationship-orientation, and autocratic versus democratic styles (e.g., Fleishman, 1953; House, 1996; Likert, 1961). By the 1960s and 1970s, researchers had come to look at contingency approaches to leadership that emphasised consideration of both task and context (Ancona et al., 2005). One notable theory within this orientation was situational leadership, a model that offered leaders a decision-tree approach that accounted for followers’ competence and commitment levels in the completion of any given task (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). By the early 1980s, the transactional leadership and transformational leadership models, first described by Max Weber in 1947, had been reintroduced into the leadership domain by Burns (1978). In
turn, Bass (1985) then built upon them to produce more contemporary versions. According to Bass (1985), transactional leadership aims to gain compliance from followers by appealing to followers’ self-interests in terms of rewards and punishments. In contrast, Bass held that transformational leadership emphasises achieving change by igniting the emotions and energy of followers. Because in his formulations Bass recognised that transformational leaders could be both good and evil, citing Hitler as an example of the latter (Ciulla, 2004), the model was criticised for its inclusion of charismatic elements (Barbuto, 1997). In response, Bass increased the emphasis on ethical elements in subsequent revisions (Ciulla, 2004), to the point where “in the leadership literature, transforming or transformational leadership has become almost synonymous with ethical leadership” (Ciulla, 2004, p. 316), a style of leadership which entails “the ability of leaders to sustain fundamental notions of morality such as care and respect for persons, justice, and honesty, in changing organizational, social, and global contexts” (Ciulla, 2004, p. 326). That said, transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and ethical leadership theory (Brown & Treviño, 2006) are distinct theories that make differential predictions. Although transformational leadership has become and remains a key focus of leadership study, spectacular corporate and government misconduct in the 2000s, affecting large organisations through to whole economies, led to the call for more genuine, transparent, and values-based leadership (Gardner et al., 2011; May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). This resulted in another focal shift for leadership research and amongst the various attempts to respond to this call, the theory-based model of authentic leadership was born.
3.3 Authentic Leadership

As a construct, personal authenticity can be traced back to ancient Greek philosophy through injunctions such as “To thine own self be true” and “Know thyself” (Harter, 2002). In line with these, modern formulations of authenticity see it as owning one’s personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, wants, preferences, or beliefs, and as acting in accord with one’s true self by expressing oneself in ways that are consistent with inner thoughts and feelings (Harter, 2002). The formulation is about being more or less authentic rather than viewing authenticity as an either/or condition (Erickson, 1995).

With such philosophical ideas at its core, authentic leadership theory aims to capture the essence of what is required to be an effective leader today. The model incorporates insights from positive organisational behaviour, transformational leadership, and ethical perspective taking (Gardner et al., 2011) and to date, over a dozen definitions have been proposed that attempt to capture the concept (Gardner et al., 2011). A recent formulation that addresses earlier definitional criticisms, describes authentic leadership as:

> a pattern of leader behaviour that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development (Walumbwa et al., 2008, p. 94).

At its core, this definition portrays authentic leadership as comprising four dimensions, namely, balanced processing, internalised moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness, a formulation which is generally supported in the literature (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Balanced processing refers to objectively analysing relevant information before making decisions. Internalised moral perspective refers to being guided
by one’s internal moral standards and using these to regulate one’s behaviour. Relational transparency refers to openly and appropriately sharing information and feelings, and thereby avoiding inappropriate displays of emotion. Self-awareness refers to demonstrating an understanding of one’s own strengths and weaknesses as well as demonstrating how one makes sense of the world (Avolio et al., 2009).

The concept of authentic leadership and its four dimensions were operationalised by Walumbwa et al. (2008). They created and tested a measure called the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ), and using participants from America, Kenya, and China, demonstrated that the four dimensions described above could be represented by unique and reliable scales. They also found the four scales loaded onto one higher-order factor, which they named authentic leadership. They showed that the ALQ predicted important work-related attitudes and behaviours, such as organisational citizenship behaviour, organisational commitment, and follower satisfaction with supervisor, better than did measures of ethical and transformational leadership, and showed the authentic leadership model to be a construct separate from both the transformational and ethical leadership models. They also showed authentic leadership to be positively associated with follower job satisfaction and supervisor-rated follower job performance, and concluded that the construct was meaningful in terms of legitimate organisational metrics (Avolio et al., 2009; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

### 3.4 Transactional Leadership and Transformational Leadership

Although the initial evidence to support the validity of the authentic leadership construct has been promising, the concept is still in its early stages of development. As a result, relatively little of the leadership literature, and virtually none that links to attachment theory, examines authentic leadership. Much of the literature that explores the
relationship between attachment and leadership uses instead the transactional and transformational leadership models or refers to personalised versus socialised leadership. It is therefore worth briefly comparing these various formulations of leadership with authentic leadership so that the relationship between attachment and authentic leadership, to be presented shortly, can be more clearly understood.

Transactional leadership entails an exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers receive certain valued outcomes (e.g., wages, prestige) when they act in accord with leaders’ wishes (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership theories hold that leader-follower relationships involve a series of exchanges or implicit bargains between the two parties. These theories also hold that when the job or environment fail to provide followers with the necessary motivation, direction, or satisfaction, leaders will clarify what is expected from followers and what they can expect in return (Bass, 1985; House, Woycke, & Fodor, 1988). This model of leadership therefore, can be conceptualised as a transactional or cost-benefit exchange process.

If transactional leaders motivate followers to perform in exchange for certain rewards, then transformational leaders attempt to inspire followers to go beyond expectations for the greater good. Transformational leadership theories hold that leader behaviours influence follower emotions, motivations, and emotional attachment to the leader (Burns, 1978; House et al., 1988). Under such leadership, followers closely identify with leaders, join with leaders in a shared vision of the future, and focus beyond their personal cost-benefit interests to instead consider the greater good that is possible (Hater & Bass, 1988). Such leaders share a vision of the future that stimulates followers to engage (Yammarino & Bass, 1988). Burns (1978) held that the transactional and transformational leadership styles are mutually exclusive, whereas Bass (1985) argued that both approaches are linked to the achievement of some goal or objective. He held that transformational
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Leadership is a special case of transactional leadership even though the styles differ in terms of the processes by which the respective leaders motivate followers and the types of goals the leaders set with followers (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Bass (1985) translated Burns’s (1978) work on transformational leadership, applying it to organisational settings (Brown & Treviño, 2006), and with others created a multi-dimensional transformational leadership construct (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Over time, research efforts and theory refinements (Barbuto, 2005) have resulted in the construct being conceptualised as comprising five components, namely, idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, and attributed charisma (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Idealised influence refers to leaders placing followers’ needs ahead of their own needs, acting in ways that do the right thing by followers, and displaying high standards of ethical and moral conduct. Inspirational motivation refers to leaders providing meaning and challenge that followers find motivating and inspiring. Intellectual stimulation refers to leaders reframing problems, approaching situations in new and novel ways, and encouraging followers to question assumptions. Individualised consideration refers to leaders paying attention to followers’ needs by creating learning opportunities for them, coaching and mentoring them, and fostering their growth (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Finally, attributed charisma refers to followers’ perceptions of leaders’ power and confidence levels and the value of leaders’ ideas (Boyett, 2006). Some scholars, however, claim that attributed charisma reflects followers’ attributions rather than leaders’ behaviours (Walumbwa et al., 2008), and is incompatible with transformational ideals (Barbuto, 1997; Hunt, 1999). They therefore debate its inclusion in the transformational leadership construct (Walumbwa et al., 2008).
3.5 Authentic leadership and Transformational Leadership

Authentic leadership is considered more akin to transformational leadership than it is to transactional leadership, and the two are regarded to share considerable overlap (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Consideration of the first four components of transformational leadership alone reveals considerable overlap between it and the thrust of authentic leadership. Factors such as attending to and addressing followers’ needs, implementing high standards of ethical and moral conduct, questioning assumptions, being open to new ways of doing things, and creating meaning and growth opportunities for others are common to both approaches. However, it has also been contended that authentic leadership is more solidly associated than transformational leadership with leaders who have a strong sense of themselves in terms of their values, their beliefs, and where they stand on important issues, and with leaders who convey their internalised moral perspective both in terms of how they act and in what they say. Also, authentic leaders are thought to select roles that enable them to act congruently with their own moral code while also acting to serve their organisation. Authentic leaders are also likely to be more transparent than transformational leaders and as a result, to rely upon this aspect of their style to generate change and transformation rather than rely upon painting visions of the future and being charismatic. Certainly, transformational leaders may have a deep sense of their ethical values just as authentic leaders have. However, some scholars have questioned this and consequently coined the term authentic transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999) in an attempt to distinguish between pseudo and genuine transformational leadership approaches. Despite this, it has been argued that even authentic transformational leaders may need to be manipulative for the common good, which authentic leadership proponents contend goes against the very core of the authentic leadership concept. So although there appears to be overlap between the two constructs,
enough conceptual differences exist to warrant each being considered a distinct leadership style in its own right (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Having briefly introduced the concept of leadership, the next chapter examines attachment in the workplace and brings together what is known about attachment, introduced in the first chapter, and leadership, as just presented.
Chapter 4: Attachment in the Workplace

4.1 Chapter Overview

Much of leadership theory and the associated research has focussed on the transactional elements of the process, such as contingency and reward (Bass, 1985). However in recent years, researchers have come to recognise the importance of the affective aspects of leadership and leader-follower relationships (Popper & Mayseless, 2003), and in an attempt to better understand and explain these aspects, have turned their attention to attachment theory (Mayseless, 2010). So as to describe what is known about such affective workplace aspects, the current chapter first overviews how attachment dynamics are proposed to manifest in the leader-follower relationship. Next, the chapter presents research that demonstrates associations between leader attachment orientation and followers’ perceptions of both leadership potential and leadership effectiveness. This is then followed by an examination of how followers’ own attachment orientations may colour their perceptions of leadership. The chapter then examines how both followers’ and leaders’ attachment orientations influence followers’ work experiences. As no known empirical studies exist that examine attachment in relation to authentic leadership, the final section of this chapter reviews theoretical predictions of how leaders’ and followers’ attachment orientations may be associated with authentic leadership, drawing upon research that has connected attachment with other leadership models.

4.2 Attachment Dynamics in the Leader-Follower Relationship

Drawing upon Freud’s metaphor of the leader as a father, Popper and Mayseless (2003) proposed that leader-follower relationships function in many respects as attachment relationships. They proposed that like parents, leaders guide, direct, take charge of, and
look after others less powerful than themselves, where the fate of the others is highly
dependent upon the leaders, just as the fate of infants is highly dependent upon parents. In
other words, effective leaders, just like security-enhancing attachment figures, are likely to
be available and sensitive to their followers’ needs and able to provide them with a secure
base and a safe haven, both key tenets of attachment theory (Popper & Mayseless, 2003).
Researchers have referred to these leadership processes as evoking attachment dynamics
rather than necessarily a full-blown attachment relationship (Mayseless, 2010; Mayseless
& Popper, 2007). These dynamics are seen as normal components of the attachment
behavioural system and to reflect the increasingly diverse people, including leaders, with
whom adults form attachments (Mayseless, 2010). Attachment dynamics are likely to be
aroused during times of threat and when other forms of safety and comfort are insufficient
or unavailable (Mayseless, 2010). At such times, adults wanting to achieve felt security
with their leader may seek proximity by either connecting with the leader directly or by
using symbolic cognitive methods that do not require direct contact. In turn, followers
have the opportunity to become better, stronger, and wiser adults under the guidance and
support of a stronger and wiser leader, just as children are more likely to become high-
functioning adults if under the guidance of effective parents (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).
Popper and Mayseless (2003) have suggested that creating a sense of attachment security
amongst followers is the main method leaders have at their disposal to empower followers
and enhance followers’ levels of self esteem, competence, and well being. Conversely,
leaders’ inabilities and unwillingness to respond sensitively to followers’ needs may
provoke hyperactivation or deactivation of the attachment behavioural system, which in
turn results in followers becoming, respectively, increasingly anxious about or detached
from their leaders (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).
4.3 Leader Attachment and Leadership Effectiveness

Individuals with secure attachment orientations appear to be better placed to become effective leaders than individuals with insecure attachment orientations. Qualities associated with secure attachment, including self-confidence, empathy, and caring, together with positive models of the self and others, support leaders’ capacities to focus fully and accurately on followers’ needs and to meet followers’ safe haven and secure base desires (Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Leaders who have an anxious attachment orientation may be hampered by their preoccupation with their own unmet attachment needs and their desires for attention, acceptance, and closeness (Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). They may intrude upon followers and foster followers’ dependence upon them, even when not desired or required by followers (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Their negative models of self may result in self-doubts about their leadership effectiveness, in turn arousing anxiety amongst followers who may respond to perceptions of leadership weakness with disapproval and rejection (Keller, 2003; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In contrast, leaders with an avoidance attachment orientation, characterised by avoiding closeness and interdependence, may be hampered by their insensitivity toward others and their struggles to rely upon followers (Mayseless, 2010), in turn undermining followers’ competence levels and growth (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Their negative models of others may keep them isolated from followers and lead them to misread followers’ needs and concerns (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), which in turn may result in followers feeling disenfranchised with and unsupported by such leaders.

Numerous studies have supported the proposal that leadership potential and leadership effectiveness are more closely associated with secure attachment orientations than with insecure attachment orientations. Looking longitudinally, Englund, Levy,
Hyson, and Sroufe (2000) found that secure attachment orientations, as assessed in infancy, were associated with more positive leadership ratings at 15 to 16 years of age, where the leadership ratings were completed by others blind to the adolescents’ developmental histories. Along similar lines, Scharf and Mayseless (2009) found amongst a sample of early adolescents that self-reported attachment security with peers was associated with social leadership qualities as assessed by teachers, mediated via adolescents’ pro-social interpersonal skills. Mikulincer and Florian (1995) found that military recruits who described themselves as securely attached were nominated more frequently by colleagues as having the qualities required to be good leaders than were recruits who described themselves as anxiously attached. This finding was replicated in a larger study of 402 Israeli soldiers, whereby soldiers who reported secure attachment orientations were nominated more often by peers and commanders as possessing leadership potential than were soldiers who reported insecure attachment orientations (Popper, Amit, Gal, Mishkal-Sinai, & Lisak, 2004). Along a similar vein, Popper et al. (2000) found that securely attached Israeli military officer cadets and commanders were associated with higher levels of transformational leadership than were insecurely attached individuals. Assessments of leadership potential amongst students have also shown comparable findings. Berson, Dan, and Yammarino (2006) found that American management students ranked the leadership potential of their securely attached team members more highly than they ranked the leadership potential of their insecurely attached colleagues. In addition, Towler (2005) found that securely attached undergraduate students were associated with higher levels of charismatic leadership than insecurely attached students. Extending such findings into hospital, manufacturing, and banking contexts, Grosvenor and Boies (2006) found amongst employees that leaders perceived as
transformational tended also to be perceived as securely attached and that leaders perceived as less transformational were more likely to be perceived as insecurely attached.

Finally, further studies have examined attachment as it relates to personalised and socialised leadership styles. A personalised style of leadership involves leaders being dictatorial and putting their own interests ahead of their followers’ needs. In contrast, a socialised style of leadership involves leaders using their power to assist and empower others, aligning their own vision with followers’ needs and aspirations, and respecting followers’ rights and feelings. Popper (2002) found that leaders’ avoidant attachment orientations were associated with lower levels of socialised leadership and higher levels of personalised leadership. Popper suggested that leaders’ avoidant attachment orientations may interfere with their capacities to adopt a more caring leadership style, focussed upon followers’ needs. Consistent with this is the finding of Davidovitz et al. (2007), being that in both military and non-military settings, leaders’ insecure attachment orientations were associated with personalised leadership styles more than they were with socialised leadership styles. Also consistent with this is Johnston’s (2000) research which showed that insecurely attached leaders were less likely than secure ones to delegate responsibility and power to followers, and more likely to create centralised authority structures.

Taken together, such findings support the conception that securely attached individuals are better placed for leadership and more likely to be preferred by followers than leaders with an insecure attachment style. Davidovitz et al. (2007) proposed that this configuration is because attachment-anxious leaders may be preoccupied with their needs for approval and security, may have a tendency to adopt a dictatorial leadership style and may lack confidence in their leadership abilities, particularly in relation to their capacity to support followers to complete task related job activities. They also suggested that attachment-avoidant leaders may be preoccupied with demonstrating their self-reliance and
superiority, may have a tendency to ignore the supportive and caring aspects of their leadership role and may have doubts about their leadership in terms of supporting followers with their emotional needs. Further, Davidovitz et al. (2007) suggested that such findings parallel the attachment-related behaviours observed in both the caregiver-infant and adult romantic partner dyads, suggesting that attachment orientation shows itself in similar ways across different kinds of relationships.

4.4 Follower Attachment and Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness

Although it seems clear that followers prefer leaders with secure rather than insecure attachment orientations, followers’ preferences are likely to be influenced by followers’ own attachment orientations. Berson et al. (2006) found that different leadership style preferences were associated with the attachment orientations of American college graduates, whereby securely attached graduates when compared with their insecurely attached counterparts, viewed ideal leadership as more relationship-oriented. Along similar lines, Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, VanDerWege, and Huber (2010), using data collected from 617 workers in a retail organisation, examined attachment orientations and leadership style preferences, where the data in relation to the latter concept were collected in terms of task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours. Task-oriented leadership was described as involving behaviours such as directing work, establishing strategies for task completion, and structuring workplace controls, whereas relationship-oriented leadership was described as involving behaviours such as establishing warmth and rapport, collaborating, and being concerned for followers’ needs. Boatwright et al. examined attachment in a more finely tuned way than did Berson et al., and as a result found more complex relationships between attachment orientation and leadership preferences. Boatwright et al. found that workers with secure (i.e., low anxiety and low
avoidance) attachment orientations reported significantly higher ideal preferences for relationship-oriented leadership than did workers with dismissive (i.e., high avoidance) attachment orientations, and that workers with a preoccupied attachment orientation (i.e., high anxiety) expressed significantly stronger ideal preferences for relationship-oriented leadership than did workers with either dismissive or fearful (i.e., high anxiety and high avoidance) attachment orientations. They found no significant differences in relationship-oriented leadership preferences between workers who had (a) secure and preoccupied attachment orientations, (b) secure and fearful attachment orientations, and (c) dismissive and fearful attachment orientations. The findings led the researchers to suggest that different leadership approaches may be deemed by followers as more or less ideal depending upon followers’ own attachment orientations.

Along similar lines, but instead looking specifically at transformational and transactional leadership, Hansbrough (2012) presented undergraduate students with a video showing a leader giving a speech. The leader was unknown to the students and the presentation had been selected for its objective lack of transformational leadership qualities. Hansbrough found that students with anxious attachment orientations attributed significantly more transformational leadership qualities to the leader than did students with avoidant attachment orientations. Yet, Hansbrough found no such differences between anxiously attached and avoidantly attached students in their attribution of transactional leadership qualities to the leader. Her findings led her to suggest that anxiously attached followers may be predisposed to judge leaders as capable of meeting followers’ anxious attachment needs, something more likely of transformational leaders than of transactional leaders. Her results suggested that followers’ own attachment styles may bias their perceptions of others’ leadership styles and capabilities.
Rather than use hypothetical or laboratory-based methods, other researchers have used in situ methods to investigate differences in followers’ perceptions of leadership given their own attachment orientations. Davidovitz et al. (2007) found amongst soldiers that the stronger the soldiers’ avoidant attachment orientations, the more the soldiers judged officers to display personalised rather than socialised leadership behaviours and the more they generated negative rather than average appraisals of officers. In contrast, less avoidant soldiers judged the officers as secure and to display socialised leadership behaviours. Taken together, these various laboratory and in situ findings suggest that preferences for and perceptions of leadership style are influenced by followers’ own attachment orientations.

4.5 Follower Attachment and Follower Work Experiences

An individual’s ability to work effectively involves a variety of skills and attributes, including the capacity to develop alternatives, refine one’s skills, adjust to change, and practise conscientiousness and self-control, as well as the capacity to communicate, negotiate, and adapt. Work effectiveness in turn, is likely to contribute to individuals’ levels of positive mental health and adjustment, just as ineffectiveness in this realm is likely to lead to distress and emotional turmoil. As a result, one’s attachment orientation is likely to affect one’s experiences of work and the workplace (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), and research into adult attachment has found this to be the case. One of the first such investigations was carried out by Hazen and Shaver (1990). Surveying newspaper readers, they found that those who recorded secure attachment orientations had more positive attitudes toward work and fewer work-related problems than did those readers who reported insecure orientations. Compared with those who reported an insecure attachment orientation, individuals with a secure attachment orientation reported
more satisfaction with work and fewer tendencies to allow their work to interfere with their relationships. They found that attachment-anxious individuals tended to be preoccupied with worries related to disapproval and rejection due to poor performance, so much so that it interfered with their effectiveness. Interestingly, attachment-anxious individuals were associated with lower salaries, even after controlling for gender and education.

Attachment-avoidant individuals tended to use work to avoid social connections and were less able to balance work with other non-work activities. Hardy and Barkham (1994) found amongst depressed individuals who were receiving psychological treatment for work stress, that those with an anxious/ambivalent attachment orientation reported anxiety about work performance and work relationships, whereas those with an avoidant attachment orientation reported concerns about work hours and non-work relationship difficulties. Pines (2004) found across five different studies that attachment-secure and attachment-insecure individuals were, respectively, less likely and more likely to experience burn out. Pines also found that attachment-avoidant individuals were less likely to talk about their problems and more likely to leave the situation.

Associations between follower attachment orientation and job satisfaction have been well shown. Sumner and Knight (2001) using a large sample of university employees, found that securely attached individuals reported higher levels of job satisfaction while anxiously attached individuals reported significantly lower levels of job satisfaction. In a broad survey of the workplace, Hazan and Shaver (1990) found that securely attached individuals reported significantly higher satisfaction with most aspects of their workplace (e.g., co-workers, job security, recognition). Secure individuals were also less likely to report hostile outbursts in the workplace, were less prone to psychosomatic illnesses, and less prone to experiencing actual physical illnesses. Similarly, in a sample consisting mostly of computer software workers, securely attached individuals reported
higher levels of work satisfaction and various other aspects of their jobs (Krausz, Bizman, & Braslavsky, 2001). More specifically, Schirmer and Lopez (2001) found that low attachment anxiety and high attachment avoidance amongst university employees best predicted job satisfaction. Of interest is their finding that, after controlling for followers’ perceptions of supervisor support, work stress was predicted by followers’ attachment anxiety and avoidance orientations. Although the researchers did not measure leader attachment per se, perceptions of support could be considered a proxy for attachment orientation, given that elsewhere, leaders’ abilities to provide support to followers has been shown to depend upon leaders’ attachment orientations. From this, Schirmer and Lopez proposed that workers who were less anxious about interpersonal rejection and less invested in forming close relationships were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs.

Considering job burnout, Ronen and Mikulincer (2009) found that higher levels of burnout were related to insecure attachment orientations amongst non-managerial workers from a variety of private sector business organisations in Israel. Specifically, they found that the link between attachment avoidance and burnout was fully mediated by negative perceptions of organizational fairness, and separately, that the link between attachment anxiety and burnout was partially mediated by negative perceptions of team cohesion. Taken together, the findings from these numerous studies suggest that one’s own attachment insecurities contribute to poor adjustment in the workplace.

4.6 Impact of Leader Attachment upon Follower Work Experiences

Despite the significance of the findings presented above, it could be argued that they fail to account for a key variable that affects followers’ workplace experiences, that is, leader attachment orientation. Davidovitz et al. (2007) found in the Israeli military that officers’ attachment-avoidant orientations had a detrimental effect upon soldiers’ group
cohesion and socio-emotional functioning, and that this was mediated by officers’ lack of socialised leadership behaviours and their poor dealings with soldiers’ emotional needs. The researchers suggested that officers’ attachment-avoidant orientations may alienate and demoralise soldiers, reduce their enthusiasm for each other and for team tasks, and leave soldiers feeling dissatisfied—not too dissimilar from avoidant spouses’ effects upon their partners’ feelings. By comparison with attachment-avoidant orientations, officers’ attachment-anxious orientations appeared to have more complex effects upon soldiers’ functioning. Davidovitz et al. found officers’ attachment-anxious orientations had a negative effect upon soldiers’ instrumental functioning, that is, task completion, which the researchers found to be mediated by officers’ poor dealings with task-related situations.

The researchers suggested that officers’ attachment anxiety and self-doubts eroded soldiers’ confidence levels in their own instrumental abilities. In contrast, officers’ attachment-anxious orientations were associated with positive effects upon group cohesion and soldiers’ socio-emotional functioning. The researchers interpreted officers’ emphases on closeness and interdependence as being helpful for followers. They speculated that soldiers may defend against their officers’ anxieties and worries by themselves promoting group cohesion. They also proposed that such officers may divert soldiers’ attentions from task-related functions onto relational functions because of the officers’ own attachment insecurities.

Other work, although limited, has also attempted to examine the effect of leader attachment on follower work experience. Ronen and Mikulincer (2012) found amongst workgroups sourced from 71 different organisations in Israel, that leader attachment anxiety was positively associated with job burnout and negatively associated with job satisfaction amongst followers, mediated by leaders’ hyperactivated caregiving behaviours. Interestingly, and inconsistent with what might be expected based upon the work of
Davidovitz et al. (2007), leader attachment avoidance showed no significant associations with follower job satisfaction or burnout. Consistent with research noted earlier, they further found that followers’ attachment insecurities were associated with their own burnout and job dissatisfaction. It seems therefore that followers’ own attachment orientations influence their levels of job satisfaction and burnout, but that leaders’ attachment insecurities, particularly in terms of the anxiety dimension, also influence followers’ workplace experiences.

Given it appears that both follower and separately leader attachment orientations influence follower workplace experiences, it may be that the various combinations of the two attachment orientations present in any leader-follower relationship manifest in distinct ways. Not all leaders will have a secure attachment orientation and therefore the dynamics of that orientation at their disposal when performing their leadership role (Mayseless, 2010). Similarly, followers, just like leaders, will have attachment orientations that represent the spectrum of the anxiety and avoidance dimensions. As a result, the attachment orientations of leaders and followers may combine to create distinct and dynamic interplays that influence followers’ experiences of the leader and the workplace. In an early attempt to describe how such dynamic interplays may unfold and the impact of these interplays upon the individuals involved, Keller (2003) speculated that pairings of anxious with avoidant attachment orientations in the leader-follower relationship would be ineffective, but that pairings of the same orientation, such as anxious with anxious, may be more tolerable although still potentially troublesome. Relatively little research exists that attempts to explain such attachment interplays and their subsequent outcomes, but the little that does exist indicates greater complexity than Keller initially proposed.

Davidovitz et al. (2007) found that insecurely attached soldiers as opposed to securely attached soldiers reported significant deteriorations in their mental health after
being led by attachment-avoidant officers for two months. In other words, the negative effects of attachment-avoidant officers upon the mental health of soldiers were moderated by the soldiers’ own attachment orientations. Specifically, the more avoidant the officer, the more the mental health of the insecurely attached soldiers deteriorated (Davidovitz et al., 2007), similar to findings observed to occur in the mental health of children and adolescents of insecurely attached parents (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In contrast, secure soldiers were able to maintain their levels of mental health despite being led by attachment-avoidant officers. It appeared that these soldiers’ attachment securities and the accompanying mental models they carried buffered them from the negative effects of avoidant officers. However, the researchers found that after reporting to the attachment-avoidant officers for four months, securely attached soldiers, like their insecure counterparts, reported deteriorations in their mental health. The researchers suggested that the protective aspects of soldiers’ secure attachment orientations initially buffered them from the negative effects of officers’ avoidant orientations, but that as the problems continued, their secure attachments no longer afforded them such protection. Although the military represents a dangerous and stressful context, the findings of Davidovitz et al. suggested an interplay between the attachment orientations of leaders and followers. Of interest was the finding that officers’ and soldiers’ avoidance preferences were independent and contributed additively to soldiers’ functioning. Hence, the poorest functioning was shown to occur when avoidant soldiers and avoidant officers were paired, counter to Keller’s (2003) earlier speculations.

Together, the research presented above provides considerable support for the idea that the leader-follower relationship constitutes an attachment relationship and also that follower workplace experience, of which job satisfaction is one factor, is influenced by both follower and leader attachment orientation. Research suggests that effective
leadership is associated with the transformational leadership and socialised leadership styles, which in turn are more closely associated with attachment security. Research also suggests that leader attachment security results in better workplace experiences and outcomes for followers. The research additionally shows that leader attachment insecurity results in less positive workplace experiences for followers, which in some circumstances can even become harmful to followers’ mental health. Together these findings justify the inclusion of attachment theory in research that aims to deepen our understanding of effective leadership.

4.7 Attachment and Authentic Leadership

Given that interest in the authentic leadership theory is growing, it is important to consider how attachment may deepen our understanding of leaders’ abilities to adopt the authentic leadership principles. Unfortunately, no published systematic study has investigated the relationships between the attachment and authentic leadership concepts. However, given the tenets of authentic leadership, it has been proposed that authentic leadership will be aligned with secure attachment (Hinojosa & Davis, 2010), as are transformational and other socialised leadership styles.

The argument for an alignment between authentic leadership and attachment security is based upon the idea that significant overlaps exist between attachment theory and many of the elements of authentic leadership. In relation to the authentic leadership dimension called self-awareness, attachment-secure adults are capable of reflecting upon both the positive and negative aspects of their actions and behaviours within their attachment relationships, whereas attachment-insecure adults struggle with this. Such differences have been demonstrated by Main, Kaplan, and Cassidy (1985) using the Adult Attachment Inventory. They showed that when reporting on relationships, secure adults
demonstrated balanced reflections, whereas attachment-anxious adults contradicted themselves and attachment-avoidant adults reflected only superficial memories. In terms of the authentic leadership dimension called relational transparency, studies of romantic relationships have shown that secure individuals are more likely to self-disclose and more able to elicit disclosure from others than are insecure individuals (Keelan, Dion, & Dion, 1998). In other words, secure individuals are more transparent in their relationships than are insecure individuals. In relation to the authentic leadership dimension called balanced processing, attachment-secure individuals are less likely to process information in biased ways when compared to their attachment-insecure counterparts. Attachment-anxious individuals tend to intensify their problems and attachment-avoidant individuals tend to suppress their problems, which lead both to process information in biased ways (Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, Fleming, & Gamble, 1993). Certainly, research suggesting that insecure adults tend to focus upon their own needs over the needs of others supports the notion that insecurely attached leaders may have less balanced information at their disposal than do securely attached leaders, the latter being more able to focus their attention toward others and gather more balanced information accordingly. Further, Kobak et al. (1993) found that during problem solving tasks, securely attached individuals were able to express their opinions without keeping their attachment figure from expressing their own, unlike insecure individuals who were more likely to become angry. Research indicates, therefore, that securely attachment individuals are more likely and more able to engage in balanced processing than insecurely attachment individuals. And finally, with regard to the authentic leadership dimension called internal moral perspective, secure individuals have been shown to be more likely than insecure individuals to be active problem solvers who are able to compromise and use constructive conflict strategies that reflect concern for both their own interests and those of the relationship (Lin, 2003; O'Connell Corcoran &
Mallinckrodt, 2000; Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1995). Although such behaviour is not moral in and of itself, it demonstrates a desire to use fair and reasonable conflict resolution strategies, which may reflect an internal moral code encompassing fairness and balance.

Given the alignments noted between authentic leadership and secure attachment, many of the findings that associate secure attachment with both transformational and socialised leadership styles are similarly likely to apply to authentic leadership. From a theoretical perspective, Hinojosa and Davis (2010) proposed that leaders’ attachment styles influence the extent to which leaders engage in authentic leadership behaviours and that followers’ attachment styles will influence how followers perceive and respond to leaders’ authenticity levels. In particular, they proposed that follower attachment style will influence how correctly or not followers perceive leaders to be authentic, and that increased authenticity will be possible when the leader-follower relationship is characterised by a secure attachment style. Although their proposals were theoretical, they drew upon a range of research findings to explain their hypotheses.

Having examined how the concepts of attachment and leadership play out in the workplace, the next chapter introduces the present study’s aims and hypotheses.
Chapter 5: The Present Study

5.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter provides the aims of the present study and the rationale behind each. The aims have been broadly grouped into two categories—context and study sample aims and research aims. In relation to the latter, this chapter goes on to list the research questions that lead from each aim and presents each of the specific hypotheses associated with each research question.

5.2 Context and Study Sample Aims

The present study aimed to achieve three context and study sample aims. The first was to position the study within a real in situ workplace context. Based upon the aforementioned research, many of the studies that have examined attachment relationships between leaders and followers have utilised samples from university or college settings (e.g., Towler, 2005). In addition, numerous studies in educational settings have employed laboratory-based or hypothetical settings rather than real situations (e.g., Hansbrough, 2012). Such contexts are unlikely to represent typical workplace environments and therefore may not accurately reflect actual leader-follower relationships. The second aim was to use not only an in situ context, but one that was typical of many conventional workplaces. Some of the research to date has taken place in military environments (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper, 2002; Popper et al., 2000), which are likely to be more stressful and emotionally charged than the average workplace setting. Similarly, workplace settings are likely to be more emotionally charged than the equivalent amongst student populations, given that leaders within workplace teams will have significantly more position-power over followers than do leaders within student teams. For example,
workplace leaders may determine whether followers remain employed, but student leaders in educational settings are unlikely to influence the grades received by fellow students or whether fellow students remain enrolled in their courses of study. Given that most people are employed in settings that are not reflective of military or student settings, the present study sought to investigate the influence of leaders’ attachment orientations upon followers’ work experiences using a sample derived from a more representative workplace. The third and final aim was to ensure that women were adequately represented in the sample. Some of the related in situ research, particularly that in military contexts, predominantly involved men. For example, two of the three studies reported by Davidovitz et al. (2007) used all-male samples, while the third of their studies used a sample of 200 participants, of whom only 23 were women. By representing a more balanced proportion of men to women in the sample, the present study would more accurately reflect the everyday work environments that are typical of most workers.

An additional important element of the present study was also to obtain matched group data, where leaders and followers completed their own questionnaires and provided their perceptions of both themselves and of their leaders, in the context of an ongoing, paired working relationship.

5.3 Research Aims

Based upon the research findings presented in the previous chapters, the present study sought to achieve four research aims. The first was to explore any connections between leader attachment orientation and the practice of authentic leadership, from the perspectives of both the leader and follower. Given that research has shown both transformational leadership qualities and socialised leadership styles to be related to leaders’ attachment security rather than attachment insecurity (e.g., Grosvenor & Boies,
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2006; Popper et al., 2000; Scharf & Mayseless, 2009; Towler, 2005), and separately that authentic leadership has both conceptual and actual overlap with transformational leadership (e.g., Walumbwa et al., 2008), it is reasonable to expect that authentic leadership would be associated with individuals who show secure rather than insecure attachment orientations. In addition, research has shown that follower-perceptions of leadership style are influenced by followers’ own attachment orientations (e.g., Berson et al., 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010; Hansbrough, 2012) and so it is reasonable to anticipate that this dynamic will also play out in the present study.

The second research aim of the present study was to explore the relationship, if any, between leaders’ attachment orientations and a variety of concepts that capture followers’ work experiences, including job satisfaction, turnover intent, and relationship quality. Prior research has shown that leaders’ secure attachment orientations have positive outcomes for followers and that leaders’ insecure attachment orientations have negative outcomes for followers. In particular, followers of attachment-anxious leaders are more likely to experience positive group cohesion, positive socio-emotional functioning (Davidovitz et al., 2007), and greater burnout (Ronen & Mikulincer, 2012), but negative instrumental functioning (Davidovitz et al., 2007) and reduced job satisfaction (Ronen & Mikulincer, 2012). In contrast, followers of attachment-avoidant leaders are more likely to experience negative group cohesion and negative socio-emotional functioning (Davidovitz et al., 2007). Leaders’ attachment orientations therefore appear to influence certain aspects of followers’ work experiences and it was therefore expected that followers’ job satisfaction levels, turnover intentions, and the leader-follower relationship quality would similarly be affected by leaders’ attachment orientations.

Prior research has also shown that followers’ own attachment orientations influence how followers experience their leaders and the quality of the leader-follower relationship
Based upon this, the third research aim of the present study was to explore the extent to which, if at all, follower attachment style moderates follower job satisfaction and perceptions of authentic leadership.

Finally, the fourth research aim of the present study was to explore the extent to which a short-term psycho-educational intervention influenced leaders’ attachment orientations and their take up of authentic leadership behaviours, thereby influencing the workplace experiences of themselves and followers. Over the past two decades, organisations have been placing greater responsibility on leaders to develop themselves (Boyce, Zaccaro, & Wisecarver, 2010; Reichard & Johnson, 2011), and leadership theories have promoted this idea (Karp, 2013). To this end, thousands of books and self-growth methodologies aim to assist leaders to improve their leadership capabilities and qualities (Karp, 2013). In terms of authentic leadership, some materials originate from an academic perspective (e.g., Gardner, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2005) while others originate from a practitioner perspective and target the general public (e.g., George, 2003; George & Sims, 2007). That said, no research is known to have investigated the efficacy of educating leaders about their authentic leadership. Additionally, although there is much support for educating people about attachment concepts in therapeutic and clinical settings (e.g., Biringen, 1994; Bowlby, 1988; Johnson, 2003; Obegi & Berant, 2009), only one study is know that has investigated the efficacy of educating leaders about their attachment orientations in organisational settings. Pedrazza and Boccato (2012) found that after attending classes that in total amounted to 22 hours of training on attachment-related topics, securely attached nurses showed a non-significant increase in their perceptions of their internal locus of control and a significant decrease in their perceptions of external loci of control. In contrast, insecurely attached nurses showed no change in their self-perceptions of locus of control. The researchers argued that this difference between secure
and insecure individuals reflected the greater ability of the securely attached individuals to integrate information relevant to their attachment style into their positive internal working models and to avoid defensive attitudes, when compared with insecurely attached individuals.

No publicly available leadership education and development programme is known of in Australia that includes content on attachment theory, and certainly none that presents authentic leadership in the context of attachment. If individuals’ internal working models of attachment are open to influence through reflection as Bowlby (1973) has suggested, then it would seem feasible that a learning programme that engages leaders to explore their attachments, whether workplace based or otherwise, may cause shifts toward the lower ends of the attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance dimensions. Along similar lines, it would seem feasible that a learning programme that educates leaders about authentic leadership, may cause leaders to adopt the associated behaviours more than they have in the past, just as many learning programmes do in relation to other positive leadership models. Further, if such shifts in leaders’ attachment and authentic leadership levels were to occur, then it is reasonable to expect that followers would notice these and possibly begin to experience their workplaces more positively.

5.4 Research Questions and Hypotheses

With the aforementioned research aims in mind, the following research questions and hypotheses were posed in the present study:

- Research Question 1: How is leader attachment orientation related to self- and follower-perceptions of authentic leadership? Four hypotheses were associated with this research question:
Hypothesis 1: Leader attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with authentic leadership.

Hypothesis 2: Leader attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with authentic leadership.

Hypothesis 3: Leader attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with follower-perceptions of authentic leadership.

Hypothesis 4: Leader attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with follower-perceptions of authentic leadership.

Research Question 2: How is leader attachment orientation related to follower job satisfaction and follower turnover intent? Four hypotheses were associated with this research question:

Hypothesis 5: Leader attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with follower job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: Leader attachment anxiety will be positively associated with follower turnover intent.

Hypothesis 7: Leader attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with follower job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 8: Leader attachment avoidance will be positively associated with follower turnover intent.

Research Question 3: To what extent does follower attachment orientation moderate the relationship between follower job satisfaction and follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership? One hypothesis was associated with this research question:

Hypothesis 9: Follower attachment orientation will moderate the relationship between follower job satisfaction and follower-perceptions of authentic leadership.
• Research Question 4: What are the short-term effects, if any, of a psycho-educational intervention that encourages leaders to examine their attachment orientations and their levels of authentic leadership? Two hypotheses were associated with this research question:

  ▪ Hypothesis 10: Subsequent to leader participation in the psycho-educational intervention, leader attachment anxiety, leader attachment avoidance, and leader turnover intent will decrease, while leader authentic leadership and leader job satisfaction will increase.

  ▪ Hypothesis 11: Subsequent to leader participation in the psycho-educational intervention, follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership, follower job satisfaction and follower relationship quality will increase, while follower turnover intent will decrease.

This paper will now turn to a description of the method used in the present study to investigate the research questions and test the hypotheses just presented.
Chapter 6: Method

6.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter describes the method used to investigate the research questions and hypotheses of the present study. It first provides a high-level summary of the research method. It then details the study sample, the procedures used to recruit participants and collect data, and the composition of the two surveys used in the present study, including details about the measures contained in each. The chapter then described the psycho-educational intervention conducted in the period between the two surveys and outlines the feedback provided to both study participants and the host organisation.

To ensure clarity of description hereafter, people who partially or fully completed one or both of the surveys are referred to as “respondents.” In addition, respondents hereafter have been referred to as “follower” and “followers” or “leader” and “leaders” when distinguishing between the sample types that, respectively, a particular respondent or set of respondents represent. A respondent was deemed a follower if he or she, while completing the first survey, nominated one of the other respondents as his or her leader. A respondent was deemed a leader if he or she was (a) nominated by another respondent as a leader, (b) accepted additional leader-only consent items, and (c) completed the additional items presented only to leaders.

6.2 Method Summary

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether leaders’ attachment orientations and their adoption of authentic leadership behaviours influence the experiences of both leaders and followers in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intent. Broadly, the study involved collecting from leaders and their direct-report followers, on a
voluntary basis, data about themselves and their work experiences using two online surveys, whereby the second was conducted six months after the first. Data were collected in three forms, being (a) self-reports provided by leaders, (b) self-reports provided by followers, and (c) other-reports provided by followers about their leaders. These reports provided information on attachment orientation, leadership style, job satisfaction, and turnover intent, plus demographic, personal, and job-experience information. Some leaders also participated in a psycho-educational intervention during the intervening period between the two surveys. Broadly, this comprised a workshop during which leaders received a confidential feedback report that was based upon their first survey data, and the periodic supply of self-paced learning activities. Finally, after the second survey was complete, the host organisation received a detailed project report that provided high-level feedback on the project overall.

6.3 Sample

The study sample was sourced from one national Australian retail company and approval to proceed was gained from the company’s Managing Director and the Board of Directors. The organisation employed approximately 400 permanent full- and part-time employees, and up to 1200 casual employees during peak seasonal periods.

Accounting for valid responses, 249 adults (152 women, 97 men; age range 18-62 years; $M = 35.95$ years; $SD = 10.83$ years) voluntarily completed the first survey and 162 of them (92 women, 70 men; age range 19-62 years; $M = 37.74$ years; $SD = 10.39$ years) also voluntarily completed the second survey. The first survey sample included 54 leaders (19 women, 35 men; age range 25-62 years; $M = 38.91$ years; $SD = 8.30$ years) and the second survey sample included 46 leaders (14 women, 32 men; age range 26-62 years; $M = 38.83$ years; $SD = 8.51$ years). The 54 leaders in the first survey had, on average, 4.11
followers respond on their behalf ($SD = 1.80$). Followers responded on behalf of 32 of the 46 leaders in the second survey. These 32 leaders in the second survey had, on average, 3.50 followers respond on their behalf ($SD = 2.24$).

In order to participate in the study, respondents needed to have met a variety of criteria. All respondents were required to be aged 18 years or older and to have reported to their leader for at least one month, a cut off selected to ensure that respondents had adequate experience of their leader. A further criterion was that respondents were employed on a permanent full- or part-time basis. Employees engaged on casual contracts were excluded from participating in the study because it was judged that their transient employment may have resulted in their workplace experiences and expectations being different to those of employees engaged on permanent contracts. It was judged that mixing data from employees on both casual and permanent contracts would confound the results. In addition, it was thought likely that many of the employees engaged on casual contracts at the time of the first survey would have left the host organisation by the time of the second survey.

Of the 249 respondents to the first survey, 86% reported being employed on a permanent full-time basis and 14% reported being employed on a permanent part-time basis. Twenty two percent of the 249 respondents were tertiary qualified, with 14% having bachelor degrees, a further 2% having graduate diplomas or graduate certificates, and a further 6% having post-graduate degrees. Participants’ job levels ranged from managing director, the most senior employee in the organisation, to front line staff, the most junior employees in the organisation. Considering the full sample, 47% of respondents reported working in managerial roles, 22% reported working in sales roles, and 9% reported working in clerical or administrative roles. Taking an average from the full sample, respondents reported that they had worked for their respective leaders for 1.26 years
(range = .08-11.00, $SD = 1.43$) and spent 13.70 hours (range = 0.00-60.00, $SD = 15.12$) per week in face-to-face, telephone, group setting, and email contact with their respective leaders.

The first survey procedure was piloted with four people (two women, two men; age range 30-61 years; $M = 42.25$ years; $SD = 14.08$ years) as was the second survey procedure (four women, zero men; age range 30-62 years; $M = 44.75$ years; $SD = 14.86$ years). The data provided by these individuals were not included in any aspect of the study analyses.

### 6.4 Recruitment and Data Collection Procedures

#### 6.4.1 Recruitment process.

Permanent full-time and part-time employees were recruited into the project using a recruitment campaign that was managed by the host organisation’s General Manager for Human Resources (GM HR). The first step of the campaign was the announcement to employees that the organisation planned to participate in the study. The announcement took place at the host organisation’s national, bi-annual all-staff meeting, an internal communication event that disseminated financial and non-financial information to all employees. Information about the study was presented at the all-staff meeting by the GM HR, and included (a) why the organisation was participating in the study, (b) what the organisation hoped to gain from its participation, (c) what participation involved, and (d) how employees could become involved.

The second step of the recruitment campaign was the inclusion of an agenda item about the study at all team meetings across the organisation immediately following the all-staff meeting. The GM HR gave all line-managers a discussion outline (Appendix B) drafted by the researcher that guided them in their explanation of the project process. The outline stressed that participation in the project was voluntary and indicated that if employees wished to become involved, they needed to volunteer an email address so as to
receive the email-based link to the first of the two internet-based surveys. Line-managers were also given a registration sheet onto which those employees who wished to complete the survey wrote their email address, either work or personal, thereby requesting the survey link. The distribution of the discussion outline and registration sheets, plus the collection of the latter, was coordinated by an employee of the GM HR. The registration sheets were transcribed by this person into a soft-copy format and emailed to the researcher.

The third step of the recruitment campaign was the advertising of the project in the host organisation’s newsletter, which was distributed to employees via email and placed on the organisation’s internal notice boards during the recruitment period. The fourth step of the recruitment campaign was to email the first survey link and survey completion reminders to those employees who had volunteered to participate. The researcher entered the volunteered emails into the survey software, and using the software’s functionality, sent an email containing the first survey link to each volunteer. Volunteers who had not opened the survey link received between one and five additional emails, automatically generated by the survey software, reminding them to open and complete the survey. Separately, respondents who had only partially completed the survey received one or two emails generated by the researcher, reminding them to complete the survey. The total number of reminder emails received, therefore, varied according to each person’s progress, but did not exceed five.

It was originally planned that the second survey would be conducted five months after the first, but at the three-month mark, the host organisation requested this be extended to six months for business-related reasons. This request was accommodated and respondents were notified accordingly. This notification was sent via email directly from the researcher in order to maintain respondent confidentiality.
Six months after sending the first survey link, the researcher entered the respondents’ emails as nominated in the first survey into the survey software and sent them an email containing a link to the second survey. Similar to the communication process employed for the first survey, respondents received up to five reminder emails generated by either the survey software or the researcher, depending upon each respondent’s progress toward completing the survey. The final step in the recruitment campaign was the distribution of a note written by the host organisation’s Managing Director encouraging respondents to complete the second survey. The note, sent by the researcher directly to respondents so as to maintain respondent confidentiality, was implemented because both the number of respondents and in particular the number of leaders who had completed the second survey at the time of sending, was under half that of the first survey.

6.4.2 Survey process. The two surveys used in this study were presented electronically over the internet using Opinio software supplied and hosted by Swinburne University of Technology. Access to the surveys was gained via unique email invitations that each contained a link with an embedded identifier and password code. Upon access, the survey content was presented over a series of pages in logical groupings or sections. “Back” and “Next” buttons enabled navigation through both surveys. All presented items were compulsory, and if any remained unanswered, an error message appeared above them requesting that they be completed. Access to the next page of items was blocked until all items were completed. It was possible to exit the survey at any point and re-start it at a later point by selecting a button titled “Save and return later.” If this option was selected, the survey software saved all completed responses up to that point, requested an email address, and sent a link with an embedded identifier and password code to the nominated email address. The survey could then be re-accessed using the link, and once accessed, the survey page from which the survey was exited, was presented as the starting point.
Certain sections or part-sections of both surveys were omitted or skipped depending upon respondent’s answers to various conditional branching questions embedded within each survey. The conditional branching questions discerned the relevance of each respective section or part-section to each respondent. When any conditional branching question was answered “No,” then the relevant section or part-section was omitted. For example, if “No” was selected in answer to the conditional branching question “Do you have three or more direct report staff?” then the section following, which asked about line-management responsibilities, was skipped. This was because responding in the negative to the conditional branching question rendered the section irrelevant. The item numbering within the survey software was dynamic, such that consecutive numbers were applied even if sections or part-sections had been omitted. The dynamic presentation of items meant that the response frequency for some items differed from that of other items. Flow charts showing the conditional branching questions and section sequences for both the first and second surveys are shown in Appendices C and D respectively.

6.4.3 Data supplied by the host organisation. Data were also supplied by the host organisation that enabled spellings of leaders’ names to be checked and corrected as required. Correct spellings were necessary for case matching purposes. The host organisation also provided performance rating data where respondent consent had been obtained, and turnover data, for incorporation into the project report supplied to the host organisation.

6.5 Survey Composition

6.5.1 Overview of survey content. Two surveys were used in the present study. Each provided respondents with information about the study and gathered data from them
using a selection of measures and other information gathering items. The measures used in each survey are listed in Table 1.

The first survey (Appendix E) comprised the following sections: (a) opening comments, project information statement, survey completion instructions, and informed consent items; (b) demographic items; (c) the ALQ-Other Rater 2007 Version 1.0 (ALQ Other Rater; Walumbwa et al., 2008); (d) the Leader-Member Exchange – Multidimensional Measure (LMX-MDM; Liden & Maslyn, 1998); (e) four items from the Index of Job Satisfaction (IJS; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951); (f) three items about turnover intent from the Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983); (g) the ECR-R (Fraley, Waller, et al., 2000); (h) the Mini-International Personality Item Pool scale (Mini-IPIP; Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006); (i) the Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17; Stöber, 2001); (j) the informed consent items targeting leaders; (k) the ALQ-Self Rater 2007 Version 1.0 (ALQ Self Rater; Walumbwa et al., 2008); and (l) an invitation to be notified of any future publications arising from the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>First Survey</th>
<th>Second Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire – Revised</td>
<td>ECR-R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership Questionnaire – Other Rater 2007 Version 1.0</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership Questionnaire – Self Rater 2007 Version 1.0</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>IJS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Organisational Assessment questionnaire (three items about turnover intent)</td>
<td>MOAQ</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability Scale-17</td>
<td>SDS-17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange – Multidimensional Measure</td>
<td>LMX-MDM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-International Personality Item Pool scale</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ✓ = included in survey; ✗ = not included in survey.
The second survey (Appendix F) comprised the following sections: (a) a shortened version of the project information statement and survey completion instructions; (b) demographic items; (c) four items from the IJS (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951); (d) three items about turnover intent from the MOAQ (Cammann et al., 1983); (e) the ECR-R (Fraley, Waller, et al., 2000); (f) the SDS-17 (Stöber, 2001); (g) the ALQ Other Rater (Walumbwa et al., 2008); (h) the LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998); (i) items regarding followers’ perceptions about their involvement in the project; (j) one consent item and the ALQ Self Rater (Walumbwa et al., 2008); (k) items regarding leaders’ perceptions about their involvement in the project; (l) items regarding project experience; and (m) an invitation to comment on the project.

For the purposes of clarity, both surveys contained components, including demographic items and measures, that gathered data that were not used in the present study. Feedback was provided in relation to some of this data to both leaders and the host organisation, at the latter’s request. These components are mentioned in this chapter in relation to the leader feedback report (section 6.7.2) and also in the appendices related to the conditional branching of both surveys (Appendix C and Appendix D), the appendices related to the content of both surveys (Appendix E and Appendix F), and the appendix that reproduces a sample of the leader feedback report (Appendix I). Otherwise, these components have been omitted from all aspects of the present study and therefore from the descriptions that follow.

The remainder of this section describes the components of both surveys. The chapter section that then follows details the measures used in each survey.

6.5.2 Project information statement. The first section of the first survey included a project information statement. It provided an overview of the project and its aims, an explanation of what participation would involve, a description of the risks and benefits of
participating in the project, how to access back-up support if needed, an explanation of the
free consent requirements and withdrawal rights, a brief description of the anticipated
research output, details regarding privacy and confidentiality arrangements, and the contact
details of the researcher and her supervisor. The statement indicated that the study had
been approved by the Swinburne Human Research Ethics Committee and gave details
about who to contact regarding concerns and complaints.

6.5.3 Informed consent. The informed consent appeared in the first section of the
first survey, immediately following the project information statement and the survey
completion instructions. It comprised 13 items that stated the conditions of participation
and summarised the key features of the study, as described in the project information
statement. It was a requirement of participation that respondents accept each of the
consent items. An additional three consent items appeared further into the first survey if
respondents indicated that they had line-management responsibilities. It was a requirement
of continued participation that the respondent also accept these additional consent items.
The second survey included one consent item presented only to leaders, which sought
permission to obtain performance review data from the host organisation.

6.5.4 Demographic items. Demographic items were included in the first survey to
gather information about (a) respondents, such as gender, age, email address, education,
and relationship status, (b) respondents’ work, such as tenure, role type, role tenure,
employment basis, employment location, organisation division/department, and team size,
(c) respondents’ leaders, such as name and team size, and (d) respondents’ relationships
with their leaders, such as whether the leader recruited the respondent, the period of time
the respondent had reported to the leader, and the time spent with the leader on average per
week. Leaders were additionally required to supply their name and information about their
team size and employee turnover rates.
The second survey repeated the demographic items that gathered information about age and email address, for case matching purposes across the two surveys. A selection of demographic items were repeated from the first survey if respondents indicated that their roles and/or leaders had changed during the interim period between the two surveys.

Select demographic information was used in the present study’s analyses and two elements in particular were given brief names for clarity of reporting purposes. These elements were contact amount, which represented the average time the follower spent with his or her leader each week, and reporting duration, which represented the period of time the follower had reported to the leader.

6.5.5 Notification of study publications. At the completion of the first survey, respondents were invited to provide their email address if they wished to be notified of publications associated with the study.

6.6 Measures

The sections that follow provide detailed descriptions of each of the measures used in the present study.

6.6.1 Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire – Revised. The ECR-R (Fraley, Waller, et al., 2000) was used to measure the two higher-order attachment factors, anxiety and avoidance. The questionnaire of 36 items comprised two scales, anxiety and avoidance, where each was measured using 18 separate items. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which each statement described how they felt in their emotionally intimate relationships with close others, where close others was defined as romantic partners, close friends, or family members. Respondents were directed to answer in terms of how they generally experienced close relationships with others, not just in how they were experiencing a current romantic relationship or one particularly close non-romantic
relationship. Respondents were asked to use a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). On advice from Mario Mikulincer (personal communication, April 18, 2010), the item wording was modified from “romantic partners” and “my partner” to either “close others” or “others,” the latter being used as a substitute if the item already contained the word “close.” Additional words in some items were also modified to ensure the statement remained grammatically correct. Thus, the Anxiety item “I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me” became “I often worry that close others don’t really love me” and the Avoidance item “I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners” became “I prefer not to be too close to others.” All of the original and revised inventory items are shown in Appendix G. After reverse coding negatively worded items, item scores for each factor were summed and averaged to obtain separate anxiety and avoidance scores ranging from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating higher levels of anxiety or avoidance.

Using item response theory methods, Fraley, Waller, et al. (2000) conducted 100 simulations that generated expected observed scores on the anxiety and avoidance scales for 200 people across two time points. Their simulations resulted in average test-retest reliability coefficients for both scales above .93. Fairchild and Finney (2006) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the two scales above .90. Confirmatory factor analysis of the ECR-R instrument confirmed a good fit for a two-factor model (Sibley, Fischer, & Liu, 2005). Sibley et al. (2005) confirmed the short-term stability, discriminant validity, and convergent validity of the ECR-R. Specifically, the scales were found to be significantly correlated in the expected direction with measures of loneliness, social support, touch, and worry.

6.6.2 Authentic Leadership Questionnaire. The ALQ (Walumbwa et al., 2008) was used to measure the authentic leadership construct plus the four authentic leadership
subscales, transparency, moral/ethical, balanced processing, and self awareness. The full scale comprised 16 items of which five measured transparency, four measured moral/ethical, three measured balanced processing, and four measured self awareness. Respondents were asked to judge how frequently each statement matched his or her leader’s leadership style using a five-point scale with the anchors 0 (Not at all), 1 (Once in a while), 2 (Sometimes), 3 (Fairly often), and 4 (Frequently, if not always). Note that in the surveys, only the descriptive anchors were presented to describe the five-point scale; the numerals were not presented. Examining first the ALQ Self Rater, an example of a transparency item is “As a leader I encourage everyone to speak their mind,” of a balanced processing item is “As a leader I analyse relevant data before coming to a decision,” and of a self awareness item is “As a leader I show I understand how specific actions impact others.” The equivalent items in the ALQ Other Rater are, respectively, “My leader encourages everyone to speak their mind,” “My leader analyses relevant data before coming to a decision,” and “My leader shows he or she understands how specific actions impact others.” Note that copyright restrictions permit only three items from this measure to be reproduced in this paper. Because the three items shown here are also used in this paper’s discussion, it is not possible to show an item that represents the moral/ethical subscale. Item scores for the full scale and each subscale were summed and averaged to obtain separate scores ranging from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating higher levels of the particular construct.

Walumbwa et al. (2008) reported acceptable internal consistency for the four subscales across three different studies with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients above .70. These results have since been supported by Hannah, Avolio, and Walumbwa (2011) who reported acceptable Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the overall full scale and the four subscales in a military context, being .88 for the full scale and above .70 for the four
subscales. Spence Laschinger, Wong, and Grau (2012) reported similar results using newly graduated nurses, whereby they found Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .95 for the full scale and between .81 and .93 for the subscales. Similarly, Peus, Wesche, and Streicher (2012) reported for a business setting a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the full scale of .94 and coefficients for each of the four subscales ranging from .78 to .86.

6.6.3 Index of Job Satisfaction. Four items from the 18-item IJS (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) were used to measure overall job satisfaction. This instrument was selected to measure job satisfaction due to recent and frequent use of both the full scale (Bhal, Gulati, & Ansari, 2009; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999) and partial versions of the full scale (Heller, Ferris, Brown, & Watson, 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Ogho, Price, & Mueller, 1992). It was decided to use a global measure of job satisfaction, which focuses on the overall level of satisfaction with the current job, rather than a facet measure, which focuses on the satisfaction associated with specific job dimensions (e.g., pay, coworkers; Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992), so as to account for any and all elements that may have affected respondents’ job satisfaction levels. Four items were used rather than the full scale as a compromise to the total survey length. The items were selected on the basis that each was a general statement about jobs and work (e.g., “I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job”) and overlapped with the items selected by others who had also used shortened versions of the scale (Heller et al., 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Ogho et al., 1992). Respondents were asked to judge the extent to which each statement described how they felt in their job using a five-point scale with the anchors 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Undecided), 4 (Agree), and 5 (Strongly agree). Note that in the surveys, only the descriptive anchors were presented to describe the five-point scale; the numerals were not presented. After reverse coding negatively worded items, item scores
were summed to obtain scores ranging from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating higher levels of overall job satisfaction.

In terms of full scale reliability, Brayfield and Rothe (1951) reported an odd-even product moment reliability coefficient of .77 which was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to .87. In terms of shortened versions of the full scale, no research is known that uses the exact same four items as used in the present study. For this reason, it is not possible to quote alpha coefficients from studies that have used the exact same four items. However, other researchers have found acceptable alphas for slightly different item combinations. For example, Lambert and Hogan (2009) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .92 using five items from the full scale, three of which were used in the present study. Similarly, Walumbwa et al. (2008) used five items and reported a Cronbach’s alpha co-efficient of .82, although they did not indicate which items they selected.

6.6.4 Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire. Three items from the MOAQ (Cammann et al., 1983) were used to measure respondents’ intentions to leave their current jobs, termed “turnover intent” in the present study. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which two of the three statements described their intention to leave their current job using a seven-point scale with the anchors 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Slightly disagree), 4 (Neither agree nor disagree), 5 (Slightly Agree), 6 (Agree), and 7 (Strongly agree). Note that in the surveys, only the descriptive anchors were presented to describe the five-point scale; the numerals were not presented. An example of such an item was “I often think about quitting.” The third item, “How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?” required respondents to rate how true the statement was of them using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Not at all likely) to 7 (Extremely likely). The MOAQ used two additional anchor descriptions with this item, being 3 (Somewhat likely) and 5 (Quite likely) (Cammann et al., 1983) and
left the remaining anchors, that is, the second, fourth, and sixth, unlabelled. The third and fifth anchor descriptions were omitted from the surveys of the present study due to software limitations. The Opinio survey software required either that the first and last anchors only of a scale range be labelled or that all anchors of a scale range be labelled; it did not allow a mixture of labelled and unlabelled intermediate anchors within a scale range. The item scores were summed and averaged to obtain composite scores ranging from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating stronger intentions to resign.

In developing the scale, Cammann et al. (1983) reported an internal consistency reliability of .83. Using a five-point scale rather than a seven-point scale as used by both Cammann et al. and the present study, Law and Wong (1999) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .81.

6.6.5 Leader-Member Exchange – Multidimensional Measure. The LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) was used to measure perceptions of the leader-follower relationship from the follower perspective. This was termed “relationship quality” in the present study. The full scale comprised 12 items and although it constituted four subscales, namely, affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect, these were not used in the present study; only the full scale was used in the present study. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which each statement described their relationship with their leader using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). An example of an affect item is “I like my manager very much as a person,” of a loyalty item is, “My manager defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question,” of a contribution item is “I do work for my manager that goes beyond what is specified in my job description,” and of a professional respect item is “I am impressed with my manager’s knowledge of his/her job.” Item scores
for the full scale were summed and averaged to obtain scores ranging from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating higher levels of relationship quality.

In developing the scale, Liden and Maslyn (1998) reported acceptable results in terms of response bias susceptibility, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and criterion-related validity, and reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .89 for the composite measure. These analyses were based upon an 11-item scale, where only two items loaded onto the contribution factor. The researchers indicated that they later improved the Contribution factor by enhancing the wording of one item and adding a third item. The improved items were used in the present study. Other studies have used the LMX-MDM and reported an acceptable Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the full scale of .92 (Sparrowe & Liden, 2005) amongst banking industry workers.

6.6.6 Mini-International Personality Item Pool. The Mini-IPIP (Donnellan et al., 2006) was used to measure respondents’ personality traits. This 20-item scale is a short form of the 50-item International Personality Item Pool Five-Factor Model measure (Goldberg et al., 2006). The Mini-IPIP comprised five scales that represent the Big Five personality traits, namely, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and intellect/imagination, with each scale in turn comprising four items. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which each statement was an accurate reflection of their general behaviour. They were asked to choose a rating in relation to others they know of the same sex and age, using a five-point scale with the anchors 1 (Very inaccurate), 2 (Moderately inaccurate), 3 (Neither inaccurate or accurate), 4 (Moderately accurate), and 5 (Very accurate). Note that in the surveys, only the descriptive anchors were presented to describe the five-point scale; the numerals were not presented. An example of an extraversion item is “I am the life of the party,” of an agreeableness item is “I sympathize with others’ feelings,” of a conscientiousness items is “I get chores done right away,” of a
neuroticism item is “I have frequent mood swings,” and of an intellect/imagination item is “I have a vivid imagination.” After reverse coding negatively worded items, item scores were summed and averaged to obtain scale scores ranging from 1 to 5 for each scale. Higher scores indicated higher levels of the particular trait.

6.6.7 Social Desirability Scale-17. The SDS-17 (Stöber, 2001) was used to measure respondents’ social desirability biases, that is, respondents’ “…readiness to give biased, distorted self-descriptions that portray oneself in a manner that can make a favorable impression on others” (Blake, Valdiserri, Neuendorf, & Nemeth, 2006, p. 1626). Respondents were asked to determine whether each of 17 item statements described them or not. Respondents were asked to select one of two possible responses, being either “true” or “false.” An example of an item is “I sometimes litter.” After reverse coding negatively worded items, all items that were answered with “true” were given a score of 1 and all answered with “false” were given a score 0. The scores were summed to obtain a social desirability score ranging from 0 to 17, with higher scores indicating higher levels of socially desirable answering.

In developing the scale, Stöber (2001) reported convergent validity values of .68, \( p < .01 \) with the Marlow-Crowne scale, .60, \( p < .01 \) with the revised Lie Scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, and .52, \( p < .01 \) with the Sets of Four Scale. Stöber reported that discriminant validity was indicated by non-significant correlations with neuroticism, extraversion, and psychoticism, as gauged by the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, and with openness to experience as gauged by the NEO Five Factor Inventory. Blake et al. (2006) reported that the scale’s discriminant validity in Stöber’s 2001 study was lower than would be desirable given significant positive correlations with agreeableness and conscientiousness as measured by the NEO Five Factor Inventory. However, Stöber argued that scores on social desirability scales usually show substantial
Method

Correlations with self-ratings for agreeableness and conscientiousness. Stöber also reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients over four different studies that ranged from .61 to .84.

Stöber (2001) noted that the validation results were based upon 16 of the original 17 items that comprised the scale. The fourth item, “I have tried illegal drugs (for example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.)” was excluded because although it had displayed corrected item-total correlation coefficients ranging from .27 to .37 in earlier studies, these had dropped in the 2001 study to range from -.04 to -.07. This item was therefore excluded from the calculation of the total score. A further study (Blake et al., 2006) which also used 16 of the 17 items, reported seven separate homogeneity coefficients that ranged from .63 to .92, with six of the seven being .70 or above. This study also confirmed the discriminant validity and convergent validity of the SDS-17 through it being significantly correlated in the expected direction with the Marlowe-Crowne measure of social desirability. The authors concluded that the scale appeared to be valid for use in American settings. Also using 16 items of the SDS-17, Fleming and Zizzo (2011) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .64 and a test–re-test reliability of .86, $p < .001$. Despite such studies omitting the fourth item, it was decided to include all 17 items in both surveys of the present study, and to subsequently exclude the fourth item from the analyses if it detrimentally affected the reliability of the scale.

6.7 Psycho-Educational Intervention

Respondents who had been nominated as a leader by three or more other respondents were invited to participate in the study’s psycho-educational intervention. The intervention was termed “learning intervention” within the host organisation for ease of understanding and communication. The intervention commenced approximately one week
after the first survey closed and comprised the provision of a half-day feedback workshop, during which a confidential feedback report was delivered to leaders, and the provision of four Learning Activities Guides (LAGs) that each contained a variety of self-paced learning activities, delivered during the five months between the two surveys.

Four half-day feedback workshops were conducted across a one-week period approximately one week after the closure of the first survey. Given that leaders were located in a variety of metropolitan and rural areas across the south-eastern states of Australia, three different geographical locations were selected from which to conduct the workshops. The locations were selected so as to maximise the attendance levels of leaders and minimise their travel requirements. One workshop was conducted in each of Adelaide and Canberra and two were held in Melbourne. Four leaders were unable to attend a workshop and instead engaged directly with the researcher in either a face-to-face or a telephone conference version of the workshop.

Approximately one week after the completion of the last feedback workshop, leaders received via email the first of four LAGs. The remaining three LAGs were then distributed monthly, via email, with a one month break between the second and third. This break was at the host organisation’s request so as not to clash with their peak Christmas and New Year retail period. The LAGs comprised a variety of activities that leaders could complete at their own discretion and pace, within their respective workplace locations. The intervention also promoted the formation of buddy pairs amongst leaders, so as to aid learning and to motivate leaders to engage in the intervention across its duration.

6.7.1 Feedback workshop. Leaders who attended a half-day feedback workshop engaged in facilitated group processes that introduced the attachment and authentic leadership concepts. They also received a confidential, feedback report that summarised their own survey responses, the aggregated responses provided by their followers and
sample averages. Finally, leaders received support during the workshop to develop plans that would address their results in the workplace. The workshop outline is presented in Appendix H.

6.7.2 Leader feedback report. Leaders who participated in the psycho-educational intervention received a feedback report, a sample of which is presented in Appendix I. The report provided leaders with their raw scores and aggregated follower means for the ALQ Self Rater and ALQ Other Rater subscales, plus the means and response ranges for both the leader group and the complete follower group. The report then provided leaders with their raw scores for the ECR-R. Finally, the report provided leader raw scores, leader group quartiles, follower group means, and follower group response ranges for the Job Control, IJS, and Turnover Intent (called “Intention to Turnover” in the report) scales, and the LMX-MDM and Work Engagement subscales. Note that the data provided in the feedback report that related to the Job Control and Work Engagement scales, and the LMX-MDM subscales, were not used in the present study. In all cases, means were reported in conjunction with their associated standard deviations. Quartile data were provided in the feedback report to provide leaders with relativity information that would allow them to see where their results were positioned in relation to their leader colleagues.

6.7.3 Leader feedback confidentiality. All feedback to leaders was confidential and as such, results were only supplied to the intended leader. In addition, none of the workshop processes or LAG processes required leaders to share their results with any other person. Leaders were encouraged to share their feedback with their own leader and their employees, but the extent to which they did this was at their own discretion.

6.7.4 Learning activities guides. Four LAGs were issued to leaders during the psycho-educational intervention and each is presented in Appendices J to M. Each comprised a variety of self-paced activities that aimed to engage leaders in furthering their
understandings of adult attachment and authentic leadership, and to support leaders in applying their learning about these concepts in the workplace.

The activities were designed by the researcher in accord with Kolb and Kolb’s Experiential Learning Cycle (2005, 2009). As a collective, the activities in each LAG were created to address each of the four domains of adult learning described by the model, being reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation, active experimentation, and concrete experience. As such, the activities invited leaders to reflect upon their past and current actions, develop hypotheses about their own and others’ experiences, test approaches, plan for application consistent with the study’s concepts, and implement and experience their plans in the workplace and beyond. All the activities were designed to be easy to complete, so as to encourage participation. For example, the activities included performing day-to-day leadership tasks while applying the study concepts, reflecting upon experiences, analysing effectiveness, engaging with others to apply the concepts, reading supplied materials, completing questionnaires and worksheets, viewing internet-based materials and presentations, and watching and analysing relevant movies. Completion instructions accompanied each activity.

6.8 Host Organisation Project Report

The host organisation received a 38-page project report a few months after the closure of the second survey, when the initial analysis of the results was complete. The body of the report provided a summary of the survey and psycho-educational intervention participation levels, aggregated results for the study’s main measures, and recommendations in light of the results. An appendix held detailed data and all the comments provided by respondents at the end of the second survey. The comments were de-identified but otherwise provided verbatim. At the request of the host organisation, the
numeric data provided throughout the report represented two sets of leaders—all leaders, and separately, only those leaders from the Retail and Operations Division. Both sets of data were further subdivided by (a) leaders who received a feedback report; (b) leaders who received a feedback report and who left the organisation before the second survey, and where performance ratings were known; (c) leaders in the top 10th percentile in terms of performance ratings; and (d) leaders in the bottom 10th percentile in terms of performance ratings.

Having explained the method, procedures, and materials used to investigate the present study’s research questions and hypotheses, this paper will now turn to describing the statistical analyses undertaken.
Chapter 7: Results

7.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter provides detailed information about the statistical analyses performed to examine the present study’s research questions and test the associated hypotheses. First, descriptions are provided of the preliminary analyses performed on the data, including the screening processes and the treatments of univariate outliers and non-normal score distributions. Next, descriptive statistics are presented for the various scales and subscales including internal reliability measures. Finally, the chapter describes each research question in turn, and in particular, the statistical analyses conducted to test the associated hypotheses and the results of each analysis. Unless stated otherwise, the Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW) package version 18 produced by SPSS, a company of IBM, was used to perform the analyses presented in this chapter.

7.2 Terminology

When completing the surveys, respondents were invited to complete each of the presented measures in relation to themselves. In the case of the authentic leadership measure, respondents were additionally invited to complete the measure in relation to their leader. To this end, individuals’ ratings of themselves have been referred to as “self-report” ratings and followers’ ratings of leaders have been referred to as “other-report” ratings. Further, some analyses were performed using aggregated data and others were performed using disaggregated data. By way of a summary, aggregated data were created by averaging the other-report authentic leadership ratings related to the relevant leaders and coding this into the respective leaders’ cases, whereas the disaggregated data were created by coding leaders’ self-report ratings on select variables into all relevant follower
cases. Details are provided about these procedures in the relevant sections of this chapter. However, for the current purpose of clarifying terminology, the averaged other-report follower ratings coded into leaders’ cases have been referred to as “follower-report” ratings and the self-report leader ratings coded into followers’ cases have been referred to as “leader-report” ratings. Lastly, data collected using the first and second surveys have been categorised and referred to as “Time 1” and “Time 2” respectively.

7.3 Preliminary Analyses

7.3.1 Data screening. The data from the two surveys were downloaded from the Opinio survey software into two separate PASW data files and amalgamated into one PASW data file. This single file, therefore, comprised cases that contained not only Time 1 data, but also Time 2 data for those respondents who had completed the second survey in addition to the first. In total, 250 people completed the first survey and of these, 163 completed the second survey.

The final data file was screened for errors and aside from correcting any misspelled leader names, none were found. The survey design included conditional branching whereby some items that were not relevant to certain respondents were not presented to those respondents. In some cases, the survey software had automatically filled these skipped items with zero values. In such cases, the zero values were deleted rendering the relevant data fields empty. Allowing for the conditional branching requirements of the surveys, no cases contained any missing values. It should be noted, however, that attrition from Time 1 to Time 2 meant that 87 cases contained no data in relation to the second survey.

The data screening process included cross-checking certain item responses to ensure consistency. This resulted in the removal of data supplied by two respondents. One
female case was removed completely because although she had selected “Yes” to the consent item “I acknowledge that I am over 18 years of age,” she reported her actual age to be 17 years. The Time 2 data for one male case were also removed after comparisons of age, gender, and email address for Time 1 and Time 2 revealed that two different people had responded to the two surveys using the same email link. It was discovered that the person who had completed the second survey had taken over the work email address of the person who had completed the first survey, thereby linking the first and second survey responses of the two people involved. As a result, the Time 2 data of this case were removed and the Time 1 data retained. Removal of these data from the data file reduced the number of valid first survey responses to 249 and valid second survey responses to 162. Scale and subscale scores were then calculated according to the scoring procedures for each scale.

7.3.2 Descriptive statistics and internal reliability of measures. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated to assess the reliability of all scales and subscales. These are presented in Table 2 along with the variable name, number of items, theoretical range, mean, and standard deviation associated with each scale and subscale. Acceptable reliability was shown for most scales and subscales with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients above .7 (J. M. Cortina, 1993), although it should be noted that this level, commonly used in the fields of psychology and leadership, is a somewhat arbitrary convention. Unacceptable Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were shown for the ALQ Self Rater – Balanced Processing (α = .40) and the ALQ Self Rater – Transparency (α = .54) subscales at Time 1. As a result, all four ALQ subscales were excluded from any further self-report analyses. In addition, poor Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were shown for the Mini-IPIP – Neuroticism (α = .63), Mini-IPIP – Conscientiousness (α = .66), Mini-IPIP – Intellect/Imagination (α = .67), and the Mini-IPIP – Agreeableness (α = .69) subscales.
### Table 2

**Summary of Descriptive Statistics Including Cronbach’s Alpha Values for Each Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale/Subscale</th>
<th>No. items</th>
<th>Theoretical range</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment anxiety</td>
<td>ECR-R Anxiety</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment avoidance</td>
<td>ECR-R Avoidance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-report transparency</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater – Transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-report moral/ethical</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater – Moral/Ethical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-report balanced processing</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater – Balanced Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-report self awareness</td>
<td>ALQ Other Rater – Self Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report transparency</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater – Transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report moral/ethical</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater – Moral/Ethical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report balanced processing</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater – Balanced Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report self awareness</td>
<td>ALQ Self Rater – Self Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>IJS (four items)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intent</td>
<td>MOAQ (three items about turnover intent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>SDS-17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>LMX-MDM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP – Extraversion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP – Agreeableness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP – Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect/imagination</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP – Intellect/Imagination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Mini-IPIP – Neuroticism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 91-249, the range being due to the conditional branching of both surveys.*
These subscales were included in subsequent analyses but any results related to these subscales were interpreted with caution. Finally, because acceptable Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were found for the SDS-17 ($\alpha = .71$ at Time 1 and $\alpha = .72$ at Time 2), the fourth item was retained in the present study, despite others having removed it in prior studies (e.g., Blake et al., 2006; Stöber, 2001).

### 7.3.3 Univariate outliers and non-normal score distributions

All continuous variables were checked for univariate outliers and non-normal score distributions. This was done repeatedly throughout the study because the samples of interest differed across the various analyses. For each different set of cases, the score distributions and what was deemed an outlier differed. This meant that each time a new case set was selected, the data were checked for outliers and non-normality anew.

Despite the need to do this for a variety of case sets, the same procedure was followed throughout. The distributions of all the variables of interest were first explored. Any variables with a significant skewness statistic were examined for outliers. Any outliers were recoded to be three standard deviations from that variable’s mean unless the resultant value became less than the next most extreme value that was not deemed an outlier. At such times, the outlier was recoded to be one unit more than the next most extreme value not deemed an outlier (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). If, after recoding outliers the variables continued to show a significant skewness statistic, the variables were transformed with the aim of improving normality and rendering the skewness statistic non-significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). If any variables were found to have a significant skewness statistic but no outliers, they too were transformed to render the skewness statistic non-significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

To avoid repetition in the remainder of this chapter, the explanations of this procedure for each analysis have been kept to a minimum, whereby only the recoding of
outliers and the application of transformations have been noted for the relevant variables. Otherwise, it can be taken that all other variables in that particular analysis were used without any adjustments or treatments.

7.3.4 Correlation analyses. Correlation analyses using Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficients have been reported throughout this chapter. If there existed a theoretical argument that suggested a uni-directional correlation was to be expected, then a one-tailed test was used. Otherwise, two-tailed tests were employed. This distinction has been notated throughout this chapter and the distinction has been further denoted in tables using the dagger symbol (i.e., †) for one-tailed tests and the asterisk symbol (i.e., *) for two-tailed tests.

7.3.5 Testing hierarchical multiple regression assumptions. Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to test a number of the study’s hypotheses. Given that the various analyses used different case sets, it was required that the assumptions of this statistical method be tested prior to each analysis.

Despite the need to do this for a variety of case sets, the same procedure (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) was followed throughout. First, the adequacy of the number of cases was assessed given the number of independent variables involved in the regression. Second, the assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of residuals were tested through preliminary screening of residual statistics and examination of the Normal P-P plot and scatterplot. Third, the absence of multivariate outliers was tested by ensuring that (a) the standardised residuals did not exceed ± 3.3 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), (b) Mahalanobis distance scores did not exceeded the critical value, and (c) Cook’s distances were within acceptable limits. Fourth, the assumption of non-multicollinearity was tested by ensuring that Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients between the dependent and independent variables were within acceptable
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limits, as were the correlation coefficients between the independent variables. The
collinearity statistics, tolerance, and variance inflation factor were also inspected to ensure
their values were within acceptable limits. Finally, the assumption of singularity was
tested by ensuring that no independent variable was a combination of any other
independent variables.

Similar to the procedure described earlier for reducing repetition related to the
treatment of univariate outliers and non-normal score distributions, the explanations in this
chapter of testing hierarchical multiple regression assumptions prior to conducting each
analysis have been kept to a minimum. Any assumption violations have been noted,
followed by descriptions of how the data were subsequently treated to allow the particular
regression to proceed. Otherwise, it can be taken that all assumptions of the regression
procedure had been upheld for that particular analysis.

The assumptions of other statistical tests used in this study were similarly tested,
but because these were done only the once, the procedures have been described at the
relevant point of this chapter.

7.3.6 Power analyses. Power represents the probability of detecting a true effect,
that is, a statistically significant result, when one exists (Cohen, 1988; "G*Power Data
Analysis Examples," n.d.) and depending upon the statistical test used, is dependent upon
significance criterion or alpha level, effect size, which signifies the strength of the
relationship, and sample size. Power analyses were conducted in the present study using
G*Power Version 3.1.7 software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). This was done
to determine whether the various samples planned to test the research questions were
sufficiently large to provide adequate power for the statistical methods employed. Given
that the various analyses used different case sets, it was required that the power be tested
prior to each analysis.
Despite the need to do this for a variety of case sets, the same criteria were used throughout. The required sample size was calculated using $\alpha = .05$, a medium effect size, and power = .80. The exact numeric value deemed to represent a medium effect size for each of the statistical methods used in this study, whereby the selected effect size category represented an arbitrary convention, was taken from Cohen (1988). These were $\rho = .30$ for correlation analyses, $f^2 = .25$ for multiple regression analyses and $d = .50$ for t-test analyses. Similarly, the power level of .80 was based upon Cohen’s recommendation, which aims to balance achievable sample sizes with the likelihood of realising a more serious type I error over a type II error.

In order to reduce repetition related to the testing of power, the explanations in this chapter have been kept to a minimum. Any insufficient sample sizes have been noted at the appropriate point in this chapter. Otherwise, it can be taken that the sample sizes used were deemed sufficient to provide adequate power for the analyses undertaken.

This chapter will now describe the analyses used to test each of the hypotheses and present the results of each analysis, for each research question in turn,

7.4 Examination of Research Question 1

The first research question posed in this study aimed to explore how leader attachment orientation is related to self- and follower-perceptions of authentic leadership. Specifically, it was proposed that leader authentic leadership would be, according to hypothesis 1, negatively associated with leader attachment anxiety and according to hypothesis 2, negatively associated with leader attachment avoidance. Additionally, it was proposed that follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership would be, according to hypothesis 3, negatively associated with leader attachment anxiety, and according to hypothesis 4, negatively associated with leader attachment avoidance. It was planned that
multiple regression techniques would be used to test these hypotheses using the Time 1
data, and using both the full authentic leadership scale and the four other-report authentic
leadership subscales. This resulted in four different analyses being conducted to
investigate Research Question 1.

The first of the four analyses examined whether a relationship existed between
leaders’ self-report ratings on the authentic leadership variable and their self-report ratings
on both the attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance variables. A subset of 91 cases
from the full data file was used for this analysis, these cases representing leaders who had
responded to the first survey. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a
logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the attachment
anxiety variable.

Next, the relationships between the variables were examined using Pearson’s
product-moment correlation coefficient, 1-tailed. The authentic leadership variable
showed a small, significant negative correlation coefficient with the attachment avoidance
variable, $r = -0.21$, $n = 91$, $p = 0.025$, but showed no significant correlation with the
attachment anxiety variable, $r = -0.13$, $n = 91$, $p = ns$. As such, leaders’ self-report ratings
on the attachment avoidance variable were shown to be negatively associated with their
self-report ratings on the authentic leadership variable, as predicted. In addition, leaders
self-report ratings on the attachment anxiety variable were not shown to be associated with
their self-report ratings on the authentic leadership variable. Because only one of the two
attachment variables showed a relationship with the authentic leadership variable, it was
deemed unnecessary to proceed with a multiple regression analysis and that a correlation
analysis was sufficient.

The second of the analyses conducted to investigate Research Question 1 examined
whether a relationship existed between followers’ other-report ratings on the authentic
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leadership variable and leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable. A subset of 57 cases from the full data file was used for this analysis, these cases representing respondents who had been nominated as leaders by followers when the latter were completing the first survey. To perform this analysis, a variable was first created in each leader case and named “follower-report authentic leadership”. The term follower-report was used to distinguish this variable from both the self-report and the other-report authentic leadership variables contained in the same case. The follower-report authentic leadership variable represented the average of followers’ other-report authentic leadership ratings, where the average for each leader was calculated using the ratings given by only those followers who had indicated, when completing the first survey, that they had a line-reporting relationship to the respective leader. For example, if a particular leader had five followers who, when completing the first survey, had nominated him or her as their leader, then these followers’ other-report authentic leadership ratings, representing each follower’s perceptions of their leader’s level of authentic leadership, were averaged and manually entered into each leader’s case as the follower-report authentic leadership rating. In this way, aggregated follower data coded into leaders’ cases were used in this second analysis. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the attachment anxiety variable. Finally, examination of the sample size revealed that it lacked adequate power for the planned analyses (Cohen, 1988). Despite this, it was decided that the analyses should continue, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the relationships between the variables were examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 1-tailed. The follower-report authentic leadership variable was not shown to be correlated with either the attachment anxiety variable,
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$r = .05, n = 57, p = \text{ns}$, or the attachment avoidance variable, $r = .17, n = 57, p = \text{ns}$. As such, followers’ averaged other-report ratings of leaders on the authentic leadership variable were not associated with leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable. Because no relationships were found between the variables, it was deemed unnecessary to proceed with a multiple regression analysis and that a correlation analysis was sufficient.

The third analysis repeated that of the second using the same subset of 57 cases, but instead used variables derived from the authentic leadership subscales rather than the full scale. Four variables were created in each leader case, called follower-report transparency, follower-report moral/ethical, follower-report balanced processing, and follower-report self awareness, each representing the average of followers’ four separate other-report authentic leadership subscale ratings. These variables were calculated for each leader in the same way that the follower-report authentic leadership variable (i.e., based upon the full-scale other-report authentic leadership ratings) had been calculated for each, as described earlier. As a result, four follower-report authentic leadership subscale ratings were entered manually into each leader case. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the self-report attachment anxiety variable. Finally, examination of the sample size revealed that it lacked adequate power for the planned analyses (Cohen, 1988). Despite this, it was decided that the analyses should continue, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the relationships between the variables were examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 1-tailed. None of the four follower-report authentic leadership subscale variables were shown to be correlated with either the attachment anxiety variable or attachment avoidance variable, as reported in Table 3. As such, followers’ averaged other-report ratings of leaders on the authentic leadership
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subscale variables, namely, transparency, moral/ethical, balanced processing, and self awareness, were not associated with leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable. Because no relationships were found between the variables, it was deemed unnecessary to proceed with a multiple regression analysis and that a correlation analysis was sufficient.

The fourth and final analysis performed to examine Research Question 1 repeated that of the second analysis, in that it examined whether a relationship existed between the follower-report authentic leadership variable and leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable. However, in this fourth analysis, instead of calculating the ratings on the follower-report authentic leadership variable using other-report data supplied by all followers, it was calculated from data supplied by only those followers who had indicated that they had a line-reporting relationship with their leader of more than one month’s duration. Although this narrowed the pool of follower data, it was hoped that by using reports from followers who had worked for their leader for over one month, the data would be more representative of the leaders concerned. Despite narrowing the pool of follower data, a value for the follower-

Table 3

Correlations Between the Self-Report Attachment Orientation and the Follower-Report Authentic Leadership Subscale Variables Amongst Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>.31 ††</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Follower-report transparency</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Follower-report moral/ethical</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.72 ††</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Follower-report balanced processing</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.70 ††</td>
<td>.71 ††</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follower-report self awareness</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.79 ††</td>
<td>.73 ††</td>
<td>.83 ††</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 57. \)

†† \( p < .01 \), one-tailed.
report authentic leadership variable was able to be calculated for all of the 57 leaders used in the second and third analyses. This value was entered into the leaders’ respective cases, using the same method as that described earlier. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the attachment anxiety variable. Finally, examination of the sample size revealed that it lacked adequate power for the planned analyses (Cohen, 1988). Despite this, it was decided that the analyses should continue, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the relationships between the variables were examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 1-tailed. The follower-report authentic leadership variable was not shown to be correlated with either the attachment anxiety variable, $r = .15, n = 57, p = ns$, or the attachment avoidance variable, $r = .13, n = 57, p = ns$. As such, when considering followers who had reported to their leaders for more than one month, followers’ averaged other-report ratings of leaders on the authentic leadership variable were not associated with leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable. Because no relationships were found between the variables, it was deemed unnecessary to proceed with a multiple regression analysis and that a correlation analysis was sufficient.

A fifth analysis had been planned that aimed to examine the relationship between the follower-report authentic leadership subscale variables and leaders’ self-report attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance variables using data supplied by only those followers who had reported to their leader for more than one month. However, the non-significant results of the third and fourth analyses suggested that this fifth analysis would prove to be equally non-significant and as such, the decision was taken not to proceed.

In summary, the first of the four analyses performed to examine Research Question 1 showed that a small, significant negative correlation existed between leaders’ self-report
ratings on the attachment avoidance and authentic leadership variables, as predicted by hypothesis 2. No relationship was found between leaders’ self-report ratings on the attachment anxiety and the authentic leadership variables and therefore, no support was found for hypothesis 1. Further, no relationships were found between leaders’ self-report ratings on either the attachment anxiety variable or the attachment avoidance variable, and the follower-report authentic leadership variables, whether considering authentic leadership in terms of the full scale or the four subscales, or whether determining followers’ ratings of leaders’ authentic leadership using all relevant follower data or using data from only those followers who had reported to their leaders for more than one month. Taken together, no support was found for either hypotheses 3 or 4.

7.5 Examination of Research Question 2

The second research question of the present study aimed to explore how leader attachment style is related to follower job satisfaction and follower turnover intent. Specifically, it was proposed that leader attachment anxiety would be, according to hypothesis 5, negatively associated with follower job satisfaction, and according to hypothesis 6, positively associated with follower turnover intent. Further, it was proposed that leader attachment avoidance would be, according to hypothesis 7, negatively associated with follower job satisfaction, and according to hypothesis 8, positively associated with follower turnover intent.

Given the hierarchical structure of the data, whereby observations were gathered from followers about both themselves and their leaders and also from leaders about themselves, it was decided to first explore the merits of addressing the second research question using hierarchical linear modelling (HLM), a technique that accounts for variables measured at two or more levels of analysis (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Using HLM 7.0
Student Edition software for Windows, produced by Scientific Software International, two analyses were conducted to establish whether leader attachment was a significant predictor of follower job satisfaction and separately follower turnover intent, whilst taking into account any nesting within leaders.

To perform the HLM analyses, two separate data files were created in the PASW package using the Time 1 data. Specifically, a follower file was created that comprised those follower cases where paired leader cases existed, and a leader file was created that comprised leader cases where paired follower cases existed. All leader cases with no corresponding follower cases, and all follower cases with no corresponding leader cases, were excluded from the selection and thereby omitted from any further analyses related to this second research question. This resulted in a leader data file that comprised 57 leader cases and a follower data file that comprised 225 follower cases. It should be noted that the job grades of the survey respondents spanned the entire range of job grades found within the host organisation; in other words, multiple job grades were represented in the data. As a result, some respondents who had been nominated as leaders, had themselves nominated other respondents as leaders. This meant that cases with both paired follower cases and a paired leader case were included in both data files. The leader data file contained leaders’ self-report ratings on the attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance variables. The follower data file contained follower self-report ratings on the job satisfaction and turnover intent variables. All cases also contained an identification code variable that linked leader and follower cases. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to both the leader attachment anxiety and the follower turnover intent variables.

The two data files were imported into the HLM software package and the variables were chosen for the two separate analyses. In the first analysis, the follower job
satisfaction variable was nominated as the follower-level outcome variable while the leader attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance variables were nominated as the leader-level variables. The unconstrained null hypothesis was tested and the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) was found to be .14. The ICC represents the ratio of between-group to within-group variance, that is, the level of consensus amongst raters on the same subject (Nezlek, 2011), sometimes known as the cluster effect (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). The current value of the ICC suggested that 14% of the variation in the follower job satisfaction variable could be attributed to nesting within leaders. In the second analysis, the outcome variable was changed to be the follower turnover intent variable. The unconstrained null hypothesis was then tested and the ICC was found to be .12. This result suggested that 12% of the variation in the follower turnover intent variable could be attributed to nesting within leaders. As the ICC for both analyses was less than 20%, it was deemed that there was poor agreement between followers (Chang, n.d.) on the respective dependent variables, given the grouping by leader. In other words, the follower-level variables did not differ to any great extent across the higher-level leader variables (Nezlek, 2011). It was therefore concluded that HLM analyses may not yield results any different from those using traditional analyses, and so it was decided to continue the analyses using hierarchical multiple regression techniques using disaggregated data, on the basis that any between-group variation was low.

A data file containing disaggregated data was created in the PASW package by manually entering matched data from the previously selected 57 leader cases into the previously selected 225 follower cases. If a leader had been nominated by one or more followers as their leader, the relevant data from the leader case were coded into the paired follower cases. This process resulted in three variables, named “leader-report attachment anxiety”, “leader-report attachment avoidance” and “leader-report social desirability”,.
being created in follower cases. These three variables are summarised in Table 4. The term leader-report was used to distinguish these variables from both self-report and other-report variables contained in the same case. These three variables, together with the follower self-report attachment anxiety and follower self-report attachment avoidance variables, were explored for outliers and non-normal distributions. The latter two variables were included in the exploration procedure as it was planned that they be used as control variables in the hierarchical regression analysis. Outliers were recoded for the self-report attachment avoidance and the self-report attachment anxiety variables, using the procedure previously outlined. A logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) was applied to both the self-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment anxiety variables, while a square root transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) was applied to the leader-report attachment avoidance variable.

The analyses for the two dependent variables of interest, namely, the follower self-report job satisfaction variable and the follower self-report turnover intent variable, were performed separately and are presented here in turn.

Examining first the follower job satisfaction variable, the correlations between the variables were explored using the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed. The dependent variable, follower job satisfaction, showed significant correlation

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. items</th>
<th>Theoretical range</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-report social desirability</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N* = 225.
coefficients with all the independent variables except the follower attachment avoidance variable, and so this variable was omitted from the analyses related to the follower job satisfaction variable from this point onwards. The assumptions of the regression technique were tested (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and deemed upheld.

A two-step hierarchical regression was conducted with follower job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The follower attachment anxiety variable was entered at step 1 and the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance variables were entered at step 2. The resultant regression statistics are presented in Table 5. The follower attachment anxiety variable, entered at step 1, explained 3.0% of the variance in follower job satisfaction, $F(1, 223) = 6.89, p = .009$. After entry of the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance variables at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 6.8%, $F(3, 221) = 5.37, p = .001$. The two leader-report attachment variables explained an additional 3.8% of the variance in follower job satisfaction after controlling for follower attachment anxiety, $R^2$ change = .04, $F$ change $(2, 221) = 4.50, p = .012$. In the final model, however, neither of the leader-report attachment variables made a unique statistically significant contribution to the

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Squared semi-partial correlation</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-2.63**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-2.75**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 225$.  
*p < .05, **p < .01.
variance in the follower self-report job satisfaction variable, both showing non-significant beta values.

Because both steps of the regression were significant, it was decided to introduce select control variables into the equation to determine if they were masking any effects of the independent variables of interest. The variables selected fell into three categories. The first category comprised eight variables that represented follower intrapersonal constructs, namely, age, gender, social desirability, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and intellect/imagination. The second category comprised three variables that represented leader-follower relationship constructs, namely, contact amount, reporting duration, and relationship quality. The third and final category comprised one variable that represented a leader intrapersonal construct, namely, social desirability. It was planned that the variables would be introduced into the regression equation over three steps, each step according to the three categorisations. Exploration of the potential control variables’ distributions resulted in outliers being recoded for the agreeableness, conscientiousness, and reporting duration variables, using the procedure previously outlined. A logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) was applied to the contact amount, reporting duration, and follower self-report attachment anxiety variables, and a reflected logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) was applied to the agreeableness, conscientiousness, and relationship quality variables.

The relationships between the follower job satisfaction variable and the potential control variables were examined using the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed. The various coefficients were calculated and are presented in Table 6. Eight of the 13 potential control variables were shown to be significantly correlated with the follower job satisfaction variable and were therefore selected for inclusion in the hierarchical regression analysis as independent variables. This meant that six control
variables from the first category, one control variable from the second category, and the single control variable in the third category were selected for inclusion in the regression equation. Further, this also meant that together with the two independent variables of interest, leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance, a total of 10 variables were intended for inclusion in the regression equation over three steps.

The assumptions of this statistical technique were tested (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and although no cases appeared to have a standardised residual value in excess of ±3.3 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), one case had a Mahalanobis distance score that exceeded the critical value, $\chi^2(10, N = 225) = 29.59$, $p < .001$. This case was removed and fresh correlations were obtained to re-check the selection of variables for inclusion in the regression equation. All the variables that previously showed a significant relationship with the follower job satisfaction variable continued to show significant correlation coefficients and further, no new significant relationships were shown. The testing of the assumptions was resumed (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and no multivariate outliers were found. The assumption of non-multicollinearity was deemed met although
the correlation between the follower attachment anxiety and follower neuroticism independent variables was slightly high, $r = .47, p < .001$. For this reason, the results were treated with caution, given too that the neuroticism scale showed a somewhat low Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, as reported earlier in this chapter.

A three-step hierarchical regression was conducted with the follower job satisfaction variable as the dependent variable. The control variables in the first category, being related to follower intrapersonal constructs, were entered at step 1. These were the age, attachment anxiety, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness variables. The control variable in the second category, which represented a leader-follower relationship construct, was entered at step 2. This was the relationship quality variable. Finally, the control variable in the third category, being a leader intrapersonal construct, was entered at step 3. This was the leader-report social desirability variable. Also entered at step 3 were the two independent variables of interest, namely, the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance variables. The resultant regression statistics are presented in Table 7. The six variables entered at step 1 explained 19.1% of the variance in the follower job satisfaction variable, $F (6, 217) = 8.53, p < .001$. In particular, the age and extraversion variables made significant positive contributions to the regression model at step 1 while the neuroticism variable made a significant negative contribution to the regression model at step 1. After entry of the relationship quality variable at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 27.4%, $F (7, 216) = 11.63, p < .001$. This variable explained an additional 8.3% of the variance in the follower job satisfaction variable after controlling for the variables entered at step 1, $R^2$ change = .08, $F$ change (1, 216) = 24.79, $p < .001$. The follower age, extraversion, and neuroticism variables continued to make significant contributions to the regression model at step 2. In addition, the relationship quality variable now made a significant negative
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Contribution to the regression model at step 2. Note that the negative valence of the contribution made by the relationship quality variable should be considered in light of the variable having received a reflected transformation. After entry of the three variables at step 3, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 29.6%, $F (10, 213) = 8.95$.

Table 7

Summary of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Leader-Report Attachment Orientation Variables Predicting the Follower Job Satisfaction Variable while Controlling for Select Follower Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Squared</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semi-partial correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.75***</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-3.68***</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>4.23***</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-3.24**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower relationship quality</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-4.98***</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.09***</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-2.95**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower relationship quality</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-4.76***</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report social desirability</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 224$.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
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*p < .001*. These three variables explained an additional 2.2% of the variance in the follower job satisfaction variable after controlling for the variables entered at steps 1 and 2, $R^2$ change = .02, $F$ change (3, 213) = 2.19, *p* = ns. The same variables continued to make significant contributions to the regression model at step 3 as at step 2, namely, age, extraversion, neuroticism, and relationship quality. None of the variables entered at step 3 made a significant contribution to the regression model. In the final model, neither the leader-report attachment anxiety variable nor the leader-report attachment avoidance variable made a unique statistically significant contribution to the variance in the follower self-report job satisfaction variable, both showing non-significant beta values. Followers’ job satisfaction ratings, therefore, were not shown to be associated with leaders’ self-report ratings regarding either their attachment anxiety or their attachment avoidance, and as such, no support was found for either hypotheses 5 or 7.

Having examined the first dependent variable of interest, follower job satisfaction, the above process was repeated for the second dependent variable of interest, follower turnover intent, using the same 225 cases. As the distributions of the independent variables of interest had already been examined in the prior analysis, the current analysis used these variables with the same adjustments as those made earlier. As a result, the follower turnover intent, follower attachment anxiety, and leader-report attachment anxiety variables were used with a logarithmic transformation having been applied and the leader-report attachment avoidance variable was used with a square root transformation having been applied. The follower attachment avoidance variable was used having previously needed only outliers recoded, which was done using the procedure previously outlined.

The first step of the analysis involved exploring the correlations between the variables using the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed. This was done to explore whether a relationship existed between the turnover intent variable and the
independent variables of interest, and in turn determine which variables merited inclusion in the regression equation. The dependent variable, follower turnover intent, showed significant correlation coefficients with all the independent variables except follower attachment avoidance, and so the latter was omitted from the analyses related to the second research question from this point onwards. The assumptions of this regression technique were tested (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and deemed upheld.

A two-step hierarchical regression was then conducted with the follower turnover intent variable as the dependent variable. The follower attachment anxiety variable was entered at step 1, and the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance variables were entered at step 2. The resultant regression statistics are presented in Table 8. The follower attachment anxiety variable, entered at step 1, explained 3.5% of the variance in follower turnover intent, \( F(1, 223) = 8.15, p = .005 \). After entry of the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance variables at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 6.4%, \( F(3, 221) = 5.06, p = .002 \). The two leader-report attachment variables explained an additional 2.9% of the variance in the follower turnover intent variable after controlling for follower attachment, \( R^2 \) change = .03, \( F \) change (2, 221) = 3.43, \( p = .034 \). In the final model, however, neither

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Squared semi-partial correlation</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 225 \).

*\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \).
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Table 9

Correlations Between the Follower Turnover Intent Variable and Potential Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>Follower intellect/imagination</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower social desirability</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>Follower contact amount</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>Follower reporting duration</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>Follower relationship quality</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>Leader-report social desirability</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 225.
* p < .05, ** p < .01 (2-tailed).

of the leader-report variables made a unique statistically significant contribution to the variance in the follower turnover intent variable, both showing non-significant beta values.

Because both steps of the regression were significant, it was decided to introduce select control variables into the regression equation to determine if they were masking any effects of the independent variables of interest. The same variables were selected as those used earlier when investigating the follower job satisfaction variable. These control variables sat within the same three categorisations used earlier, which in turn guided the entry of the variables into the regression equation. Because the case set was also identical to that used earlier, the variables were used with the same manipulations and treatments as those previously applied.

The relationships between the follower turnover intent variable and the potential control variables were examined using the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed. The various coefficients were calculated and are presented in Table 9. Ten of the 13 potential control variables were shown to be significantly correlated with the follower turnover intent variable and were therefore selected for inclusion in the
hierarchical regression analysis as independent variables. This meant that seven control
variables from the first category, two control variables from the second category and the
single control variable in the third category were selected for inclusion in the regression
equation. Further, this also meant that together with the two independent variables of
interest, leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance, a total of
12 variables were intended for inclusion in the regression equation.

The assumptions of this statistical technique were tested (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick
& Fidell, 2013) and the assumption of non-multicollinearity was deemed met although, as
before, the correlation between the follower attachment anxiety and follower neuroticism
independent variables was slightly high, $r = .47$, $p < .001$. For this reason, the results were
treated with caution, given too that the neuroticism scale showed a somewhat low
Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, as reported earlier in this chapter.

A three-step hierarchical regression was conducted with the follower turnover
intent variable as the dependent variable. The control variables in the first category, being
related to follower intrapersonal constructs, were entered at step 1. These were the age,
attachment anxiety, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and social
desirability variables. The control variables in the second category, which represented
leader-follower relationship constructs, were entered at step 2. These were the reporting
duration and relationship quality variables. Finally, the control variable in the third
category, being a leader intrapersonal construct, was entered at step 3. This was the leader-
report social desirability variable. Also entered at step 3 were the two independent
variables of interest, namely, the leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report
attachment avoidance variables. The resultant regression statistics are presented in Table
10. The seven variables entered at step 1 explained 15.6% of the variance in the follower
turnover intent variable, $F (7, 217) = 5.75$, $p < .001$. In particular, the age and extraversion
Results

Table 10

Summary of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Leader-Report Attachment Orientation Variables Predicting the Follower Turnover Intent Variable while Controlling for Select Follower Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Squared semi-partial correlation</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-4.05***</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower social desirability</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.40*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-5.36***</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower social desirability</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.52*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower reporting duration</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower relationship quality</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>6.16***</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Follower age</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-5.25***</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower social desirability</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower extraversion</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.53*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower neuroticism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower agreeableness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower conscientiousness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower reporting duration</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower relationship quality</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>5.94***</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report social desirability</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 225.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
variables made significant negative contributions to the regression model at step 1. After
entry of the two variables at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole
was 30.3%, $F (9, 215) = 10.41, p < .001$. These two variables explained an additional
14.7% of the variance in the follower turnover intent variable after controlling for the
follower variables entered at step 1, $R^2$ change = .15, $F$ change (2, 215) = 22.69, $p < .001$.
The follower age and extraversion variables continued to contribute significantly to the
regression model at step 2. In addition, the reporting duration and relationship quality
variables now made significant positive contributions to the regression model at step 2.
Note that the positive valence of the contribution made by the relationship quality variable
should be considered in light of the variable having received a reflected transformation.

After entry of the three variables at step 3, the total variance explained by the model as a
whole was 31.8%, $F (12, 212) = 8.24, p < .001$. These three variables explained an
additional 1.5% of the variance in the follower turnover intent variable after controlling for
the variables entered at steps 1 and 2, $R^2$ change = .02, $F$ change (3, 212) = 1.51, $p = ns$.
The same variables continued to make a significant contribution to the regression model at
step 3 as at step 2, namely, age, extraversion, reporting duration, and relationship quality.
None of the variables entered at step 3 made a significant contribution to the regression
model. In the final model, neither the leader-report attachment anxiety variable nor the
leader-report attachment avoidance variable made a unique statistically significant
contribution to the variance in the follower turnover intent variable, both showing non-
significant beta values. Followers’ turnover intent ratings, therefore, were not shown to be
associated with leaders’ self-report ratings regarding either their attachment anxiety or
their attachment avoidance, and as such, no support was found for either hypotheses 6 or 8.
7.6 Examination of Research Question 3

The third research question of this study aimed to explore the extent to which attachment orientation moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and perceptions of leaders’ authentic leadership. Hypothesis 9 proposed that follower attachment orientation would moderate the relationship between follower job satisfaction and follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership. Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to test this hypothesis using the Time 1 data supplied by all 249 respondents in the full data file.

The variables selected for analysis were the self-report job satisfaction variable as the dependent variable, the other-report authentic leadership variable as the independent variable, and the self-report attachment anxiety and self-report attachment avoidance variables as the moderating variables. The self-report social desirability variable was also selected as it was planned that it be used as a control variable. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in outliers being recoded for the self-report attachment anxiety and other-report authentic leadership variables, using the procedure previously outlined, and a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the self-report attachment anxiety, other-report authentic leadership and self-report job satisfaction variables.

Next, the relationships between the variables were examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed, the results of which are presented in Table 11. Correlations were shown between the job satisfaction variable and both the attachment anxiety and follower-report authentic leadership variables, but not between the job satisfaction variable and either the attachment avoidance variable or the social desirability variable. As a result, the latter two variables were removed from all further analyses related to this third research question.
A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with the job satisfaction variable as the dependent variable and the attachment anxiety and other-report authentic leadership variables as the independent variables. It showed that both independent variables were related to job satisfaction with significant beta values. Based upon this, it was decided to pursue the analysis of a moderation effect between attachment anxiety and other-report authentic leadership in the prediction of job satisfaction.

To determine which variables should be included in a test for moderation, the attachment anxiety and other-report authentic leadership variables were centred, giving each a mean of zero, and the interaction term between them was calculated. Next, the relationships between the job satisfaction variable, both centred variables, and the interaction term were examined using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, 2-tailed, the results of which are presented in Table 12. The job satisfaction variable was shown to be significantly correlated with both centred variables but not with the interaction term. As a result, it was deemed unnecessary to perform any further analyses and it was concluded that no moderating interaction existed between the attachment orientation and other-report authentic leadership variables in the prediction of the job satisfaction variable. As such, no support was found for hypothesis 9.

Table 11

*Correlations between the Self-Report Job Satisfaction, Attachment Orientation, and Social Desirability Variables and the Other-Report Authentic Leadership Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-report job satisfaction</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-report social desirability</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 249.*

**p < .01, two-tailed.
Examination of Research Question 4

The fourth and final research question of this study aimed to explore the short-term effects, if any, of a psycho-educational intervention that encouraged leaders to examine their attachment orientations and levels of authentic leadership. Specifically, it was proposed that subsequent to leader participation in a psycho-educational intervention that targeted attachment orientation and authentic leadership concepts, according to hypothesis 10, leader attachment anxiety, leader attachment avoidance, and leader turnover intent would decrease while leader authentic leadership and leader job satisfaction would increase. Further, hypothesis 11 proposed that follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership, follower job satisfaction, and follower relationship quality would increase while follower turnover intent would decrease. These hypotheses were investigated using paired samples t-tests where the categorical independent variable was time with two different levels, Time 1 and Time 2, representing pre- and post-intervention periods respectively.

Table 12

Correlations Between the Self-Report Job Satisfaction, Centred Attachment Anxiety, and Centred Other-Report Authentic Leadership Variables, and the Interaction Term Based Upon the Two Centred Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-report job satisfaction</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Centred attachment anxiety</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Centred other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Centred attachment anxiety X centred other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 249.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001, two-tailed.
This fourth research question was investigated in relation to four different sample groups using a number of different variables. The four samples used to test these hypotheses each comprised cases that separately met the following four criteria: (a) leaders who attended a feedback workshop; (b) followers of the leaders who met the first criterion; (c) leaders who after attending a feedback workshop went on to complete the distance learning activities to at least an average extent, where average was based upon the sample of leaders in the present study who engaged in the LAG process; and (d) followers of the leaders who met the third criterion. Note that the calculation of the average LAG completion level is described later in this section. As a result of the criteria just explained, four different sets of analyses were conducted to investigate Research Question 4, each based upon paired Time 1 and Time 2 data. Further, the variables of interest selected for inclusion in the analyses were slightly different for the two respondent groups. Regarding leaders, the variables selected were the self-report attachment anxiety, self-report attachment avoidance, self-report authentic leadership, self-report job satisfaction, and self-report turnover intent variables. Regarding followers, the variables selected were the other-report authentic leadership, self-report job satisfaction, self-report turnover intent, and self-report relationship quality variables.

Before proceeding with the t-test analyses, the assumptions of this statistical method were first tested (Pallant, 2010). The first requirement of this method, that the dependent variables be continuous in nature, was deemed upheld because all the dependent variables had been measured using continuous scales. Second, it was deemed sufficient that the respondents had participated voluntarily and to that extent, the scores had been obtained from a representative sample from within the host organisation. However, the entire sample was not truly random because all the respondents were sourced from the one organisation and as a result, the findings were treated with caution. The third assumption,
independence of observations, was deemed upheld, first in relation to leaders as there were no leader groupings as such, and second in relation to followers because although followers worked together in groups and may not have been independent of one another, the low ICC results (Chang, n.d.) reported earlier in this chapter in relation to Research Question 2, suggested that the follower-level variables did not differ to any great extent across the higher-level leader variables (Nezlek, 2011). Fourth, the assumption of normally distributed samples was also deemed upheld, although in relation to select variables, this had been achieved by recoding outliers and/or applying transformations. Fifth, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was deemed upheld because the two samples used in the two levels of analysis, Time 1 and Time 2, comprised the same respondents. Lastly, the final assumption, that the differences between the Time 1 and Time 2 ratings obtained for each respondent were normally distributed, was investigated for each specific t-test, the results of which are reported below prior to the description of each t-test analysis.

The first of the analyses undertaken to investigate Research Question 4 involved exploring any differences in Time 1 and Time 2 rating on the self-report attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, authentic leadership, job satisfaction, and turnover intent variables, amongst leaders who had attended a feedback workshop. A subset of 46 cases from the full data file was used for this analysis, these cases representing leaders who had attended a feedback workshop and who continued to be employed by the host organisation at the Time 2 testing. Of these, three leaders reported at Time 2 that they had moved to new roles within the host organisation in the month prior to the testing. The conditional branching embedded within the second survey meant that respondents who had moved roles within the last month were not presented with the items related to the job satisfaction and turnover intent variables. As a result, data were not collected at Time 2 in relation to
these two variables for three leaders. Consequently, only 43 leaders in the sample of 46 responded to all of the variables under investigation.

Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the attachment anxiety variable at Time 1. Given the comparative nature of t-test analyses, the same transformation was applied to the paired Time 2 variable. The distribution of the transformed Time 2 variable was subsequently examined, which revealed no outliers and a non-significant skewness statistic. The assumption of normally distributed rating differences across the Time 1 and Time 2 levels (Pallant, 2010) was tested and the attachment avoidance variable showed a significant skewness statistic and one outlier. However, because violations of normality are unlikely to cause serious problems with samples of 30 or more (Pallant, 2010), it was decided to continue the analysis without attempting to recode the outlier and reduce the skewness, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the t-tests were performed, the results of which are presented in Table 13. No significant differences were shown for the ratings on the self-report attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, authentic leadership, job satisfaction, or turnover intent variables from Time 1 to Time 2 amongst leaders who had attended a feedback workshop. In an attempt to counteract the problem of multiple comparisons, it was planned to apply a Bonferroni correction to the significance level applied to each t-test. The Bonferroni correction (Matthew, 2012; Sedgwick, 2012) is used to reduce the chances of obtaining false-positive results (i.e., type I errors) when multiple pair-wise tests are performed on a single set of data. This correction was not applied, however, because none of the t values were significant. Leaders’ attendances at a feedback workshop, therefore, were not shown to be associated with any significant differences in leaders’ ratings from Time 1 to Time 2
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Table 13

Contrast of Time 1 with Time 2 Variables for Leaders who Attended a Feedback Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report attachment anxiety</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report attachment avoidance</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report turnover intent</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 43-46, the range being due to three leaders who had changed roles within the four weeks prior to completing the Time 2 survey and the conditional branching of that survey therefore not presenting the IJS or MOAQ items to them.

The second of the analyses undertaken to investigate Research Question 4 involved exploring any differences in scores for the other-report authentic leadership, self-report job satisfaction, self-report turnover intent, and self-report relationship quality variables, amongst followers whose leaders had attended a feedback workshop. A subset of 71 cases from the full data file was used for this analysis, these cases representing followers who had reported to the same leader at both Time 1 and Time 2, who themselves had not participated in the psycho-educational intervention, and whose leaders had attended a feedback workshop. Followers who themselves had attended a feedback workshop were excluded from the analysis as it was believed that their experiences may confound the results. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in a reflected logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) being applied to the other-report authentic leadership variables at both Time 1 and Time 2. The assumption of normally distributed rating differences across the Time 1 and Time 2 levels (Pallant, 2010) was deemed upheld.

for any of the self-report variables under investigation. As such, no support was found for hypothesis 10.
Next, the t-tests were performed, the results of which are presented in Table 14. Although followers whose leaders had attended a feedback workshop showed higher ratings on the job satisfaction variable at Time 1 than at Time 2, this result was not significant once a Bonferroni (Matthew, 2012; Sedgwick, 2012) correction was applied to the usual significance level of \( p < .05 \). The correction modified the significance level to become \( p < .0125 \), based upon four simultaneous t-tests. The corrected \( p \) value was less than the actual significance of the \( t \) statistic, \( p = .014 \), which rendered the difference non-significant. Further, no significant differences were shown in the ratings on the other-report authentic leadership, turnover intent, or relationship quality variables from Time 1 to Time 2. Leaders’ attendances at a feedback workshop, therefore, were not shown to be associated with any significant differences in followers’ ratings from Time 1 to Time 2 on the other-report authentic leadership, self-report turnover intent, or self-report relationship quality variables. As such, no support was found for hypothesis 11.

The third of the four analyses undertaken to investigate Research Question 4 involved exploring any differences in self-report ratings on the attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, authentic leadership, job satisfaction, and turnover intent variables, amongst leaders who had not only attended a feedback workshop, but who had also

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1 M</th>
<th>Time 1 SD</th>
<th>Time 2 M</th>
<th>Time 2 SD</th>
<th>( t(70) )</th>
<th>( p ) (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report turnover intent</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report relationship quality</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 71 \).
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completed the self-paced distance learning activities presented in the four LAGs to at least an average extent.

The first step of this analysis was to determine the extent to which leaders had completed the self-paced distance learning activities presented in the four LAGs and to then ascertain the average level of completion across all leaders who had participated in the psycho-educational intervention. This would then enable the appropriate cases to be selected for this third analysis. To achieve this, a variable was created termed “LAG completion”, which represented the extent to which leaders had completed the learning activities offered across the four LAGs. A value was calculated for each leader based upon data provided by leaders when completing the second survey. Leaders indicated the extent to which they completed each LAG activity using the scale 0 (Did not attempt), 1 (Partially completed), and 2 (Fully completed). The scores for the 33 activities offered across the four guides were summed to give each leader an LAG completion score ranging from 0 to 66. Higher scores indicated higher activity completion levels. Next, accounting for all the leaders who had participated in the psycho-educational intervention, the average LAG completion level was calculated for the sample and found to be 12.46 (SD = 9.31).

Based upon this average value, a subset of 18 cases from the full data file was used for this third analysis, these cases representing leaders whose LAG completion scores were equal to or greater than the average LAG completion level. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in no adjustments being required (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The assumption of normally distributed rating differences across the Time 1 and Time 2 levels (Pallant, 2010) was tested and the attachment avoidance variable showed a significant skewness statistic. However, because violations of normality are unlikely to cause serious problems with samples of 30 or more (Pallant, 2010), it was decided to continue without performing any adjustments, although the results were treated with caution. Finally,
examination of the sample size revealed that it lacked adequate power for the planned analyses (Cohen, 1988). Despite this, it was decided that the analyses should continue, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the t-tests were performed, the results of which are presented in Table 15. No significant differences were shown for the ratings on the self-report attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, authentic leadership, job satisfaction, or turnover intent variables from Time 1 to Time 2 for leaders who had attended a feedback workshop and completed the self-paced distance learning activities to at least an average extent. Bonferroni corrections (Matthew, 2012; Sedgwick, 2012) were not applied to any of the t-test significance level because none of the t values were significant. Leaders’ completion levels of the LAG activities to at least an average extent, therefore, were not associated with any significant differences in leaders’ ratings from Time 1 to Time 2 for any of the self-report variables under investigation. As such, no new support was found for hypothesis 10.

The fourth and final analysis undertaken to investigate Research Question 4 involved exploring any differences in scores for the other-report authentic leadership, self-
report job satisfaction, self-report turnover intent, and self-report relationship quality variables, amongst followers whose leaders had not only attended a feedback workshop, but who had also completed the self-paced distance learning activities to at least an average extent. A subset of 27 cases from the full data file was used for this analysis, these cases representing followers who had reported to the same leader at both Time 1 and Time 2, who themselves had not participated in the psycho-educational intervention, and whose leaders had completed the self-paced distance learning activities to at least an average extent. As for the second analysis related to this research question, followers who themselves had attended a feedback workshop were excluded from this analysis as it was believed that their experiences may confound the results. Further, the level of LAG completion was determined in accord with that described earlier. Exploration of the variables’ distributions resulted in no adjustments being required (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Also, the assumption of normally distributed rating differences across the Time 1 and Time 2 levels (Pallant, 2010) was deemed upheld. Finally, examination of the sample size revealed that it lacked adequate power for the planned analyses (Cohen, 1988). Despite this, it was decided that the analyses should continue, although the results were treated with caution.

Next, the t-tests were performed, the results of which are presented in Table 16. No significant differences were shown for the ratings on the other-report authentic leadership, self-report job satisfaction, self-report turnover intent, and self-report relationship quality variables from Time 1 to Time 2 for followers whose leaders had attended a feedback workshop and completed the self-paced distance learning activities to at least an average extent. Bonferroni corrections (Matthew, 2012; Sedgwick, 2012) were not applied to each t-test significance level because all of the $t$ values were non-significant without the correction. Leaders’ completion levels of the LAG activities to at least an average extent,
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therefore, were not associated with any significant differences in followers’ ratings from Time 1 to Time 2 for any of the variables under investigation. As such, no new support was found for hypothesis 11.

It was also planned to investigate any change in the ratings on the variables of interest from Time 1 to Time 2 for leaders who had not participated in the psycho-educational intervention. However, respondent numbers ($N = 3$) were insufficient to meet the assumptions of the proposed statistical methods and therefore these analyses were not pursued.

### 7.8 Summary of Results

In summary, the analyses conducted to test the various hypotheses associated with the study’s four research questions showed support for hypothesis 2, but otherwise, no support for hypothesis 1 or hypotheses 3 to 11. This paper will now turn to a detailed discussion of these results and present suggestions as to why the results may have transpired as they did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>t(26)</th>
<th>p (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other-report authentic leadership</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report turnover intent</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report relationship quality</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 27$. 

Table 16

Contrast of Time 1 with Time 2 Variables for Followers of Leaders who Completed the Learning Activities to an Average or Greater Extent
Chapter 8: Discussion

8.1 Chapter Overview

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationships between the attachment orientations of workplace leaders, their displays of authentic leadership behaviours, and the work experiences of both themselves and their followers, where work experience was measured primarily in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intent. With this purpose as a backdrop, this chapter discusses the results of this study in light of both theory and current research. The chapter begins with a comment on the psychometric properties of the measures used and then continues with a brief discussion of the descriptive information provided by respondents when completing the two surveys. Next is a discussion of the results that pertain, in turn, to each of the study’s four research questions and the associated hypotheses. Because the present study provided support for only one of the proposed hypotheses, the discussion includes a commentary as to why such limited support was found. The chapter then examines the study’s limitations more broadly and presents these with suggestions regarding possible future research.

8.2 Psychometric Properties of the Research Measures and Variables

A variety of psychometric scales and subscales were used in the present study. All of them showed acceptable internal consistency statistics except the ALQ Self Rater – Transparency and the ALQ Self Rater – Balanced Processing subscales. As a result, none of the self-rated authentic leadership subscales were used in the present study. In addition, the self-report Mini-IPIP – Agreeableness, Mini-IPIP – Conscientiousness, Mini-IPIP – Intellect/Imagination, and Mini-IPIP – Neuroticism scales each showed low internal consistency statistics. These scales continued to be used because the statistics were not so
low as to render the scales unviable. However, any conclusions drawn about the present study’s findings in relation to these scales were treated with caution.

Although the majority of the research measures showed acceptable internal consistency statistics, the distributions of the variables meant that many of them were transformed prior to testing each hypothesis. As a result, many of the results were obtained using transformed data. Transformations involve applying a mathematical modification to the values of variables to improve their distributions and to render outlier values less extreme (Osborne, 2002). Although such manipulations enable certain statistical procedures to be used, they may also fundamentally transform the nature of the variable, making the interpretation of the results somewhat more complex (Osborne, 2002). Therefore, although the commentary in this chapter refers to findings related to variables such as attachment anxiety and turnover intent, it should be noted that in some cases, such findings relate to transformed variables, as noted in the previous chapter.

8.3 Target Context and Study Sample

The present study was designed to achieve three context and study sample aims. The first of these was to position the study within an in situ context that offered up a sample of employment-based followers and leaders. The reason for this was that some of the related research studies used samples that comprised undergraduate students in educational settings (e.g., Towler, 2005) or further, employed laboratory settings (e.g., Hansbrough, 2012). It was believed that the findings of such studies may be difficult to generalise into the broader community because their contexts are not always representative of actual employment-based settings. The second aim was not only to use an in situ context, but to use one that was typical of many workers. Some of the related research studies (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper, 2002; Popper et al., 2000) were conducted in
military settings using soldiers and commanding officers, a setting that is unlikely to be typical of many work contexts. Again, it was believed that it would be difficult to generalise the findings of such studies because the military context is dissimilar to those within which many people work. The third and final context and study sample aim was to ensure a greater representation of women in the study sample than that achieved in some past studies. The reason for this was that some of the related in situ research involved samples that predominantly comprised men. For example, two of the three studies reported by Davidovitz et al. (2007) used all-male samples, while their third study used a sample of 200 participants, of whom only 23 were women. It was believed that a more balanced proportion of women to men would more typically reflect everyday work environments.

The demographics reported by the respondents in the present study confirmed that two of these three aims had been achieved and that one had been somewhat achieved. First, all the respondents reported that they were employed by the host organisation on a permanent full- or part-time basis. Second, virtually all of the respondents reported working in either a retail or office environment, while a small number reported that they worked in a warehouse and dispatch setting. As a result, the two context aims had been achieved. In relation to the gender balance aim, the sample included a large proportion of women, to the point where the sample was, in fact, weighted toward women over men. Nearly two thirds of the first survey respondents and over half of the second survey respondents were women. Conversely, a higher proportion of the sample’s leaders were men. Of the 54 leaders at Time 1, 65% were men, and of the 46 leaders at Time 2, 70% were men. So although the present study achieved its aim of increasing the representation of women in the sample overall, the full sample was over-represented with women while the leader sample was over-represented with men. It should be noted that despite the
improved representation of women in the present study, the resulting gender-specific sample sizes were deemed too small to conduct any systematic comparison of the relationships amongst the variables of interest for female as compared to male leaders.

This chapter will now turn to a discussion of the results specific to each research question and each hypothesis.

### 8.4 Discussion of Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked about how leaders’ attachment orientations were related to self- and follow-perceptions of authentic leadership. Specifically, it was proposed that leader authentic leadership would be, according to hypothesis 1, negatively associated with leader attachment anxiety and according to hypothesis 2, negatively associated with leader attachment avoidance. Additionally, it was proposed that follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership would be, according to hypothesis 3, negatively associated with leader attachment anxiety, and according to hypothesis 4, negatively associated with leader attachment avoidance. All four hypotheses were tested using the full authentic leadership scale and additionally for hypotheses 3 and 4, using the authentic leadership subscales. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not tested using the authentic leadership subscales because the self-report subscales had been excluded from the present study, as noted earlier. Additionally, hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested using all follower data related to each leader and separately, data from only those followers who had reported to their leaders for a period of more than one month. This resulted in four separate sets of analyses being conducted.

Based upon the analyses conducted, support was shown only for hypothesis 2. Specifically, leader attachment avoidance was found to show a small, significant negative association with leader authentic leadership, when judged by leaders themselves. In
contrast, no relationship was found between leader attachment anxiety and leader authentic leadership, again as judged by leaders themselves. This meant that the findings of the present study provided no support for the first hypothesis. Similarly, the study provided no support for the third and fourth hypotheses. Follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership were not shown to be associated with either leader attachment anxiety or leader attachment avoidance. This was the case when the full authentic leadership scale was used and when the authentic leadership subscales were used. Further, this was also the case when, using the full authentic leadership scale, follower data were based upon all relevant followers and separately, only those followers who had reported to the leader for a period of more than one month. Followers therefore did not reflect the negative association shown by leaders between their attachment avoidance and authentic leadership levels.

Interestingly, leader authentic leadership was shown to be negatively associated with leader attachment avoidance but not shown to be associated at all with leader attachment anxiety. Many researchers have argued that leaders with secure attachment orientations are better placed to be effective leaders than those with insecure attachment orientations (e.g., Englund et al., 2000; Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper et al., 2004; Scharf & Mayseless, 2009). However, such research studies have assessed leadership from the perspective of followers rather than from the perspective of the leaders themselves. Therefore, the question could be asked as to whether leaders themselves would also reflect such associations in their self-assessments.

This difference in leaders’ perceptions regarding the associations between authentic leadership and attachment avoidance versus attachment anxiety may be related to the findings of other researchers, being that the anxiety and avoidance attachment orientations play out somewhat differently in the workplace. As a backdrop to this argument, Davidovitz et al. (2007) found in the Israeli military that officers’ attachment-avoidant
orientations had a detrimental effect upon soldiers’ group cohesion and socio-emotional functioning whereas officers’ attachment-anxious styles had a positive effect on these things. Additionally officers’ attachment-anxious styles were shown to have a negative affect upon soldiers’ instrumental functioning. The researchers suggested that differences between attachment-avoidant officers’ poor dealings with soldiers’ emotional needs and attachment-anxious officers’ emphases on closeness and interdependence could be key to the differences in soldiers’ experiences.

Examination of the authentic leadership scale reveals that many of the items reflect leaders’ interactions and relationships with followers. For example, two such items are “As a leader I encourage everyone to speak their mind” and “As a leader I show I understand how specific actions impact others.” Perhaps the predominant reflection of positive interpersonal behaviours inherent in the authentic leadership scale results in attachment-avoidant leaders who, struggling with followers’ emotional needs (Davidovitz et al., 2007), fail to recognise their attachment preferences reflected in the authentic leadership items and subsequently rate themselves unfavourably on the authentic leadership scale. This could result in the negative association shown by leaders between their attachment avoidance orientations and self-perceptions of their authentic leadership levels.

Following this line of thought, however, it could be argued that attachment-anxious leaders who, valuing closeness and interdependence (Davidovitz et al., 2007), recognise their attachment preferences in the predominantly interpersonal authentic leadership scale items. This suggests a positive association between attachment anxiety and authentic leadership, not shown in the present study and also, counter to the prediction of hypothesis 1. There are at least two possible explanations as to why, in light of this line of reasoning, no association was shown. The first is that examination of the authentic leadership scale
Discussion reveals that it also includes a few items that may be more reflective of the instrumental aspects of leadership. For example, one such item is “As a leader I analyse relevant data before coming to a decision.” It may be that the scale incorporates enough emphasis on instrumental functioning that leaders may, in terms of their attachment-anxious orientations, respond to these items less favourably than they respond to items that reflect the interpersonal aspects of their roles, and as such, respond inconsistently to the scale as a whole, thereby showing no association between their authentic leadership and attachment anxiety levels.

The second explanation for the lack of an association between attachment anxiety and authentic leadership comes from research by Main et al. (1985) who showed that the two attachment orientations were associated with different self-awareness capacities when reflecting upon relationships. They found that attachment-anxious adults contradicted themselves and attachment-avoidant adults struggled to reflect anything that was more than superficial. Perhaps, then, leaders have contradicted themselves when responding to the authentic leadership scale items associated with the attachment anxiety concepts, thereby reducing the likelihood that any association be shown between the two.

Thus, a possible explanation for the finding in the present study, that leaders associate authentic leadership with attachment avoidance but not attachment anxiety, is that the emphasis in the authentic leadership scale on interpersonal relations may mean that it becomes apparent for leaders that authentic leadership is not consistent with attachment avoidance preferences, thus creating a negative association. Further, the scale’s de-emphasis of the instrumental aspects of leadership when compared with the relational aspects, may mean that leaders do not make any consistent associations between the authentic leadership model and their attachment anxiety preferences. This may be further compounded by the different self-awareness capacities associated with the two attachment orientations.
orientations. Finally, it should be noted that the analyses associated with this research question used the attachment anxiety variable with a transformation having been applied and the attachment avoidance variable without any mathematical manipulations. The transformation of the attachment anxiety variable may have changed the very nature of the variable, as noted earlier.

The lack of an association between leaders’ attachment orientations and followers’ perceptions of leader authentic leadership provides no support for the third and fourth hypotheses of the present study, or for the findings of other researchers. Research has shown leader attachment orientation to be associated with follower-perceptions of leadership style, in terms of transformational and positive leadership models. Given the similarities noted earlier in this paper between transformational and authentic leadership, it seemed reasonable to conclude that the present study would similarly reflect a relationship between follower-perceptions of authentic leadership and leader attachment orientation.

Numerous studies (e.g., Englund et al., 2000; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper et al., 2004; Scharf & Mayseless, 2009) have supported the proposal that leadership potential and leadership effectiveness are more closely associated with secure attachment orientations than with insecure attachment orientations. Specifically, Popper et al. (2000) found that soldiers associated securely attached military officer cadets and commanders with higher levels of transformational leadership than they did insecurely attached individuals. Similarly, Towler (2005) found that students associated securely attached fellow undergraduates with higher levels of charismatic leadership than they did insecurely attached undergraduates. For the purposes of comparison, attachment insecurity describes the presence of attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, or both. Popper (2002) found that army cadet leaders’ avoidant attachment orientations were associated with lower levels of socialised leadership and higher levels of personalised leadership, where leadership was
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judged by platoon and squad commanders. Therefore, the fact that the present study did not find any association between follower-perceptions of authentic leadership and leader attachment orientation, whether considering either the anxiety or avoidance dimensions, is inconsistent with others’ findings when transformational, charismatic, or other positive, socialised leadership models have been used.

There are a number of possible reasons as to why no association was shown in the present study between leader attachment orientation and follower-perceptions of authentic leadership. First, hypotheses 3 and 4 were analysed using averaged follower data that was coded into leaders’ cases. The averaging process may have caused slight changes in the follower data such that subtle differences were lost. Second, the leader-follower relationships represented in the present study’s sample may not have constituted attachment relationships. Although researchers have suggested that the leader-follower relationship constitutes an attachment relationship (Mayseless, 2010; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2003), some of the supporting research has been conducted in military contexts (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper, 2002; Popper et al., 2000). Because of the dangerous nature of military settings, followers in such contexts may be more likely to become emotionally and physically dependent upon their leaders than followers in retail environments. Further, the attachment behavioural system may be triggered more frequently and more strongly for military-based followers than for retail-based followers, thus reinforcing the attachment nature of the relationship, something akin to the process described of infants when they first form attachment relationships with their caregivers (Bowlby, 1969). Perhaps, therefore, the strength or the prevalence of leader-follower relationships in retail contexts differ to those in military environments, to the point where the relationships represented in the present study sample were not attachment relationships in nature. That said, Boatwright et al. (2010) showed that within a retail
environment, different leadership approaches were deemed by followers as more or less ideal depending upon followers’ own attachment styles. Although this suggests for retail environments that followers’ attachment orientations influence leadership style preferences, it cannot be concluded that attachment relationships exist for followers with leaders in every retail environment.

Although attachment relationships may occur differently when military and retail contexts are compared, there is another possible reason as to why the leader-follower relationships in the present study may not have constituted attachment relationships. Of the Time 1 respondents, 188 of the 249, in other words 76%, reported that they were in an exclusive romantic relationship, defined in the first survey to include dating, engaged, de-facto, and married relationships. Such relationships are highly likely to constitute attachment relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and as a result, these respondents may not have sought to have their attachment needs met by their leader, but instead relied upon their romantic partner to achieve such ends. In contrast to the present study, the third of the three studies reported by Davidovitz et al. (2007) used a follower sample that comprised 541 soldiers who were all single males aged 18 years. The youths in the study were all engaged in compulsory military service and were likely separated from their families. These circumstances, coupled with the soldiers being single, may have meant that the leader-follower relationship was of greater significance to them than it was for the present study’s respondents, who likely returned home each day to partners who supported them. Note that although Boatwright et al. (2010) collected information on relationship status, they did not report this in their findings. Given, therefore, that 76% of the present study’s sample were involved in a romantic relationship that was likely to be an attachment relationship, the leader-follower relationships in the present study might not have constituted attachment relationships for the majority of respondents. Alternatively, the
leader-follower relationships may have existed as attachment relationships for the respondents of the present study, but not as relatively strong ones when compared with the other attachment relationships in respondents’ lives. Based upon Bowlby’s (1969) concept that an individual’s attachment relationships exist in a hierarchy, the leader-follower relationships in the present study may have sat lower in respondents’ respective attachment hierarchies than they did in the attachment hierarchies of the respondents in the Davidovitz et al. and possibly the Boatwright et al. studies.

A third explanation as to why no associations were shown between leader attachment orientation and follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership, is that followers’ own attachment orientations may have affected their perceptions of their leaders. For example, Boatwright et al. (2010) found that followers who presented with high attachment anxiety and low attachment avoidance preferred relational leadership behaviours more than did followers who presented with high attachment avoidance and low attachment anxiety. Further, Hansbrough (2012) found that attachment-anxious students recognised more transformational leadership qualities in a specific leader than did attachment-avoidant students. Such findings have led researchers to suggest that anxious attachment orientations may predispose followers to judge leaders as capable of meeting the followers’ anxious attachment needs. Hansbrough suggested that followers’ own attachment styles bias their perceptions of others’ leadership styles and capabilities. Perhaps the attachment orientations of the followers in the present study biased their perceptions of leader authentic leadership in such a way that their judgements resulted in no association being shown.

A fourth reason for the lack of support for hypotheses 3 and 4 is that if the testing of these hypotheses had used data from followers who had been working for their leaders for longer than the one month period used here, then the findings would have been based
upon more established leader-follower relationships. This in turn, might have allowed associations to be shown that were not possible given that the present sample included less established relationships. In the second of the three studies reported by Davidovitz et al. (2007), soldiers had reported to their officers for a 6 to 12 month period. The sample numbers in the present study did not allow for the analyses to be conducted using data supplied by only those followers who had reported to their leaders for six months or more, but a future study may be able to explore this.

A fifth reason, as discussed earlier, as to why no support was found for hypotheses 3 and 4 is that the transformation applied to the attachment anxiety variable may have altered the nature of the variable and therefore, similarly altered the nature of its relationship to other variables.

Lastly, a final explanation for the lack of significant findings is that simply, the constructs of attachment orientation and authentic leadership may not be related. Albeit a lack of significance does not provide conclusive evidence that a relationship does not exist. However, with this caveat in mind, the possibility that the constructs are not related should be considered.

8.5 Discussion of Research Question 2

The second research question of the current study asked whether leader attachment orientation is related to follow job satisfaction and follower turnover intent. Specifically, it was proposed that leader attachment anxiety would be, according the hypothesis 5, negatively associated with follower job satisfaction, and according the hypothesis 6, positively associated with follower turnover intent. Further, it was proposed that leader attachment avoidance would be, according to hypothesis 7, negatively associated with
follower job satisfaction, and according to hypothesis 8, positively associated with follower turnover intent.

The present study did not provide support for hypotheses 5 to 8. Both follower job satisfaction and turnover intent were not shown to be associated with either leader attachment anxiety or leader attachment avoidance. Many researchers have shown that followers relate effective leadership more to leaders with secure attachment orientations than to leaders with insecure attachment orientations (e.g., Englund et al., 2000; Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper et al., 2004; Scharf & Mayseless, 2009). Further, there is abundant evidence to suggest that perceptions of effective leadership are positively related to job satisfaction and turnover intent. For example, Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, and Shaikh (2012) found amongst teachers that leadership style was related to follower job satisfaction. Similarly, Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, and Frey (2013) found more specifically, that transformational leadership was positively related to job satisfaction at both the individual and group level, within an educational setting. Further, Yu-Jia, Yi-Feng, and Islam (2010) found in the retail sector that followers’ perceptions of transformational leadership and job satisfaction were related. Al-Swidi, Nawawi, and Al-Hosam (2012) found equivalent results in the banking sector. Focussing instead on turnover intent, Wells and Peachey (2011) found within an athletic association, a direct negative relationship between transformational leadership and voluntary follower turnover intentions, mediated by satisfaction with the leader. Similarly, Spence Laschinger, Wong, Grau, Read, and Pineau Stam (2012) found that the transformational leadership practices of senior nurses lead to decreased intent to leave amongst follower nurses. Such linkages between effective leadership and leaders’ secure attachment orientations, and separately between perceptions of effective leadership and both follower job satisfaction and follower turnover intent, suggest that it would be reasonable to expect leader attachment orientation
to be related to follower job satisfaction and follower turnover intent. In fact, recent research by Ronen and Mikulincer (2012) has shown that leaders’ attachment anxiety predicted higher job burnout and lower job satisfaction amongst followers, mediated by leaders’ ineffective caregiving orientations. Despite such findings, the present study showed no support for such arguments.

A variety of reasons may suggest why no support was found for hypotheses 5 to 8. First, the analyses were conducted using a disaggregated data file, whereby leader self-report data were coded into follower cases. This duplication of leader-report data across multiple follower cases may have resulted in a loss of differentiation across the data file, hindering the likelihood of finding support for the hypotheses. Second, perhaps the nature of the leader-follower relationships as manifested in the host organisation did not constitute attachment relationships. Without repeating here the arguments presented earlier in relation to Research Question 1, if this was the case, then it would be reasonable to conclude that leader attachment orientation would be of no consequence to either follower job satisfaction or follower turnover intent. Third, perhaps followers’ own attachment orientations, shown to affect their perceptions of leadership as described earlier, influenced the outcomes of the analyses. This moderating interaction was not supported in the analyses related to Research Question 3, to be discussed, but certainly others have shown similar findings whereby follower attachment orientation moderated the relationship between self-perceptions of leader attachment orientation and follower mental health (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007). Given that mental health has been shown to be correlated with job satisfaction, for example, amongst Indian teachers (Maheshbabu & Jadhav, 2012) and English and Scottish customer service centre workers (Bond & Bunce, 2003), it could be argued that a similar moderating relationship would be seen between leaders’ attachment orientations and followers’ job satisfaction levels. Fourth, these hypotheses were tested
using data from all followers and perhaps if there had been sufficient cases to enable the analyses to proceed using only those followers who had reported to their leaders for a longer time period, as proposed when discussing Research Question 1, the results may have supported the hypotheses.

Finally, a last possible reason as to why no support was found for hypotheses 5 to 8 could be due of the fact that transformations had been applied to many of the variables included in the regression analyses. Considering the two regression equations that included the control variables, six of the 10 independent variables associated with the follower job satisfaction equation, and seven of the 12 independent variables associated with the follower turnover intent equation, had been transformed. In both cases, the transformed variables included the two independent variables of particular interest, leader-report attachment anxiety and leader-report attachment avoidance, and in the case of the dependent variable turnover intent, it too was also transformed. Such manipulations to over half of the variables in both equations may have altered the very natures of the variables concerned, and thereby similarly altered their relationships with one another.

Instead of finding support for the proposal that leader attachment orientations were related to follower job satisfaction and turnover intent, the present study showed that follower age, follower extraversion, and follower relationship quality, taking into account the reflected nature of the applied transformation, made significant positive contributions to follower job satisfaction, while follower neuroticism made a significant negative contribution to follower job satisfaction. Further, the study found that, reporting duration made a significant positive contribution to follower turnover intent, while follower age, follower extraversion, and follower relationship quality, again accounting for the reflected transformation, made significant negative contributions to follower turnover intent. These results are consistent with those of other researchers.
Looking first at job satisfaction, Templer (2012) found amongst Asian office workers that extraversion was positively associated with job satisfaction, and that neuroticism was negatively associated with job satisfaction. Using meta-analytic techniques with 163 independent samples, Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) found similar results. Further, Judge et al. found that of the Big Five personality factors, only extraversion and neuroticism were related to job satisfaction across all studies included in their meta-analysis. Many studies have shown positive associations between relationship quality and job satisfaction (e.g., Ariani, 2012; Golden & Veiga, 2008; Major, Kozlowski, Chao, & Gardner, 1995; Malangwasira, 2012; Michael, 2011; Vecchio, Griffeth, & Hom, 1986). Further, Volmer, Niessen, Spurk, Linz, and Abele (2011) showed that relationship quality not only predicted an increase of job satisfaction but also that job satisfaction predicted an increase in relationship quality. They concluded that their results demonstrated a reciprocal relationship between job satisfaction and relationship quality.

Paul and Phua (2011) found age to be negatively related to job satisfaction but their findings suggested a possible non-linear relationship, whereby for their sample of lecturers, job satisfaction showed a positive trend with participant age for those in the older cohort of 55 to 64 years.

Looking next at turnover intent, no research appears to exist that examines the relationship between turnover intent and reporting duration, defined here as the period of reporting to the leader. However, taking tenure as a proxy for reporting duration, Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) found a negative relationship between tenure and actual turnover, moderated by follower age, such that the relationship was less negative in older populations. They found that company tenure was one of the few demographic attributes that meaningfully predicted turnover. Kabungaidze, Mahlatshana, and Ngirande (2013) found age and tenure predicted employee turnover intent amongst South African teachers,
and more specifically, Liu et al. (2012) found that age contributed negatively to turnover intent. Findings regarding the relationship between turnover intent and extraversion appear conflicting. Timmerman (2006) found extraversion to be positively associated with turnover intent, and yet Salgado (2002) found the opposite using meta analytic studies, being that extraversion was positively associated with a lack of turnover intent. Finally, the relationship between relationship quality as measured by the LMX-MDM and turnover intent is well shown, but more recent studies have suggested that the relationship may be curvilinear. Harris, Kacmar, and Witt (2005) found amongst employees from a water management district and separately from a distribution services organization, a curvilinear relationship between relationship quality and turnover intent. Specifically, they found that lower and higher levels of relationship quality were associated with higher levels of turnover intent, while middling levels of relationship quality were associated with lower levels of turnover intent. In other words, they found a relationship that could be represented by an upright U-shape. Similarly, Kim, Lee, and Carlson (2010) found within the hospitality industry evidence for a U-shaped curvilinear relationship between relationship quality and turnover intent for non-supervisory employees, but interestingly, they separated out organisational level and as a result, found a linear relationship for supervisory employees.

The results of the present study in relation to the constructs that contribute to follower job satisfaction and turnover intent appear consistent with those of numerous other studies. This suggests that the present study was in fact able to demonstrate expected relationships with job satisfaction and turnover intent, despite these relationships not being the main focus of the study. Such findings therefore, may add weight to the validity of the present study’s findings that do not support the proposed hypotheses. If the findings regarding the relationships with job satisfaction and turnover intent had been equally
inconsistent with expectations, then it could be argued that the study was flawed in some fashion. However, the fact that these relationships were found suggests that the study design and implementation is robust enough such that well established expectations have been upheld. This therefore suggests that perhaps the hypotheses themselves were misguided or that perhaps the leader-follower relationships in the study’s sample did not represent attachment relationships. These conceptions are discussed later in this chapter.

8.6 Discussion of Research Question 3

The third research question of the present study investigated the extent to which follower attachment orientation moderated the relationship between follow-perceptions of leader authentic leadership and follower job satisfaction. Hypothesis 9 proposed that such a moderating effect would exist.

The present study showed no support for the moderating effect predicted in hypothesis 9. When developing the ALQ, Walumbwa et al. (2008) showed that follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership were positively related to follower job satisfaction, controlling for the effect of organisation climate. Hypothesis 9 posited that this relationship would be moderated by follower attachment orientation, but here this was not shown to be the case. No known research investigates this exact moderation pattern, but the moderating effect of follower attachment orientation has been shown between other related constructs. Davidovitz et al. (2007) found in military settings that the negative effects of attachment-avoidant officers upon the mental health of soldiers were moderated by the soldiers’ own attachment orientations. Specifically, the more avoidant the officer, the more the mental health of the insecurely attached soldiers deteriorated. Drawing upon arguments that a negative relationship exists between leader attachment security and follower-perceptions of leadership (Berson et al., 2006; Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer &
Florian, 1995; Popper et al., 2004; Towler, 2005), it could be proposed that the more avoidant officers in the Davidovitz et al. study would also show fewer behaviours consistent with the authentic leadership model. Separately, and along similar lines, it could also be proposed that soldiers who experience reduced mental health due to their relationships with their leaders would also experience reduced job satisfaction levels. Because job satisfaction has been shown to correlate with mental health, (Bond & Bunce, 2003; Maheshbabu & Jadhav, 2012), it would be reasonable, therefore, to expect that follower attachment orientation would moderate the relationship between follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership and follower job satisfaction, just as soldier attachment orientation has been shown to moderate the relationship between officer attachment-avoidant orientation and soldier mental health. Despite this parallel argument, the present study did not provide support for this.

There are a number of possible explanations as to why the present study showed no support for hypothesis 9. A number of the explanations presented in relation to the lack of support for the prior hypotheses associated with research questions 1 and 2 are valid here. In particular, perhaps the nature of the leader-follower relationship as manifested in the host organisation did not constitute an attachment relationship and as such, the style of leadership shown by leaders did not have an impact upon followers’ job satisfaction levels. Although followers’ own attachment orientations have been shown to affect their perceptions of leadership, as described earlier, perhaps there are enough differences between the authentic leadership model and other forms of positive leadership, such as transformational leadership, such that the patterns shown with the latter do not manifest when leadership is defined in terms of authentic leadership. Lastly, as stated earlier, the transformations applied to all three of the original variables involved in this analysis may
have altered the very natures of the variables concerned, and thereby similarly altered their relationships with one another.

8.7 Discussion of Research Question 4

The fourth and final research question of the present study investigated the effects of a psycho-educational intervention that targeted leaders’ attachment orientations and authentic leadership levels. Specifically, it was proposed that subsequent to leader participation in a psycho-educational intervention that targeted attachment orientation and authentic leadership concepts, according to hypothesis 10, leader authentic leadership and leader job satisfaction levels would increase while leader attachment anxiety, leader attachment avoidance, and leader turnover intent would decrease. Further, hypothesis 11 proposed that follower-perceptions of leader authentic leadership, follower job satisfaction, and follower relationship quality would increase while follower turnover intent would decrease.

It was hoped that educating leaders in the present study about the attachment and authentic leadership concepts would result in them employing new strategies and practices in the workplace, which in turn would have a positive affect upon their own workplace experiences and upon those of their followers. However, the present study showed no changes in the various concepts of interest amongst leaders and followers when pre- and post-intervention data were compared, and therefore showed no support for hypotheses 10 or 11.

Interestingly, the present study did not show a statistically significant change in follower job satisfaction when Bonferroni corrections were applied, but it did show a reduction when the Time 1 and Time 2 variables were compared for all relevant followers, not just those followers whose leaders had completed the learning activities to an average
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or greater extent. A reduction in follower job satisfaction is counter to that hypothesised. Although it is impossible to know why followers’ job satisfaction levels reduced, it could be speculated that this may have been due to followers’ hopes at Time 1, being that the project would result in positive workplace changes, being unrealised at Time 2. On the assumption that any changes, whether statistically significant or not, were more likely to be experienced amongst those leaders and followers where the leaders had engaged in the LAGs to the greatest extents, then this speculation is worthy of mention, because the downward trend was shown amongst all followers, not just those whose leaders had completed the LAG activities to at least an average extent. Inspection of comments provided by followers at the end of the second survey adds some weight to this speculation. In total, over 50 followers commented in various ways that they had experienced no workplace changes as a result of the project. One follower summed this up when she wrote: “The culture and the vibe in the workplace improved significantly around the time of the workshops & when the feedback report came through, but then dropped back again quite significantly.”

Related to this may be the concept of direct voice, the experience of two-way communication between staff and management (Holland, Pyman, Cooper, & Teicher, 2011). Because direct voice has been positively related to job satisfaction (Ackers, Marchington, Wilkinson, & Dundon, 2006; Green & Tsitsianis, 2005), it could be that followers’ beliefs at Time 2, being that they had no direct voice because their feedback to leaders at Time 1 had largely gone unheeded, could have caused a reduction in follower job satisfaction levels. Such a speculation is one possible explanation as to why no support was found for hypotheses 10 and 11, and further, why a reduction in follower job satisfaction was shown between the two testing times.

There are a number of other possible explanations as to why the present study’s psycho-educational intervention did not result in the changes amongst leaders and
followers as hoped. The intensity of the intervention was negotiated with the host organisation so that it provided enough opportunities for leaders to examine their attachment and authentic leadership behaviours without overly distracting leaders from the core aspects of their work. This meant that the intervention was not particularly intensive. Over the five months during which the intervention was conducted, leaders received only four formal contacts, these occurring when the LAGs were distributed. In addition, the host organisation requested a temporary pause in the intervention process at the halfway mark to allow for the peak Christmas and New Year retail period, because it judged that leaders would be too busy to work on the intervention at that time. For these reasons, it would have been easy for leaders to lose momentum with the intervention, and certainly, examination of their LAG completion rates showed gradual reductions with each successive LAG. The intervention relied upon leaders to complete the learning activities on a voluntary basis and although no comparison exists, examination of their completion levels suggest that this was relatively low. As it was, the average LAG completion score was found to be 12.46 out of a possible total score of 66.00, which meant that on average, leaders completed just under 20% of the activities offered, that is, between six and seven of the 33 activities offered over the five months of the intervention. This relatively low level of completion may account for the fact that none of the leaders or their followers recorded any significant changes subsequent to the intervention. Given the low intensity of the intervention, it may have been overly ambitious to expect that it would result in the changes as hypothesised. The counselling literature makes it clear that changing attachment orientations, which are largely unconscious to the person, takes considerable time and effort. Changes in attachment orientation have, for example, been shown amongst people diagnosed with borderline personality disorder after one year of twice-weekly 45 minute therapy sessions (Levy et al., 2006). In a further example, subtle rather
than dramatic positive shifts in the features of the preoccupied/ambivalent attachment orientation have been shown amongst female inpatients with personality disorders (Strauss, Mestel, & Kirchmann, 2011). The women’s attachment insecurities became less significant following psychological treatment over a seven week period that comprised three 90-minute group therapy sessions, four 60-minute disorder-specific group sessions, and six 60-minute body and emotional awareness sessions per week. Similarly, attachment orientation change occurred amongst a sample of therapy clients who attended, on average, 21.4 therapy sessions (Travis, Bliwise, Binder, & Horne-Moyer, 2001). Despite such research studies being concerned with people who may be grappling with mental illness or struggling with problems requiring psychotherapeutic treatment, they do suggest that targeted interventions can result in attachment orientation shifts. These studies employed interventions that were more intense than that offered by the present study’s psycho-educational intervention and therefore suggest that if effective and lasting shifts in attachment orientation are to occur, the interventions employed need to be more thorough and intensive than that offered in the present study.

It is also worth noting that the possible competitive culture of the host organisation, arising from it being in the retail sector, may not have been conducive to the buddy process promoted during the intervention. Being in the retail sector, the host organisation may have had what is termed a market culture, one that emphasises competitive advantage and expects that competitiveness be reflected at the individual level (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). The competitive nature of such organisations rubs off onto employees such that, for example, they work in silos and tend not to engage in cross-organisation communication or share tacit information (Suppiah & Sandhu, 2011). If the host organisation’s culture reflected a market culture, then the sample’s leaders may have been hesitant to work with fellow leaders. This may have been particularly so for leaders in the Retail and Operations
Division, who comprised the majority of the leaders in the study sample. Such as culture may have hindered the use of the buddy system, despite its value, and as a result, the system may not have provided the support or motivation for leaders as hoped.

A further possible explanation for the lack of significant findings in relation to this research question is that the psycho-educational intervention may indeed have had an effect, but that it dissipated before the second wave of data collection. Indeed, as Mitchell and James (2001) discuss, one of the challenges in conducting quasi-experimental studies in the field is determining how much lag-time should elapse between measurements. The lag-time used in the present study was based upon the host organisation’s business requirements. Although not possible in the present study, regular testing throughout the psycho-educational intervention may have highlighted changes as a result of the intervention that were not sustained by the end of the intervention period and therefore not present at the time of the second testing.

Finally, changes within the leader group may have contributed to the poor focus on the psycho-educational intervention. Investigations regarding the reduction in the number of leaders from 54 at Time 1 to 46 at Time 2 revealed that seven of the eight leaders missing at Time 2 had been sacked or summarily dismissed. Further investigation revealed that an additional six leaders in the Retail and Operations Division had been moved to manage different stores within one month of completing the first survey. Such changes may have resulted in some or all of the leaders feeling a degree of anxiety, which in turn may have caused them, say, to focus on core organisational deliverables at the expense of participating in the intervention. Although speculation, such ideas offer possible explanations for the poor engagement levels in the psycho-educational intervention.

To increase the likelihood of achieving the hoped for changes amongst leaders and followers, the intervention could have been improved in a number of ways. First, regular
reminders could have been sent to leaders that may have resulted in higher LAG completion rates. Second, more LAGs could have been issued, also resulting in more frequent reminders to leaders. More LAGs may not necessarily have resulted in more activities for leaders to complete. The current number of activities could have been spread over more LAGs, so that the effort involved for leaders remained the same but the number of contact points and therefore reminders to them increased. Third, select incentives could have been incorporated into the intervention that encouraged leaders to complete the activities. For example, the provision of a second feedback report that compared Time 1 with Time 2 results may have motivated leaders to complete the activities consistently across the intervention period. Alternatively, formal submission requirements may have helped keep leaders on track with their efforts. A further incentive could have been to integrate the follower results into an organisation-wide measure of staff satisfaction, that in turn could have been integrated into organisational systems, such as the training and development strategy or the performance management system. Fourth, the activities themselves could have been improved. Despite the LAG activities being designed with the aim of increasing leaders’ understandings of attachment and authentic leadership, the activities may have fallen short of this aim. Pilot trials of the activities or reviews by experts may have ensured that the activities were targeted and efficacious.

The psycho-educational intervention could have been further improved by implementing the buddy pair support process more effectively. Formalising this aspect of the intervention may have kept leaders motivated to complete activities and offered leaders help and support as they needed it. This may have been particularly important given that the intervention was remote by nature and that many leaders were geographically isolated from fellow leaders. Buddy systems have been shown to have a positive effect on adult learning amongst, for example, educators (Abdullah, Alzaidiyeen, & Seedee, 2010;
Kukulska-Hulme & Pettit, 2008) and tertiary students (Consolo, 2009), through not only face-to-face contact but also remote contact using electronic and telephone systems (Rotheram-Borus et al., 2012). Leaders were encouraged to form buddy pairs during the feedback workshop and to register their pairings with the researcher before the first LAG was issued. Thereafter, each LAG referred to the buddy pair process and encouraged leaders to support each other as they completed the activities. The buddy system was voluntary and leaders’ responses to the second survey suggested that 26 of the 46 leaders who completed the second survey were still in contact with their buddy partner at the time of completing the first LAG. Leaders’ responses also suggested that only nine of the 46 leaders remained in contact with their buddy partner by the time the last LAG was issued. Based upon research that has demonstrated the efficacy of buddy systems in learning environments, formalising and facilitating this aspect of the intervention may have resulted in more buddy pairs lasting the duration of the intervention, which in turn may have augmented leader learning.

Having discussed the results associated with each research question and possible study improvements related to each, this discussion will now turn to examine some of the limitations of the present study as a whole, together with suggestions about possible future research.

8.8 Study Limitations and Possible Future Research

There are a number of limitations related to the present study that, if addressed, could enhance possible future research. First, the study used self-report and other-report measures, which contain the inherent limitation that respondents may not accurately reflect their experiences. Despite assurances about confidentiality and the inclusion of a social desirability measure, future research may benefit from additional data collection methods,
including observations of leader-follower relationships and structured interviews with leaders, followers, and third parties such as human resource staff. Further, organisational data could have been used to verify the findings. For example, actual turnover data could have been used to examine any parallels with turnover intent. As it happens, such data were collected from respondent leaders, but inspection revealed that respondents struggled to provide the detail required to conduct thorough analyses that, for example, separated voluntary turnover from involuntary turnover, a key distinction in the literature (Castle, 2006; Ohana & Meyer, 2010). Such data from, in this case, the host organisation, together with qualitative data from participants and possibly others, would allow comparisons to be made with quantitative self-report and other-report data, and enrich the study accordingly.

Second, the present study used the ECR-R to measure attachment orientations and the completion instructions may have confounded the results. Respondents in the present study were asked to think about romantic partners, close friends, or family members when responding to the ECR-R items. However, Fraley et al. (2011) have argued that the common trait-like approach to measuring attachment, whereby working models are assumed to be relatively influential across a wide variety of relational contexts, may not account for subtle differences in attachment orientation across contexts. It could be that asking respondents to reference a variety of relationships when completing the ECR-R may have confounded their ECR-R results. Since completing the data collection stage of the present study, a revised version of the ECR-R has been produced, the ECR-RS questionnaire (Fraley et al., 2011), which aims to assess attachment orientations in specific, nominated relationships, such as those with mothers, fathers, partners, and best friends. This scale comprises 10 items, such as “I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.” People are directed to answer each item “about your mother” or “about your best friend.” Such a scale could easily be used by followers to describe their attachment
orientations with their leaders. Other than a slight modification to the directions, no items would need revision. This might provide a far more accurate estimate of attachment than that used in the present study, given that the ECR-R, which targets romantic relationships, required item rewording, as described in the Method chapter of this paper, and asked respondents to simultaneously reflect upon a variety of relationships when completing the scale. As a result, the attachment orientations reported here were treated as a proxy for the attachment at play for followers with their leaders. Although the authors note some limitations and caveats with regard to the ECR-RS measure, it may enable future research to obtain a closer estimate of the actual attachment orientations present for followers in the leader-follower relationship, rather than take as a proxy, followers’ general attachment orientations as based upon a variety of relationships.

Third, perhaps the authentic leadership and transformational leadership models, although similar, have enough differences to warrant different predictions about how they manifest in the leader-follower relationship. The hypotheses proposed in the present study drew upon empirical studies that had used transformational leadership in particular, and other positive leadership models more generally. None of these studies used the authentic leadership model, and as a result, there were only theoretical arguments to draw upon when formulating the hypotheses (Hinojosa & Davis, 2010). Although there appears to be considerable overlap between the two constructs, it has also been contended that there are enough conceptual differences to warrant each being considered a distinct leadership style in its own right (Walumbwa et al., 2008). In particular, the ethical and moral aspects of leadership are suggested to be emphasised more strongly in the authentic leadership model than in the transformational leadership model (Walumbwa et al., 2008), despite Bass’s revisions that integrate ethical components into the latter (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Examination of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, a popular measure of
transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, n.d.), reveals items such as “Talks optimistically about the future” and “Avoids making decisions.” It may be that there are enough differences between the two models and the associated scales that findings in relation to transformational leadership cannot be extrapolated to authentic leadership, as originally hoped. Perhaps, therefore, the research questions and hypotheses were misguided, given they were based upon many findings in relation to transformational and other positive leadership models. Further, findings as expected for other constructs, such as job satisfaction and turnover intent, suggest that the lack of support for the majority of the hypotheses may be more of an issue of conception than one of study design. Future studies into the relationship between attachment and leadership could include both authentic leadership and transformational leadership scales to allow a direct comparison between the two.

Fourth, although the current study found little evidence to support the proposed hypotheses, the little it did find was correlational in nature and not causal. Although a negative association was shown between leader attachment avoidance and leader authentic leadership, it cannot be concluded that the relationship between the two is causal. There may be additional factors at play that were not examined in the present study. Conducting research that explores these variables longitudinally may provide a more in-depth analysis of the leader-follower relationship. In addition, some of the measures used in the present study to control for intra-personal factors, such as personality, used scales that were not as robust as hoped. For example, the Mini-IPIP (Donnellan et al., 2006) was used instead of the full IPIP scale ("International Personality Item Pool," n.d.) as a compromise to survey length. Future studies could use measures that are more robust so as to better tease out the relationships between variables. Further, the analyses undertaken in the present study assumed linear associations amongst the array of variables investigated. Although beyond
the scope of the present study, future research could undertake to confirm that these
associations are indeed linear and not curvilinear in nature.

Fifth, the present study sample originated from one organisation and so, there may
have been characteristics of the sample that not only influenced the results but may also
have made generalisation of the results difficult. This resulted in a sample of people who
all worked in the retail industry and who all worked in a similar cultural context. For
example, many of the respondents were subject to the same pay policies, enterprise
bargaining agreement, work conditions and so on, all of which may have influenced their
views of their work experiences and reduced the variation within the sample accordingly.
Although this demographic attempted to expand research knowledge beyond the contexts
currently represented in the literature, such as military and educational settings, future
research could use a sample that represents a wider context which in turn will enable the
results to be generalised more broadly.

Sixth, although the present study utilised data gathered from over 200 people, some
of the case sets were insufficiently large to provide adequate power for the analyses. This
was particularly so when case sets were formed for leaders as opposed to followers, given
the number of leaders represented in the full data set was comparatively small. The lack of
significant results may be attributable to a lack of power, and as such, future research
would benefit from a greater number of respondents, particularly respondent leaders.

Seventh, although this study aimed to increase the representation of women in the
sample when compared with some previous studies, women, particularly at Time 1, were
overly represented in the sample. It has been argued that women when compared with men
are more interdependent and concerned with close relationships (Cross & Madson, 1997).
This then raises the question about whether the gender imbalance in the present study may
have influenced the findings given that attachment orientation is all about relationships and
connections. This argument is similarly applicable to the gender imbalance in the leader sample, which as noted earlier, was over represented with men. Future research could aim for a more balanced representation of women and men in both the follower and leader samples. Future research could also incorporate separate analyses for men and women so as to tease out any gender differences.

Finally, although this study aimed to further prior research by using a sample that sat within a real organisation, it also grappled with the challenges of conducting in situ research. Such challenges included, for example, designing the psycho-educational intervention to accommodate host organisation requests that it not require too much time and attention from leaders, and pausing the learning intervention at the halfway mark to accommodate host organisation business pressures. One challenge of particular significance was in relation to obtaining a sample that contained direct rather than distal leader-follower relationships. It became apparent during the data screening process that some followers had nominated leaders several levels higher in the job grade structure than their immediate leader. Investigations revealed that some store managers from the Retail and Operations Division, in their desires to obtain a feedback report, the prerequisite of which was to have a minimum of three follower respondents, had instructed staff to respond to the survey and nominate the store manager as the leader rather than the assistant store manager, who in many cases was the immediate leader of the respondents concerned. This was discovered only after the survey process was complete. Although it was believed that the instructions within the survey made it clear to respondents who they should nominate as their leader, discussions with followers revealed that the pressures they felt made it difficult for them to ignore their store managers’ requests, despite the assurances of confidentiality in the project communications and the surveys themselves. Examination of the data revealed that 51% of respondents reported that they spent 5 hours or less on
average per week with their nominated leaders, where contact was defined to include face-to-face, telephone, group setting, and email contact. This meant that these respondents, on average, spent no more than one hour per weekday having some contact with their leader, whether this be direct (e.g., face-to-face) or indirect (e.g., a group setting in which the follower may or may not have any direct contact with the leader). Although no comparison is available, such contact levels offer some support for the suggestion that followers may have nominated leaders higher in the grade structure than their immediate leaders. The stronger support for this, however, comes from the fact that not one of the 50 or so assistant store managers employed by the host organisation qualified to receive a feedback report, whereas the majority of store managers did. The present study was designed, like others (e.g., Ronen & Mikulincer, 2012), to investigate a direct rather than distal leader-follower relationship. Given that attachment relationships are believed to manifest themselves more strongly in closer relationships than in more distal ones (Bowlby, 1980), it is likely that any such distal leader-follower relationships in the present study sample would not constitute attachment relationships. If this was indeed the case, this implementation challenge adds weight to the explanation offered earlier in relation to the poor support of the hypotheses, that perhaps some or all of the leader-follower relationships in the study simply did not constitute attachment relationships. Future studies of this nature would benefit from anticipating the fact that leaders may ignore the study instructions in their efforts to gain the most from the study outputs. Further, alerting host organisation implementation agents that such circumstances could occur will assist them to emphasise the study requirements to both leaders and followers.

Having discussed the result of the present study, the next and final chapter offers some concluding remarks about the study overall.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

Overall, the findings of the present study do not make a particularly strong contribution to the understanding of the relationships between the attachment orientations of workplace leaders, their use of the authentic leadership style, and the work experiences of both themselves and their followers, where work experience is measured primarily in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intent. The current study extended prior research into an in situ work environment that reflects the work settings of many people, and it achieved a somewhat more balanced proportion of women to men in its sample when compared with prior studies, although men continued to be over-represented in the leader sample. The study did not provide any significant answers to the four research questions and no support was found for any of the hypotheses except one, whereby a small, significant negative association was shown between attachment avoidance and authentic leadership, where the two constructs were based upon leaders’ self-perceptions. Although not the focus of the present study, a number of additional significant relationships were shown between, separately, job satisfaction and turnover intent and a variety of intrapersonal and leader-follower relationship constructs. These relationships were consistent with prior research. The poor support of the hypotheses resulted in a number of suggestions being offered as to why such little support was found. Possibly of greatest importance was the suggestion that the leader-follower relationships in the present study’s sample simply may not have represented attachment relationships. Of all the suggestions offered, this one in particular is able to explain the lack of support for the study hypotheses as a whole. A number of reasons as to why the leader-follower relationships may not have represented attachment relationships were also offered, a number of which were associated with the challenges of conducting research in the real world context. The poor support of
the hypotheses also resulted in further insights being offered, each with the aim of enhancing the designs and robustness of future studies. It is hoped that such suggestions will enable future research to unravel the nature of the relationships between leaders’ attachment orientations, their authentic leadership levels, and the work experiences of both leaders and followers.

Given that so many people spend significant amounts of their time at their jobs, the aspirational aim of the present study was to provide new insights regarding the leader-follower relationship as it manifests in typical work environments, in the hope that, over time, these could be leveraged by organisations to ensure peoples’ experiences of their jobs are fulfilling and rewarding. Although the present study did not produce findings as anticipated, it is hoped that nonetheless, the lessons learned from this study can be used to good effect in the future.
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Appendix A: Ethics Approval and Modification Approvals

Below is the ethics approval for the present study, followed by two separate approvals for amendments to the original submission.

SUHREC Project 2009/207 Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences

A/Prof Roger Cook FLSS/Ms Ann Pensom
Approved Duration: 01/10/2009 To 01/10/2010

I refer to the ethical review of the above project protocol undertaken on behalf of Swinburne's Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) by SUHREC Subcommittee (SHESC2) at a meeting held on 11 September 2009, the outcome of which is as follows.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, the project has approval to proceed in line with standard on-going ethics clearance conditions here outlined.

- All human research activity undertaken under Swinburne auspices must conform to Swinburne and external regulatory standards, including the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and with respect to secure data use, retention and disposal.

- The named Swinburne Chief Investigator/Supervisor remains responsible for any personnel appointed to or associated with the project being made aware of ethics clearance conditions, including research and consent procedures or instruments approved. Any change in chief investigator/supervisor requires timely notification and SUHREC endorsement.

- The above project has been approved as submitted for ethical review by or on behalf of SUHREC. Amendments to approved procedures or instruments ordinarily require prior ethical appraisal/clearance. SUHREC must be notified immediately or as soon as possible thereafter of (a) any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants and any redress measures; (b) proposed changes in protocols; and (c) unforeseen events which might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

- At a minimum, an annual report on the progress of the project is required as well as at the conclusion (or abandonment) of the project.

- A duly authorised external or internal audit of the project may be undertaken at any time.

Chief Investigators/Supervisors and Student Researchers should retain a copy of this e-mail as part of project record-keeping.
SUHREC Project 2009/207 Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences

A/Prof Roger Cook FLSS/Ms Ann Pensom
Approved Duration: 01/10/2009 To 01/10/2010 [Extended to 31/12/2011] [Project Modified June 2010]

I refer to your email of 9 June 2010 requesting a modification to the protocol to address recruiting and data collection issues that have arisen in the planning stages of this project and an extension of the data collection timeframe. The request was put to a delegate of the relevant SUHREC Subcommittee (SHESC2) for consideration.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, the modified project/protocol may continue in line with standard ethics clearance conditions previously communicated.

SUHREC Project 2009/207 Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences

A/Prof Roger Cook FLSS/Ms Ann Pensom
Approved Duration: 01/10/2009 To 01/10/2010 [Extended to 31/12/2011] [Project Modified June 2010] [July 2010]

I refer to your email of 12 July 2010 requesting a modification to the protocol by recruitment and methodology changes. The request was put to a delegate of the relevant SUHREC Subcommittee (SHESC2) for consideration.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, the modified project/protocol may continue in line with standard ethics clearance conditions previously communicated.
Appendix B: Team Briefing for Line-Managers

Below is the team briefing outline given to line-managers during the project recruitment process in anticipation of the first survey. The outline aimed to assist line-managers discuss the project with their teams. Line-Managers were asked to read the outline to their staff during their team meetings. To maintain the confidentiality of the host organisation, its name in the reproduction below has been replaced with “Company Name.”

- The engagement survey is a joint effort between researchers at Swinburne University and Company Name. The research group is looking at some specific elements of leadership and how they connect with what the world of psychology calls ‘attachment’.

- Company Name has volunteered to be involved because we believe it will give us useful information about our people and how we manage them. The research won’t tell us everything, but it will give us a picture of what it is like to work at Company Name and aims to help us improve our management and leadership of people.

- That said, it will only be useful if lots of people participate. In fact, it will only be useful for individual managers if three or more of each manager’s staff get involved. So, the more staff who participate, the more we will be able to use the information to understand what it is really like to work here.

- For this reason, the opportunity to participate is being offered to everyone in the company. Casual workers however, will probably struggle with the questions because they don’t know us well enough, so rather than make it awkward for them, they won’t be asked to participate.

- Participation will involve completing two online surveys, one now and one in February 2011. The first will take about 30 minutes and the second will be shorter.

- Once all the information is collected from the first survey, each manager will receive individual and confidential feedback at a half-day workshop in October. The feedback to managers will be on their leadership style, the attachments they create with staff—in other words, the emotional connections they form—staff satisfaction and staff engagement. During the workshop, the managers will be coached to implement the feedback in the workplace.

- All the feedback to a manager will be individual and confidential—no one else will receive that manager’s results. In addition, managers will only get feedback if the information can be ‘averaged’ from three or more of their staff. Managers will not be told who has responded and the feedback will be presented in such a way to ensure that no one person can be identified in the responses.
• To further protect everyone’s identity, you can receive the survey links using an email of your choice, whether a work or private email address.

• Regardless of the email you nominate, we realise that this is a work activity and so participating in this should form part of your normal duties so that you get paid for your efforts.

• After getting their feedback, the managers will receive four emails between the workshop and the second survey, each email containing information to support the workshop coaching.

• Then four months later, in February 2011, everyone who completed the first survey will be asked to complete a second, shorter survey to see what’s changed, if anything, since the workshops.

• After the second survey, the senior managers at Company Name will then receive high-level feedback on leadership and management across the company. Again, this information will be ‘averaged’, confidential and delivered in such a way that no responses can be attributed to any one individual.

• It’s important that everyone also does the second survey because this collects the information that will be going to the senior managers. We will then look at ways to implement this feedback across the company.

• Everyone will do the same survey. If you do not manage people, there will be a set of questions that you will not be required to complete at the end of your survey.

• The first survey will be open between September 15 and September 30. It will take about 30 minutes and there is an option for you to save your responses and return later in case you are interrupted. The survey software will also send you reminders to complete the survey.

• If you would like to participate, then please let me know your preferred email address, one that is private to you, and I will forward it to HR along with everyone else’s in the team. The researchers will then send us all an email on the 15th with the survey link and further instructions.
Appendix C: Conditional Branching of Time 1 Survey

Opening Statements

Q1-13
Consent? No

Demographics
Intention to Turnover
Authentic Leadership (Other)
Leader Member Exchange
Job Control
Work Engagement
Job Satisfaction

Q84
Romantic relationship? No

Romantic Relationship

Romantic Relationship
Attachment
Self Monitoring
Personality
Social Desirability

Q172
Mgr of >2 staff? No

Q173
Want feedback re? No

Q174
Consent? No

Name
Authentic Leadership (Self)
Actual Turnover

Survey End
Appendix D: Conditional Branching of Time 2 Survey

Opening Statements

Q4
Same Company? No

Q5
Current role >1 mth? No

Q6
Diff role to T1? No

Job Demographics (Other)

Q16
Job Control
Work Engagement
Job Satisfaction
Intention to Turnover

Q37
First Language

Q38
Romantic relationship? No

Romantic Relationship

Q40
Attachment
Trust Disposition
Social Desirability

Q103
Reported to mgr >1 mth? No

Manager Name
Authentic Leadership (Other)
Leader Member Exchange
Trustworthiness of Manager

Q152
Same Mgr as T1? No

Staff Enrolment (Other)
Appendix E: Time 1 Survey

Opening Comments

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. It represents one component of a wider project that aims to improve our experiences of our work environments so that they are more fulfilling for all concerned. Given that most people need to work for a living, why is it that some workplaces are more satisfying than others? Your contribution will help the researchers, through this project, explore aspects of work environments that make a difference to how people experience their jobs. This will give us a better understanding of how these aspects contribute to, or not, the creation of a workplace that people feel happy to work in. To this end, your help is greatly appreciated.

It is important that you be aware of the scope of the project and how the information you supply will be used. It is also a requirement of the university sponsoring this project that we supply this information to you. The Project Information Statement below details all aspects of the project and attempts to cater to all the information needs of the various people, such as yourself, who are helping us by participating in this project. Although the information below may exceed what you in particular need, we encourage you to read it none the less.

Project Information Statement

Project Title: Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences

Researchers
Associate Professor Roger Cook PhD, FAPS
Ann Pensom BSc (Hons), Assoc MAPS.

Your organisation is participating in a Swinburne University project studying managers’ attachment styles and how these influence the work experiences of staff. As a result, you are invited to participate in the project. Depending upon your organisation, this project may sit within a wider organisational development initiative.

What this project is about and why it is being undertaken
This project studies managers’ attachment styles and how these influence staff members’ work experiences. Attachment styles describe how people react and respond to changes in their emotional connections with significant others. Whilst well accepted as being part of adult romantic relationships, little is known about the connections formed between managers and staff. Recent findings amongst army cadets suggest that leaders’ attachment styles influence followers' experience of working for that person in terms of trust, team cohesion, delegation and emotional functioning. The current project aims to look at whether or not the attachment system is part of the relationship between managers and staff in an Australian-based corporate setting. It also aims to look at the short-term effects, if any, in an educational intervention that encourages managers to examine their attachment and leadership styles and implement actions aimed at improving their management of staff.

Project interests
The project is being conducted by Ann Pensom to satisfy the requirements of the Doctorate of Psychology degree.

What participation will involve
All staff members are invited to complete an online survey. They will receive an email from the second researcher containing a link to the online survey and an access password. At the end of the survey, managers with three or more staff will be invited to complete some additional questions. Those managers who answer the additional questions will be invited to attend a Feedback Workshop to be conducted a few weeks after completing the survey. During the workshop managers will receive feedback on their results and support to develop plans to implement their
results in the workplace. The managers who attend the workshop will then receive up to four
emails that contain information and materials, such as reading matter, relevant to the concepts
presented during the workshop. These will be emailed to the managers on a monthly basis.
Everyone who participated in the survey will then be asked to complete a second survey
approximately four months after completing the first. Those managers who attended the Feedback
Workshop will again be invited to complete some additional questions. It is anticipated that the first
survey will take about 30 minutes to complete while the second will be shorter, taking about 20
minutes. Organisations may also receive amalgamated results if desired after the second survey
has been completed by its staff.

**Risks, benefits and back-up support**

One concern that people might have about participating in this project is the preservation of their
anonymity. For example, so that only those people who complete the first survey are invited to
complete the second survey, the surveys will ask respondents to supply their work or private email
address, whichever they trust to be private to them. And, so that staff information can be linked to
the appropriate manager, the surveys will ask managers to supply their name and staff to supply
their manager’s name. In all cases, all results, whether given to managers or organisations, will be
treated confidentially and no person or organisation shall receive the respective results of another.
So that staff information will not be identifiable by the managers, it will be aggregated for each
manager only if three or more staff members, each over 18 years of age, have participated. If
fewer than three staff members participate, the manager will not receive any self or staff feedback.
Similarly, information requested by an organisation at a departmental or divisional level will only be
supplied as an aggregate of the results of three or more managers. To ensure that the results are
meaningful, both managers and staff must have been in their current roles for at least one month in
order to participate in the study.

There is a slight chance that the managers could receive feedback that they find disappointing or
worrisome. It is planned that any such issues be addressed in the Feedback Workshop, where
managers will be supported to understand and address their feedback. Should there be any longer
lasting effects, the second researcher (Ann Pensom) will be available to assist with resolving these,
including if necessary, support beyond the project.

By participating in the study, managers will receive information about their workplace functioning
and others’ perceptions regarding their staff management skills. They will be educated about the
theoretical concepts being investigated and supported to implement learning in the workplace.
Staff may see improvements in their managers’ workplace functioning and in their relationship with
their manager. More generally, this project may provide a better understanding of how personal
attachment styles play out in workplace leadership and management activities, a better
understanding of attachment styles in adults and a better understanding of the interplay between
attachment and leadership amongst adults.

**Free consent and withdrawal from participation**

Participation in this project is voluntary. Your organisation has been invited to participate on a
voluntary basis and in turn, have invited managers and staff to voluntarily participate on either an
ad hoc basis or because it has been integrated into a wider development initiative. Managers’
decisions about whether or not to participate in the project will have no bearing on their results,
treatment or employment.

Managers and their staff members may withdraw their participation or any information contributed,
without question or explanation, at any point.

In some organisations, this project may form part of a wider development initiative. By remaining
involved in the project, managers will be able to reap the full benefits of both this project and any
broader initiatives.

To ensure that people participate in this project of their free will, everyone will be required to read
and accept an online consent statement that will sit at the start of each survey.
**Research output**
The research will be documented in the form of the second researcher’s (Ann Pensom) Doctorate dissertation. It is also planned that the research be published in one or more professional journals. The data from one of the measures will be provided in anonymous form to the publishers of the test. No individuals or organisations will be identified through the publication of data proper or the research findings.

Any publication can be made available to those interested, where appropriate. To be informed of such publications, people will need to provide their contact details to the second researcher, separate to the online surveys. This instruction will sit at the end of each online survey.

**Privacy and confidentiality**
All people who wish to participate will be asked to contact the second researcher (Ann Pensom) using their email address, so that the survey link and password can be provided. In all cases, these email addresses will be stored in a password-protected file by the second researcher for the duration of the project only and will not be used for any other purposes.

All information collected using the online surveys, including managers’ names and respondents’ email addresses, will be stored on password protected hard drives belonging to both researchers. Once the study is complete, this information will be kept on CD in a locked file in the first researcher’s office (Assoc. Professor Roger Cook) for five years beyond publication, after which it will be destroyed.

All contact details provided by those wishing to hear about publications related to this study will be stored in a password-protected file by the second researcher and will not be used for any other purposes. This information will be kept only up until initial publication information has been communicated.

**Further information about the project – who to contact**
If you would like further information about the project, please do not hesitate to contact:

Associate Professor Roger Cook PhD, FAPS
Swinburne University of Technology. PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122
Telephone: (613) 9214 8358
Facsimile: (613) 9819 6857
Email: rcook@swin.edu.au

**Concerns/complaints about the project – who to contact**

| This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact: Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research (H68), Swinburne University of Technology, PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122. Tel (03) 9214 5218 or +61 3 9214 5218 or resethics@swin.edu.au |

**Survey Instructions**

This survey comprises questions that ask about a range of things to do with yourself and your work circumstances. You will be presented with a number of questions per page. Please answer all the questions. If you accidentally leave any unanswered, the survey will ask you to complete them. A progress indicator sits at the bottom of each page indicating how far you have progressed and how much of the survey is left to complete.

If you find yourself interrupted and needing to leave the survey before completing it, click the button titled ‘Save and return later’ at the bottom of each page. The survey software will then send you an email with new login details. All completed questions up to and including the previous page, will be
saved and when you re-start the survey, you will be returned to the page you were on at the time you exited.

As you progress through the survey, you will find instructions that direct you in relation to the questions that follow. Please read the instructions carefully as they differ over the course of the survey.

**Informed Consent**

The statements that follow comprise the Informed Consent of the survey. If you respond ‘No’ to one or more statements, you will not be able to complete the survey or participate in the project.

1. I have been provided a copy of the Project Information Statement (previous page) and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

2. I agree to complete questionnaires asking me about myself, my work situation, my attachment style and my manager’s leadership style.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. I agree to supply my manager’s full name so that my responses can be paired with those of my manager, and acknowledge that my manager’s identity will be known only to the researchers.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

4. I agree to supply my work or private email address, which ever I trust to be private to me, so that the link and password to the second survey can be sent to me in due course (approximately four months from now).
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. I agree to complete the second survey when asked to do so.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

6. I acknowledge that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. I acknowledge that the project is for the purpose of research and not for profit.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

8. I acknowledge that any personal or health information about me which is gathered in the course of and as a result of my participation in this project will be (i) collected and retained for the purpose of this project and (ii) accessed and analysed by the researcher(s) for the purpose of conducting this project, and that some anonymous data will be sent to the publishers of one of the questionnaires used.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

9. I acknowledge that the researchers will provide the information I supply to my manager only if it can be aggregated with that of at least two other staff members.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

10. I acknowledge that my anonymity is preserved and I will not be identified in publications or otherwise without my express written consent.
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No

11. I acknowledge that the possible side effects have been explained to me to my satisfaction.
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
12. I acknowledge that I have been in my current role for at least one month.
   □ Yes
   □ No

13. I acknowledge that I am over 18 years of age.
   □ Yes
   □ No

By selecting the ‘Next’ button I agree to participate in this project.

**Views of Your Work**

This first part of the survey asks you to consider your work circumstances and aims to gather general information about the organisation you work for and your job.

14. What is your gender?
   □ Female
   □ Male

15. What was your age at your last birthday?
   I was ______ years old at my last birthday.

16. What is your work or private email address, the best one that is private to you. The researchers will use this email to send you the link to the second survey in about four months from now.
   [Space for free-hand text]

17. What is the highest level of formal education you have completed?
   □ Primary education
   □ Secondary education
   □ Advanced diploma and diploma level
   □ Certificate level
   □ Bachelor degree level
   □ Graduate diploma and graduate certificate level
   □ Postgraduate degree level
   □ Other: [Space for free-hand text]

18. Which organisation do you work for? If only one option is offered, please select it.
   □ Company Name
   □ Other [Space for free-hand text]

19. What type of industry do you work in?
   □ Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing
   □ Mining
   □ Manufacturing
   □ Electricity, Gas, Water and Waste Services
   □ Construction
   □ Wholesale Trade
   □ Retail Trade
   □ Accommodation and Food Services
   □ Transport, Postal and Warehousing
   □ Information Media and Telecommunications
   □ Financial and Insurance Services
   □ Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services
   □ Professional, Scientific and Technical Services
   □ Administrative and Support Services
   □ Public Administration and Safety
   □ Education and Training
   □ Health Care and Social Assistance
   □ Arts and Recreation Services
   □ Other: [Space for free-hand text]

20. What type of organisation do you work for?
   □ Proprietary (e.g. commercial organisation, for profit)
   □ Public (e.g. government department)
   □ Community (e.g. charity, welfare, not for profit)
   □ Academic (e.g. school, university)
   □ Other: [Space for free-hand text]
21. What is the size of the organisation you work for based upon the number of full-time and part-time employees, globally? Please include permanent and contract employees but exclude temporary/casual employees from your answer. If you are unsure, please indicate a rough estimate.

- Less than 10
- 11-100
- 101-500
- 501-1000
- 1001-2,500
- more than 2,500

22. How long have you been employed by Company Name? Think in terms of the continuous period since commencing your current employment with Company Name, even if over this time you have had different jobs/roles/work places within Company Name. Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

Please note: For all questions, such as this one, that require you to enter numerals in a table, please enter '0' if the answer is zero, rather than leave the cell empty. As well as positioning the cursor in each cell using your mouse, you can use the 'Tab' key to move between cells, which may be faster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have worked in Company Name for:

23. What is your current role?

- Manager
- Professional
- Technician and Trades Worker
- Community and Personal Service Worker
- Clerical and Administrative Worker
- Sales Worker
- Machinery Operator and Driver
- Labourer
- Other: [Space for free-hand text]

24. How long have you been working in your current role at Company Name? Think of this in terms of the role you currently fulfil, as distinct from previous roles you may have had during the course of your current employment. Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have worked in my current role in Company Name for:

25. What is the basis of your current employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Employment</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary or Casual Employment</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In which Australian state do you work? If you work across a number of states, select the state that you work in most often or in which you are based? If you work overseas, select the response 'Outside Australia'.

- VIC
- NSW
- QLD
- SA
- WA
- TAS
- NT
- Outside Australia
27. In which division/part of Company Name do you work?
   - Stores
   - Buying Home
   - Buying apparel
   - Marketing
   - HR
   - IT
   - Finance
   - Supply Chain
   - Operations
   - Other: [Space for free-hand text]

Many of the questions that follow ask about your manager. When thinking about your manager, think about the person who manages your work and to whom you report. Please answer the questions about your manager keeping the same person in mind throughout the survey.

28. What is your manager’s surname?
   [Space for free-hand text]

29. What is your manager’s given name?
   [Space for free-hand text]

30. Was your current manager involved in recruiting you into your current role? If you are not sure, please select ‘No’.
   - Yes
   - No

31. How many people, including yourself, have a direct reporting line to your manager? Take ‘direct reporting line’ to mean the people for whom your manager has direct management responsibility rather than functional oversight. Please include full-time and part-time permanent and contract staff in your answer, but exclude all temporary/casual staff. If you are not sure of the exact numbers, please indicate an approximate value.

Example: Imagine the diagram below represents the reporting structure for a part of the organisation managed by Kate.

```
Manager Kate

Tori Permanent Full-Time
Harry Permanent Part-Time
Lee Casual
Bob Contract Full-Time
Lily Permanent Full-Time
```

Based upon the above, Kate’s staff would answer this survey question by indicating that she has 2 full-time (Tori and Bob) direct reports and 1 part-time (Harry) direct report.

In this example, Lee is excluded from the count as he is employed on a casual basis while Lily is excluded as Kate has only functional oversight for her.

Please respond by typing the appropriate number (using numerals) in the spaces provided.

```
My manager has the following numbers of direct reports staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
```

32. How long have you reported to your manager in total, accounting for this current reporting relationship and any past occasions when you reported to this same person? Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

```
I have reported to my manager, accounting for the current and any past reporting relationships, for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
```
33. How long have you reported to your manager in this current reporting relationship? Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

| I have reported to my manager, during this current reporting relationship only, for |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Full-Time                      | Part-Time     |

34. How many hours do you spend on average per week with your manager? This can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. Please round your answer to the nearest whole hour.

I spend on average _____ hours per week with my manager.

35. How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year? Scale: 1 = Not at all likely, 7 = Extremely likely

The following survey items refer to your leader’s style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits his or her leadership style using the following scale: ‘Not at all’, ‘Once in a while’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Fairly often’, ‘Frequently, if not always’

Please note: Copyright prevents the researchers from changing the references in the following questions from ‘leader’ to ‘manager’. Please answer these questions in relation to the manager you nominated earlier in the survey and base your responses on your own experience of being managed by this person.

36. My leader encourages everyone to speak their mind.

37. My leader analyses relevant data before coming to a decision.

38. My leader shows he or she understands how specific actions impact others.

Scale: Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently, if not always

Copyright © 2007 Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) by Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, & Fred O. Walumbwa. All rights reserved in all mediums. Distributed by Mind Garden, Inc. www.mindgarden.com.

The following statements refer to your relationship with your manager, as you perceive it. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your relationship with your manager using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

52. I like my manager very much as a person.

53. My manager is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.

54. My manager is a lot of fun to work with.

55. My manager defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.

56. My manager would come to my defence if I were ‘attacked’ by others.

57. My manager would defend me to others in the organisation if I made an honest mistake.

58. I do work for my manager that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.

59. I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to meet my manager’s work goals.

60. I do not mind working my hardest for my manager.

61. I am impressed with my manager’s knowledge of his/her job.

62. I respect my manager’s knowledge of and competence on the job.

1 Copyright restrictions permit only three items from this measure to be reproduced in this paper.
63. I admire my manager's professional skills.
   Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

Below are listed a number of statements that could be used to describe a job. Please read each
statement carefully and select the phrase underneath that indicates the extent to which each is an
accurate or inaccurate description of your job.
64. How much control do you have over how you do your work?
65. How much control do you have over the sources of information you need to do your job?
66. How much can you control the number of times you are interrupted while you are at work?
67. How much control do you have over how your work is evaluated?
68. In general, how much overall control do you have over work and work-related matters?
   Scale: 1 = Very Little, 2 = Little, 3 = A moderate amount, 4 = Much, 5 = Very Much

The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully
and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, select
‘Never’. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by selecting the phrase below
each statement that best describes how frequently you feel that way.
69. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
70. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
71. I am enthusiastic about my job.
72. My job inspires me.
73. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
74. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
75. I am proud of the work that I do.
76. I am immersed in my work.
77. I get carried away when I am working.
   Scale: Never, A few times a year or less, Once a month or less, A few times a month, Once a
   week, A few times a week, Every day

Some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. Below are some statements about jobs.
Please select the phrase below each statement that best describes how you feel about your
present job. There are no right or wrong answers.
78. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
79. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
80. Each day of work seems like it will never end.
81. I find real enjoyment in my work.
   Scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly agree

The survey items below are about intentions to leave a job. Please read each item carefully and
select the response underneath that best reflects your intention to leave your current job.
82. I often think about quitting.
83. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.
   Scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Slightly disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Slightly
   agree, Agree, Strongly agree

Views of Yourself

The next part of the survey asks you to consider your personal circumstances, preferences and
tendencies beyond the work environment.
84. Are you involved in an exclusive romantic relationship (i.e. dating, engaged, de-facto or
   married)?
   □ Yes
   □ No
85. How long have you been involved in your current exclusive romantic relationship? Please
   round your answer to the nearest whole month.
   I have been in this relationship for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The statements below concern how you feel in your emotionally intimate relationships with close others e.g. with romantic partners, close friends or family members. We are interested in how you generally experience close relationships with others, not just in how you are experiencing a current romantic relationship or one particularly close non-romantic relationship. Please respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

86. I often worry that close others don’t really love me.
87. I tell close others just about everything.
88. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
89. I often worry that close others will not want to stay with me.
90. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on close others.
91. I find that others don’t want to get as close as I would like.
92. I’m afraid that once a close other gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.
93. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
94. I worry that close others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.
95. Close others only seem to notice me when I’m angry.
96. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
97. It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from close others.
98. I am nervous when others get too close to me.
99. I often wish that close others’ feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for them.
100. Sometimes close others change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
101. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with close others.
102. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with close others.
103. When I show my feelings for close others, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.
104. I’m afraid that I will lose close others’ love.
105. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to close others.
106. I rarely worry about close others leaving me.
107. I prefer not to show close others how I feel deep down.
108. I get uncomfortable when others want to be very close.
109. Close others make me doubt myself.
110. I find it easy to depend on close others.
111. When close others are out of sight, I worry that they might become interested in someone else.
112. Close others really understand me and my needs.
113. It helps to turn to close others in times of need.
114. I feel comfortable depending on close others.
115. I worry a lot about my relationships.
116. I am very comfortable being close to others.
117. I prefer not to be too close to others.
118. It’s not difficult for me to get close to others.
119. I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.
120. I talk things over with close others.
121. It’s easy for me to be affectionate with close others.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

Below are statements describing people’s behaviours and sensitivity toward others. Please use the rating scale below each statement to describe how true each statement is of you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

122. In social situations I have the ability to alter my behaviour if I feel that something else is called for
123. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people depending on the impression I wish to give them
124. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does
125. I have trouble changing my behaviour to suit different people and different situations*R
126. I have found that I can adjust my behaviour to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in
127. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.*R
128. Once I know what the situation calls for, it’s easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.
129. I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes
130. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I’m conversing with.
131. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others’ emotions and motives.
132. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.
133. I can usually tell when I’ve said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener’s eyes.
134. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.

Scale: Certainly, always false; Generally false; Somewhat false, but with exception; Somewhat true, but with exception; Generally true; Certainly, always true.

Below are phrases describing people's behaviours. Please use the rating scale below each item to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are and roughly your same age. Please read each statement carefully and then select the appropriate description on the scale underneath each phrase.

135. I am the life of the party.
136. I sympathize with others’ feelings.
137. I get chores done right away.
138. I have frequent mood swings.
139. I have a vivid imagination.
140. I don’t talk a lot.
141. I am not interested in other people's problems.
142. I often forget to put things back in their proper place.
143. I am relaxed most of the time.
144. I am not interested in abstract ideas.
145. I talk to a lot of different people at parties.
146. I feel others' emotions.
147. I like order.
148. I get upset easily.
149. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.
150. I keep in the background.
151. I am not really interested in others.
152. I make a mess of things.
153. I seldom feel blue.
154. I do not have a good imagination.

Scale: Very inaccurate, Moderately inaccurate, Neither inaccurate nor accurate, Moderately accurate, Very accurate.

Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you, select the word 'True'; if not, select the word 'False'.

155. I sometimes litter.
156. I always admit my mistakes openly to face the potential negative consequences.
157. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.
158. I have tried illegal drugs (example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.).
159. I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own.
160. I take out my bad moods on others now and then.
161. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.
162. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
163. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency.
164. When I have made a promise, I keep it – no ifs, ands or buts.
165. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back.
166. I would never live off other people.
167. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
168. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
169. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.
170. I always eat a healthy diet.
171. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return.
Response options: True, False

**Final Part of the Survey**

This project includes the opportunity for managers to receive feedback on their attachment and leadership styles. To take up this opportunity, managers must answer additional questions and have three or more direct report staff members participate in the survey. These managers will be invited to attend a Feedback Workshop to be conducted a few weeks after completing the survey. During the workshop, these managers will receive feedback on their results and support to develop plans to implement their results in the workplace. The managers who attend the workshop will then receive up to four emails that contain information and materials, such as reading matter, relevant to the concepts presented during the workshop. These will be emailed to the managers on a monthly basis.

With this in mind, please answer the next two questions. If you answer ‘No’ to either question, you will not be able to participate in this aspect of the project and the survey will end.

172. Do you have three or more direct report staff? Take ‘direct report’ to mean the people for whom you have direct management responsibility rather than the people for whom you have a functional oversight.
   - Yes
   - No

173. Would you like to receive anonymous feedback from your direct report staff about your leadership of them? This will require you to answer only a few more questions, which should take no more than 5 minutes. If you have fewer than three direct report staff i.e. you answered ‘No’ to the question above, please answer ‘No’ to this question also.
   - Yes
   - No

**Informed Consent**
The statements that follow comprise the Informed Consent for this next part of the survey. If you respond ‘No’ to one or more statements, you will not be able to participate in the Management Feedback Workshops and the survey will end.

174. I agree to supply my full name so that my responses can be paired with those of my staff, and acknowledge that my identity will be known only to the researchers.
   - Yes
   - No

175. I agree to the researchers using the email address I have supplied earlier in this survey to contact me regarding the Feedback Workshop and learning materials.
   - Yes
   - No

176. I acknowledge that the researchers will provide my results to me alone in hardcopy format identified with my name, and otherwise my results will remain private and confidential.
   - Yes
   - No

By selecting the ‘Next’ button I agree to participate in this next part of this survey.

**Views of Your Own Leadership and Management**

177. What is your surname?
   [Space for free-hand text]

178. What is your given name?
   [Space for free-hand text]

The following survey items refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits your leadership style using the following scale: ‘Not at all’, ‘Once in a while’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Fairly often’, ‘Frequently, if not always’.
179. As a leader I encourage everyone to speak their mind.

180.

181. As a leader I analyse relevant data before coming to a decision.

182.

183.

184.

185.

186.

187.

188.

189. As a leader I show I understand how specific actions impact others.

Scale: Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently, if not always

The final survey questions ask about your ‘direct report’ staff. Take ‘direct report’ to mean the
people for whom there is a direct management responsibility rather than the people for whom there
is a functional oversight. Please include full-time and part-time permanent and contract staff in
your answer but exclude all temporary/casual staff.

Example: Imagine the diagram below represents the reporting structure in your part of the organisation:

![Diagram of reporting structure]

Based upon the above, you would answer the following three survey questions as follows:

Q195: You have 1 full-time (Jan) direct report and 1 part-time (Ed) direct report. In this example, Joe is
exclude from the count as you have only functional oversight for him.

Q196: Considering all of your direct reports (i.e. Jan and Ed), in total they have 2 staff members (Bob
and Di) who report directly to them. In this example, Viv is excluded from the count as she is
employed on a casual basis.

Q197: In total, 5 staff members (Jan, Ed, Bob, Di and Bee) report up, through all levels, to you. In this
example, Joe and Viv are excluded for the reasons given above.

Please respond by typing in the appropriate number (using numerals) in the spaces provided.

2 Copyright restrictions permit only three items from this measure to be reproduced in this paper.
195. Currently, how many people have a direct reporting line to you (i.e. your staff)?

I currently have the following number of direct report staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

196. Currently, how many staff members in total report to all of your direct reports (i.e. the number of staff members in that part of the organisation for which you are responsible, who are one-removed from (below) you)?

Considering all of my direct reports, in total they have ____ staff members (full-time and part-time) who report directly to them.

197. Currently, how many people in total, regardless of the number of organisational/structural layers, do you have management responsibility for (i.e. the number of staff members, including your direct reports, who report up, through all levels, to you)?

In total, I have _____ staff members (full-time and part-time) report up, through all levels, to me.

198. Did you start in your current role on or before 01 June 2010? If you answer 'No', the survey will end.

□ Yes
□ No

199. How many direct reports did you have on 01 June 2010?

On 01 June 2010 I have the following number of direct report staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

200. How many direct reports did you have on 31 August 2010?

On 31 August 2010 I have the following number of direct report staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

201. Between 01 June and 31 August 2010, inclusive, how many people joined your team as a direct report to you?

Between 01 June and 31 August 2010, inclusive, the following number of staff joined my team as a direct report to me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

202. Between 01 June and 31 August 2010, inclusive, how many of your direct reports left your team?

Between 01 June and 31 August 2010, inclusive, the following number of my direct reports left my team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

203. Of the direct reports left your team (nominated in the question above), please indicate the number that left for the reasons listed in the table below. If the answer is zero, please type '0' in the corresponding table cell. Remember that you can use the 'Tab' key to move between cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resigned from Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to another role in Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date reached and not renewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract terminated prior to contract end date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position made redundant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntarily left Company Name for reasons other than those listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntarily left Company Name for reasons other than those listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Time 2 Survey

Opening Comments

Your organisation is participating in a Swinburne University project studying managers’ attachment styles and how these influence the work experiences of staff. You have received this second survey link because you took up the invitation to participate in the project in September 2010, at which time you committed to complete two surveys, this being the second of the two. Thank you for doing this – your help is greatly appreciated.

Further information about the project – who to contact
If you would like further information about the project, please do not hesitate to contact:

Ann Pensom
The Change Navigators, GPO Box 681, Melbourne, 3001
Telephone: (613) 9763 3855
Facsimile: (613) 9763 3899
Email: ann@thechangenavigators.com.au

Associate Professor Roger Cook PhD, FAPS
Swinburne University of Technology. PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122
Telephone: (613) 9214 8358
Facsimile: (613) 9819 6857
Email: rcook@swin.edu.au

Concerns/complaints about the project – who to contact

This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact:

Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research (H68),
Swinburne University of Technology, PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122.
Tel (03) 9214 5218 or +61 3 9214 5218 or resethics@swin.edu.au

Survey Instructions

This second survey, like the first, comprises items that ask about yourself and your work circumstances. Although some items may seem similar to those presented in the first survey, please respond to the items presented here based upon your current circumstances and views. Don’t try to be consistent with your responses to the first survey – simply respond according to your current beliefs and opinions. Also, some items within this survey are similar to other items, so it may seem like you are being asked the same thing in subtly different ways. Again, simply answer each question in accord with your current views and feelings rather than by trying to be consistent with your prior answers.

You will be presented with a number of items per page. Please respond to every item. If you accidentally miss an item, the survey will redisplay the page with an error message immediately above the missing item. Depending upon the length of the page and the size of your screen, the error message may not be immediately visible and you may need to scroll down the page to see where the missing item is located.

Some questions require you to enter numerals in a table. Please enter ‘0’ if the answer is zero, rather than leave the cell empty. And as well as positioning the cursor in each table cell using your mouse, you can use the ‘Tab’ key to move between cells, which may be faster.
A progress indicator sits at the bottom of each page indicating how far you have progressed and how much of the survey is left to complete. If you find yourself interrupted and needing to leave the survey before completing it, click the button titled ‘Save and return later’ at the bottom of each page. The survey software will then send you an email with a new link to the survey. All completed items up to and including the previous page will be saved and when you re-start the survey, you will be returned to the first item on the page you were on at the time you exited.

As you progress through the survey, you will find instructions that direct you in relation to the items that immediately follow. Please read the instructions carefully as they differ over the course of the survey.

**Opening**

These first questions will enable the researchers to match your responses here with your responses to the first survey, conducted in September/October 2010.

1. Please provide the email address you nominated in the first survey, even if different to the email used to send the link to this second survey. Your nominated email will be used purely to match your responses across the two surveys. It does not matter if your nominated email is no longer applicable to you – the researchers will not be using it for contact purposes. Please type this carefully and check for any errors – it is important that it match identically with the email you nominated in the first survey.

   [Space for free-hand text]

2. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

3. What was your age at your last birthday?
   I was ______ years old at my last birthday.

**Views of Your Work**

The next part of the survey asks about your work circumstances and will help the researchers to determine what features have changed, if any, since you did the first survey in September/October 2010.

4. Are you still currently employed by the same organisation as the one you worked for when you completed the first survey in September/October 2010? If so, please select the organisation from the list below. If not, (in other words, if you worked for an organisation listed below at the time of the first survey, but have since moved to another organisation), please select ‘Other’. Selecting ‘Other’ will cause the survey to end.
   - Company Name
   - Other

5. Have you been in your current role for one month or more?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Are you in a different role now to the one you worked in when you completed the first survey in September/October 2010? For example: If you were a Sales Assistant in Store X when you completed the first survey and are now a Sales Assistant in Store Y, then this would be deemed a different role, even though your job title might be the same. In this example, you would answer ‘Yes’ to this question.
   - Yes
   - No
7. **What is your current role?**
   - [ ] Manager
   - [ ] Professional
   - [ ] Technician and Trades Worker
   - [ ] Community and Personal Service Worker
   - [ ] Clerical and Administrative Worker
   - [ ] Sales Worker
   - [ ] Machinery Operator and Driver
   - [ ] Labourer
   - [ ] Other: [Space for free-hand text]

8. **How many months have you been working in your current role at Company Name?** Please round your answer to the nearest whole month and use numerals to enter your answer in the space provided below.
   - I have worked in my current role at Company Name for ______ months.

9. **What is the basis of your current employment?**
   - Permanent Employment
   - Temporary or Casual Employment
   - Contract Employment

10. **In which Australian state do you work?** If you work across a number of states, select the state that you work in most often or in which you are based? If you work overseas, select the response ‘Outside Australia’.
   - [ ] VIC
   - [ ] NSW
   - [ ] QLD
   - [ ] SA
   - [ ] WA
   - [ ] TAS
   - [ ] NT
   - [ ] Outside Australia

11. **In which division/part of Company Name do you work?**
   - [ ] Stores
   - [ ] Buying Home
   - [ ] Buying apparel
   - [ ] Marketing
   - [ ] HR
   - [ ] IT
   - [ ] Finance
   - [ ] Supply Chain
   - [ ] Operations
   - [ ] Other: [Space for free-hand text]

12. **Was your current manager involved in recruiting you into your current role?** If you are not sure, please select ‘No’.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

13. **How many people, including yourself, have a direct reporting line to your manager?** Take ‘direct reporting line’ to mean the people for whom your manager has direct management responsibility rather than functional oversight. Please include full-time and part-time permanent and contract staff in your answer, but exclude all temporary/casual staff. If you are not sure of the exact numbers, please indicate an approximate value.
Example: Imagine the diagram below represents the reporting structure for a part of the organisation managed by Kate.

Based upon the above, Kate’s staff would answer this survey question by indicating that she has 2 full-time (Tom and Bob) direct reports and 1 part-time (Harry) direct report.

In this example, Lee is excluded from the count as he is employed on a casual basis while Lily is excluded as Kate has only functional oversight for her.

Please respond by typing the appropriate number (using numerals) in the spaces provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My manager has the following number of direct report staff:</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. How long have you reported to your manager in total, accounting for both this current reporting relationship and any past occasions when you reported to this same person? Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have reported to my manager, accounting for both the current and any past reporting relationships, for</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. How long have you reported to your manager in this current reporting relationship? Please round your answer to the nearest whole month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have reported to my manager, during this current reporting relationship only, for</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Below are listed a number of statements that could be used to describe a job. Please read each statement carefully and select the phrase underneath that indicates the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your job.

16. How much control do you have over how you do your work?
17. How much control do you have over the sources of information you need to do your job?
18. How much can you control the number of times you are interrupted while you are at work?
19. How much control do you have over how your work is evaluated?
20. In general, how much overall control do you have over work and work-related matters?
   Scale: Very little, Little, A moderate amount, Much, Very much

The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, select ‘Never’. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by selecting the phrase below each statement that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

21. At my work, I feel bursting with energy
22. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
23. I am enthusiastic about my job
24. My job inspires me
25. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
26. I feel happy when I am working intensely
27. I am proud of the work that I do
28. I am immersed in my work
29. I get carried away when I am working
Some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. Below are some statements about jobs. Please select the phrase below each statement that best describes how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers.

30. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
31. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
32. Each day of work seems like it will never end.
33. I find real enjoyment in my work.

Scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly agree

The survey items below are about intentions to leave a job. Please read each item carefully and select the response underneath that best reflects your intention to leave your current job.

34. How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?
   Scale: 1 = Not at all likely, 7 = Extremely likely
35. I often think about quitting.
36. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.
   Scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Slightly disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Slightly agree, Agree, Strongly agree

**Views of Yourself**

The next part of the survey asks you to consider some of your personal preferences and tendencies beyond the work environment. This information will be used to help the researchers understand trends and patterns across the population of people who respond to this survey. It will not be used to examine any one individual.

37. Is English your first language?
   □ Yes
   □ No

38. Are you involved in an exclusive romantic relationship (i.e. dating, engaged, de-facto or married)?
   □ Yes
   □ No

39. Were you involved in this same, current romantic relationship when you responded to the first survey in September/October 2010?
   □ Yes
   □ No

The statements below are concerned with how you feel in your emotionally intimate relationships with close others e.g. with romantic partners, close friends or family members. We are interested in how you generally experience close relationships with others, not just in how you are experiencing a current romantic relationship or one particularly close non-romantic relationship. Please respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

40. I often worry that close others don’t really love me.
41. I tell close others just about everything.
42. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
43. I often worry that close others will not want to stay with me.
44. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on close others.
45. I find that others don’t want to get as close as I would like.
46. I’m afraid that once a close other gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.
47. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
48. I worry that close others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.
49. Close others only seem to notice me when I’m angry.
50. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
51. It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from close others.
52. I am nervous when others get too close to me.
53. I often wish that close others’ feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for them.
54. Sometimes close others change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
55. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with close others.
56. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with close others.
57. When I show my feelings for close others, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.
58. I’m afraid that I will lose close others’ love.
59. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to close others.
60. I rarely worry about close others leaving me.
61. I prefer not to show close others how I feel deep down.
62. I get uncomfortable when others want to be very close.
63. Close others make me doubt myself.
64. I find it easy to depend on close others.
65. When close others are out of sight, I worry that they might become interested in someone else.
66. Close others really understand me and my needs.
67. It helps to turn to close others in times of need.
68. I feel comfortable depending on close others.
69. I worry a lot about my relationships.
70. I am very comfortable being close to others.
71. I prefer not to be too close to others.
72. It’s not difficult for me to get close to others.
73. I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.
74. I talk things over with close others.
75. It’s easy for me to be affectionate with close others.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

Below are phrases describing people’s behaviours. Please use the rating scale below each item to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of your sex and roughly your age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully and then select the appropriate description on the scale underneath each phrase.

76. I trust others.
77. I believe that others have good intentions.
78. I am wary of others.
79. I trust what people say.
80. I believe that people are basically moral.
81. I believe in human goodness.
82. I suspect hidden motives in others.
83. I distrust people.
84. I think that all will be well.
85. I believe that people are essentially evil.

Scale: Very inaccurate, Moderately inaccurate, Neither inaccurate or accurate, Moderately accurate, Very accurate

Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you, select the word ‘True’; if not, select the word ‘False’.

86. I sometimes litter.
87. I always admit my mistakes openly to face the potential negative consequences.
88. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.
89. I have tried illegal drugs (example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.).
90. I always accept others’ opinions, even when they don’t agree with my own.
91. I take out my bad moods on others now and again (should be ‘then’).
92. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.
93. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
94. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency.
95. When I have made a promise, I keep it – no ifs, ands or buts.
96. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back.
97. I would never live off other people.
98. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
99. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
100. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.
101. I always eat a healthy diet.
102. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return.
   Response options: True, False

Views of Your Manager

Many of the questions that follow ask about your manager. When thinking about your manager, think about the person who manages your work and to whom you report. Please answer the questions about your manager keeping the same person in mind throughout the survey.

103. Have you reported to your current manager for one month or more?
   □ Yes
   □ No

104. What is your manager’s surname?
   [Space for free-hand text]

105. What is your manager’s given name?
   [Space for free-hand text]

106. How many hours do you spend on average per week with your manager? This can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. Please round your answer to the nearest whole hour.
   I spend on average _____ hours per week with my manager.

The following survey items refer to your leader’s style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits his or her leadership style using the following scale: ‘Not at all’, ‘Once in a while’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Fairly often’, ‘Frequently, if not always’

Please note: Copyright prevents the researchers from changing the references in the following questions from 'leader' to 'manager'. Please answer these questions in relation to the manager you nominated earlier in the survey and base your responses on your own experience of being managed by this person.

107.  
108.  
109. My leader encourages everyone to speak their mind.
110.  
111.  
112.  
113.  
114.  
115.  
116.  
117. My leader analyses relevant data before coming to a decision.
118.  
119.  
120.  
121.  
122. My leader shows he or she understands how specific actions impact others.
   Scale: Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently, if not always
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The following statements refer to your relationship with your manager, as you perceive it. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your relationship with your manager using the scale 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

3 Copyright restrictions permit only three items from this measure to be reproduced in this paper.
123. I like my manager very much as a person.
124. My manager is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
125. My manager is a lot of fun to work with.
126. My manager defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
127. My manager would come to my defence if I were ‘attacked’ by others.
128. My manager would defend me to others in the organisation if I made an honest mistake.
129. I do work for my manager that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.
130. I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to meet my manager’s work goals.
131. I do not mind working my hardest for my manager.
132. I am impressed with my manager’s knowledge of his/her job.
133. I respect my manager’s knowledge of and competence on the job.
134. I admire my manager’s professional skills.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

Think about your manager in relation to the statements below. Please respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale 'Disagree strongly' to 'Agree strongly'.

135. My manager is very concerned about my welfare.
136. My manager has a strong sense of justice. Integrity
137. My manager is very capable of performing his/her job.
138. My needs and desires are very important to my manager.
139. I never have to wonder whether my manager will stick to his/her word.
140. My manager is known to be successful at the things he/she tries to do.
141. My manager would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.
142. My manager tries hard to be fair in his/her dealings with me.
143. My manager has much knowledge about the work that needs to be done.
144. My manager really looks out for what is important to me.
145. My manager’s actions and behaviours are very consistent.
146. I feel very confident about my manager’s skills.
147. My manager goes out of his/her way to help me.
148. I like my manager’s values.
149. My manager has specialised capabilities that can increase our team’s performance.
150. Sound principles seem to guide my manager’s behaviour.
151. My manager is well qualified for his/her job.

Scale: 1 = Disagree strongly, 7 = Agree strongly

152. Is your current manager the same manager as the one you nominated in the first survey in September/October 2010?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Views of Project Engagement

The statements that follow refer to your manager’s enrolment of you, if at all, to participate in this project. This may have included, for example, encouraging you to complete the first and this second survey. Although the statements refer to your manager’s behaviour toward you specifically, this can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your manager’s enrolment of you to participate in this project, as you perceive it, using the scale 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

153. Before the first survey started, my manager helped me understand how the project would fit with my job and be used to improve the workplace.
154. My manager explained to me the project process.
155. My manager encouraged me to participate in the project.
156. My manager demonstrated to me his/her enthusiasm for the project.
157. My manager explained to me the positive aspects of participating in the project.
158. My manager explained to me that if I didn’t participate in the project, there would be negative consequences.
159. My manager allowed me the time to participate in the project.
160. My manager talked to me about the wider project participation, beyond our team.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

This project included the opportunity for some managers to receive a Feedback Report that contained anonymous feedback from the first survey responses. Managers received this report if they and three or more staff responded to the first survey. The report was given to managers at a workshop, teleconference or meeting.

161. Did your current manager receive a feedback report? If you are not sure, please select ‘No’.
   □ Yes
   □ No

The statements that follow refer to your manager’s engagement of you regarding the Feedback Report he/she received. Although the statements refer to your manager’s behaviour toward you specifically, this can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your manager’s engagement of you regarding the Feedback Report, as you perceive it, using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

162. My manager shared with me his/her feedback results.
163. My manager asked for my opinion about the feedback results so that he/she could better understand them.
164. My manager asked for my ideas on how the feedback results could be used to improve the workplace.
165. My manager agreed goals with me that took into account the project feedback.
166. My manager talked with me about a range of opportunities to implement the project feedback.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

This project included the opportunity for managers to participate in a learning programme that included the supply of four Learning Activities Guides that each contained activities, readings and other development suggestions for them to complete.

167. Did your current manager receive one or more of the four Learning Activities Guides? If you are not sure, please select ‘No’.
   □ Yes
   □ No

The statements that follow refer to your manager’s engagement of you regarding the Learning Activities Guides he/she received. These guides contained instructions and materials for various activities that your manager could complete at his/her own pace. Although the statements below refer to your manager’s behaviour toward you specifically, this can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your manager’s engagement of you regarding the Learning Activities Guides, as you perceive it, using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

168. My manager told me that he/she had received one or more of the Learning Activities Guides.
169. My manager shared with me some of the content from the Learning Activities Guides.
170. My manager engaged me in one or more of the activities.
171. My manager shared with me some of the activity materials for my own development.
172. My manager asked me to help him/her complete one or more of the activities.
173. My manager discussed with me his/her experience of the activities.
174. My manager showed me one or more of the Learning Activities Guides.
175. My manager encouraged me to complete one or more of the activities myself.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree
Appendix F: Time 2 Survey

Views of Your Own Leadership and Management

176. Did you have three or more direct-report staff when you completed the first survey in September/October 2010? Take ‘direct report’ to mean the people for whom you have direct management responsibility rather than the people for whom you have functional oversight.
   □ Yes
   □ No

177. What is your surname?
   [Space for free-hand text]

178. What is your given name?
   [Space for free-hand text]

179. Are you willing for Company Name to provide the research team with your performance review information, if it exists? Performance review information will be used to help the researchers understand trends and patterns across the population of people who respond to this survey. It will not be used to examine any one individual.
   □ Yes
   □ No

The following survey items refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits your leadership style using the following scale:
'Not at all', 'Once in a while', 'Sometimes', 'Fairly often', 'Frequently, if not always'.

180. 4
181.
182. As a leader I encourage everyone to speak their mind.
183.
184.
185.
186.
187.
188.
189.
190. As a leader I analyse relevant data before coming to a decision.
191.
192.
193.
194.
195. As a leader I show I understand how specific actions impact others.
   Scale: Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently, if not always

4 Copyright restrictions permit only three items from this measure to be reproduced in this paper.
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The next part of the survey asks about your ‘direct report’ staff. Take ‘direct report’ to mean the people for whom you have direct management responsibility rather than the people for whom you have functional oversight. Please include full-time and part-time permanent and contract staff in your answer but exclude all temporary/casual staff.

196. Are you in a different role now to the one you worked in when you completed the first survey in September/October 2010? For example: If you were a Store Manager in Store X when you completed the first survey and are now a Store Manager in Store Y, then this would be deemed a different role, even though your job title might be the same. In this example, you would answer ‘Yes’ to this question.
   □ Yes
   □ No

The example below is provided to help explain the nature of the questions that follow.
Example: Imagine the diagram below represents the reporting structure in your part of the organisation.

Based upon the above, you would answer the following three survey questions as follows:

Q195: You have 1 full-time (Jan) direct report and 1 part-time (Ed) direct report. In this example, Joe is exclude from the count as you have only functional oversight for him.

Q196: Considering all of your direct reports (i.e. Jan and Ed), in total they have 2 staff members (Bob and Di) who report directly to them. In this example, Viv is excluded from the count as she is employed on a casual basis.

Q197: In total, 5 staff members (Jan, Ed, Bob, Di and Bee) report up, through all levels, to you. In this example, Joe and Viv are excluded for the reasons given above.

Please respond to the following questions by typing the appropriate number (using numerals) in the spaces provided.

197. Currently, how many people have a direct reporting line to you (i.e. your staff)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Report</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

198. Currently, how many staff members in total report to all of your direct reports (i.e. the number of staff members in that part of the organisation for which you are responsible, who are one-removed from (below) you)?

Considering all of my direct reports, in total they have _____ staff members (full-time and part-time) who report directly to them.

199. Currently, how many people in total, regardless of the number of organisational/structural layers, do you have management responsibility for (i.e. the number of staff members, including your direct reports, who report up, through all levels, to you)?

In total, I have _____ staff members (full-time and part-time) report up, through all levels, to me.

200. Were you in the same role between 01 January 2011 and 31 March 2011, inclusive? If you changed roles at any point during this period, please answer 'No'. For example: If you were a Store Manager in Store X on 01 January and moved to become a Store Manager in Store Y on or before 31 March, then you would be deemed to have changed roles, even though your job title might have remained the same. In this example, you would answer 'No' to this question.

☐ Yes
☐ No

201. How many direct reports did you have on 01 January 2011? If the answer is zero, please type '0' in the corresponding table cell. Remember that you can use the 'Tab' key to move between cells.
On 01 January 2011 I had the following number of direct report staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

202. How many direct reports did you have on 31 March 2011?

On 31 March 2011 I had the following number of direct report staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

203. Between 01 January and 31 March 2011, inclusive, how many people joined your team as a direct report to you?

Between 01 January and 31 March 2011, inclusive, the following number of staff joined my team as a direct report to me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

204. Between 01 January and 31 March 2011, inclusive, how many of your direct reports left your team?

Between 01 January and 31 March 2011, inclusive, the following number of my direct reports left my team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

205. Of the direct reports that left your team (nominated in the question above), please indicate the number that left for the reasons listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resigned from Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to another role in Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from Company Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date reached and not renewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract terminated prior to contract end date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position made redundant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntarily left Company Name for reasons other than those listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntarily left Company Name for reasons other than those listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Views of Project Engagement**

The statements that follow refer to your engagement of staff, if at all, to participate in this project. This may have included, for example, encouraging them to complete the first and this second survey. The statements refer to your behaviour toward staff, which can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. When responding to these items, please think about the staff you managed at the time of the first survey in September/October 2010. This could require you to think about both past and present staff if you and/or your staff have moved roles since the first survey. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your enrolment of staff to participate in this project using the scale 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

206. Before the first survey started, I helped staff understand how the project would fit with their jobs and be used to improve the workplace.

207. I explained the project process to staff.

208. I encouraged staff to participate in the project.

209. I demonstrated to staff my enthusiasm for the project.

210. I explained to staff the positive aspects of participating in the project.

211. I explained to staff that if they didn’t participate in the project, there would be negative consequences.

212. I allowed staff the time to participate in the project.

213. I talked to staff about the wider project participation, beyond our team.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree
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This project included the opportunity for some managers to receive a Feedback Report that contained anonymous feedback from the first survey responses. Managers received this report if both they and three or more staff responded to the first survey. The report was given to managers at a workshop, teleconference or meeting.

214. Did you receive a feedback report?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

215. How did you receive your feedback report?
- [ ] Via a feedback workshop
- [ ] Via a one-on-one discussion
- [ ] Via a telephone conference

The statements that follow refer to your engagement of staff regarding the Feedback Report you received. The statements refer to your behaviour toward staff, which can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. When responding to these items, please think about the staff you managed over the course of the Learning Programme (October 2010 to March 2011). This could require you to think about both past and present staff if you and/or your staff have moved roles since the first survey. These statements are NOT intended to reflect your behaviours toward your buddy/buddies (if you formed a buddy partnership) but rather your direct report staff over the course of the Learning Programme. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your engagement of staff regarding the Feedback Report using the scale 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

216. I shared my feedback results with staff.
217. I asked staff for their opinions about my feedback results so that I could better understand them.
218. I asked staff for ideas on how the feedback results could be used to improve the workplace.
219. I agreed goals with staff that took into account the project feedback.
220. I talked with staff about a range of opportunities to implement the project feedback.

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

This project included the opportunity for managers to participate in a learning programme that included the supply of four Learning Activities Guides that each contained activities, readings and other development suggestions for them to complete.

221. Which of the four Learning Activities Guides did you receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Not Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities Guide Number One [If Not Received, skip Q222.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities Guide Number Two [If Not Received, skip Q223.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section of the survey asks you to indicate the activities you attempted from each guide. Please be fully truthful when indicating what you did or did not attempt. As with all information collected in this survey, this will remain confidential, so if you attempted absolutely nothing, please indicate as such.

222. Please indicate the extent to which you completed each of the activities contained in Learning Activities Guide - Number One by selecting 'Partly Completed' or 'Fully Completed' for each activity listed below. If you did not attempt a particular activity, or if you can’t remember whether you attempted an activity, please select 'Not Attempted'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not Attempted</th>
<th>Partly Completed</th>
<th>Fully Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Report - read this in detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Partnerships - formed a partnership and met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Report - discussed your feedback report with your manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Report - discussed your feedback report with your staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Suggestion - watched 'Invictus' and considered its links to the concepts being addressed by this research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Suggestion - read 'A Brief Overview of Adult Attachment Theory and Research'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Suggestion - read 'Discovering your Authentic Leadership'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

223. Please indicate the extent to which you completed each of the activities contained in Learning Activities Guide - Number Two by selecting 'Partly Completed' or 'Fully Completed' for each activity listed below. If you did not attempt a particular activity, or if you can’t remember whether you attempted an activity, please select 'Not Attempted'.
224. Please indicate the extent to which you completed each of the activities contained in Learning Activities Guide - Number Three by selecting 'Partly Completed' or 'Fully Completed' for each activity listed below. If you did not attempt a particular activity, or if you can’t remember whether you attempted an activity, please select 'Not Attempted'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not Attempted</th>
<th>Partly Completed</th>
<th>Fully Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Attachment Style - talked to a close person about your attachment style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations - watched the two Bill George presentations on YouTube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Suggestion - watched ‘Coach Carter’ and considered its links to the concepts being addressed by this research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Partnerships - connected with your buddy/buddies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

225. Please indicate the extent to which you completed each of the activities contained in Learning Activities Guide - Number Four by selecting 'Partly Completed' or 'Fully Completed' for each activity listed below. If you did not attempt a particular activity, or if you can’t remember whether you attempted an activity, please select 'Not Attempted'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not Attempted</th>
<th>Partly Completed</th>
<th>Fully Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment at Work - investigated a staff-related problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership in the Workplace - investigated a staff-related problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Quiz - completed the quiz about attachment to different groups of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Suggestion - watched ‘12 Angry Men’ and considered its links to the concepts being addressed by this research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Partnerships - connected with your buddy/buddies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership - examined the connections between Attachment and Authentic Leadership

Reading Suggestion - read ‘Adult Attachment Styles in the Workplace’

Movie Suggestion - watched ‘Apollo 13’ and considered its links to the concepts being addressed by this research project

Buddy Partnerships - connected with your buddy/buddies

Bonus Reading Suggestion - read the web page on Bartholomew’s attachment prototypes/categories

Bonus Movie Suggestion - watched ‘Dave’ and considered its links to the concepts being addressed by this research project

226. Please indicate the overall extent to which you completed the activities presented in the Learning Activities Guides you received, using the scale ‘Not at all’ to ‘Fully’. Scale: 1 = Not at all, 7 = Fully

227. If you formed a buddy partnership, please list the name/s of the person/people in your partnership in the space provided below. Please include both the first and last names of the other/s in your partnership. If you did not form a partnership, please leave this blank.

[Space for free-hand text]

228. If you formed a buddy partnership, please describe the main things you did with your buddy/buddies over the entire duration of the learning programme associated with this project. If you did not form a partnership, please leave this blank.

[Space for free-hand text]

The statements that follow refer to your engagement of staff regarding the Learning Activities Guides. The statements refer to your behaviour toward staff, which can include face-to-face, telephone, group setting and email contact etc. When responding to these items, please think about the staff you managed over the course of the Learning Programme (October 2010 to March 2011). This could require you to think about both past and present staff if you and/or your staff have moved roles since the first survey. These statements are NOT intended to reflect your behaviours toward your buddy/buddies (if you formed a buddy partnership) but rather your direct report staff over the course of the Learning Programme. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your engagement of staff regarding the Learning Activities Guides using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

229. I told staff that I had received one or more of the Learning Activities Guides.

230. I shared with staff some of the content from the Learning Activities Guides.

231. I engaged staff in one or more of the activities.

232. I shared some of the activity materials with staff for their own development.

233. I asked staff to help me complete one or more of the activities.

234. I discussed with staff my experience of the activities.
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235. I showed staff one or more of the Learning Activities Guides.
236. I encouraged staff to complete one or more of the activities themselves.
   Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

Project Experience

The statements that follow refer to your own experience of this project. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or inaccurate description of your experience of this project using the scale ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’.

237. Before the first survey started, I had a good understanding of how it would fit with my job-related development.
238. I felt excited when thinking about using my learning on the job.
239. My manager rewarded me when I used my learning on the job.
240. My manager brought it to my attention when I didn’t apply my learning on the job.
241. My workload allowed me the time to try the new things I learnt.
242. My colleagues encouraged me to use my learning.
243. My manager and I agreed goals for me that encouraged me to apply my learning on the job.
244. My manager encouraged me to use my learning on the job.
245. The content of the activities closely matched the needs of my job.
246. The activities helped me to see how I could apply my learning on the job.
247. My ability to apply my learning was not limited by poor access to the resources I needed.
248. I have been able to transfer my learning to my job.
249. My job performance improved when I used the new things that I learnt.
250. When I did things to improve my performance, good things happened to me.
251. My colleagues have been open to changing the way they have done things.
252. I felt confident in my ability to use newly learned skills on the job.
253. My manager provided me with feedback about how well I applied what I learnt.
254. My manager helped me apply my learning on the job.
   Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree

255. Please take a moment to describe what, if anything, has changed for you as a result of this project.
   [Space for free-hand text]

256. Do you have any comments you would like to make about this project? If so, please use the space provided below.
   [Space for free-hand text]
## Appendix G: Original and Revised Item Wording for the ECR-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Original Wording</th>
<th>Revised Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me.</td>
<td>I often worry that close others don’t really love me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I tell my partner just about everything.</td>
<td>I tell close others just about everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.</td>
<td>I find it relatively easy to get close to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.</td>
<td>I often worry that close others will not want to stay with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I find that my partners don’t want to get as close as I would like.</td>
<td>I find that others don’t want to get as close as I would like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I’m afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.</td>
<td>I’m afraid that once a close other gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not often worry about being abandoned.</td>
<td>I do not often worry about being abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them.</td>
<td>I worry that close others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My partner only seems to notice me when I’m angry.</td>
<td>Close others only seem to notice me when I’m angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.</td>
<td>My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from my partner.</td>
<td>It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am nervous when partners get too close to me.</td>
<td>I am nervous when others get too close to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I often wish that my partner’s feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.</td>
<td>I often wish that close others’ feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.</td>
<td>Sometimes close others change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.</td>
<td>I usually discuss my problems and concerns with close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.</td>
<td>When I show my feelings for close others, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Original Wording</td>
<td>Revised Wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I’m afraid that I will lose my partner’s love.</td>
<td>I’m afraid that I will lose close others’ love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I don’t feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.</td>
<td>I don’t feel comfortable opening up to close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.</td>
<td>I rarely worry about close others leaving me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.</td>
<td>I prefer not to show close others how I feel deep down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.</td>
<td>I get uncomfortable when others want to be very close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.</td>
<td>Close others make me doubt myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.</td>
<td>I find it easy to depend on close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.</td>
<td>When close others are out of sight, I worry that they might become interested in someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My partner really understands me and my needs.</td>
<td>Close others really understand me and my needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.</td>
<td>It helps to turn to close others in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable depending on close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I worry a lot about my relationships.</td>
<td>I worry a lot about my relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.</td>
<td>I am very comfortable being close to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.</td>
<td>I prefer not to be too close to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>It’s not difficult for me to get close to my partner.</td>
<td>It’s not difficult for me to get close to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.</td>
<td>I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I talk things over with my partner.</td>
<td>I talk things over with close others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>It’s easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.</td>
<td>It’s easy for me to be affectionate with close others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Feedback Workshop Content and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Topic</th>
<th>Key Workshop Content</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Introduction | - Open the workshop  
- Manage housekeeping etc.  
- Discuss workshop purpose and agenda  
- Overview the research study. | 9:00-9:20  
20 mins |
| 2. Education on the Main Research Topics – Attachment and Authentic Leadership | - Describe the two key research topics – attachment and authentic leadership  
- Provide examples that bring each research topic to life  
  - Attachment: Two and a Half Men – Chelsea (secure), Alan (high anxious), Mother (high avoidant), Charlie (high anxious and avoidant)  
  - Authentic Leadership: elicit ideas from audience  
- Make connections between the topics – how each is related to the other, how they are different etc.  
- Activity  
  - Invite participants to brainstorm well known people who exemplify the attachment styles and authentic leadership dimensions and have them justify their categorisation in terms of the attachment and authentic leadership models  
  - Debrief the activity to ensure understanding. | 9:20-10:00  
40 mins |
| 3. Individual Results | - Show an example of the format that the results will be presented in, walk through how to read the results  
- Invite participants to mark-up an actual and/or aspirational profile  
- Show two amalgamated profiles comprising those managers with the ‘best’ and ‘worst’ turnover intention i.e. highest 10% and lowest 10% and/or Leader-Member Exchange results. | 10:00-10:15  
40 mins |
| Break | 10:15-10:30  
15 mins |
| 3. Individual Results cont. | - Provide participants with Feedback Report  
- Give participants time to read their reports  
- Guide participants through the process of ‘reading’ their results  
- Discuss the Management Group and Population findings and answer questions as appropriate. | 10:30-11:00  
30 mins |
| 4. Understanding Your Results | - Invite participants to engage in one or more activities to help them further their understanding of their results e.g.:  
  - Invite participants individually to list examples of their behaviours that both support and refute their results and to discuss this in small groups/pairs. | 11:00-11:30  
30 mins |
| 5. Action Plans | - Invite participants to develop an action plan to enhance an aspect of their management behaviour with the aim of enhancing staff experiences of the work place: request that the plan include feedback to and conversation with staff and the one-up manager; discuss ‘Tips’ on how to conduct this – approach (thanks for helping with this rather than direct)  
- Invite participants to form buddy pairs and to share their plans so that each buddy can support the other to implement the plan over time; have the buddies ‘coach’ each other for successful implementation  
- Explain that the buddy pairing is an opportunity to apply the attachment and authentic leadership concepts beyond the workshop, as much as it is a support; request that each buddy pair connect again after each mailing. | 11:30-12:15  
45 mins |
| 6. Close | - Explain next steps  
  - Four monthly emails/mailings with further information  
  - Encourage each buddy pair to connect after each mailing  
  - Second survey in February.  
- Handout a workshop evaluation for completion and collection  
- Close. | 12:15-12:30  
15 mins |
Appendix I: Sample Leader Feedback Report

Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences
Results Report for NAME
Private and Confidential
13 October 2010

Thank you for your support of the Swinburne University project titled Managers’ Attachment Styles and Staff Members’ Work Experiences. As a part of this project, you completed a survey that comprised a number of published questionnaires. The following component questionnaires are reported here:

- Authentic Leadership
- Adult Attachment Style
- Staff Attachment to Leader
- Job Control
- Work Engagement
- Job Satisfaction
- Intention to Turnover

This report provides you with your results for the above questionnaires. The results are based on both your own responses and those of others who also work at Company Name.

- Staff (people who nominated you as their manager): X
- Management Group (people, like you, who were named by three or more others as their manager, and who also responded to the survey themselves): 54
- Population (all people in the Staff and Management Group populations above): 225.

A description of each questionnaire is outlined on the following pages, as is a summary of your results and any appropriate contextual information. Depending upon the nature of the information, your results are presented in a number of ways:

- Your own scores are shown as raw scores (not adjusted in any way).
- Staff, Management Group and Population information is shown as an average with standard deviation (SD) in brackets (standard deviation (SD) shows the amount of variation from the average). A low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be very close to the average, whereas a high standard deviation indicates that the data is spread out over a larger range of values.
- Reliability information is based upon either your Staff responses or the Management Group, as indicated, and is shown as a quartile category and a response range. The quartiles are defined as shown below.

This report is intended to give you an outline of your results. It is best read in light of the presentations and discussions conducted at the Feedback Workshop associated with this project and with reference to the materials supplied both at the workshop and subsequent to it. If at any time you have any concerns or questions about the concepts and/or your results, please contact Ann Pensom on 03 9763 3655, 0402 075 975 or ann@thecanavigator.com.au.
Authentic Leadership

Overview

The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)\(^1\) is a theory-driven leadership survey instrument designed to measure the components that have been conceptualized as comprising authentic leadership. The four scales comprising the ALQ address the following questions:

- **Transparency:** To what degree does the leader reinforce a level of openness with others that provides them with an opportunity to be forthcoming with their ideas, challenges and opinions?
- **Ethical/Moral:** To what degree does the leader set a high standard for moral and ethical conduct?
- **Balanced Processing:** To what degree does the leader solicit sufficient opinions and viewpoints prior to making important decisions?
- **Self Awareness:** To what degree is the leader aware of his or her strengths, limitations, how others see him or her and how the leader impacts others?

Sample Questions

- My Manager says exactly what he or she means\(^2\) say exactly what I mean.
- My Manager demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with actions\(^3\) demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions.
- My Manager solicits views that challenge his or her deeply held positions\(^4\) solicit views that challenge my deeply held positions.
- My Manager seeks feedback to improve interactions with others\(^5\) seek feedback to improve interactions with others.

Results

The following is based upon a 5-point scale:
0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2=Sometimes, 3=Fairly often and 4=Frequently, if not always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Self</th>
<th>View of Manager – Staff Average (SD)</th>
<th>Difference between Self and Staff</th>
<th>View of Self – Mgt Group Average (SD)</th>
<th>View of Self – Mgt Group Range</th>
<th>View of Manager – Population Average (SD)</th>
<th>View of Manager – Population Response Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=1)</td>
<td>(N=X)</td>
<td>(b) – (a)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
<td>(N=225)</td>
<td>(N=225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>3.14 (0.41)</td>
<td>2.20–4.00</td>
<td>2.83 (0.78)</td>
<td>0.69–4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical/Moral</td>
<td>3.42 (0.41)</td>
<td>2.25–4.00</td>
<td>2.97 (0.78)</td>
<td>0.25–4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Processing</td>
<td>3.42 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.25–4.00</td>
<td>2.70 (0.88)</td>
<td>0.00–4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>3.08 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.00–4.00</td>
<td>2.50 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.00–4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A positive (+) result represents a possible unrecognized strength while a negative (-) result represents a possible blind spot.

---

1. Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) 2007 Version 1.0 (Waldman, Avola, Gardner, Weming, & Peterson, 2008)
2. 
3. 
4. 
5.
Adult Attachment Style

Overview

The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale – Revised2 is designed to measure your attachment style—the way you relate to others in the context of emotionally intimate relationships e.g. with romantic partners, close friends or family members. As you might suspect, people differ greatly in the ways in which they approach close relationships. For example, some people are comfortable opening up to others emotionally, whereas others are reluctant to allow themselves to depend upon others. According to attachment theory and research, there are two fundamental ways in which people differ from one another in the way they think about relationships:

- Anxiety – some people are more anxious than others. People who are high in attachment-related anxiety tend to worry about whether their close intimates are really connected to them, genuinely like them and/or really love them, and often fear rejection. People low on this dimension are much less worried about such matters.
- Avoidance – some people are more avoidant than others. People who are high in avoidance are less comfortable depending on and opening up to close intimates. People low on this dimension are much more at ease with these things.

Sample Questions

- I worry a lot about my relationships.
- I find it relatively easy to get close to others.

Results

The following is based upon a 7-point scale where 1=Strongly Disagree and 7=Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Self (N=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale – Revised Survey: ECR-R; (Fisler, Waller, & Brennan, 2000)
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Staff Connection to Leader

Overview

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Multidimensional Measure is based upon Leader-Member Exchange theory which suggests that leaders do not use the same style in dealing with all staff; but rather develop a different type of relationship or 'exchange' with each staff member. These relationships range from those that are based strictly on employment contracts (i.e. a low score) to those that are characterised by mutual trust, respect, liking and reciprocal influence (i.e. a high score). High scores have been shown to be negatively related to staff turnover and turnover intentions, and positively related to staff organisational commitment, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with work and higher performance ratings. The LMX measure comprises 4 dimensions:

- Affect – the staff member's liking of the manager based on interpersonal connections rather than work or professional values.
- Loyalty – the staff member’s perception of the manager’s loyalty to the staff member and the extent to which the manager publicly supports the staff member’s actions and/or character.
- Contribution – the staff member’s perception of the amount, direction and quality of work-oriented activity the or she does toward mutually held goals.
- Professional Respect – the staff member’s respect for the manager’s professionalism within the organisation and/or prominence within the profession, this may encompass perceptions about the manager’s connections both within and beyond the organisation, and the manager’s competence, knowledge and skill levels.

Sample Questions

- I like my manager very much as a person.
- My manager would come to my defence if I were “attacked” by others.
- I do work for my manager that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.
- I respect my manager’s knowledge of and competence on the job.

Results

The following is based upon a 7-point scale where 1=Strongly Disagree and 7=Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Response Range (N=225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>5.08 (1.56)</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.14 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>5.79 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.00-7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Respect</td>
<td>5.59 (1.59)</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Leader-Member Exchange – Multidimensional Measure (LMX/MM): Liden & Maslyn, 1998
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Job Control

Overview

The Job Control Scale\(^1\) gathers information regarding perceptions of personal control at work. It is believed that people who have some degree of control over their tasks and conduct during the working day experience less work-related stress during times of pressure than do people with less control, and that this might have some link to absenteeism and tardiness. Higher scores suggest that staff have higher levels of control over their work and may therefore be able to manage their stress levels more effectively while lower scores suggest the opposite.

Sample Questions

- How much control do you have over how you do your work?
- In general, how much overall control do you have over work and work-related matters?

Results

The following is based upon a 5-point scale:

\[ 1=\text{Very Little}, 2=\text{Little}, 3=\text{A moderate amount}, 4=\text{Much}, 5=\text{Very Much} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Average (SD) (N=X)</th>
<th>Management Group Quartile</th>
<th>Population Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Response Range (N=225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29 (0.75)</td>
<td>1.00-5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Job Control Scale; (Owens & Gammer, 1991)
Work Engagement

Overview

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale[^1] measures work engagement—a positive work-related state of fulfilment that is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption. People with high levels of work engagement (which is considered the opposite of ‘burnout’) have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities and see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their jobs. This questionnaire measures three dimensions of work engagement:

- **Vigour**—characterised by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work and persistence even in the face of difficulties.
- **Dedication**—characterised by being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge.
- **Absorption**—characterised by being fully concentrated on and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.

Sample Questions

- When I get up in the morning I feel like going to work.
- I am proud of the work that I do.
- I get carried away when I am working.

Results:

The following is based upon a 7-point scale:

- 0=Never
- 1=A few times a year or less
- 2=Once a month or less
- 3=A few times a month
- 4=Once a week
- 5=A few times a week
- 6=Every day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Average (SD) (N=10)</th>
<th>Management Group Quartile</th>
<th>Population Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Response Range (N=225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigour</td>
<td>4.77 (1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67-8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>5.04 (1.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33-6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>5.04 (1.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33-6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale 9 (UWES-9), (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2002)
Job Satisfaction

Overview
The Index of Job Satisfaction\(^1\) takes as its foundation the idea that job satisfaction can be inferred from a person's attitude toward his or her work. High scores suggest a positive attitude toward work and by implication a higher level of job satisfaction when compared with low scores that suggest a less positive attitude toward work and lower levels of job satisfaction.

Sample Questions
- I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
- I find real enjoyment in my work.

Results
The following is based upon a 5-point scale:
1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Management Group Quantile</th>
<th>Population Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Response Range (N=225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07 (0.02)</td>
<td>1.75-5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Index of Job Satisfaction: (Brayfield & Rothe, 1950)
Intention to Turnover

Overview

Whilst organisations will typically experience some degree of staff turnover, if this becomes too high it can be seen as a negative indicator of organisational health. The Intention to Turnover component of the Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire\(^2\) gathers information about people’s intentions to leave their current jobs. It asks people to indicate the extent to which they think about and/or plan to look for an alternative job within the next year.

Unlike the other questionnaires in this survey, this one gives a high score for a less desirable or ‘negative’ result. In other words, high scores indicate a higher or greater intention to turnover while low scores suggest the opposite. As a consequence, higher scores yield a lower quartile category while lower scores yield a higher quartile category.

Sample Questions

- I often think about quitting.
- I will probably look for a new job in the next year.

Results

The following is based upon a 7-point scale:

\[1=\text{Strongly disagree}, 2=\text{Disagree}, 3=\text{Slightly disagree}, 4=\text{Neither agree nor disagree}, 5=\text{Slightly agree}, 6=\text{Agree}, 7=\text{Strongly agree}.\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Average (SD) (N=10)</th>
<th>Management Group Quartile</th>
<th>Population Average (SD) (N=225)</th>
<th>Population Response Range (N=225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention to Turnover</td>
<td>3.02 (1.72)</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{2}\) The Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire; (Cammann, Fishman, Jenkins Jr., & Kleh, 1993)
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Learning Activities Guide - Number One

1. Form a Buddy Partnership and meet

Connecting with other managers who are also engaged in a parallel learning process can enable knowledge sharing, enhance application, planning, and deepen implementation attempts. For these reasons, form a Buddy Partnership with one or two others who attended the Feedback Workshop. The idea here is for the partnership to meet at a regular interval following receipt of each Learning Activities Guide and to reflect upon your actions to date, discuss your plans regarding the Learning activities going forward and to support each other in the learning process. The meetings can be conducted face-to-face or via telephone and you will receive suggested discussion topics with each Activities Guide. If you follow the activities as suggested, you will have met as many occasions by the end of the project, but of course, if you wish to meet more often then please do so.

Buddy Partnerships are to comprise 2-3 people, not more.

Each person is to be a member of one partnership only.

When forming the partnership, discuss the best times and forms of contact that suit all members; e.g. Mondays before 10am, Wednesdays over lunch etc. via telephone, via video conference etc.

Convene your buddy group to Ann Persson at ann@hangergroupinternational.com. Please, can everyone send an email indicating who you have partnered with rather than one person send one email on everyone’s behalf.

If you cannot find a buddy, if the people you have contacted have already committed to a partnership, then contact Ann and she will let you know who is still available.

Possible topics for discussion:
- Who has tried the various activities
- What you plan to try next
- What you have tried that went well and why
- What you have tried that did not go well and why
- What you could do differently next time.

Make sure you allow enough time for everyone to contribute their experience to the discussion and to offer support and suggestions regarding everyone’s efforts.

It is better to lead from behind and to put others in the front, especially when you celebrate victory when nice things occur. You take the front line when there is danger. Then people will appreciate your leadership.

Nelson Mandela
2. Discuss your Feedback Report with your team.

a. Manager

Refer back to the Action Plan you developed during the Feedback Workshop and discuss with your manager the support you require to implement your plan. If you have direct reports that received a Feedback Report ask your staff about the support you can offer them in relation to their project.

b. Staff

Refer back to the Action Plan you developed during the Feedback Workshop and begin to share your results with your team in an authentic way.

1. Transparency: How will you explain this project and its purpose? To what extent will you reveal your results?
2. Ethical/Moral: How will you encourage people to help you understand the results more deeply? How will you let people know that it’s safe to be honest with you as you try to explore the results with them more deeply?
3. Balanced Processing: What questions will you ask of the team/specific individuals to help you understand the results? How will you engage the team to help you decide what to do differently given the results (whether this is to improve something or to enhance a strength)?
4. Self-Awareness: How will you frame this discussion in terms of developing your self-awareness? How can you remain open and create an environment that allows people to open up? How will you find out how comfortable people felt as you discussed the results with them?

---

**Movie Suggestion:**

**Movie Title:** a great demonstration of Nelson Mandela’s Authentic Leadership

---

**Reading Suggestions:**

**A Brief Overview of Adult Attachment Theory and Research** by Dr. Chris Frayley

A copy was handed out at the Feedback Workshop or it can be found online at [http://www.adultiatt.com/attachmenttheory.html](http://www.adultiatt.com/attachmenttheory.html)

**Discovering Your Authentic Leadership** by William George, Peter Sims, Andrew McLean, David Mayer & Dana Mayer

A copy was attached to the email that included the Feedback Workshop.

---
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1. Own Attachment Style

Describe the concept of attachment and the four styles, Secure, Preoccupied, Dismissing and Fearful-Avoidant to someone who knows you well, e.g. your romantic partner or a parent, and ask them to suggest your predominant attachment style.

Some pointers:
- Explain that you are doing this for your own growth and learning and to enhance your self-awareness.
- Explain that you want the person to be honest and reassess them if they want to suggest a style that they believe you will not like or feel told off against them or will you punish them for this?
- Distinct with them why they suggested the style offered. Ask them for examples of your behaviour that has them suggest that style.
- Ask them how comfortable they felt being truthful with you.

Note: If you do not like what they offer, your reaction may be a clue to your attachment style. How do you want to behave in response to their feedback?

2. Presentations by Bill George

Bill George is Professor of Management Practice at Harvard Business School and the author of True North. Discover Your Authentic Leadership. Take a look at some of Bill's presentations online, such as:

- Good Leaders are Authentic Leaders (5min)
  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7f0D2ZJkqvd&list=1
- Bill George on Leadership's Gains
  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=14026lyJM&feature=related

Some pointers:
- Reflect on Bill's comments in terms of your own authenticity with staff.
- Bill talks about how important it is to give people a chance to try things out and learn on the job. What do your staff always on job control and work engagement in your Results Report, p5-6 say about this?
- Bill also talks about the importance of working for someone you respect. What do your staff comments on their connection to you (the LMX in your Results Report, p5) say about this?

Buddy Partners - We Want You!

It's not too late to form a buddy partnership. Please let us know who you have teamed with!

Movie Suggestion: Coach Carter

The true-life story of a coach (Samuel L. Jackson) who in the 1980s tries to teach his High School players that there is more to life than basketball (2005). Rated PG.

Q. To what extent does Coach Carter provide a secure base for his team members? To whom do some of the team members turn in times of trouble? Consider the boy who leaves the team and how a family member or coach supports them.

Q. What is Coach Carter's connection like with his own family, particularly his son?

Q. What is Coach Carter's predominant attachment style? What is it that Coach Carter does that has you suggest this style (see the explanation in your Results Report, p5)?

Q. To what extent does Coach Carter demonstrate Authentic Leadership? What behaviours of his suggest for/not the Authentic Leadership dimensions: Transparency, Ethicality, Balanced Processing and Self-Awareness (Results Report, p5)?

Q. To what extent does the team members engage in the team? Think in terms of Vision, Dedication and Accountability (Results Report, p5). How connected are the team members in Coach Carter (Results Report, p5)? And how happy are they with the team (Results Report, p5)? How do these things change over the course of the story?

Reminder
Connect with your buddies and share your thoughts and actions in relation to the attached. What resonated, worked, didn’t work...??
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Learning Activities Guide - Number Four

If your leadership was represented by a garden, what would that garden be like?

Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership

Please complete the Work Sheet appended to this Learning Activities Guide, which asks you to reflect upon specific attachment behaviours that overlap with authentic leadership.

Reading Suggestion - Adult Attachment Styles in the Workplace (in-press)

As Prof. Peter Harris has kindly allowed us to use his exceptional, up-to-the-minute review of attachment in workplace settings, “in-press” means it is still being refined, so please ignore any typos etc. However, that also means we are being offered the opportunity to read it before anyone else—which is quite an honour. A copy was attached to the email that included this Learning Activities Guide.

Some Pointers:

- It is written for an academic audience, so I encourage you to persevere if you find the going a bit tough.
- I have highlighted the most relevant parts, so feel free to read them rather than the whole text.

Quote of the Month

In my early professional years I was asked the question: How can I treat or cure, or change this person? How would change the person in this way? How can I provide a relationship which this person may use for his own personal growth?

Carl Rogers (world-renowned psychologist)

Buddy Partnerships

Remember to connect with your buddies and share your thoughts and actions in relation to these activities—what resonated, what didn’t work, etc.

What more could you do to drive your growth as a leader and the growth of your team? Try the two bonus suggestions below!

Want to know more about Attachment?

Go to: http://www.ssc.ca/psy5/loc1/transfhome/prototypes.html for descriptions of the attachment categories, from one of the leading researchers in the attachment field.

Some pointers:

- Which type best describes you? Is this consistent with your results (Feedback Report, p.3)?
- How would each type present in the workplace? Which is most aligned with Authentic Leadership?

Movie Suggestion - Apollo 13 (1995)

Starring Tom Hanks, Kevin Bacon, Bill Paxton and Ed Harris, the movie is largely faithful to actual events and tells the story of NASA’s third lunar landing mission. In short, all is going smoothly until halfway through the mission when an oxygen tank explodes, threatening the crew’s oxygen and power supplies. As the courageous astronaut face the dilemma of either sacrificing or risking death, the Mission Control leader struggles to find a way to bring the crew back home, all the while knowing that the men face probable death once the bathed ship re-enters the Earth atmosphere.

Some pointers:

- Which relationships amongst the various characters constitute attachment relationships, ones where the connection provides a secure base or haven for one or both of the people, as opposed to a working- or friendship-based relationship?
- Which, if any, of the behaviours listed in the Secure Attachment column of the table “Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership” (appended to this learning guide) can you observe?
- Who in particular stands out as an authentic leader? Why?
- What is this person’s attachment style?

Movie Suggestion - Dave (1993)

Starring Kevin Kline and Sigourney Weaver, the movie tells the story of Dave, a US president look-alike who, for security purposes, is forced to act as a decoy for an upcoming appearance by the president. This whimsical movie shows how two different styles of interacting lead to different outcomes.

Some pointers:

- Contrast the leadership displayed by Dave Kline (Kevin Kline) and Gene Kran (Ed Harris) in Apollo 13. Look beyond the differing contexts and genres of the two films. Who of the two characters is the more authentic? Why?
- What attachment style does each of these characters (Dave and Gene) display? Why do you suggest this style for each?
- What is the difference between a manager and a leader? Which characters in these movies are examples of each?
Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership Work Sheet

Bring to mind a colleague with whom you work closely. Considering your relationship with this person over the last three months, complete the steps below.

Some Points:
- The idea of this activity is to work with what is ‘top of mind’, so please keep to the brief timeframes provided.
- Use bullet points and brief phrases rather than sentences and paragraphs – this activity is meant to be short and sharp.
- Be honest in your answers – this activity will offer you learning only if your answers are truthful.
- You will be asked to list your immediate points of view then select the statements that most closely describe your view. This will be a judgement call on your part rather than a precise one-to-one match. However, as a guide, when selecting the closest statement consider the number of positive and/or negative points you have listed in each column and the relative importance and value of each point.

Step 1:
- Spend up to 2 minutes – no more – listing the self-disclosures you have shared between the two of you – those self-disclosures that come immediately to mind.
- Indicate whether each self-disclosure improved (+) or worsened (-) trust and intimacy in the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Disclosures that you have shared with the other</th>
<th>Self-Disclosures that the other has shared with you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Place a check mark (+) next to the one statement below that most closely describes the self-disclosure in the relationship, based upon your list:
  1A □ You have tended not to self-disclose
  1B □ You have both self-disclosed equally
  1C □ You have self-disclosed more than the other

Step 2:
- Spend up to 2 minutes – no more – listing the compromises you have made for each other – those compromises that come immediately to mind.
- Indicate whether each compromise improved (+) or worsened (-) respect and connection in the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compromises that you have made for the other</th>
<th>Compromises that the other may have made for you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Place a check mark (+) next to the one statement below that most closely describes the compromise in the relationship based upon your list:
  2A □ You have rarely compromised for the other
  2B □ You have both compromised equally
  2C □ You have compromised more than the other
Step 3:
- Spend up to 2 minutes – no more – listing the strong emotions you have expressed to each other – those strong emotions that come immediately to mind.
- Indicate whether each strong emotion improved (+) or worsened (-) communication and understanding in the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional outbursts that you have expressed to the other</th>
<th>Emotional outbursts that the other has expressed to you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Place a check mark (+) next to the one statement below that most closely describes the emotional expression in the relationship, based upon your list.
  3A □ You have expressed fewer strong emotions than the other
  3B □ You have both shared your strong emotions equally
  3C □ You have expressed more strong emotions than the other

Step 4:
- Spend up to 2 minutes – no more – listing the apologies you have made to each other – those times that come immediately to mind.
- Indicate whether each apology improved (+) or worsened (-) acknowledgement and appreciation in the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies that you have made to the other</th>
<th>Apologies that the other has made to you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Place a check mark (+) next to the one statement below that most closely describes the admission in the relationship, based upon your list.
  4A □ You have apologised less than the other
  4B □ You have both apologised equally
  4C □ You have apologised more than the other

Step 5:
- Now transfer each of your selections, 1A, 1B, 1C, 2B etc. to the respective boxes in the table ‘Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership’ (next page).
- Consider the following questions:
  o With which attachment styles are your selections most consistent? Note that this process reflects only one of a number of behaviours relevant to the attachment styles.
  o What do your selections suggest in terms of your display of authentic leadership?
  o How do your attachment and authentic leadership results in your feedback report?
  o How might this relate to the other results in your feedback report, such as ‘Staff Connection to Leader’, ‘Job Control’, ‘Work Engagement’, ‘Job Satisfaction’ and ‘Intention to Turnover’?
Connecting Attachment and Authentic Leadership

Generally, one’s attachment style is thought to influence one’s leadership style. More specifically, many of the behaviours associated with secure attachment are similar to the components of authentic leadership. In contrast, many of the behaviours associated with insecure attachment are inconsistent with the components of authentic leadership. Selected attachment behaviours and corresponding authentic leadership dimensions are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure Attachment</th>
<th>Authentic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insecure Attachment Behaviours – high avoidance</td>
<td>Secure Attachment Behaviours – low on both anxiety and avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids self-disclosure and tends not to seek disclosure from others</td>
<td>Can self-disclose information and elicit disclosure from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A □</td>
<td>1B □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can struggle with self-disclosure and may find others withhold from them</td>
<td>Can use constructive strategies that reflect their concern both for supporting their own interests and enhancing their relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C □</td>
<td>2B □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May readily uphold their own standards and values to the detriment of their relationships</td>
<td>May oblige or be guided by others’ standards and values, possibly in an attempt to avoid conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A □</td>
<td>2C □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to suppress their problems; may succumb to extreme feelings and distance themselves from others</td>
<td>Can be assertive in expressing their opinions without keeping others from also expressing their opinions; able to regulate their emotions toward others and keep their biases in check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A □</td>
<td>3B □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids detailed reflection about themselves as well as their relationships; any reflection would not go beyond surface-level</td>
<td>Can accurately depict and reflect upon both positive and negative aspects of their relationships; figures, both their own behaviours and those of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A □</td>
<td>4B □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can reflect on both the positive and negative aspects of relationships, but may struggle to understand their own role and accurately pinpoint the impact they have upon relationships</td>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C □</td>
<td>Understanding one’s strengths, weaknesses and other unique parts of the self which influence how one makes meaning of the world and the way one views himself or herself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>