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In the current investigation, leader and follower perceptions of leadership behaviour were studied by taking a person by situation (i.e., interactionist) perspective to the study of leadership. Building on the increasing emphasis in the leadership literature on the value of applying personal relationships frameworks to the study of leadership, the present thesis examined the interaction between attachment style (people’s chronically accessible ways of thinking and behaving in relationships) and the manipulations of situational factors in predicting leadership behaviour. Therefore, in employing an attachment theory perspective, the aim of this thesis was to examine the effect of individual differences in the form of attachment style, alongside situational factors (i.e., task difficulty, task timeline and follower needs) on leadership behaviour. This broad research aim was distilled in three specific research aims which were to: (1) examine the links between attachment style and leadership behaviour from the leader perspective under varying situational demands; (2) examine the associations between attachment style and follower perceptions of leadership effectiveness under varying situational demands; and, (3) investigate the extent to which leader and follower attachment style was associated with leader and follower perspectives of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness. These aims were tested across three studies. Study 1 examined the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and the use of structure and consideration leadership behaviours across situational manipulations of task difficulty, timeline pressure and follower needs. The sample comprised 405 participants (118 males, 271 females, 16 participants did not provide gender, $M = 32.70$ years, $SD = 11.14$ years). Analyses revealed that secure attachment was associated with the least difference in structure and consideration leadership behaviour and attachment anxiety and avoidance were associated with consideration and structure leadership when follower needs and task timeline were manipulated. Study 2 investigated the associations between follower attachment
anxiety and avoidance and follower ratings of effectiveness for consideration and structure leadership behaviours across situational manipulations of task difficulty, timeline pressure and follower needs. The sample comprised 250 participants (109 males, 139 females, 2 participants did not provide their gender, $M = 39.13$ years, $SD = 11$ years). Analyses revealed that attachment anxiety and avoidance were associated with follower ratings of effectiveness for consideration and structure leadership when follower needs and task timeline were manipulated. Attachment security was associated with effectiveness ratings for both considerate and structure leadership. In taking a dyadic perspective, Study 3 again examined the association between attachment and leadership from an interactionist perspective, such that perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness can be regarded as jointly determined by the perspectives of the leader and the follower(s). Thus in Study 3, an actor-partner interdependence model was proposed of leader-follower relationships using a sample of 106 leader-follower dyads comprising 38 leaders (22 males, 16 females, $M = 45.87$ years, $SD = 7.39$ years) and 106 followers (38 males, 67 females, 1 participant did not provide their gender, $M = 41.94$ years, $SD = 9.24$). Results indicated that leader attachment anxiety was negatively associated with leader ratings of transformational and transactional leadership and follower ratings of transactional leadership. Leader attachment avoidance was positively associated with leader and follower ratings of transactional leadership. Leader and follower ratings of transformational leadership were positively associated with leader and follower ratings of leadership effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction. Taken together, these findings confirm that attachment plays a role in shaping perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness from the perspectives of both the leader and follower. Additionally, attachment is a robust individual difference variable explaining a leader’s preference for certain types of leadership behaviour and follower ratings of leadership effectiveness in response to typical situational demands.
Chapter 1 – Introduction and Thesis Overview

In this chapter, a brief introduction and definition regarding leadership and the interpersonal nature of leader-follower interactions is presented. Chapter one also outlines the general aims and scope of this thesis.

1.1 Introduction

In the organisational literature, leadership is one of the most widely studied concepts (Bass, 1985). For over seven decades, conceptualisations of leadership have been proposed, with many of these conceptualisations advocating either a largely dispositional approach to leadership or a situational approach to leadership (Chemers, 2000). Dispositional approaches to leadership suggest that individuals harbour various individual differences that yield patterns of leadership behaviour which are generally invariant across contexts (Chemers, 2000). In contrast, situational approaches to the study of leadership regard leadership behaviour as more fluid, suggesting that the demonstration of certain leadership behaviours is determined by the demands of particular organisational or workplace situations (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Implicit within the writings of scholars that approach leadership from these distinct perspectives is that there are instances in which person by situation interactions may play a role in the demonstration of leadership behaviour (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Despite this implicit assumption, few studies into leadership have attempted to test an interactionist model of leadership in which particular individual difference variables and the manipulation of particular situational variables are used to predict leadership behaviour (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011). To this end, the current thesis addresses this gap by taking an interactionist perspective to the study of leadership.
Moreover, the interactionist approach taken in this thesis incorporates both sides of the ‘leadership coin’ – the views of the leader and the views of the follower (Kets de Vries, 2009). In doing so, this thesis firmly acknowledges the two primary stakeholders that constitute leadership relations – the leader and the follower. To date, a large proportion of research into leadership has focused on investigating attitudes and behaviours of the leaders themselves (Harms, 2011). Fewer studies have investigated the attitudes and behaviours of followers (Boatwright, Lopez, Sauer, Van Der Wege, & Huber, 2010), and fewer still have examined the perspectives of both leaders and followers (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Harms, 2011). Thus, in investigating the perspectives of leaders and followers, this thesis highlights the interdependent nature of leader-follower relations. This emphasis on the interdependent nature of leader-follower relations is in line with the increasing requirement for organisations to engage in more consultative processes with employees regarding key decision-making and organisational planning, and in creating nurturing supportive workplaces (Turner & Muller, 2003). Consequently, there has been an emerging emphasis on training leaders to build positive relationships with followers (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996). In an attempt to better understand the interpersonal aspects of leadership, research has begun to explore the application of relationships frameworks to the field of leadership (Harms, 2011).

Positioning leadership research within a broad relationships framework has been argued to enhance understanding regarding how relationships between the leader and follower can be developed, enhanced and maintained (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007; Popper, 2004). Specifically, numerous relationships and leadership researchers have advocated for the application of attachment theory – a theory of human bonding and relationship functioning (Bowlby, 1969/1982) – as a useful framework in which to situate the study of leadership (Davidovitz, et al., 2007; Harms, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2003).
The current thesis extends on past research linking attachment style to leadership behaviour by: (1) taking an interactionist approach, and (2) investigating the associations between attachment style and leadership from both leader and follower perspectives. Consequently, this thesis takes an attachment theory approach to the study of leadership behaviour. The broad aim of this thesis is to apply attachment theory to the study of leadership from both leader and follower perspectives. Two experimental studies (Studies 1 and 2) were conducted to investigate the associations between attachment and leader and follower perspectives of effective leadership across manipulations of three situational variables. Furthermore, a third study in the form of a dyadic study (Study 3) was conducted to examine the associations between attachment and leadership behaviours from both leader and follower perspectives. In taking a dyadic perspective, Study 3 again examined the associations between attachment and leadership from an interactionist perspective, such that perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness can be regarded as jointly determined by the perspectives of the leader and the follower(s).

In conducting these three studies, this thesis builds on the leadership and relationships research literature in three significant ways. First, the study of leadership is examined from an interactionist perspective by measuring how an individual difference variable such as attachment style, coupled with manipulations in situational factors, effects leadership behaviour. Second, the application of attachment theory extends on past research examining leader-follower relations from a personal relationships framework. Third, this investigation incorporates both leader and follower perspectives thereby addressing a general limitation in past leadership research which has largely focused on studying either leader or follower perspectives of leadership rather than incorporating the views of both parties in a single study. Section 1.2 provides an overview of this investigation into leadership.
1.2 Thesis Overview

Chapter one provides a brief introduction into the topic of leadership and highlights the importance of examining leadership from both an interactionist and attachment theory perspective. Chapter one also outlines the general aims and scope of this thesis. Chapter two presents a review of the leadership literature from both leader and follower perspectives including an overview of major theories of leadership. Specifically, dispositional, situational, exchange-based models of leadership and the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) are reviewed, concluding with the importance of examining leadership from an attachment theory perspective. Chapter three introduces and defines attachment theory and explores its application to the workplace. Chapter four reviews the research linking attachment theory to leadership and provides a rationale for the use of attachment theory as a framework in which to understand leader-follower relationships. Chapter four concludes with a presentation of the research aims of this thesis. Chapter five presents the aim, hypotheses, methodology, results and discussion of Study 1 – an investigation of the associations between attachment and self-reported leadership behaviour across a series of hypothetical workplace scenarios. Chapter six presents the aim, hypotheses, methodology, results and discussion of Study 2 - an investigation of the associations between attachment and follower ratings of leadership effectiveness across a series of hypothetical workplace scenarios. Chapter seven presents the aim, hypotheses, methodology, results and discussion of Study 3, a dyadic study, in which an actor-partner interdependence model of leader and follower attachment, leadership behaviour and leadership outcomes is presented. Chapter eight provides a general discussion of the findings across the three studies and the contributions that this thesis makes to the attachment theory and leadership literature. This chapter also addresses the strengths, limitations, and implications of this thesis.
Chapter 2 – Theories of Leader and Follower Behaviour

In this chapter, a critical review of dispositional, situational, exchange-based theories of leadership and the Full-Range Leadership Model (FRLM) is presented. Particular focus is given to the FRLM as it conceptualises leadership drawing on elements of dispositional, situational and exchange-based theories of leadership. Research describing leader and follower perspectives of leadership is presented, highlighting the importance of measuring leadership from both the leader and follower perspectives. The chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the interpersonal nature of leadership and the efficacy of studying leader and follower behaviours from an attachment theory perspective – a widely studied theory of relationships.

2.1 Dispositional Perspectives of Leadership

Early theories of leadership were largely dispositional in nature, assuming that effective leadership behaviours were largely driven by personality traits. Carlyle’s (1841/1907) ‘great man theory’ of leadership proposed that leaders possess character traits that set them apart from ordinary individuals. Traits including intelligence and assertiveness were found to correlate with leadership behaviours however these associations have been inconsistent across studies and found to predict modest variance in leadership behaviours (Chemers, 2000). For example, Stogdill’s (1948) 30-year review of trait studies on leadership concluded that intelligence was associated with reliable differences between leaders and followers in only 35% of the literature reviewed. More recent research (e.g., Judge & Bono, 2000; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005; Thomas, Dickson, & Bliese, 2001) has reported weak to moderate correlations between the Big Five dimensions of personality (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism, Costa & McCrae, 1992) and leadership behaviour. Despite mixed findings, this personality-based
approach has remained very popular in the leadership literature and continues to garner support. Whilst authors including Stogdill (1948) noted that no trait consistently predicted leadership, other studies have provided support for the associations between intelligence, assertiveness, extraversion, dominance, efficacy and social sensitivity and leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986).

Taken together, research into leadership from a personality perspective suggests that aspects of personality have been found to explain modest variance in leadership behaviour (Judge et al., 2002). Thus, it is likely that factors beyond personality are also likely influence leadership behaviour and its effectiveness (Bono & Judge, 2004). Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) also argued that leadership traits linked to effectiveness in one situation may not necessarily be effective in another situation and therefore a pure dispositional approach to leadership fails to acknowledge the full breadth of the leader’s experience. Furthermore, Zaccaro (2007) noted that personality approaches to leadership also fail to explain how a leader uses diverse behaviours necessary for effective leadership in a variety of situations. Finally, a recent meta-analysis of the leadership literature noted that leadership traits do not predict leadership effectiveness as well as actual leadership behaviours, presumably because leadership behaviours are more proximal antecedents of leadership effectiveness than broad personality traits (Derue et al., 2011; Van Iddekinge, Ferris, & Heffner, 2009).

### 2.2 Situational Perspectives of Leadership

In an attempt to address early shortcomings of trait leadership approaches, which assumed that effective leadership was purely a function of invariant characteristics of an individual (Stogdill, 1974), situational and contingent perspectives of leadership were developed following empirical analysis of leadership behaviour (Fiedler, 1964; Stogdill, 1948). According to situational and contingent models of leadership (Fiedler, 1967, Stogdill, 1948),
the effective leader is often described as an individual who is able to manage various situational factors such as the demands of the task and the needs of their followers or team members (Vroom & Jago, 2007). That is, no one profile of a leader exists that is universally optimal for all situations, and instead, leadership behaviour is largely dependent on what the leader believes is needed in a particular situation (Fleishman, 1973).

2.2.1 Ohio State University studies in situational leadership.

Situational leadership research, as distinct from the trait-based stream of leadership literature, gained momentum through researchers at Ohio State University. As part of the Ohio State University leadership studies conducted in the 1950’s, situational variables such as size of team, job anxiety, role clarity and supervisory control were found to influence the extent to which the leader would display leadership behaviours of initiating structure or showing consideration (Shartle, Stogdill, & Campbell, 1949; Stogdill & Shartle, 1948; Hollander, 1979; Yammarino, Dionne, Chun, & Dansereau, 2005). Initiating structure refers to the extent to which the leader is likely to focus on task-related objectives to ensure goal attainment, for example defining a team member’s role, outlining the requirements of the task and the requirements of team members to complete the task (Fleishman & Peters, 1962). Showing consideration refers to the extent to which a leader is likely to foster warm and caring relationships with team members that encompass mutual trust and respect for team member’s ideas and feelings (Fleishman & Peters, 1962). The 150-item Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ, Hemphill, 1950) was developed to measure initiating structure and showing consideration and subsequent factor analyses conducted by Halpin and Winer (1957), suggested that a large portion of variance in leadership behaviour could be explained by these two major factors of leadership behaviour – initiating structure and consideration (Chemers, 2000).
Methodologically, subsequent revisions of the LBDQ appeared to be very sound hence the Ohio Leadership Studies contributed to progress in the leadership literature from both a theoretical and measurement perspective (Schriesheim & Bird, 1979). The dimensions of initiating structure and consideration, as measured by the LBDQ and its subsequent revisions, still remain one of the most widely used conceptualisations and operationalisations of leadership behaviour (Derue et al., 2011). A meta-analysis of the relationship between initiating structure and consideration and leadership outcomes conducted by Judge, Piccolo and Illies (2004) revealed that initiating structure and consideration shared moderately strong, non-zero correlations with leadership outcomes including: follower satisfaction with the leader, follower job satisfaction, follower motivation, leader effectiveness and job performance (Judge et al., 2004). Thus, the results provided important support for the validity of initiating structure and consideration as robust dimensions of leadership behaviour.

The findings of the Ohio Leadership Studies spawned a wealth of literature on leader behaviour across different situations, its effect on group behaviour, and broader organisational behaviour (Judge et al., 2004; Schriesheim & Bird, 1979). Moreover, it highlighted that leadership should be approached from a multidimensional perspective such as the bi-factor model espoused as part of the Ohio studies of leadership (Schriesheim & Bird, 1979). In relation to this bi-factor model of leadership, Fleishman (1973) noted that the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration were complementary and not orthogonal in that a manager may in fact rank high on both dimensions.

2.2.2 Fiedler’s contingency theory of leadership.

The dominance of situational and contingency approaches to leadership continued and later work by Fiedler (1958, 1967, 1971) further explored the leader by situation interaction
suggesting that varying degrees of task and relationship-oriented leadership should be displayed dependent on situational variables, namely – structure of task (i.e., the extent to which group tasks are clearly outlined and articulated), leader-follower relations (i.e., the degree to which leaders and followers mutually trust and respect each other), and leader power (i.e., the authority inherent in the leader’s position based on its location in the organisational hierarchy). According to Fiedler’s contingency theory, task-focused leadership should be used when the task is unclear hence team members require clarity and direction. Furthermore, Fiedler argued that when leaders are working in highly volatile, environments characterised by unpredictable and low control over situations, a leader should use task-focused behaviours in an effort to stabilise the situation. Conversely, relationship-oriented leadership should be used when the task is well-structured, leader-follower relations are strong and the situation demands greater delicacy to navigate task challenges.

To support his claims, Fiedler (1958, 1967) developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPCW). Intended as a measure of contingent leadership, participants were asked to reflect on the person they least enjoyed working with and then describe them by rating on a scale of 1 to 8 the extent to which the work colleague was hostile or supportive, friendly or unfriendly and so forth. Fiedler hypothesised that high scores indicated favourable reports of the least preferred co-worker, hence more of a relationship-oriented leadership style. Low scores suggested the leader is driven by task motivation instead. Fiedler’s contingency approach to leadership received mixed support in the literature with a key criticism being that it did not assume a leader could be both task-focused and relationship-focused in their leadership style dependent on the situation (Chemers, 2000). Furthermore, the LPCW does not directly measure leadership behaviours but rather infers a leadership style from a general perception of co-workers.
2.2.3 Path-goal theory.

Subsequent work by House (1971) attempted to investigate leadership behaviour across various situations and its effect on employee motivation and satisfaction. Specifically, House’s ‘path-goal theory’ proposed that situational variables moderate the extent to which different leadership styles, namely directive and empowering leadership behaviours are used. The extent to which a leader is directive or empowering across different situations was assumed to predict motivation levels of team members to reach their own personal goals (Chemers, 2000; House, 1971). Similar to initiating structure and task-focused leadership, directive leadership refers to the extent to which the leader clearly defines team member roles and responsibilities and monitors the team to ensure they are forthright in meeting these objectives. Similar to consideration and relationship-focused leadership, empowering leadership refers to the extent to which the leader encourages team members to show initiative in problem-solving and contribute to decision making. According to path-goal theory, leaders should use directive leadership when the task structure is unclear or the task is particularly difficult to best motivate team members (Chemers, 2000). However, this style is not particularly effective when the task is highly structured in which case a more relationship-oriented, empowering leadership style is best so that team members do not feel like they are being monitored or their abilities undermined (Chemers, 2000; Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Kerr and Jermier (1978) extended path-goal theory by proposing the ‘substitutes for leadership’ model. Kerr and Jermier argued that the leader’s role is to supply the missing elements of a follower’s work environment to facilitate optimal performance. They proposed that if a situation provided sufficient task-related feedback, a leader would not be required to demonstrate structure leadership behaviours. Moreover, if a team provided each other with emotional support, there would be minimal requirement for a leader to intervene and lead the situation employing consideration leadership behaviours (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). However,
this theory received little support in the literature with researchers arguing that a leader’s influence and presence is very important regardless of varying situational requirements (Chemers, 2000; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, & Williams, 1993).

2.2.4 Hersey and Blanchard’s model of situational leadership.

Continuing the trend of adopting a situational approach to leadership, Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) defined an effective leader as an individual who was able to alter their leadership style and enact task or relationship-oriented leadership behaviours to match changes in followers’ competency levels (Avery & Ryan, 2002). Specifically, Hersey and Blanchard proposed four types of leadership behaviour, namely – telling, selling, participating and delegating styles and postulated that a leader’s propensity to engage in these behaviours should be dependent on the maturity level of the follower and the follower’s level of development. Maturity was defined as the extent to which the follower was competent, willing and adequately resourced to perform a given task, while level of development was defined as the combination of follower’s commitment (either high or low) and competence (either high or low).

In responding to the competency needs and developmental level of followers, Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) proposed that the role of an effective leader was analogous to that of a skilled parent. Specifically, like parents, leaders can modify their leadership style dependent on the skill level, maturity and developmental level of those whom they mentor and support. According to Hersey and Blanchard, like developing children, new employees demonstrate high enthusiasm and energy towards workplace tasks, but are likely to harbour minimal competence when first engaging in a new task (Avery & Ryan, 2002). Over time, with the guidance of a leader who nurtures the employee’s growth and development, the employee gradually masters these tasks, gains in maturity and accrues experience that
facilitates competent completion of these, and other, workplace tasks (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996). Based on this argument, Hersey and Blanchard proposed that the most effective situational leaders, like parents, would move from displaying task-oriented, directing behaviours when their followers require frequent supervision, to delegating tasks when followers have established competencies and can complete projects on their own.

Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969, 1982) model was regarded as a good attempt to explain the nature of the leader-follower relationship and acknowledged that leaders should pay close attention to follower characteristics to ensure that their leadership behaviour was effective. Moreover, it identified that the follower themselves was a key situational factor that could influence leadership behaviour. However, various researchers identified a number of limitations with this model including ambiguity in the definition and measurement of follower maturity, commitment, and motivation (Avery, 2001; Graeff, 1997). Furthermore, researchers argued that the model was somewhat atheoretical in nature, and derived from Hersey and Blanchard’s own management experiences (Blank, Weitzel, & Green, 1990; Graeff, 1983, 1997; Vecchio, 1987).

2.3 Exchange-based Theories of Leadership

Following the dominance of situational leadership approaches, the focus began to shift to conceptualise leader-follower processes as exchanges between leaders and followers, rather than focusing solely on the leader as exerting influence across given situational contexts. As described by Yammarino (1995), examining leader-follower dyads allows for an understanding of how leader-follower relations are formed, maintained and dissolved. Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) is one example of an attempt to examine the dyadic, interdependent aspects of leadership, which draws on concepts of social exchange theory to describe the relationship between a leader and follower (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991, 1995).
According to LMX theory, an interpersonal relationship exists between leaders and their followers against the backdrop of a formal organisation. Despite the formality and structure of organisations, both self and follower appraisals of leadership style suggest that leaders can be characterised as exhibiting contrasting relationships with different followers (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). For example, initial research (e.g., Graen, 1976, Graen & Schiemann, 1987), found that different followers would rate the same leader in different ways. On one hand, some followers would describe their relationship with their leader to be a high-quality exchange characterised by a high degree of mutual respect, trust and obligation. Conversely, other followers would describe their relationship with their leader as a low-quality exchange with the same leader characterised by low trust, respect and obligation. In high-quality exchanges the leader would treat their followers as ‘trusted advisors’ and in low-quality exchanges the leader would treat their followers in a transactional manner and as ‘work hands’ only (Zalesny & Graen, 1987). It was argued that these differentiated relationships between the leader and followers resulted from the extent to which some followers exchanged resources, materials and information with their leader compared to others (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Later iterations of LMX further investigated how some leaders develop different relationships with different followers; focusing on communication frequency, follower loyalty, leader-follower agreement on values and follower influence on leader decision-making as variables influencing the quality of the LMX (Ashkanasy & O’Connor, 1994; Scandura & Graen, 1984; Schiemann & Graen, 1984). Research discussed how some leader-follower dyads remain purely contractual characterised by infrequent communication between leader and follower, formally defined role responsibilities and unidirectional influence of follower behaviour by the leader (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Vecchio, 1982). Research into LMX also has also identified that in some instances, partnerships are
formed between leaders and some followers characterised by bi-directional influence, high trust and organisational commitment that enhances followers’ willingness to engage in altruistic, citizenship behaviours beyond the follower’s self-interest (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

LMX and other exchange-based theories viewed leadership as a dyadic process such that the leader and follower exist in an interdependent relationship (Chemers, 1997; Hollander, 1992; Messick, 2005). Specifically, LMX theory attempted to explain why leaders develop high-quality exchanges with some followers and low-quality exchanges with others, drawing on principles of social-exchange. However, limited attention is given to the leader’s personal characteristics that shape why they are inclined to build close relationships with some followers and not others. Furthermore, there is little discussion describing the follower’s personal characteristics that shape their inclination to offer the leader more resources and thus shape the quality of exchange. That is, the theory is not particularly helpful in describing the specific qualities of a leader or follower that promote high-quality relationships (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

To this point, a number of leadership theories have been discussed representing approaches to leadership based on individual differences or contextual / situational differences in leadership behaviours. However, examination of individual and contextual approaches to leadership bring to light the opportunity to review an interactionist perspective (Kets de Vries, 2009) in the form of a hybrid model that acknowledges both individual differences and situational characteristics in shaping leadership behaviour. In the next section, a hybrid model of leadership is discussed drawing on elements of dispositional, situational and exchange-based theories of leadership.
2.4 Hybrid Model of Leadership Combining Elements of Dispositional, Situational and Exchange-based Theories

More recent conceptualisations of leadership have built on the interpersonal and affective aspects of leader-follower relations (Burns, 1978; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Specifically, these conceptualisations have attempted to unpack how highly effective leaders develop positive interpersonal relationships to motivate, inspire, mentor and engage followers to perform above and beyond expectations. Similar to the bi-factor model proposed in the Ohio studies of leadership, Burns’ (1978) conceptualised leadership as comprising two types of behaviours termed transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leaders were defined as leaders who engaged in behaviours associated with the exchange of resources and rewards for follower productivity (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leaders were defined as leaders who engaged in behaviours that inspired, motivated and encouraged followers’ to achieve outcomes that extended their abilities and developed the followers’ own leadership capacity (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Building on Burns’ concepts of transactional and transformational leadership, the FRLM was proposed in an attempt to explain the leadership behaviours that specifically enhance followers’ workplace performance and wellbeing (Avolio and Bass, 1991). This model attempted to differentiate leaders who engage in mere transactional relations with followers to leaders who emphasise the development and growth of followers, to the extent that employees become highly inspired and transformed organisational citizens. Importantly, leaders who engage in transformational leadership behaviours may at times forgo their own needs to assist their followers (Avolio & Bass, 1991).

To date, the FRLM has become one of the most widely used and researched models of leadership as it draws on elements of dispositional leadership, noting that transformational leadership is generally the most effective leadership style to enact, leading to superior
outcomes at both the follower and organisational level (Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006). It is also proposed under the FRLM that there exists variability around the expression of transactional and transformational leadership behaviours, noting that effective leaders can evoke varying leadership behaviours to different degrees depending on the situations in which they find themselves in. Therefore, the FRLM refers to fundamental principles associated with situational or contingent leadership, acknowledging that one leadership style may not be the most suitable for all situations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Moreover, the FRLM draws upon elements of exchange-based theories like LMX, differentiating between

transactional leaders who merely exchange reward for effort with followers and transformational leaders who form close, bi-directional partnerships with followers to yield mutually encouraging and trusting partnerships with the aim of fostering optimal workplace performance and outcomes (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The FRLM denotes three types of leadership behaviours – transformational, transactional and laissez-faire – measured across nine dimensions. Transformational leadership is comprised of four dimensions termed idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration (Bass, 1985). Idealised influence is the degree to which leaders communicate the vision of a desirable future to followers and demonstrate high moral standards (Bass, 1999). Inspirational motivation is the degree to which leaders support leader-follower goals and encourage followers to perform beyond their own expectations (Kelloway & Barling, 2000; Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000). Intellectual stimulation represents the leader’s desire to challenge and encourage followers to be innovative, creative, question assumptions and view problems from different and novel perspectives (Bass, 1999; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). Individualised consideration describes the leader’s consistent efforts to engage with each follower in a dyadic relationship,
acting as their personal mentor and guiding each follower to fulfill their potential (i.e., encouraging self-actualisation) whilst catering for their individual needs (Popper et al., 2000).

The three dimensions of transactional leadership are termed contingent reward, management by exception-active and management by exception-passive. In contingent reward leadership, the leader clearly articulates to the follower the standard of performance that must be achieved for the follower to be rewarded for effort (Bass, 1999). The leader will reward performance if tasks are completed to a satisfactory level in line with the leader’s demands. Management by exception characterises a leader who focuses on mistakes made by the follower and intervenes only after standards have not been met (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). In management by exception-active, the leader actively monitors follower performance to anticipate mistakes and sub-standard performance before the sub-standard behaviour becomes problematic (Hater & Bass, 1998). The active leader clarifies from the outset the standards s/he will be using against which to evaluate performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993). In management by exception-passive, the leader remains passive until problems emerge and only then offers criticism (Bass, 1999; Hater & Bass, 1998). The passive leader only clarifies the standards that should have been met after mistakes are made (Howell & Avolio, 1993). The last dimension of the leadership typology is laissez-faire leadership, defined as the absence of leadership behaviour whereby the leader abdicates responsibility and avoids making decisions (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

The FRLM is measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). Regarded as the most widely used measure of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership, the MLQ assumes that each leader displays behaviours associated with both transformational and transactional leadership dimensions to varying degrees (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass, 1999; Bono & Judge, 2004). Ratings across the dimensions of the MLQ give rise to individual differences in one’s leadership orientation.
Typically, individuals who score high on the transformational dimensions and low on the transactional dimensions are termed transformational leaders (Bass, 1999). Individuals who score low on the transformational dimensions and high on the transactional dimensions are characterised as transactional leaders (Bass, 1999).

In qualifying the central tenants of the FRLM, Bass (1985) contended that transformational and transactional leadership cannot be represented as distinct styles because managers display behaviours characteristic of both leadership orientations in their everyday work environment (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001). Researchers argued that transformational leadership behaviours are required to ensure followers are engaged, inspired and motivated, while some degree of transactional leadership is also required to ensure followers are clear on the details of a task and its outcomes (Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987). Specifically, Bass and colleagues suggested that the most effective form of leadership comprises both transformational and transactional leadership behaviours (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). For example, leaders will use transactional strategies when appropriate (i.e., contingent reward) however they are also able to connect with followers to engage, inspire and motivate them (i.e., transformational behaviours). Thus, the most effective leaders move beyond mere transactions of reward for effort, thereby ‘transforming’ followers to enhance their work performance and workplace wellness (Bass et al., 1987). According to proponents of the FRLM as measured by the MLQ, the most effective leaders display mostly transformational leadership behaviours, some transactional leadership behaviours and very few laissez-faire leadership behaviours (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Consequently, transformational leadership behaviours have been found to be positively associated with numerous work-related outcomes such as: organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), self-esteem, self-efficacy, leadership effectiveness, work productivity and
positive ratings of job performance (Barling et al., 1996; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Levy, 2006; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Ross & Offerman, 1997; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Martin and Epitropaki (2001) also found that followers who reported their leaders as transformational leaders reported lower levels of intention to leave their organisation compared to followers who did not rate their leaders as transformational. Overall, the research suggests that followers of transformational leaders are largely more satisfied with their leader, rate their leader as more effective, and are more likely to exert extra effort compared to followers who do not rate their leader as transformational (Bass, 1990). In contrast, transactional leadership has been empirically demonstrated to be less effective in comparison to transformational leadership (Sivanathan & Fekken, 2001), presumably because transactional leaders have an exchange-based relationship with employees compared to transformational leaders who develop a more interpersonal relationship with employees, thereby moving beyond mere social exchange of reward for effort (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The transformational and transactional leadership conceptions outlined as part of the MLQ share much in common with the initiating structure and showing consideration dimensions of the Ohio State University leadership studies (Derue et al., 2011; Bass & Bass, 2008; Fleishman, 1953). Specifically, initiating structure and transactional leadership both refer to task-oriented leadership, such as defining tasks, determining standards of performance, clearly articulating lines of organisational reporting and performance monitoring (Derue et al., 2011). Furthermore, showing consideration and transformational leadership both refer to relationship-oriented leadership, including: showing concern for others, acting in a friendly and approachable manner, fostering an environment for learning and growth, and building close relationships with followers (Derue et al., 2011).
2.4.1 Limitations of the FRLM.

Whilst the FRLM is widely recognised as a valid conceptualisation of leadership, like other models of leadership it does have limitations. Specifically, the FRLM has two particular limitations. Firstly, while Bass and colleagues articulate that leadership behaviour largely comprises of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours, there exists little emphasis in the model regarding the role that individual difference variables may play in leaders’ tendencies to engage in more transformational or transactional leadership (Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper et al., 2000). Nevertheless, research has been increasingly identifying various factors that influence leaders’ tendencies to demonstrate transformational and transactional leadership behaviour and how follower individual differences influence their perceptions of a leader’s abilities to demonstrate these leadership behaviours (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2010; Yukl, 1999). For instance, work involving Bass and Avolio has investigated individual difference variables as part of studies into the FRLM and found individual difference variables such as positive and negative affect, psychological empowerment, empathy and sense of humour moderate leadership behaviour tendencies and follower perceptions of leadership (e.g., Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Bass, 1990; Bass, 2008; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005a; Walumbwa, Lawler, & Avolio, 2007). Despite this research, the importance of individual difference variables is not explicitly acknowledged as part of the FRLM.

Secondly, as part of the FRLM, effective leadership is operationalised as somewhat invariant. That is, effective leadership consists of engaging in a high degree of transformational leadership behaviour and some transactional leadership behaviour (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Implicit in this optimal configuration of leadership is that situational factors are less important in influencing the demonstration of certain leadership behaviours (Derue et al., 2011). As a case in point, while Bass (1990, 1999) has maintained a
rhetoric that effective leadership involves a combination of both transformational and transactional behaviours (as described in the augmentation hypothesis), an explication of the types of situational variables that are likely to influence leaders’ relative demonstration of transformational and transactions behaviours remain empirically unclear.

More recently however, Bass and Riggio (2006) have increasingly acknowledged that some of the variance in leadership effectiveness can be attributed to the person by situation interaction, specifically alluding to an effective leader’s ability to balance the use of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours as dependent on contextual variables related to task and follower needs. For example, Bass and Riggio note that transformational leadership behaviours are more appropriate in contexts where coaching, quality performance and appreciation of the role of the employee are needed. Conversely, transactional leadership behaviours are deemed appropriate in situations when task clarification is required, performance needs to be rewarded, or corrective actions are required. In examining the broader organisational context, Ansoff and Sullivan (1991) suggested that transactional leadership is likely to emerge and be effective when leaders face a stable and predictable workplace environment. In contrast, transformational leadership is likely to be more effective when leaders face an uncertain, unstable, turbulent environment such as organisational change, restructuring and economic downturns. Bass (1990) also noted more broadly that the best leaders integrate and balance a highly task-oriented and highly relationship-oriented leadership approach. Bass and Avolio (1993) argued that leaders learn to use the best style of leadership to suit a particular situation and the augmentation hypothesis proposed that transformational leadership builds on and augments transactional leadership.

Despite these writings, there has been little by way of advancement in the FRLM to specify and test specific situational variables that are likely to influence leader’s abilities to
balance the use of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours, and as a consequence, the optimal demonstration of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours required in certain situational contexts. In fact, Bass and Riggio (2006) acknowledged that very little empirical work had been conducted to gain insight into the contextual factors that may shape a leader’s use of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours.

It is proposed in this thesis, that the situation in which a leader works is a key factor that must be considered in determining the decisions leaders make and the effects of these decisions on how leaders work on different tasks and with different teams to achieve various organisational goals (Vroom, 2000). From an applied perspective, the same leader profile is not regarded as the ideal profile for all situations. As a case in point, it is widely acknowledged in the field of leadership recruitment that different leaders are sourced to fill positions in organisations as a function of the state of a given organisation at a given point in time (e.g., Pawar & Eastman, 1997). For instance, the characteristics desired in a given leader are likely to differ relative to whether an organisation is going through an establishment, growth or rebuilding phase (Ansoff & Sullivan, 1991; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Pawar & Eastman, 1997). Therefore, to assume that one style of leadership is generally the most desirable across workplace contexts fails to acknowledge the nuances of the broader organisational context and the diversity of personnel and situations that leaders will experience and be required to adapt to, to ensure they remain effective in their role.

Moreover, research has demonstrated that significantly more variance in leader behaviour can be attributed to situational factors than to a generalised leadership disposition (Vroom, 2000; Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Thus, focusing on general and somewhat invariant leadership styles fails to fully capture the complexity and dynamism of leadership (Vroom & Jago, 2007).
2.5 Follower Perspectives of Leadership

Whilst a wealth of literature has examined effective leadership from the leader’s perspective, much less research has examined the study of effective leadership from the follower’s perspective (Boatwright, et al., 2010; Keller, 2003). This is somewhat surprising given, that at least in part, effective leadership is determined by “the eyes of the beholder” (Meindl, 1995, p. 331). Indeed, researchers have argued that it is the interpretation of leadership behaviour, not the behaviour per se that is most important in determining the quality of leader-follower relationships and workplace outcomes (Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994). Although some empirical investigations across various leadership models (i.e., the Ohio Leadership Studies and FRLM) incorporate follower ratings of leaders, very little research has attempted to explain the factors that shape follower’s perceptions of leaders as effective. However, research over the last decade has begun to examine this issue.

Specifically, recent studies have found that followers’ implicit theories of leadership predict their expectations and perceptions of effective leadership. In particular, these studies have found that the higher the correspondence between a follower’s implicit theory of leadership and their leader’s behaviour, the more satisfied followers are with their leaders’ behaviour and with the workplace. For example, Epitropaki and Martin (2005b) found that the closer employees perceived their actual manager’s profile to be to their own implicit leadership theory, the better the quality of the leader-member exchange, and in turn, followers reported more positive workplace attitudes and well being. Other research has investigated follower preferences for particular types of leadership concluding that followers who prefer closer, warmer and intimate relations prefer a leader who is oriented towards team work, cooperation and team development (Shalit et al., 2010). Conversely, followers who prefer distant and less emotional relations prefer a leader who focuses on task accomplishment and performance (Shalit et al., 2010).
It has been increasingly suggested across studies of follower implicit theories, that a follower’s own views and perceptions of effective leadership are associated with their past relationship experiences (Keller, 1999; Keller, 2003; Keller & Cacioppe, 2001; Shalit et al., 2010). Therefore, a follower’s own relationship histories are thought to colour their perceptions of leadership behaviour and influence their expectations and beliefs regarding the manner in which work colleagues conduct themselves in leader-follower relationships (e.g., Game, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Specifically, Keller and colleagues (Keller, 1999; Keller, 2003; Keller & Cacioppe, 2001) proposed that a follower’s early childhood experiences shape their perception of themselves and their expectations of leader effectiveness. In reviewing the leadership literature from a personal relationships perspective, Keller and colleagues noted that a follower’s mental representations of close relationships shape expectations and appraisals of effective leadership. Keller (1999) found that an individual’s ‘ideal leader’ mirrored their views of relationships more generally, irrespective of whether these views were associated with leaders encompassing positive characteristics such as trustworthiness and supportiveness or negative characteristics such as being dictatorial and tyrannical. Similarly, Boatwright et al. (2010) and Zakay et al. (2010) found that an individual’s inclination to build relationships with others was positively associated with followers’ preferences for relational styles of leadership.

Given the increasing interdependent and interpersonal focus on leadership research, studies of followers can provide important insight into how followers shape the quality of the leader-follower dyad. Leadership does not exist without a person to lead, therefore it is important to examine the characteristics of the follower as a key component of the leader-follower dyad. Yet, research has largely focused on the leader only as the unit of analysis and failed to explore the characteristics of followers in shaping the leader-follower interaction (Boatwright et al., 2010; Davidovitz et al., 2007; Harms, 2011). Thus continued emphasis on
follower perspectives is necessary, as are dyadic studies, in which the behaviours and perceptions of leaders and followers can be modelled to gain further insight into the interdependent nature of leadership in the workplace.

2.6 Commonalities in the Conceptualisation of Leadership Behaviour

Despite research investigating effective leadership from either leader or follower perspectives (Harms 2011), studies generally suggest that the spectrum of leadership behaviours can be best represented by two broad dimensions, namely – a task/directive/structure category of leadership behaviours and a relationship/supportive/consideration category of leadership behaviours (Derue et al., 2011; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). At times, different terms have been used to describe the same types of leadership behaviour or theorists have defined the same thing differently (Yukl et al., 2002). That is, there has been very little sharing of ideas across various conceptualisations of effective leadership behaviours (Derue et al., 2011; Van Vugt, 2006).

Yet, regardless of the labels used in the literature, effective leadership seems to involve a combination of behaviours associated with maintaining a task focus and maintaining a relationship focus. That is, effective leadership always refers to the requirement to achieve an outcome (i.e., task leadership behaviours) and manage people and interpersonal relationships (i.e., relationship leadership behaviours). This is a consistent theme in the literature in that leadership behaviours, regardless of how they are defined within different leadership theories, generally fit into the categories of task-oriented leadership and relationship-oriented leadership (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass & Bass, 2008; Yukl et al., 2002). It is generally regarded that transformational / transactional leadership and initiating structure / consideration leadership behaviours can be organised along these dimensions (Derue et al., 2011).
Further to this, the distinction between task-oriented / initiating structure / transactional leadership and relationship-oriented / consideration / transformational leadership is present in other literature (e.g., group processes). In the group processes literature, Lewin (1947) described two types of leadership behaviours which emerge in team or group contexts. Specifically, task behaviours are associated with leading the group to achieve a particular outcome or goal, hence sharing similarities with task-oriented or initiating structure leadership behaviours (Lewin, 1947). In contrast, maintenance behaviours are associated with enhancing and encouraging social interaction and the formation of interpersonal relationships among group members, hence share similarities with relationship-oriented or showing consideration leadership behaviours (Lewin, 1947).

2.7 Emerging Emphasis on the Relational Aspects of Leadership

While past research into leadership has identified that effective leadership comprises two distinct but complementary leadership behaviours (i.e., relationship focused and task focused leadership), Carpenter (2002) and Turner and Muller (2003) suggest that industrialised nations are emphasising more relationship focused leadership behaviours. This is suggested to be due to the increasing requirement for organisations to engage in more consultative processes with employees regarding key decision-making and organisational planning and fostering supportive workplace environments (Leonard, 2003). As result, there has been an emerging emphasis on training leaders to build positive relationships with followers (Barling et al., 1996; Bass, 1990). In an attempt to understand the relational nature of leadership, research has begun to explore the application of personal relationships frameworks to the leadership literature. Couching leadership research within a broader framework of how individuals relate to each other could assist researchers identify and interpret the patterns of
emotional relationships between the leader and follower (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007; Popper, 2004).

Specifically, in an attempt to examine the factors that may shape a leader’s inclination to build affective, lasting relationships with their followers, research has begun examining the role of early relationship experiences on subsequent leadership behaviour (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper, 2000; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper & Mayseless, 2003, Popper et al., 2000). Researchers have also drawn parallels between good leaders and good parents noting that like good parents, effective leaders foster exploration of an environment and are stronger and wiser individuals who act as mentors, promote trust, self-confidence and achievement orientation (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Popper & Mayseless, 2003).

Other research has suggested that it is important to look at relationship theories as frameworks from which to gain insight into why some leaders and followers feel comfortable with themselves, the situation and each other, promote trusting collaborative relationships and encourage healthy, supporting working environments (Boatwright et al. 2010). Furthermore, researchers have noted that vital elements of leadership such as conflict resolution, ability to trust others and perception of others in the world are fundamentally associated with the ways in which a person relates to another (Avolio, 2007). Thus attachment theory, a framework of interpersonal processes defining how individuals build and maintain close relationships, provides a rich foundation from which to explore an individual’s behaviour in close relationships and how this applies to other relationship contexts such as leader-follower relations (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Pietromonaco & Barrett, 1997). Attachment theory discusses how experiences with parents and primary caregivers in infancy shape behaviour in relationships across various contexts and well into adulthood (Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Given the acceptance in the
leadership literature that building positive relationships between leaders and followers is important in effective leadership, and recent writings have drawn parallels between parent-child dynamics and leader-follower relationships, attachment theory provides a highly useful framework in which to couch the study of leader-follower interactions in the workplace (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007; Harms, 2011; Uhl-Bien, 2006). In Chapter 3, attachment theory is described and forms the basis for understanding the associations between attachment and leadership discussed in Chapter 4.
Chapter 3 – Attachment Theory

This chapter presents an overview of attachment theory and outlines key concepts in attachment theory. The chapter then examines the early research linking attachment to the workplace.

3.1 Definition of Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is one of the most comprehensive and widely researched theories of relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Over the last three decades, the theory has been used to investigate the formation, development, maintenance and dissolution of adult relationships (Desivilya, Sabag, & Ashton, 2006; Rholes & Simpson, 2004). According to the proponent of attachment theory, John Bowlby (1969/1982), individuals harbour an attachment system that encompasses a set of behaviours aimed at protecting a person (especially an infant or young child) during times of danger or threat.

The attachment system develops early in life and continues to guide emotion, cognition and behaviour in close relationships through the life span (Carpenter, 2001). Specifically, Bowlby suggested that in times of distress, the attachment system is activated promoting behaviours where the individual automatically seeks proximity, comfort and care from supportive others (termed attachment figures). The protection and support provided by an attachment figure alleviates an individuals’ distress or fear, thus deactivating the attachment system, and promoting a sense of physical and psychological security for the individual (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Therefore, the goal of the attachment system is “felt security” – a state of comfort and safety (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). In turn, the individual is able to function independently and divert their attention to other activities not associated with self-protection or the seeking of an attachment figure (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2007).
Originally developed to understand the bond between an infant and mother, Bowlby (1979) suggested that the attachment figure (usually a parent or primary caregiver) plays a special role in an infant’s development as they represent a beacon of safety and security to which a child can turn toward when protection and support are needed. According to researchers (e.g., Ainsworth, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1994), an attachment bond develops when the bond between attachment figure and infant fulfils three functions: (1) proximity seeking – the attachment figure is sought out by the infant during times of stress to provide love, affection, closeness and a sense of relief when the infant is distressed (Bowlby 1969/1982); (2) safe haven – the attachment figure provides support and comfort under conditions of distress (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), and (3) secure base – the attachment figure acts as a strong, reliable foundation that provides encouragement to assist the infant to engage in creative exploration of their environment (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Whilst an attachment figure will often be a parent, grandparent or carer during infancy, a wealth of studies in the adult attachment literature suggest that a wide variety of relationship partners can occupy the role of an attachment figure in adulthood (Doherty & Feeney, 2004; Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2007). Studies have demonstrated that relatives, friends, romantic partners, teachers or mentors and familiar co-workers can assume the role of an attachment figure, providing that these individuals are viewed as a strong and wise caregiver who is able to fulfil the three attachment functions (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

3.2 Working Models of Attachment

Bowlby (1969/1982) argued that the availability and responsiveness of the attachment figure to provide love, comfort, security and affection in times of need, fosters the development of internal working models or mental representations that guide people’s attitudes, perceptions and behaviours in relationships. According to Bowlby (1969/1982),
individuals harbour two complementary internal working models termed model of ‘other’ and model of ‘self’. The model of other is associated with an individual’s perceptions regarding others accessibility and availability in times of need. The model of self is associated with the individual’s perceptions of self-worth in receiving care and love (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). The relationship information stored about oneself and others as part of internal working models, allows a person to predict and visualise future relationship interactions (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Thus, these mental representations form the basis of a child’s interactions with others and guide relationship functioning beyond infancy into adolescent and adulthood (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006). Furthermore, research suggests that internal working models shape interpersonal relationship behaviours across a number of different contexts such as friendships, romantic and work relationships, and specific to this thesis, leader-follower relations (Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Popper et al., 2000).

3.3 Conceptualisation of Attachment

The relationship histories and internal working models of individuals yield chronically accessible attitudes, behaviours and expectations about relationships. These readily accessible cognitive and behavioural patterns are termed an individual’s attachment style (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In contemporary adult attachment research, attachment style is best conceptualised as two orthogonal dimensions termed attachment anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998).

Attachment anxiety reflects an individual’s constant fear of rejection, excessive reassurance seeking, need for approval, and a desire to merge with one’s relationship partner (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994). Attachment anxiety stems from past relationship experiences characterised by inept and inconsistent care giving (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). As a result, individuals high on attachment anxiety are uncertain as to their worthiness for
care and support, are preoccupied with obtaining validations of love and security from their attachment figure and constantly seek approval from them (Feeney et al., 1994).

Individuals high on attachment anxiety perceive their attachment figure as unreliable and inconsistent in fulfilling attachment needs (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). As such, the primary attachment strategy to seek proximity is not met and consequently, anxious individuals engage in hyperactivating strategies (i.e., strategies designed to intensify distress and attention-seeking behaviour) in an attempt to have an attachment figure pay attention to them, thereby alleviating their distress (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988, Main, 1990). Anxious individuals will therefore engage in hyperactivating behaviours such as overly depending on the attachment figure, demanding excessive attention, love and support, and engage in clinging behaviour with the attachment figure in an effort to gain more protection and security (Bartholomew, 1990; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In turn, these hyperactivating behaviours can adversely affect self-esteem, relationship satisfaction and stability due to anxious individuals’ feelings of self-doubt and worthiness and emphasis on their own helplessness, vulnerability and dependence (Batgos & Leadbeater, 1994; Besser & Priel, 2005; Cassidy, 1994; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Attachment avoidance reflects an individual’s tendencies to avoid intimacy and closeness, the unwillingness to trust or depend on others, an excessive reliance on oneself, and the prioritisation of personal achievements over relationships with others (Feeney et al., 1994; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Attachment avoidance develops from a history of constant rejection and unresponsive care giving (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). As a result, individuals high on attachment avoidance tend to disengage from emotional interactions, prefer to depend on themselves rather than others, avoid intimacy and closeness, are unwilling to openly trust others, and are not comfortable having others rely on them (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Barthomolew, 1994).
Individuals high on attachment avoidance perceive their attachment figure as absent and unresponsive when required to fulfil attachment needs. As such, they learn to deactivate the attachment system to avoid frustration and distress caused by an attachment figure’s unavailability. Consequently, avoidant individuals will engage in deactivating behaviours (i.e., strategies designed to actively suppress attachment needs) such as suppressing thoughts and feelings about dependence and closeness, and avoidance of emotionally intimate interactions that involve self-disclosure (Bartholomew, 1990; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Individuals low on anxiety and avoidance are deemed securely attached (Brennan et al., 1998). These individuals recognise the importance of developing and maintaining close personal relationships, are comfortable with closeness and are confident in depending on others when in need (Feeney et al., 1994). Secure individuals report positive early attachment experiences characterised by consistent support and love during infancy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Thus, the internal working models of secure individuals depict generally positive representations of the availability and responsiveness of the attachment figure to fulfil attachment needs, hence secure individuals perceive themselves as worthy of receiving care. As a result, secure individuals trust others, are comfortable having others rely on them during times of need, are happy to engage in interdependent relationships and look for adaptive, constructive ways to cope with stressors and threats (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2007).

Additionally, positive attachment experiences create, within the secure individual, a sense of confidence and optimism, thus enhancing emotional stability, personal and social adjustment, feelings of self-worth, autonomy, personal growth and environmental mastery (Brennan & Shaver, 1995). Given secure people are not preoccupied with fulfilling attachment needs; they are able to divert their attention to taking on life’s challenges and work to maintain the wellbeing of others. Furthermore, unlike avoidant individuals who tend
to ignore the requests for help of others, secure people are aware of others attachment needs and can engage in empathic, responsive care giving of others when required (Collins & Read, 1990).

Individuals high on both dimensions of anxiety and avoidance are often referred to in the literature as having a fearful or disorganised attachment (Bartholomew & Shaver, 1998). These individuals have especially negative representations as to the availability and trustworthiness of others and are uncomfortable getting close to others yet crave emotionally close relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2010). Furthermore, fearful individuals are more likely to be involved in highly distressed and violent couple relationships and exhibit the least empathy for others who are distressed compared to anxious, avoidant and secure individuals (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2010). Fearful attachment is associated with early childhood experiences characterised by an attachment figure whose love, responsiveness, accessibility and support cannot be predicted or relied upon (e.g., an abusive, drug-addicted or grieving parent). Consequently, the individual’s attachment system is in a constant state of flux between hyperactivation and deactivation whereby the child is simultaneously attempting to have attachment needs met while avoiding rejection and mistreatment (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2010).

3.4 Attachment and its Application to the Workplace

As noted in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, whilst attachment theory was initially applied to parent-child relationships, research during the mid 1980s and early 1990s began to explore the application of attachment theory to various adult relationship contexts including the workplace. Seminal work by Hazan and Shaver (1990) proposed that attachment processes are likely to play an important role in the workplace given that places of employment are often characterised by individuals who work closely together for long periods of each day,
and often, these workplace relations last for numerous years. Thus, attachment processes are likely to shape the regular and enduring interactions amongst work colleagues. Furthermore, Hazan and Shaver drew parallels between employees and children, arguing that employees are often encouraged to develop competencies and take on challenges similar to how children are encouraged to master skills and undertake tasks that extend their physical and socio-emotional capacities.

Hazan and Shaver (1990) contend that individuals’ capacities to engage in positive workplace relations, develop competencies, and engage in challenging tasks in the workplace are likely to be associated with their attachment style. As expected, Hazan and Shaver found that securely attached individuals approached work with confidence, valued colleague relationships, enjoyed work activities and were relatively unburdened by fears of failure in the workplace. Conversely, anxious individuals reported that their concerns about their own romantic and personal relationships interfered with work. Anxious individuals feared rejection due to poor performance and possessed a tendency to engage in social loafing on team-based work tasks. Finally, avoidant individuals used work activity to keep busy and avoid uncomfortable social interaction given their preference for working alone and spending little time with others. Whilst these findings did not specifically focus on leadership, Hazan and Shaver’s results clearly indicated that workplace behaviour and outcomes were, at least in part, associated with attachment style.

Hazan and Shaver’s (1990) early work regarding the application of attachment theory to the workplace spawned numerous studies linking attachment to organisational settings (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Later research by Hardy and Barkham (1994) found that amongst individuals treated for workplace stress, anxious attachment was associated with insecurity regarding workplace relationships and job performance and attachment avoidance was associated with increased conflicts with co-workers, concerns about hours of work and
difficulties maintaining relationships outside of work. Researchers have also begun to
explore the role of attachment orientations in predicting workplace helping behaviour,
organisational citizenship behaviour, counterproductive workplace behaviours and
organisational commitment (Desivilya et al., 2006; Geller & Bamberger, 2009; Little, Nelson,
Wallace, & Johnson, 2011; Richards & Schat, 2011). Findings have largely suggested
positive correlations between secure attachment and positive organisational behaviours, such
as staying later at work to help others (altruism) and demonstrating sportsmanship and
courtesy towards colleagues (Geller & Bamberger, 2009). Findings have also identified
negative associations between anxiety and avoidance and organisational commitment and
positive associations with intention to quit compared to secure individuals (Mikulincer &
Shaver, 2007).

Of particular interest to this thesis, research over the last decade has begun to examine the
associations between attachment style and leadership behaviour and subsequent workplace
outcomes (e.g., Berson et al., 2006; Davidovitz et al., 2007; Johnston, 2000; Mayseless, 2010;
Popper, 2002; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000; Towler, 2005). Given the emphasis
of this thesis on the links between attachment and leadership behaviours, research supporting
the application of attachment theory to the study of leadership and workplace outcomes is
presented in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4 - Attachment Theory and Leadership

This chapter presents a rationale for the application of attachment theory to the study of leadership, from the leader and follower perspectives. Research linking attachment to leader and follower behaviour is critically reviewed and the chapter concludes with the research aims of this thesis.

4.1 Leaders as Parent-like Figures

Drawing on Freud’s (1939) analogy that leaders can be viewed as father figures, Popper and Mayseless (2003) argued that leader-follower relationships share similar characteristics to those of parent-child attachment relationships. That is, like parents, effective leaders give guidance and direction, take care of those who are dependent on them and fulfil the role of an attachment-like figure to whom followers can turn in times of distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Leaders can adopt the role of a stronger and wiser caregiver-like figure and provide followers with a sense of safety and security, especially in times of workplace stress or threat, such as during periods of organisational restructure or change (Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper, 2002; Shamir, 1999). Thus, effective leaders share many qualities akin to those of positive parental figures (Popper & Mayseless, 2003, 2007).

In particular, positive parental figures create a sense of self-worth, boost self-esteem, encourage exploration, autonomy and achievement of goals whilst providing new and challenging opportunities for their child (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bornstein, 1989). While providing this positive regard and encouragement, parents also set rules, limitations and discipline; however positive parental figures do not criticise, dominate, pressure or abuse their children (Baumrind, 1967; Barber & Harmon, 2002). This particular
form of parenting is commonly referred to in the literature as authoritative parenting (Baumrind, 1967; Barber & Harmon, 2002).

These authoritative parenting behaviours parallel the behaviours of effective leaders. Effective leaders set about to earn followers trust and respect, build pride and competence in employees, and set challenging goals and standards without being critical, judgemental or aggressive in their interactions with colleagues (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House & Howell, 1992). Furthermore, similar to security-enhancing attachment figures, effective leaders provide advice, coach and mentor their team members, develop autonomy and foster innovation and support amongst their team members to take on new challenges, acquire new skills and develop their own leadership capabilities (Bass, 1985; House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Zaleznick, 1992). Whilst leaders occupy the role of stronger and wiser figure, followers can occupy the role of a vulnerable, dependent ‘child-like’ figure who is reliant on the leader for support and guidance, especially during times of distress, such as organisational uncertainty or a personal crisis (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Popper and Mayseless’ (2003) seminal work explored the parallels between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership, drawing on the research in developmental psychology and the transformational leadership literature. Their review noted that both parents and transformational leaders demonstrate individualised consideration of their ‘protégés’, reinforce autonomy, promote trust, self-confidence and self-esteem (see Popper & Mayseless, 2003 for a review). However, more importantly, leaders like good parents, provide a sense of security thus fostering exploration, independence and pro-social behaviour in those they mentor (Popper, 2004, Popper & Mayseless, 2003).
Thus, researchers have suggested that attachment theory may be a useful framework in which to understand leader-follower relationships (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). Whilst it is acknowledged that leader-follower relationships may not necessarily fulfill all attachment functions like parent-child relationships, Mayseless and Popper (2007) contend that in times of crisis, followers tend to draw on their relationships with leaders to ameliorate distress. Furthermore, to meet followers’ needs for comfort and safety in times of distress, Mayseless (2010) contends that leaders must be self-confident, empathic and caring to effectively attend to the needs of followers. Thus, effective leaders share qualities associated with that of a person with a secure attachment style (Mayseless, 2010).

4.2 Proposed Links between Attachment Style and Leadership

Recent research has begun to explore the associations between attachment and leadership (e.g., Berson et al., 2006; Davidovitz et al., 2007; Johnston, 2000; Mayseless, 2010; Popper, 2002; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000; Towler, 2005). Specifically, scholars have proposed that anxiously attached individuals do not appear well-equipped to occupy the role of a reliable, security-enhancing, effective leader given that these individuals are often consumed by their preoccupation with their own self-worth and strong desire to be noticed and appreciated (Mayseless, 2010).

As Mikulincer and Shaver suggested (2007), anxious individuals may seek to fulfill a leadership role in an attempt to have their own relationship needs met rather than as an opportunity to focus on the developmental needs of others. Furthermore, given their egoistic focus on their own emotional requirements, anxiously attached individuals may not pay adequate attention to the task-oriented side of effective leadership, which requires a conscious effort to divert attention from the needs of team members and oneself to focus on meeting deadlines and project objectives (Mayseless, 2010). Instead, anxious individuals...
may focus on building close relationships with team members and become excessively involved with their team (i.e., constant attempts to communicate and offer themselves as available for assistance) in an attempt to maintain proximity to others. Consequently, anxiously attached individuals may be liked by team members and be perceived as very friendly, and approachable, however, these anxious leaders may be ineffective in achieving key task-related goals (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

Similarly to anxiously attached people, avoidantly attached individuals are thought to be ill-equipped to occupy the leadership role of a stronger and wiser figure (Mayseless, 2010; Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper et al., 2000). Their discomfort with closeness and reluctance to build interdependent relationships with others is likely to interfere with their ability to recognise when others need assistance and to react in an empathic, helpful way (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Furthermore, avoidantly attached individuals’ tendency to maintain distance from others most likely focuses their attention on ensuring task completion rather than fostering and nurturing employee growth, building team members’ self-esteem and providing new challenges to extend followers’ competencies (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Therefore, avoidant leaders are unlikely to focus on the unique developmental needs of their team members, nor are they likely to offer adequate support and guidance when required by followers (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Consequently, avoidant individuals may succeed at mobilising a group to achieve a task-related outcome, but are unlikely to be viewed as helpful or friendly by followers (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

From an attachment theory perspective, securely attached individuals may be better suited to occupy a leadership position compared to anxiously and avoidantly attached individuals because they understand the importance of building close bonds with others and can focus fully and accurately on others’ needs without being distracted by their own distress or discomfort (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). The positive mental models of relationships held
by secure individuals are likely to sustain empathic, sensitive and responsive leadership
behaviours focused on guiding and helping others in a nurturing and caring manner
(Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper, 2000; Popper et al., 2004; Popper & Mayseless, 2003).
Furthermore, given their ability to recognise the needs of others, and to engage in prosocial,
altruistic behaviour, securely attached people are likely to have the capacity to balance
followers’ focus on workplace tasks with the need to nurture follower competencies
(Davidovitz et al., 2007).

4.3 A Dyadic Emphasis on Attachment Relationships

Given that attachment theory is a framework for understanding relationships, increasing
theoretical and empirical work in adult attachment has focused on examining attachment
processes at the dyadic rather than the individual level (e.g., Ben-Ari & Lavee, 2005;
Campbell, Simpson, Kashy, & Rholes, 2001; Furman & Simon, 2006). This approach allows
for the study of both actor and partner effects simultaneously. Actor effects are defined as
the effects of a person’s own characteristics on the behaviours and outcomes of themselves
and their partner. Partner effects are defined as the effects of the partner’s characteristics on
behaviours and outcomes of themselves and the actor (Cook & Kenny, 2005). Specifically,
these studies have focused on understanding how attachment styles of couple members
influence each other’s perceptions, behaviours and relationship outcomes (e.g., relationship
quality, relationship satisfaction, Troth & Miller, 2000).

Of the research that has examined attachment style within the context of couples, some
studies have specifically focused on the degree to which similarity between partners’
attachment styles predicts relationship outcomes (e.g., Cohn, Silver, Cowan, Cowan, &
Pearson, 1992; Senchak & Leonard, 1992). Research on romantic relationships suggests that
couples comprising of two securely attached individuals report more positive and satisfying
relationships than couples consisting of two insecure individuals (Cohn et al., 1992; Senchak & Leonard, 1992). Specifically, more secure couples report more effective communication and problem solving strategies to deal with relationship problems, higher levels of trust and intimacy, and report the exchange of higher degrees of social support in assisting a partner in distress compared to insecure couples (Berman, Marcus, & Berman, 1994; Dickstein, Seifer, St Andre, & Schiller, 2001; Senchak & Leonard, 1992). Furthermore, research suggests that attachment insecurity within the dyad can compromise couple functioning in terms of an increased tendency to use destructive conflict management patterns and a reduction in openness in dyadic communication (Bouthillier, Julien, Dube, Belanger, & Hamelin, 2002; Tucker & Anders, 1998). However, research suggests that the presence of one securely attached partner in a relationship can buffer the negative effects of an insecure partner by enhancing aspects of the relationship such as relationship satisfaction and intimacy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Allison, Bartholomew, Mayseless, and Duton (2005) examined differences in attachment styles of romantic couples and found that the combination of an anxiously attached partner with that of an avoidantly attached partner resulted in the anxious partner displaying violent behaviour when the avoidant partner withdrew from resolving conflict. Furthermore, Feeney (2003) described the relationship between two anxious partners as one of constant pursuit whereby both partners feel misunderstood and rejected, focus on their own insecurities and try to control each other’s behaviour. Keller (2003) further explored the notion of attachment style congruence and proposed theoretical assumptions regarding the optimal combinations of leader and follower attachment style. Specifically, Keller and colleagues suggested that a secure leader paired with a secure follower is likely to result in a dyad characterised by high quality workplace relations and effectiveness (Keller, 1999; Keller, 2003; Keller & Cacioppe, 2001). In contrast, a secure leader may become frustrated with an anxious follower’s
constant need for attention and reassurance or conversely, dislike an avoidant follower’s excessive self-reliance. From this perspective, it is clear that examining attachment processes in dyadic contexts can yield valuable insights into relationship functioning. Thus, applying attachment theory to the leader-follower dyad is likely to provide important understandings regarding how leader and follower attachment influences the execution and perception of leadership behaviours and workplace outcomes for both leader and follower.

4.4 Associations between Attachment and Leadership

Despite the recent interest in the application of attachment theory to the study of leadership, there exists only a few studies that have explored the association between attachment style and leadership behaviour. Surprisingly, the first study to examine links between attachment-related concepts and leadership was the work of Tarnopol (1958). Some 60 years ago, Tarnopol explored the link between parental attachment and employee ratings of leadership potential (i.e., leadership emergence), suggesting that insecure attachment was associated with a failure to develop the independence necessary to be a leader. Using a sample of supervisors and employees, Tarnopol found that individuals with distant attachment to their fathers (i.e., fathers who were strict) and overly close relationships to their mothers were less likely to be nominated by peers as being natural leaders. From these findings, it was argued that the lack of self-reliance and independence in insecurely attached individuals is related to an excessive focus on seeking validation from others as opposed to leadership behaviours focused on the development of followers (Harms, 2011; Quick, Nelson, & Quick, 1987).

In a study of leadership ability, Mikulincer and Florian (1995) found that young Israeli army recruits with a secure attachment style were rated by their peers as higher on leadership ability compared to anxiously attached recruits. Interestingly, avoidantly attached recruits
were also rated by their peers as higher on leadership ability than anxious recruits. In this
study, leadership ability was defined as physical, emotional and social performance during
four months of intensive combat training. Mikulincer and Florian argued that in a military
context, securely attached individuals’ high self-esteem and ability to provide assistance and
support to others during times of distress were likely to result in higher peer ratings of
leadership ability compared to anxiously attached recruits. Furthermore, avoidantly attached
recruits were viewed somewhat effective as leaders. Mikulincer and Florian suggested that
avoidantly attached individuals’ ability to project a false sense of security and dismiss their
emotional needs in distressing situations may have resulted in positive leadership evaluations
from their peers.

In later military studies, Popper et al. (2000) found an association between secure
attachment and transformational leadership whereby securely attached individuals were rated
as displaying more idealised influence, inspirational motivation, individualised consideration
and intellectual stimulation compared to anxious and avoidant individuals who displayed
significantly less transformational leadership behaviours. It was argued that given securely
attached individuals’ maintain a healthy view of themselves as competent and agentic, they
are better equipped to focus on articulating a leadership vision and the developmental needs
of others (Popper et al., 2000). In comparison, anxiously attached individuals are
preoccupied with gaining validation from others as opposed to genuinely investing in the
development of others, while avoidantly attached individuals are inclined to maintain
interpersonal distance and not engage in more individualised and considered forms of
leadership (Popper et al., 2000).

Popper (2002) found that attachment security was associated with socialised leadership
(similar to transformational leadership whereby leaders use their position of influence to
serve others and foster the alignment of common interests between team members). In
contrast, attachment avoidance was associated with higher levels of personalised leadership (similar to transactional leadership whereby leaders put their own interests ahead of others and tend to behave in an autocratic manner). These findings again provided support for the argument that secure attachment behaviours parallel leadership behaviours associated with demonstrating care and concern for others and fostering close relationships. In contrast, avoidant individuals’ inclination to maintain interpersonal distance interferes with their ability to gain proximity to others; hence they focus on their own goals and operate in isolation of the broader group using autocratic leadership behaviour.

Furthermore, in another study with 402 Israeli soldiers, in which personality traits such as locus of control and trait anxiety were controlled, Popper, Amit, Gal, Mishkal-Sinai, and Lisak (2004) found an association between leader secure attachment and rater perceptions of leadership potential. In contrast, leader attachment anxiety and avoidance were negatively associated with follower ratings of leadership potential. In research with undergraduate students, Towler (2005) found that participants who reported secure attachment relationships with their parents were more likely to display charismatic leadership behaviours. Later research by Berson et al. (2006) investigated the associations between attachment and leadership in a sample of American management students who had been randomly allocated to various work teams. In line with expectations, members with a secure attachment were rated as more likely to emerge as team leaders compared to anxiously and avoidantly attached team members. Collectively, these findings support the argument that secure attachment is associated with leadership behaviours associated with displaying genuine concern and interest in the welfare of others.

In other research with a sample of 229 small business owners and managers of medium-sized agricultural businesses in America, Johnston (2000) measured the associations between manager attachment, expectations of team performance and decision-making structures in the
organisation. Findings revealed that securely attached managers viewed their employees as more reliable and reported less conflict with their employees. Securely attached managers also delegated decision-making to employees, thus establishing decentralised models of decision-making in the organisation. These findings support the argument that securely attached individuals have a propensity to trust others and provide opportunities for increased accountability, growth and development (forms of leadership behaviour akin to transformational leadership).

In contrast, avoidant managers reported more conflict with staff members and higher employee turnover. They also structured the organisation in a more centralised manner to eliminate the need to rely on others for decision-making. These findings support the rationale that avoidantly attached individuals prefer to maintain tight control over situations and limit interactions with others, presumably due to their tendency to be excessively self-reliant. Anxiously attached managers reported similar levels of conflict with staff as avoidantly attached managers but also noted a higher degree of positive interactions that avoidant managers. Anxious managers also asked employees for input in decision-making, but gave little authority to others to make final decisions in their organisations. According to Johnson (2000), these findings suggest that anxiously attached managers like to get close to others to seek validation and maintain closeness, however have difficulty entrusting others to carry out final decision-making.

In a comprehensive study of attachment style and leadership, Davidovitz et al. (2007) found that attachment anxiety was positively associated with self-serving leadership motives and negatively associated with leadership efficacy in task-focused situations. In turn, follower performance on instrumental tasks was poorer for followers lead by anxiously attached compared to securely attached leaders. Furthermore, Davidovitz et al. (2007) found that avoidantly attached leaders were less likely to endorse prosocial leadership motives and
were less likely to be effective as leaders in relationship-oriented situations compared to securely attached leaders. Davidovitz et al. concluded that avoidantly attached individuals’ preference for interpersonal distance interferes with their ability to provide empathy and guidance in situations where leaders were required to attend to followers’ socio-emotional needs.

### 4.5 Associations between Attachment and Follower Ratings of Leadership

In relation to the role of follower attachment on followers’ appraisals and perceptions of leaders, Shalit et al., (2010) found that securely attached participants preferred a socialised leader (more relationship-focused) compared to avoidantly attached followers who preferred personalised leaders (more task-focused). Shalit et al’s findings are in line with the characteristics of securely and avoidantly attached individuals. Specifically, secure individuals’ comfort with closeness aligns with leaders who appear to foster relationships and support followers. In contrast avoidant followers’ preference for emotional distance and need for achievement means that leaders who take a task-focused approach are likely to be viewed as embodying similar values to these followers (Shalit et al., 2010).

Schirmer and Lopez (2001) investigated the manner in which follower attachment shapes perceptions of supervisor social support, and in turn, effects on work stress, work strain and job satisfaction. Findings indicated that when followers rated their leader as displaying supportive behaviour, followers high on attachment anxiety reported similar levels of stress and satisfaction to those low on attachment anxiety. However, when followers rated their leader as lacking in supportive behaviour, anxiously attached followers reported significantly more stress and lower job satisfaction. Conversely, followers high on attachment avoidance reported higher job satisfaction when leader support was low. These findings support claims that anxiously attached individuals crave interpersonal closeness to gain a sense of security,
and when the support of others is not available, these individuals feel distressed. Furthermore, the findings support avoidantly attached individuals’ desire to be self-reliant, regarding the support from leaders as interfering and of little benefit.

Research by Grosvenor and Boies (2006) asked employees to report on their leader’s attachment style, transformational leadership ability, quality of leader-member exchange, leader’s benevolence and their perceptions of leader trust. As expected, attachment security was positively associated with these variables whereas attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance were negatively associated with the variables. In an exploratory study, Game (2008) investigated the associations between working models of attachment and the experience of negative emotions in relation to hypothetical leadership situations. In a sample of 174 nurses, participants were exposed to two hypothetical scenarios whereby a supervisor elects to display no leadership in response to a workplace situation requiring the enactment of leadership behaviour. Game found that attachment anxiety was associated with the experience of both anger and distress, implying that anxiously attached individuals experienced emotional difficulties when leadership intervention was not apparent.

Recent research by Boatwright et al. (2010) measured the associations between attachment style and employees’ ideal preference for relational leadership behaviours. Boatwright et al. found that employees with an anxious attachment style expressed strong preferences for relational leadership behaviours compared to workers with an avoidant attachment style. Boatwright et al. argued that individuals with an avoidant attachment reported significantly lower preferences for relational leadership behaviours because these individuals avoid interpersonal closeness and highly value their sense of independence. As a result, avoidant employees do not appreciate leaders who value close and supportive relationships with staff. In contrast, Boatwright et al. suggested that individuals demonstrating an anxious attachment style were more likely to prefer relational leadership due to their excessive need for
validation and approval and high dependence on others. Boatwright et al. noted that securely
attached individuals seem better equipped to approach leaders when assistance or advice was
required and were capable of receiving constructive feedback from their leader.

4.6 Limitations and Future Directions in Attachment and Leadership Research

While research into attachment and leadership has yielded some important insights
regarding the examination of leadership from a relationship perspective, various limitations
exist – limitations which the current thesis attempts to address. Firstly, much of the research
undertaken investigating the role of attachment in leadership behaviour has been conducted in
military contexts. Although parallels can be drawn between the military and corporate
environments (i.e., both corporate and military organisations are characterised by clearly
defined leadership structures, timelines for task completion, and a high degree of teamwork),
the military environment is unique in that personnel are trained and subjected to situations of
war. Thus, few could argue that the context of war is one that applies to other organisations.
Therefore, the generalisability of findings linking attachment to leadership may be limited
given the unique aspects of the military context. As a result, future studies need to examine
these associations amongst organisational contexts that reflect the industrial and commercial
environments that dominate many Western cultures and emerging Eastern and Middle-
Eastern cultures. To this end, as part of this thesis, the investigation of attachment and
leadership is examined from a corporate perspective.

Secondly, the research on attachment and leadership has largely ignored the interactionist
perspective. As a result, studies have largely focused on investigating how leader attachment
style influences a leader’s general tendencies in engaging in particular styles of leadership
behaviour. For instance, much of the work conducted by Popper and colleagues has
specifically examined the associations between leader attachment style and individuals
tendencies to engage in transformational, personalised or socialised forms of leadership irrespective of situational factors (Popper et al., 2000; Popper, 2002). Of those studies in attachment and leadership that have attempted to move beyond person-focused research to more interactionist perspectives, the focus has been on leaders’ self-reports of their efficacy across task-focused and relationship focused situations (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007). The self-report nature of such studies questions the extent to which these studies represent an interactionist approach. To date, studies investigating the links between attachment and leadership have not systematically manipulated situational factors to determine whether the links between attachment and leadership are consistent across varying situational demands. Taking such an interactionist approach in future research is important as leaders are required to manage individuals and teams across diverse situations and tasks with much frequency (Vroom, 2000; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Moreover, calls have been made across research and practice contexts for future studies to systematically investigate the individual difference and situational factors that are likely to account for leadership behaviour (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Vroom & Jago, 2007). In response to these calls, as part of the current thesis, an interactionist perspective is applied such that the association between attachment and leadership behaviour is examined under situations in which contextual factors are experimentally manipulated.

Thirdly, whilst more recent research has examined the links between attachment and leadership from the follower perspective (e.g., Boatwright et al., 2010; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001; Shalit et al., 2010), studies are few, and more research is required to determine how follower attachment style shapes follower’s perceptions of effective leadership. Moreover, like studies investigating the topic of attachment and leadership from the leader perspective, the few studies conducted that have investigated follower perspectives have not taken an interactionist approach. Therefore, it is unclear how the links between follower attachment
style and perceptions of leadership may be moderated by situational factors. Thus, as well as taking an interactionist perspective in studying leadership from the leader’s perspective, this thesis will apply an interactionist perspective to the study of leadership from the follower perspective. Specifically, the associations between follower attachment style and leadership behaviour is examined under situations in which contextual factors are experimentally manipulated.

Finally, despite the importance that has been increasingly placed on the relational aspects of leadership, few studies have undertaken a dyadic examination of leader-follower relations from an attachment perspective (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Uhl-Bien, 2006). This is surprising, given that many leadership training programs endorse the collection and interpretation of data from both leaders and their followers in the shaping leaders’ developmental programs (e.g., Full Range Leadership Development model, Sosik & Jung, 2010). Moreover, research examining attachment processes in the adult romantic literature has often used dyadic research designs to shed important insights into relationship functioning (e.g., Campbell et al., 2001). Harms (2011) and Schirmer and Lopez (2001) proposed that unless more research into leadership takes a dyadic approach, our understanding of leadership remains incomplete. To address this limitation in the research, this thesis also embarked on a dyadic study in which the attachment styles of both leaders and followers were used to predict perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness.

4.7 Research Aims

Given the limitations of past research and future directions outlined in Section 4.6, the broad research goal of this thesis is to apply attachment theory to the study of leadership from both leader and follower perspectives. Importantly, this thesis examines the links between attachment and leadership behaviour from an interactionist perspective, investigating the
effect of individual differences in the form of attachment style, alongside situational factors (i.e., task difficulty, task timeline and follower needs) on leadership behaviour. This broad research aim is addressed in three studies. Study 1 examines the links between attachment style, situational factors and leadership behaviour from the leader perspective. To this end, the aim of Study 1 is to examine the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and the use of task-focused and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours across various workplace situations that vary in terms of workplace demands related to follower needs, task timelines, and difficulty of task.

Study 2 examines the links between attachment style, situational factors and leadership behaviour from the follower perspective. Therefore, the aim of Study 2 is to examine the associations between follower’s attachment style and their perceptions of the effectiveness of task-focused and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours across workplace situations that vary in terms of workplace demands again related to follower needs, task timelines, and difficulty of task.

Study 3 takes a dyadic perspective in investigating the associations between attachment style and leadership behaviour in leader-follower dyads. To this end, in Study 3, the situational context is the dyad itself in which both actor and partner effects represent interpersonal aspects of the situation that influence perceptions of leadership behaviour. Specifically, the aim of Study 3 is to investigate the extent to which leader and follower attachment style is associated with leader and follower perspectives of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness. Chapters 5 through 7 describe the three studies that comprise the empirical investigation that constitute this thesis.
Chapter 5 - Study 1

5.1 Introduction

The literature reviewed in Sections 4.2 to 4.5 provides evidence regarding the associations between attachment style and leadership behaviour. However, as noted in Section 4.6, research to date investigating attachment style and leadership behaviour has not taken an interactionist perspective. Therefore, extending on this literature, the aim of Study 1 is to examine the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and the use of task-focused leadership behaviours (in the form of structure) and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours (in the form of consideration) across workplace scenarios that varied in situational demands. Specifically, Study 1 focused on the manipulation of three situational variables that have received much attention across past studies adopting a situational perspective to the study of leadership (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; House & Mitchell, 1974; Shartle et al., 1949; Stogdill & Shartle, 1948; Hollander, 1979).

Across various studies testing Fiedler’s Contingency Theory and assumptions of situational leadership derived from the Ohio Leadership Studies, task difficulty, task timeline and follower needs have been consistently manipulated. *Task difficulty* refers to the extent to which the task challenges the person required to complete it (Hackman, 1968). *Task timeline* refers to the timeframe given to complete a particular task (Hackman, 1968). *Follower needs* refers to the follower’s requirement for guidance, direction and assistance from the leader (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996). Given the emphasis on these situational variables in past research, these three variables were included in Study 1, in taking an interactionist perspective into the study of attachment style and leadership behaviour.
While not directly examining the role of situational factors in the association between attachment style and leadership behaviour, past research into attachment can provide insights into a number of predictions regarding the relationship between attachment style and leadership across varying contextual demands. For instance, given that securely attached individuals (i.e., individuals low on attachment anxiety and avoidance) harbour positive mental representations of themselves and others (Collins & Read, 1994; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994), research has consistently found that secure individuals attend to the needs of others, and even forgo their own needs to assist others, across diverse contexts such as volunteerism, emergency situations, and romantic relationships (e.g., Davila & Kashy, 2009; Ein-Dor, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2011; Gillath, et al., 2005).

Moreover, the support provided by securely attached individuals is often sensitive and responsive due to their empathic accuracy (e.g., Simpson et al., 2011). However, while meeting the socio-emotional needs of others, so too has research found that securely attached individuals are able to mobilise others to engage in task-related activities to meet important and pressing goals and deadlines (e.g., Davidovitz et al., 2007). Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) suggest that the agentic nature of securely attached individuals provides them with the foundation upon which to mobilise themselves and others in task-focused behaviour as required. Based on the evidence above, it appears that securely attached individuals may have the ability to balance the use of task and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours depending on the demands of the situation.

In contrast, anxiously attached individuals’ negative views of self, excessive need for validation, and preoccupation with unmet needs has been found to result in these individuals placing high emphasis on self-focused worries (Gillath et al., 2005; Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). These self-focused concerns have been found to detract from attending and responding to the needs of others in both volunteering and workplace contexts.
(e.g., Gillath et al., 2005; Popper et al., 2000). Moreover, these self-focused concerns militate against anxiously attached individuals demonstrating self-efficacy when taking on challenges and problem-solving tasks (Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005; Mikulincer & Sheffi, 2000).

In line with these findings, Davidovitz et al. (2007) found, across a series of leadership studies, that anxiously attached individuals expressed doubts about their efficacy to lead in situations requiring achievement of task-related objectives. Thus, while it is plausible for anxiously attached individuals to engage in task-focused leadership behaviours as a means of demonstrating to others their abilities as a leader, and thereby gain approval from others; their self-focused worries may interfere with their abilities to engage in task-focused leadership behaviour. This is especially likely to be the case in situations which are highly demanding in terms of tight deadlines or challenging workplace tasks.

However, in contrast, anxiously attached individuals have been found to be highly empathic and supportive, but only in situations in which the provision of empathy is used to maintain close distance to others in order to achieve their own needs for safety and security (Gillath et al., 2005; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Simpson et al., 2011). Thus, as Keller (2003) notes, anxiously attached individuals may engage in relationship-oriented leadership behaviour to fulfil their own socio-emotional concerns and as such may impose themselves on followers even when followers do not require assistance. However, given their self-focused worries, if the needs of others outweigh their own socio-emotional needs, it is unlikely that anxiously attached leaders will forgo their own needs to provide relationship-oriented leadership to others. For instance, across various studies examining the links between volunteerism and the priming of insecurity, findings suggest that heightening anxious individuals’ sense of insecurity reduces their tendencies to provide support, even when help is required by others (e.g., Gillath et al., 2005).
Based on the review of the research above, it may be plausible to assume that attachment anxiety will be positively associated with consideration leadership behaviour but only when the needs of followers are not regarded as highly demanding. Moreover, given their self-focused worries and lack of self-efficacy, anxiously attached leaders may be unable to exhibit task-focused leadership behaviours such as structure under conditions where task-focused leadership is required.

Finally, avoidantly attached leaders’ preference for independence and interpersonal distance from followers is likely to interfere with their ability to empathically provide followers with assistance when required (Mayseless, 2010). Research across various contexts has consistently found attachment avoidance to be negatively associated with empathy, and that this is a key factor in the inability for avoidant individuals to engage in helpful and supportive behaviour of others (Gillath et al., 2005; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Simpson et al., 2011). In addition, avoidantly attached individuals’ excessive self-reliance and emphasis on personal achievements over fostering relationships (e.g., Feeney et al., 1994; Karantzas, Feeney, & Wilkinson, 2010) means that avoidantly attached leaders are likely to prioritise task accomplishment over follower development. Thus, avoidantly attached leaders may be very effective in situations requiring full attention toward task requirements, but only when followers are able to work independently and do not experience any issues around task competency. However, in situations requiring attention to employee needs (i.e., if team members require coaching and assistance), it is unlikely that avoidantly attached leaders will be able to demonstrate relationship-oriented leadership behaviours – a point made by Davidovitz et al. (2007).
5.2 Research Aim and Hypotheses

In taking an interactionist perspective to the study of attachment and leadership, the aim of Study 1 was to examine, from the leader perspective, the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and the use of task-focused and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours across various workplace situations that vary in terms of workplace demands related to follower needs, task timelines, and difficulty of task. These three situational variables were experimentally manipulated and each consisted of two levels – follower needs (low and high), task difficulty (easy and challenging) and task timeline (flexible and tight) creating eight hypothetical workplace scenarios. Therefore, it was expected that the association between attachment anxiety and avoidance and structure and consideration leadership behaviours will be moderated by the situational factors of follower needs, task difficulty and task timeline. In relation to follower needs, it was hypothesised that:

1.1 Under the condition of low follower needs:

a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and positively associated with consideration

b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration

1.2 Under the condition of high follower needs:

a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and consideration

b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration
In relation to task difficulty, it is hypothesised that:

2.1 Under the condition of an easy task:

   a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and positively associated with consideration

   b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration

2.2 Under the condition of a difficult task:

   a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and consideration

   b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration

In relation to task timeline, it was hypothesised that:

3.1 Under the condition of flexible timeline:

   a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and positively associated with consideration

   b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration

3.2 Under the condition of tight timeline:

   a. attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with structure and consideration

   b. attachment avoidance will be positively associated with structure and negatively associated with consideration
5.3 Method

5.3.1 Participants.

A total of 405 participants (118 males [29%], 271 females [67%], 16 participants did not provide their gender [4%]) aged between 18 years and 73 years ($M = 32.70\, \text{years}$, $SD = 11.14\, \text{years}$) invited from the social and professional networks of the researcher participated in the current study. The majority of participants were full-time employees (301 participants, 74.5%) followed by University/TAFE students (67 participants, 16.5%), unemployed participants (12 in total, 3%) and retired participants (5 in total, 1%). A total of 20 participants (5%) did not provide their work status. Participants were from a variety of industries including consulting/professional services (200 participants, 49.5%), education (98 participants, 24%), health (44 participants, 11%), sport/tourism/hospitality/entertainment (19 participants, 4.5%) and government (5 participants, 1.5%). A total of 39 participants (9.5%) did not provide data relating to their occupation.

In terms of level of the highest level of education attained, most participants had completed a Bachelor degree (189 participants, 46.5%), followed by a Masters/Doctoral/other Post-Graduate qualification (99 participants, 24.5%). A total of 50 participants had completed secondary school (12.5%), 29 participants attained a Diploma/TAFE qualification (7%) and 2 participants completed a Trade qualification (1%). A total of 19 participants (4.5%) did not complete secondary school and a total of 17 participants (4%) did not provide their attained level of education.

Participants’ were predominantly born in Australia and New Zealand (339 participants, 84%) with the remainder of participants from Europe (19 participants, 5%), Asia (11 participants, 3%), North America and Canada (10 participants, 2.5%), Africa (5 participants, 1%).
1%), South America (3 participants, 1%), and the Middle East (2 participants, 0.5%). A total of 16 participants (3%) did not indicate their birth country.

### 5.3.2 Materials.

**Demographic Questions.** A series of background information questions were asked for the purposes of obtaining participant demographic information (Appendix A3). All participants were asked to record their gender, age, occupation, educational level and birth country.

**Attachment.** Attachment was measured using the 29-item Attachment Style Questionnaire - Short Form (ASQ – SF, Karantzas et al., 2010, Appendix A4). The scale consists of two subscales that measure the two dimensions of attachment – anxiety (13 items) and avoidance (16 items). Items are rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). Items include ‘Achieving things is more important that building relationships’ and ‘I feel comfortable depending on other people.’ In the current study, attachment anxiety and avoidance were found to have high internal consistencies with Cronbach alpha’s of .88 and .86 respectively.

**Vignettes.** A total of 8 hypothetical vignettes were developed for the purposes of the study, with each depicting a typical workplace scenario (Appendix A1). Vignettes were dummy-coded for data analysis. The vignettes were written such that participants were instructed to imagine themselves as a senior finance manager of a large Australian accounting firm in which their role involved leading a team of employees responsible for the financial audits of clients. Three variables were manipulated across all eight vignettes. These variables were task difficulty, timeline to complete task and employee needs.
Task difficulty comprised of two levels - easy and complex workplace tasks. Under the easy task manipulation, participants were asked to investigate one client’s financial expenditures and enter data into an IT system. Under the difficult task manipulation, participants were asked to investigate six client’s financial expenditures and present a comprehensive report for analysis to the client. Timeline to complete task also comprised two levels – a flexible or tight workplace deadline. Under the flexible timeline manipulation, participants had an extended timeframe in which to complete the task, with the leader being focused on the quality of work and not when it was completed. Under the tight timeline manipulation, participants had to complete the task within a short time frame, governed by a strict, non-negotiable deadline. Employee needs similarly comprised two levels – low and high employee needs. Under the low employee needs manipulation, all team members understood the task requirements and no one required assistance. Under the high employee needs manipulation, two team members had difficulty understanding the task requirements and required assistance in completing their allocation of the task. The manipulations of task, timeline and employee needs across the vignettes are presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Employee Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 4</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 5</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Tight</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 6</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Tight</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 7</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Tight</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 8</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Tight</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of the workplace scenario (Vignette 1) administered to participants is provided below:

“You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies. Your team members must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance. The team must then present their findings to you in a detailed document which you will review before handing over this document to the CEO of Starmoney Finances. The team have approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project and you are happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). You are more focused on the quality of the work rather than your team producing a lower standard document by the completion date. However despite this flexible timeline, two of the team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. You overhear these two employees express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.”

**Leadership.** Leadership was measured using the Leadership Behaviour Descriptor Questionnaire Form XII Self (LBDQ-XII, Fleishman, 1957; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). In its original form, the LBDQ-XII measures 12 dimensions of leadership behaviour termed representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation. These dimensions can be summed to form two higher factors of leadership, namely showing consideration and initiating structure. The original LBDQ-XII questionnaire comprises 100 items and participants are asked to indicate the frequency with which various leadership behaviours are demonstrated on a 5-point scale ranging from A (always) to E (never). The questionnaire has been developed in two versions – a Rater version (followers rate the leadership behaviours of
their direct supervisor) and a Self version (leaders rate their own behaviours). Items are worded to measure the extent to which the leader (either self or other rated) uses particular behaviours when leading their team (e.g., ‘I schedule the work to be done’ in the self-rated version and ‘encourages overtime work’ in the other-rated version).

For the purposes of this study, the measure was modified to assess the use of leadership behaviours across different hypothetical workplace scenarios. Consequently, participants were asked to rate how likely they would be to use different leadership behaviours in a given fictitious workplace. Therefore, the original items of the LBDQ-XII were re-worded to measure the use of situational specific leadership behaviours. All 100 items of the LBDQ-XII were revised with the pre-fix ‘In this situation I would...’ The researcher and an independent rater reviewed the re-worded items to ensure that these items captured the two higher order dimensions of the original LBDX-XII – ‘structure’ and ‘consideration’ leadership behaviours – domains that also demonstrate high overlap with the distinction of transactional and transformational leadership behaviours articulated as part of the FRLM (Derue et al., 2011). The review of items provided a process to identify items that demonstrated the best face validity in terms of structure and consideration leadership behaviours. Therefore, as part of the review process, the researcher and second rater independently sorted all 100 items into one of three categories: (1) items that captured structure; (2) items that captured consideration; (3) items that when re-worded did not clearly capture either structure or consideration leadership behaviours.

Inter-rater reliability was high (Cohen’s kappa = .97), suggesting high agreement between raters regarding the categorisation of the reworded items. Of the 100 items, 37 items were identified by each rater to best capture the two forms of leadership behaviours, with the remaining items regarded as inadequate in capturing either form of leadership behaviour. The rating scale was also revised to capture participants’ endorsement of leadership
behaviours pertaining to structure and consideration in response to a given situation. Therefore, the revised rating scale required participants to rate all items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

To ensure the word clarity of the final 37 items and to further validate the suitability of these items when assessing leadership behaviours in situational contexts, the measure was piloted with a small sample ($N = 10$). All pilot participants agreed that the 37 items were worded clearly and that the items assessed leadership behaviours that could be endorsed across a variety of workplace situations (Appendix A5). Furthermore, a Maximum Likelihood Exploratory Factor Analysis with oblique rotation of the measure revealed a clear two factor structure that explained 45% of the variance in the situational version of the LBDX. Specifically, factor 1 consisted of 14 items (26% variance) that captured leadership behaviours that clearly related to structure. Items on this factor consisted of factor loadings varying between .64 and .35. Factor 2 consisted of 23 items (19% variance) that captured leadership behaviours related to consideration. Items on this factor consisted of factor loadings varying between .59 and .37. Furthermore, reliability analysis for both factors revealed Cronbach alphas of .84. Therefore, in scoring this measure, it was deemed appropriate to generate two total subscales scores – a structure leadership behaviour score (Scale range: 14 – 70) and consideration leadership score (Scale range: 23 – 115) with higher scores on both subscales representing greater endorsement of these leadership behaviours.

5.3.3 Procedure.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Chair of the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Subcommittee (Application HEAG-H 101_08, Appendix A10). A total of 100 individuals in the professional and social networks of the researcher were sent invitations via email describing the research and inviting them to take part. Advertisements were also
posted on the social networking sites of Facebook and LinkedIn. Email invitations and
advertisements included a URL address that was linked to the Plain Language Statement and
online questionnaire (Appendices A8 and A9). Participants for Study 1 were unrelated to
participants for Study 2. Upon agreeing to take part in the study, participants completed a
series of demographic questions and the ASQ. Participants were then randomly presented
with one of the eight workplace vignettes. Upon reading the vignette, participants completed
the modified situational version of LBDQ-XII. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to
complete and responses were submitted to a secure Deakin University password protected
server that could only be accessed by the researcher.

5.4 Results and Discussion

The data was examined for missing values, univariate outliers, univariate and multivariate
normality and multicollinearity. Seven cases were identified as having more than 15%
missing data and were deleted from the original sample of N = 405. A total of 16 univariate
outliers were detected at zresidual >± 1.96, α = .05 for the analyses pertaining to the
dependent variable consideration and deleted from the sample resulting in a sample size of N
= 382. A total of 21 univariate outliers were detected at zresidual >± 1.96, α = .05 for the
analyses related to the dependent variable of structure and deleted from the sample resulting
in a sample size of N = 377. Given the elimination of different univariate outliers for
consideration and structure, all descriptive statistics are presented in separate tables for each
leadership behaviour. Tables 5.2 and 5.3 present the standardised and absolute skewness and
kurtosis values for consideration and structure respectively. As shown in Tables 5.2 and 5.3,
standardised skewness and kurtosis values did not exceed ±3.29, α = .001, absolute skewness
values did not exceed ± 2.00 and absolute kurtosis values did not exceed ± 4.00 for all
variables (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Tables 5.4 and 5.5 present the means and standard
deviations for attachment anxiety and avoidance and consideration and structure by vignette.

Tables 5.6 and 5.7 present the bivariate correlations for attachment anxiety and avoidance and consideration and structure. Multicollinearity was not detected amongst variable pairings (rs’ <.80). The removal of outliers did not change the results.

Table 5.2

*Standardised and Absolute Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Attachment and Consideration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness Standardised</th>
<th>Skewness Absolute</th>
<th>Kurtosis Standardised</th>
<th>Kurtosis Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate Leadership</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 382

Table 5.3

*Standardised and Absolute Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Attachment and Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness Standardised</th>
<th>Skewness Absolute</th>
<th>Kurtosis Standardised</th>
<th>Kurtosis Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Leadership</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 377
### Table 5.4

**Means and Standard Deviations for Attachment and Consideration by Vignette**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Anxiety (M)</th>
<th>Anxiety (SD)</th>
<th>Avoidance (M)</th>
<th>Avoidance (SD)</th>
<th>Considerate Leadership (M)</th>
<th>Considerate Leadership (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>92.48</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>86.51</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>93.25</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>90.24</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 6</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>88.77</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 7</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>81.51</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 8</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.5

**Means and Standard Deviations for Attachment and Structure by Vignette**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Anxiety (M)</th>
<th>Anxiety (SD)</th>
<th>Avoidance (M)</th>
<th>Avoidance (SD)</th>
<th>Structural Leadership (M)</th>
<th>Structural Leadership (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>49.46</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 4</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 7</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 8</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6

Bivariate Correlations for Attachment, Situational Manipulations and Consideration

<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 Anxiety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Avoidance</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Task</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Timeline</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Needs</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Considerate</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, two-tailed, **p < .01, two-tailed, ***p < .001, two-tailed.

Table 5.7

Bivariate Correlations for Attachment, Situational Manipulations and Structure

<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 Anxiety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Avoidance</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Task</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Timeline</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Needs</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Structural</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, two-tailed, **p < .01, two-tailed, ***p < .001, two

A set of preliminary analyses were conducted to determine if any differences existed across the vignettes for attachment and between males and females on leadership. A Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) determined that there was no significant difference between the eight vignettes on attachment anxiety, $F(7, 390) = .56, p > .05$ and attachment avoidance, $F(7, 390) = .47, p > .05$. A second MANOVA determined that there was no significant difference between males and females on Considerate Leadership behaviours $F(1, 382) = .00, p > .05$ and Structural Leadership behaviours, $F(1, 382) = 2.54, p > .05$. 
5.4.1 Hierarchical regression for attachment and situational manipulations on consideration leadership behaviour.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the effects of situational manipulations and attachment on leadership behaviour relating to the demonstration of Considerate Leadership. The hierarchical regression model consisted of five steps. In step 1, all predictor variables were entered into the model (i.e., testing for main effects). In step 2, all two-way interactions were entered into the model while in step 3, all three-way interactions were included. In steps 4 and 5, all four-way interactions and the five-way interaction were entered into the model respectively.

Inspection of the hierarchical model revealed that steps 1 through to 3 resulted in significant increases in the variance explained by the model. Therefore, a significant model was found at Step 1, $F(5, 376) = 5.24, p < .001, R = .26, R^2 = .07, \Delta R^2 = .07$; Step 2, $F(15, 366) = 3.48, p < .01, R = .35, R^2 = .13, \Delta R^2 = .06$, and Step 3 of the hierarchical regression analysis, $F(24, 357) = 2.96, p < .05, R = .41, R^2 = .17, \Delta R^2 = .04$. The models at Steps 4 and 5 were not significant. The relative contribution of the predictor variables at all steps of the model are presented in Table 5.8.

As presented in Table 5.8, the model resulted in three significant three-way interactions which subsumed all significant two-way interactions (step 2) and significant main effects (step 1). No other interactions were found to be significant. In relation to the three-way interactions, an interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Needs on consideration ($\beta = -.19, p < .01$). The second significant three-way interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Task × Time on consideration ($\beta = .23, p < .05$). The final significant three-way interaction comprised Attachment Avoidance × Task × Time on consideration ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$).
Table 5.8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Attachment and Situational Manipulations Predicting Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoidance</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.67***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoidance</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.28 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-25 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8 continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ 0.05, two-tailed, ** p<0.01, two-tailed, *** p<0.001, two-tailed.
Simple slope analyses were conducted to decompose the effects of all significant three-way interactions on consideration in line with the procedures outlined by Aiken and West (1991). Each of these analyses are described in turn. To assist in the interpretation of the simple slope analyses for each interaction presented below, the combinations of low and high attachment anxiety and avoidance are labelled drawing on common terms used in the literature (Ainsworth, 1979; Bartholomew, 1990, 1993). It is important to note however, that the use of these labels does not suggest that a categorical approach is endorsed in relation to attachment, rather these labels merely provide simple descriptions of the linear combinations of the attachment dimensions (Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley & Waller, 1998; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). To this end, individuals low on attachment anxiety and avoidance are termed secure; individuals low on attachment anxiety and high on attachment avoidance are termed avoidant; individuals high on attachment anxiety and low on attachment avoidance are termed anxious, and individuals high on attachment anxiety and avoidance are termed fearful (see Section 3.3, for a review).

For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Needs illustrated in Figure 5.1, a significant difference was found between slopes 1 (fearful individuals) and 3 (avoidant individuals) and slope 1 (fearful individuals) and slope 4 (secure individuals). Specifically, fearful individuals demonstrated significantly more consideration than avoidant individuals \(t = -2.96, p < .01\) and secure individuals \(t = -2.40, p < .05\) when follower needs were low. However, fearful individuals also displayed significantly less consideration than avoidant and secure individuals when follower needs were high.

Furthermore, anxious individuals (slope 2) displayed significantly more consideration than avoidant individuals (slope 3), when follower needs were low \(t = -2.58, p = .01\). However, as shown in Figure 5.1, there was little difference between these individuals on consideration.
when follower needs were high. In addition, anxious individuals (slope 2) also endorsed more consideration compared to secure individuals (slope 4) when follower needs were low ($t = -2.94, p < .01$). However when follower needs were high, secure individuals displayed more consideration than their highly anxious counterparts.

Figure 5.1 – Interaction for Anxiety × Avoidance × Needs on Consideration

For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Task × Time illustrated in Figure 5.2, simple slope analysis revealed that anxious individuals demonstrated different patterns of consideration compared to non-anxious individuals dependent on whether a task or timeline were manipulated. A significant difference was found between slopes 2 (challenging task, flexible time) and 4 (easy task, flexible time).

Specifically, individuals high and low in attachment anxiety demonstrated significant differences in consideration across situations when the task was challenging compared to when the task was easy in a context when the timeline was flexible ($t = -2.79, p < .01$).
Individuals high in attachment anxiety demonstrated less use of consideration when the task was challenging despite the flexible timeline than when the task was easy.

For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Avoidance × Task × Time illustrated in Figure 5.3, simple slope analysis revealed that individuals high on attachment avoidance demonstrated different patterns of consideration compared to individuals low on attachment avoidance dependent on whether a task was challenging or easy and timeline was tight or flexible. Specifically, individuals high in attachment avoidance displayed significantly less consideration compared to individuals low in attachment avoidance when the task was challenging and timeline tight (slope 1) and when the task was easy and timeline flexible (slope 4) $t = 2.50, p < .05$.

Furthermore, when task was easy and timeline was flexible, individuals high on attachment avoidance displayed significantly less consideration compared to individuals low on avoidance (slope 2 compared to slope 4, $t = 3.14, p < .01$). Lastly, a marginally non-
significant difference was found between slopes 3 (easy task, tight timeline) and 4 (easy task, flexible time, $t = 1.89, p = .059$). Specifically, individuals high in attachment avoidance displayed marginally less consideration compared to individuals low on attachment avoidance when the task was easy and timeline flexible and also less consideration when the task was easy and the timeline was tight.

![Interaction for Avoidance × Task × Time on Consideration](image)

**Figure 5.3 – Interaction for Avoidance × Task × Time on Consideration**

5.4.2 **Interpretation of results for consideration leadership behaviour.**

As part of hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with consideration when follower needs were low and negatively associated with consideration when follower needs were high. Attachment avoidance was hypothesised to be negatively associated with consideration under both manipulations of follower needs. Results partially supported hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2.

Specifically, fearful individuals (i.e., high attachment anxiety and high attachment avoidance) endorsed significantly more consideration when follower needs were low
however endorsed significantly less consideration when follower needs were high compared to secure (i.e., low attachment anxiety and avoidance) and avoidant individuals (i.e., low attachment anxiety and high attachment avoidance). The fact that fearful individuals endorsed more consideration leadership behaviours than avoidant individuals suggests that the anxious tendencies of fearful individuals (more so than their avoidance tendencies) may be a key factor in the endorsement of consideration in situations when follower needs are low. Furthermore, the anxious tendencies of fearful individuals may interfere with their ability to provide consideration in high needs conditions (i.e., when followers require assistance), given their reduction in consideration shown. Furthermore, the slope pertaining to secure individuals demonstrated least deviation of consideration across low and high needs conditions, suggesting that irrespective of the needs of followers, secure individuals have a tendency to demonstrate consideration leadership behaviours. Interestingly, there was little difference between anxious and avoidant individuals on consideration when follower needs were high. This finding does not support the hypothesis that attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with consideration.

In hypotheses 2.1 and 2.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with consideration when task was easy and negatively associated with consideration when the task was challenging. Negative associations were expected between attachment avoidance and consideration across both task manipulations. Hypotheses 2.1 and 2.2 were partially supported. In line with expectations, attachment anxiety was associated with a larger difference in consideration across challenging and easy task conditions compared to individuals low on anxiety. However, both individuals low and high on anxiety demonstrated significantly more consideration when the task was easy compared to challenging. One would assume that when the task was challenging, consideration leadership
would be prioritised because it would involve guiding, directing and helping followers navigate a solution to a difficult problem. However the results do not support this assumption.

With regards to attachment avoidance, the hypotheses were supported whereby individuals high in attachment avoidance displayed significantly less consideration than individuals low in attachment avoidance across both easy and challenging task conditions. Thus, attachment avoidance was associated with less consideration in situations requiring a focus on helping others navigate a difficult task. Individuals low in attachment avoidance demonstrated a significantly smaller deviation in consideration across task difficulty manipulations compared to individuals high in attachment avoidance. This trend provides some support for the notion that low levels of attachment insecurity (in this instance, attachment avoidance) may be associated with a more balanced leadership style across situational manipulations.

In hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with consideration under flexible timeline conditions and negatively associated with consideration under a tight timeline. Attachment avoidance was hypothesised to be negatively associated with consideration under both timeline manipulations. Results partially supported the hypotheses. Attachment anxiety was associated with more consideration when the timeline was flexible. In contrast, attachment avoidance was associated with less consideration when the timeline was tight.

Taken together, these findings provide important insights into the associations between attachment and consideration leadership under varying situational demands. Specifically, it appears that individuals high on attachment anxiety (i.e., whether anxious or fearfully attached) have a tendency to endorse considerate leadership behaviours, but only when situational demands and follower needs are low. In contrast, when situations are demanding and follower needs must be attended to, it seems that individuals high on attachment anxiety
are less inclined to engage in relationship-oriented leadership. These findings align with Keller (2003) who suggests that anxiously attached people’s tendencies to provide considerate leadership when all is well is likely to be driven by anxious individuals’ desire to satisfy their own relationship needs and need for approval and validation. Moreover, their endorsement of this form of leadership when follower needs were low supports suggestions that anxiously attached leaders may provide relationship-oriented leadership to followers even when team members do not require this form of leadership (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Keller, 2003). Drawing on the attachment literature, the findings suggest that anxiously attached individuals seem unable to demonstrate effective leadership during stressful periods, (i.e., when team members themselves are in need of support or the situational demands are high). According to past research, this inability to display the required leadership behaviour and balance various situational demands may also reflect anxiously attached individuals lack of self-efficacy and concerns regarding their ability to meet the needs of others when their own competency is threatened (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Maseless, 2010, Popper et al., 2003).

The present findings indicated that attachment avoidance was associated with less consideration when the situation encompassed a challenging task. This finding is also consistent with prior research that attachment avoidance is associated with an inclination to maintain interpersonal distance and inability to recognise when others require assistance, thus engage in more relationship-oriented leadership behaviours (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper et al., 2003). Secure individuals (i.e., individuals classed as low on attachment anxiety and avoidance) displayed the least fluctuation in consideration leadership behaviour across situations. This finding supports research suggesting secure individuals are particularly adept in demonstrating a relationship-oriented style of leadership (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).
5.4.3 Hierarchical regression for attachment and situational manipulations on structure leadership behaviour.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the effects of situational manipulations and attachment on leadership behaviour relating to the demonstration of structure. The hierarchical regression model consisted of five steps. In step 1, all predictor variables were entered into the model (i.e., testing for main effects). In step 2, all two-way interactions were entered into the model while in step 3, all three-way interactions were included. In steps 4 and 5, all four-way interactions and the five-way interaction were entered into the model respectively.

Only steps 1 and 3 resulted in accounting for significant variance explained by the model. Therefore, a significant model was found at Step 1, \( F(5, 371) = 13.75, p < .001, R = .40, R^2 = .16, \Delta R^2 = .16 \), and Step 3 of the hierarchical regression analysis, \( F(24, 352) = 4.12, p < .05, R = .47, R^2 = .22, \Delta R^2 = .05 \). The models at Steps 2, 4 and 5 were not significant. The relative contribution of the predictor variables at all steps of the model are presented in Table 5.9.

As presented in Table 5.9, the model resulted in one significant three-way interaction and one marginally non-significant three-way interaction (\( p = .06 \)). These interactions subsumed all significant two-way interactions (step 2) and significant main effects (step 1). No other interactions were found to be significant. In relation to the three-way interactions, a significant interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Time × Needs on structure (\( \beta = -.36, p < .001 \)). A marginally non-significant interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Needs on structure (\( \beta = .13, p = .06 \)).
Table 5.9

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Attachment and Situational Manipulations Predicting Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.    | Anxiety           | -1.83| .88  | -1.08 | .88   | .01          |
|       | Avoidance         | -.16 | 1.08  | -.02  | 1.08  | .01          |
|       | Task              | -1.08| 1.08  | -.08  | 1.08  | .01          |
|       | Timeline          | 5.60 | 1.09  | .69   | 1.09  | .01          |
|       | Needs             | -.46 | 1.10  | -.43  | 1.10  | .01          |
|       | Anxiety × Avoid   | -.59 | .57   | -.04  | .57   | .01          |
|       | Task × Time       | -1.04| 1.26  | -.07  | 1.26  | .01          |
|       | Task × Needs      | .69  | 1.26  | -.05  | 1.26  | .01          |
|       | Time × Needs      | -.15 | 1.27  | -.01  | 1.27  | .01          |
|       | Anxiety × Task    | 1.12 | .92   | .09   | .92   | .01          |
|       | Anxiety × Time    | .42  | .94   | .04   | .94   | .01          |
|       | Anxiety × Needs   | 1.12 | .93   | .09   | .93   | .01          |
|       | Avoid × Task      | -.93 | 1.13  | -.06  | 1.13  | .01          |
|       | Avoid × Time      | 1.43 | 1.14  | .10   | 1.14  | .01          |
|       | Avoid × Needs     | .32  | 1.14  | .02   | 1.14  | .01          |

| 3.    | Anxiety           | -2.29| 1.08  | -1.26 | 1.08  | .05*         |
|       | Avoidance         | -.50 | 1.41  | -.05  | 1.41  | .05*         |
|       | Task              | -1.48| 1.09  | -.11  | 1.09  | .05*         |
|       | Timeline          | 5.68 | 1.13  | .69   | 1.13  | .05*         |
|       | Needs             | -1.17| 1.13  | .09   | 1.13  | .05*         |
|       | Anxiety × Avoid   | -1.13| 1.13  | -.09  | 1.13  | .05*         |
|       | Task × Time       | -.61 | 1.26  | -.10  | 1.26  | .05*         |
|       | Task × Needs      | .96  | 1.25  | -.04  | 1.25  | .05*         |
Table 5.9 continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.13†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-6.40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>.23</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-8.42</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-8.43</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 5.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th><strong>p</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p = .06, ‡p ≤ .05, two-tailed, **p<.01, two-tailed, ***p<.001, two-tailed.
Simple slope analyses were conducted to decompose the effects of all significant three-way interactions on structure. Each of these analyses are described in turn. For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Needs illustrated in Figure 5.4, simple slope analysis revealed that fearful individuals (slope 1) demonstrated significantly less structure than avoidant individuals (slope 3) when follower needs were low, however demonstrated significantly more structure when follower needs were high ($t = 2.64, p < .01$). This effect was also evident between fearful individuals (slope 1), and secure individuals (slope 4, $t = 2.48, p < .05$) whereby fearful individuals demonstrated less structure than secure people in conditions where employee needs were low but more structure when employee needs were high.

Anxious individuals (slope 2) demonstrated significantly less structure compared to secure individuals (slope 4) when follower needs were low, however anxious individuals demonstrated significantly more structure when follower needs were high ($t = 2.90, p < .01$). Finally, fearful individuals (slope 1) displayed less structure than anxious individuals (slope 2) when follower needs were low, however fearful individuals demonstrated more structure when follower needs were high, with this difference being marginally non-significant ($t = 1.87, p = .06$).

In summary, secure individuals demonstrated the least amount of difference in the endorsement of structure across conditions of high and low follower needs. Fearful individuals significantly differed from secure and avoidant individuals in the endorsement of structure across conditions of high and low follower needs. Additionally, avoidant and anxious individuals significantly differed in the endorsement of structure across conditions of high and low follower needs.
For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Time × Needs illustrated in Figure 5.5, simple slope analysis revealed a number of differences in the amount of structure demonstrated across individuals high and low on attachment anxiety. Specifically, individuals high on attachment anxiety demonstrated significantly less structure compared to individuals low on attachment anxiety both when timeline was tight and follower needs were high (slope 1) and when timeline was flexible and follower needs low (slope 4, $t = 2.39, p < .05$). Furthermore, individuals high in attachment anxiety demonstrated significantly less structure when follower needs were low and timeline was flexible (slope 4) but significantly more structure when follower needs were high and timeline was flexible (slope 3) compared to individuals low on attachment anxiety ($t = 5.56, p < .001$). In summary, individuals high in attachment anxiety demonstrated significantly larger differences in the endorsement of structure across tight and flexible timeline conditions compared to individuals who were low in attachment anxiety.
5.4.4 Interpretation of results for structure leadership behaviour.

As part of hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with structure and attachment avoidance would be positively associated with structure when follower needs were high and low. Results partially supported hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2. Fearful individuals (i.e., high attachment anxiety and avoidance) demonstrated the least structure in the low follower needs conditions and the most structure in high needs conditions. These findings suggest that both anxiety and avoidance are associated with a preference for structure leadership even when followers were having difficulty navigating a complex solution to a task (i.e., high follower needs condition). However, given that the needs of followers’ pertained to their personal concerns regarding the task, it may be that participants interpret effective leadership as requiring the greater use of task-focused leadership such as structure.

In hypotheses 2.1 and 2.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with structure and attachment avoidance would be positively associated with...
structure when task difficulty was manipulated (i.e., easy versus challenging task). However, no significant interaction was identified for task, thus these hypotheses were not supported.

In hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2, it was expected that attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with structure and attachment avoidance would be positively associated with structure when task timeline was manipulated (i.e., flexible versus tight timeline). Results partially supported the hypotheses. In line with expectations, individuals low on attachment anxiety demonstrated significantly less structure when timeline was tight (and when follower needs were high) and also when timeline was flexible (and follower needs low), compared to individuals low on attachment anxiety. That is, attachment anxiety was negatively associated with structure across these conditions. Additionally, anxiety was associated with a significantly larger deviation in the endorsement of structure leadership behaviours when timeline was flexible and follower needs were low compared to individuals low on attachment anxiety. These findings suggest that attachment anxiety seems to interfere with a leader’s ability to demonstrate structure or task-focused leadership in situations when time is constrained. Under these conditions, one would expect that effective leadership should result in the endorsement of task-focused behaviours to ensure tasks are completed in a timely manner. However, it appears that attachment anxiety mitigates against task-focused leadership in such situations. These findings support research suggesting that the self-focused concerns harboured by anxiously attached individuals negatively affect their ability to focus on the task and engage in leadership behaviours to achieve a challenge or problem solve (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005; Mikulincer & Sheffi, 2000).

No significant associations were found for attachment avoidance across timeline manipulations, thus the hypotheses pertaining to attachment avoidance and timeline were not supported. Past research suggests that avoidantly attached individuals’ excessive self-reliance drives an emphasis on personal achievements over fostering relationships (e.g.,
Feeney et al., 1994; Karantzaz et al., 2010). This would suggest that avoidant individuals are likely to prioritise structure behaviour particular when a task needs to be completed in accordance with a strict timeline. However the non-significant associations pertaining to hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2 do not support this argument related to task timeline.

5.5 Summary

In summary, low attachment anxiety and avoidance was associated with the least deviation in consideration and structure leadership behaviour across various situational manipulations. This finding provides some support for the claim that individuals who harbour tendencies for secure attachment seem able to endorse the moderate use of consideration and structure leadership behaviours. Thus, attachment security is associated with a leadership style in which consideration and structure leadership behaviours are consistently endorsed in circumstances where both forms of leadership are required (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2003).

Conversely, attachment anxiety was associated with greater fluctuation in leadership behaviour across situations. Specifically, attachment anxiety was positively associated with consideration when the situation did not demand such leadership behaviours (i.e., follower needs were low, the task was easy and the timeline was flexible). Attachment anxiety was negatively associated with consideration when the situation in fact required the endorsement of such leadership (i.e., follower needs were high). Furthermore, attachment anxiety was also associated with the endorsement of less structure under conditions when this form of leadership was required (i.e., the timeline was tight). With regards to attachment avoidance, negative associations were found between avoidance and consideration when the task was challenging. Additionally, a positive association was found between attachment avoidance and the endorsement of structure when follower needs were high. While the findings suggest
that structure leadership behaviours are endorsed by individuals who are insecurely attached in situations where follower’s needs must be addressed, it may be that participants interpreted the situational manipulation of follower needs as being associated with addressing task difficulties. Thus, because follower needs were embedded within task difficulties, participants may have assumed that providing structure to ensure goals are achieved, rather than addressing issues around the competencies of followers in a helpful, empathic and considerate manner, would yield more effective outcomes. Participants may have also believed that when followers require assistance on a task, a leader should attempt to stabilise the environment, create control and define clear performance targets, and therefore initiate structure to a greater degree. This has been suggested by Fiedler (1958, 1967, 1971), who argued that leaders should use task-focused behaviour when the task is not well-structured.

In conclusion, the findings from Study 1 provide general support for the notion that the association between attachment and leadership behaviour, is at least in part, moderated by contextual variables pertaining to the situation. Specifically, attachment anxiety seems to interfere with a leader’s ability to enact considerate leadership behaviours when the situation requires a focus on follower needs. Attachment avoidance (when paired with attachment anxiety, i.e., fearful attachment) was associated with structure and task-focused behaviours in situations of high follower needs. Attachment security (i.e., low attachment anxiety and avoidance) was associated with the moderate endorsement of both structural and considerate leadership behaviours across situational manipulations.
Chapter 6 – Study 2

6.1 Introduction

Despite the wealth of evidence investigating effective leadership behaviour from the leader’s perspective, very little research exists examining what followers regard as effective leadership behaviour across various workplace situations (Boatwright et al., 2010). Furthermore, few studies have investigated how follower’s perceptions and expectations of effective leadership behaviour are influenced by their attachment style, despite research examining the nexus between attachment style and leadership from the leader perspective (Davidovitz et al., 2007). What limited research has been conducted over the last decade provides preliminary support for the application of attachment theory to the study of follower’s perceptions of effective leadership behaviour (Boatwright et al., 2010; Grosvenor & Boies, 2006; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001; Shalit et al., 2010).

Findings suggest that attachment anxiety is associated with a preference for supportive leadership behaviour, presumably because anxious individuals crave closeness to satisfy their own relationship needs (Schirmer & Lopez, 2001). To this end, studies into attachment across various contexts suggest that anxiously attached individuals’ worries pertaining to their self-worth and competence, and excessive need for approval, heightens their desire to receive highly supportive feedback whether this is emotional or instrumental support, especially during challenging or stressful situations (Feeney & Collins, 2004; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992). Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) reviewed research on attachment anxiety and support seeking behaviour, concluding that anxious individuals can be somewhat disorganised in their efforts to seek support, thus may be satisfied in receiving any support or attention, whether it be instrumental or emotional, as a way of gaining approval given their intense wishes for security.
In contrast, attachment avoidance is thought to be associated with a preference for less relationship-oriented leadership behaviour, largely because attachment avoidance is associated with maintaining independence and emotional distance from others (Boatwright et al., 2010). Thus avoidant individuals are thought to prefer a more task-focused leadership approach as this approach maintains emotional distance between leader and follower and fosters effort in achieving tasks rather than building relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). However, this type of support and leadership is only endorsed in situations in which avoidant individuals are faced with significant challenges or stressors (Collins & Feeney, 2000). Otherwise, avoidantly attached individuals maintain their self-reliance and can appraise efforts by others to monitor or support them as intrusive, frustrating and ineffective forms of assistance (Anders & Tucker, 2000; Keller, 2003; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001; Shaver, Collins, & Clark, 1996). In line with these assumptions, across various studies in attachment, avoidantly attached individuals have been found to seek instrumental support and assistance rather than emotional support in stressful or challenging situations (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Karantzas & Cole, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). However, research has found that avoidantly attached individuals do not appreciate any form of assistance or feedback in situations in which they do not experience threat, distress or are challenged (Lopez, Melendez, Sauer, Berger, & Wyssmann, 1998; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001).

Securely attached individuals on the other hand, have been found to regard relationship-oriented and task-focused approaches to managing challenges across workplace and family contexts as effective (Florian, Mikulincer, & Bucholtz, 1995). However, this finding is moderated by whether the assistance provided is of the type required to meet the demands of the task or challenge. While secure individuals harbour positive views of the self in terms of their competencies and self-efficacy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), so too are they comfortable to seek either emotional support and encouragement or task-oriented advice in
order to handle difficult or challenging personal and professional situations (Collins & Feeney, 2000). Their positive working models of others and tendencies to trust others implicitly are thought to drive their responsiveness to advice and direction of both a relationship-oriented and task-oriented type (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

6.2 Research Aim and Hypotheses

Taking an interactionist perspective as in Study 1, the aim of Study 2 was to investigate from the follower perspective, the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and follower ratings of the effectiveness of structure and consideration leadership behaviours across different situational demands. Similar to Study 1, three situational variables were experimentally manipulated. These variables were follower needs (low and high), task difficulty (easy and challenging) and task timeline (flexible and tight) creating eight hypothetical workplace scenarios. It was expected that the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration will be moderated by the situational factors of follower needs, task difficulty and task timeline. In relation to follower needs, it is hypothesised that:

(1.1) Under the condition of low follower needs:

a. Follower attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration
(1.2) Under the condition of high follower needs:

a. Follower attachment anxiety will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

In relation to task difficulty, it is hypothesised that:

(2.1) Under the condition of an easy task:

a. Follower attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration

(2.2) Under the condition of a difficult task:

a. Follower attachment anxiety will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

In relation to task timeline, it is hypothesised that:

(3.1) Under the condition of flexible timeline:
a. Follower attachment anxiety will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration

(3.1) Under the condition of tight timeline:

a. Follower attachment anxiety will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and consideration

b. Follower attachment avoidance will be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure and negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration

6.3 Method

6.3.1 Participants.

A total of 250 participants (109 males [44%], 139 females [55%], 2 participants did not provide their gender [1%]) aged between 19 years and 67 years ($M = 39.13$ years, $SD = 11$ years) invited from the social and professional networks of the researcher participated in the current study. The majority of participants were full-time employees (231 participants, 92.5%) followed by University/TAFE students (13 participants, 5%), unemployed participants (1 in total, 0.5%), retired participants (1 in total, 0.5%) and part-time employees (1 in total, 0.5%). A total of 3 participants (1%) did not provide their work status. Participants were from a variety of industries including consulting/professional services (203 participants, 81%), education (23 participants, 9%), government (12 participants, 5%), health
(4 participants, 1.5%) and hospitality (2 participants, 1%). A total of 6 participants (2.5%) did not provide data relating to their occupation.

In terms of the highest level of education attained, most participants had completed a Masters / Doctoral / other Post-Graduate qualification (140 participants, 56%) followed by a Bachelor degree (75 participants, 30%). A total of 24 participants had attained a Diploma / TAFE qualification (10%) and 8 participants (3%) had completed high school. A total of 3 participants (1%) did not provide their attained level of education.

Participants’ were predominantly born in Australia and New Zealand (122 participants, 49.5%) with the remainder of participants from North America and Canada (67 participants, 27%), Europe / UK (32 participants, 13%), Africa (10 participants, 4%), India / Middle East (8 participants, 3%), South America (4 participants, 1.5%) and Asia (3 participants, 1%). A total of 3 participants (1%) did not indicate their birth country.

6.3.2 Materials.

**Demographic Questions.** The same demographic questions used in Study 1 were used to gain background information from participants in Study 2 (Appendix A3). All participants were asked to record their gender, age, occupation, educational level and birth country.

**Attachment.** As per Study 1, attachment was measured using measured using the 29-item Attachment Style Questionnaire - Short Form (ASQ – SF, Karantzas et al., 2010, Appendix A4). In the current study, the attachment avoidance and anxiety subscales were found to have high internal consistencies with Cronbach alphas of .86 and .87 respectively.

**Vignettes.** A total of 8 hypothetical vignettes were developed for the purposes of the study, with each depicting a typical workplace scenario (Appendix A2). Vignettes were dummy-coded for data analysis. The vignettes were written such that participants were
instructed to imagine themselves as an employee in an accounting team, led by a Senior Finance Manager of a large Australian accounting firm, in which their role involved working on financial audits for clients. As per Study 1, three variables were manipulated across all eight vignettes. These variables were task difficulty, timeline to complete task and employee needs.

Task difficulty comprised of two levels - easy and complex workplace tasks. Under the easy task manipulation, participants were asked to investigate one client’s financial expenditures and enter data into an IT system. Under the difficult task manipulation, participants were asked to investigate six client’s financial expenditures and present a comprehensive report for analysis to the client. Timeline to complete task also comprised two levels - flexible and tight workplace deadline. Under the flexible timeline manipulation, participants had an extended timeframe in which to complete the task, with the leader being focused on the quality of work and not when it was completed. Under the tight timeline manipulation, participants had to complete the task within a short time frame, before a strict, non-negotiable deadline date. Employee needs similarly comprised two levels – low and high employee needs. Under the low employee needs manipulation, all team members understood the task requirements and no one required assistance. Under the high employee needs manipulation, two team members had difficulty understanding the task requirements and required assistance in completing their allocation of the task. Refer to Table 5.1 in Study 1 for the variable manipulations by vignette. An example of the workplace scenario (Vignette 1) administered to participants is provided below.

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies. The team must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance. The team
must then present their final report to the senior finance manager. Your team has approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project, and your manager is happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). S/he is more focused on the quality of the work rather than producing a document of poorer quality by the completion date. However despite this flexible timeline, two of your fellow team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. Furthermore, the senior finance manager to whom you report, overheard your team members express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.

**Leadership.** As per Study 1, leadership was measured using the researcher-revised 37-item LBDQ-XII. However, given that the aim of the current study was to measure the effectiveness of leadership behaviour from the perspective of a follower, items were pre-fixed with ‘In this situation, the leader...’ and the rating scale was revised. Specifically, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of structural and considerate leadership behaviours in the given situation. Participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very ineffective) to 5 (very effective). Items included ‘In this situation, the leader acts without consulting the group’ and ‘In this situation, the leader assigns group members to particular tasks.’

Leadership subscales were created using the 37 items in line with Study 1 (Appendix A6). A Maximum Likelihood Exploratory Factor Analysis with oblique rotation of the measure revealed a clear two factor structure that explained 52% of the variance in the situational rater version of the LBDQ. Specifically, factor 1 consisted of 14 items (32% variance) that captured leadership behaviours that clearly related to structure. Items on this factor consisted of factor loadings varying between .71 and .37. Factor 2 consisted of 23 items (20% variance) that captured leadership behaviours related to consideration. Items on this factor consisted of factor loadings varying between .62 and .39. Furthermore, reliability analysis of both factors yielded Cronbach alphas of .86 for consideration and .83 for structure.
6.3.3 Procedure.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Chair of the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Subcommittee (Application HEAG-H 16/10, Appendix A10). A total of 150 individuals in the professional and social networks of the researcher were sent invitations via email describing the research and inviting them to take part (Appendices A8 and A9). Advertisements were also posted on the social networking sites of Facebook and LinkedIn. Email invitations and advertisements included a URL address that was linked to the Plain Language Statement and online questionnaire. Participants for Study 2 were unrelated to participants for Study 1. Upon agreeing to take part in the study, participants completed a series of demographic questions and the ASQ. Participants were randomly presented with one of the eight vignettes and completed the modified situational version of the LBDQ-XII once they had read their allocated scenario. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete and responses were submitted to a Deakin University secure password protected server accessed by the researcher.

6.4 Results and Discussion

The data was examined for missing values, univariate outliers, univariate and multivariate normality and multicollinearity. Two cases were identified as having more than 15% missing data and were deleted from the original sample of N = 250. A total of 10 univariate outliers were detected at zresidual >± 1.96, α = .05 for the analyses pertaining to the dependent variable of consideration and deleted from the sample resulting in a sample size of N = 238. A total of nine univariate outliers were detected at zresidual >± 1.96, α = .05 for the analyses related to the dependent variable of structure and deleted from the sample resulting in a sample size of N = 239. Given the elimination of different univariate outliers for consideration and structure, all descriptive statistics are presented in separate tables for each
leadership behaviour. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 present the standardised and absolute skewness and kurtosis values for consideration and structure respectively. As shown in Tables 6.1 and 6.2, standardised skewness and kurtosis values did not exceed ±3.29, α = .001, absolute skewness values did not exceed ± 2.00 and absolute kurtosis values did not exceed ± 4.00 for all variables (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Tables 6.3 and 6.4 present the means and standard deviations for attachment anxiety and avoidance and consideration and structure by vignette. Tables 6.5 and 6.6 present the bivariate correlations for attachment anxiety and avoidance and consideration and structure. Multicollinearity was not detected amongst variable pairings (rs’ <.80). The removal of outliers did not change the results.

Table 6.1

*Standardised and Absolute Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Attachment and Consideration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardised</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate Leadership</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 238

Table 6.2

*Standardised and Absolute Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Attachment and Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardised</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Leadership</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 239
### Table 6.3

Means and Standard Deviations for Attachment and Consideration by Vignette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Anxiety M</th>
<th>Anxiety SD</th>
<th>Avoidance M</th>
<th>Avoidance SD</th>
<th>Considerate Leadership M</th>
<th>Considerate Leadership SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>93.89</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>85.67</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>94.19</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>89.48</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>95.96</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 7</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>85.11</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 238

### Table 6.4

Means and Standard Deviations for Attachment and Structure by Vignette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Anxiety M</th>
<th>Anxiety SD</th>
<th>Avoidance M</th>
<th>Avoidance SD</th>
<th>Structural Leadership M</th>
<th>Structural Leadership SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>47.32</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 3</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>50.48</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>51.97</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 7</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>53.81</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 8</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>53.26</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 239
A set of preliminary analyses were conducted to determine if any differences existed across the vignettes for attachment and between males and females on leadership. A Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) determined that there was no significant
difference between the eight vignettes on attachment anxiety, $F(7, 240) = 1.94, p > .05$, or attachment avoidance, $F(7, 240) = 1.70, p > .001$. A second MANOVA determined that there was no significant difference between males and females on consideration, $F(1, 244) = 1.33, p > .05$ and structure, $F(1, 244) = 0.20, p > .05$.

6.4.1 Hierarchical regression analyses for attachment and situational manipulations on follower ratings of effectiveness for consideration leadership behaviour.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the effects of situational manipulations and attachment on ratings of effectiveness of leadership behaviour pertaining to consideration. The hierarchical regression model consisted of five steps. In step 1, all predictor variables were entered into the model (i.e., testing for main effects). In step 2, all two-way interactions were entered into the model while in step 3, all three-way interactions were included. In steps 4 and 5, all four-way interactions and the five-way interaction were entered into the model respectively.

Inspection of the hierarchical regression analyses revealed that steps 1 and 2 significantly explained variance in consideration. Therefore, a significant model was found at Step 1, $F(5, 232) = 10.76, p < .001, R = .43, R^2 = .19, \Delta R^2 = .19$, and Step 2, $F(15, 222) = 4.96, p = .05$, $R = .50, R^2 = .25, \Delta R^2 = .06$. The models at Steps 3, 4 and 5 were not significant. The relative contribution of the predictor variables at all steps of the model are presented in Table 6.7.
Table 6.7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Attachment and Situational Manipulations Predicting Effectiveness Ratings of Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-4.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-6.32</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoidance</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-7.89</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoidance</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>-3.89</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-6.93</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoidance</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.86</th>
<th>2.99</th>
<th>.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-5.81</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.86</th>
<th>2.99</th>
<th>.19</th>
<th>.28</th>
<th>.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>-6.99</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-5.08</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-6.45</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Anxiety 1.85 3.00 .15  .28 .00
Avoidance -3.64 2.79 -1.24
Task .63 2.21 .03
Timeline -.13 2.23 -1.01
Needs -6.94 2.31 -3.37
Anxiety × Avoid 4.66 2.63 .27
Task × Time 1.79 2.58 .08
Task × Needs 4.10 2.58 .20
Time × Needs -3.09 2.57 -1.14
Anxiety × Task 1.83 3.94 .12
Anxiety × Time -1.15 5.09 -.06
Anxiety × Needs 1.11 4.42 .06
Avoid × Task -4.99 4.28 -1.24
Avoid × Time 1.08 4.57 .05
Avoid × Needs 1.49 4.30 .07
Anxiety × Avoid × Task .13 3.76 .01
Anxiety × Avoid × Time 1.53 6.89 .06
Anxiety × Avoid × Needs -4.15 5.44 -.17
Anxiety × Task × Time 1.81 6.10 -.07
Anxiety × Task × Needs 2.44 5.61 -.11
Anxiety × Time × Needs 3.12 6.77 -.11
Table 6.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-6.27</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, two-tailed, **p < .01, two-tailed, ***p < .001, two-tailed.
As presented in Table 6.7, the model resulted in three significant two-way interactions which subsumed all significant main effects (step 1). No other interactions were found to be significant. In relation to the two-way interactions, an interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance on consideration ($\beta = .16, p = .01$). The second significant two-way interaction was found for Task × Needs on consideration ($\beta = .23, p < .05$). The final significant two-way interaction comprised Attachment Anxiety × Time on consideration ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$).

Simple slope analyses were conducted to decompose the effects of all significant two-way interactions on ratings of effectiveness for consideration (Aiken & West, 1991). Each of these analyses are described in turn. As per Study 1, to assist in the interpretation of the simple slope analyses for each interaction presented below, the combinations of low and high attachment anxiety and avoidance are labelled drawing on common terms used in the literature (Ainsworth, 1979; Bartholomew, 1990, 1993). Specifically, individuals low on anxiety and avoidance are termed secure; individuals low on anxiety and high on avoidance are termed avoidant; individuals high on anxiety and low on avoidance are termed anxious and individuals high on anxiety and avoidance are termed fearful.

For the two-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance illustrated in Figure 6.1, simple slope analysis revealed that fearful individuals and anxious individuals rated a leader using consideration as significantly more effective than securely attached and avoidantly attached individuals ($t = 3.30, p < .01$).
For the two-way interaction involving Task × Needs illustrated in Figure 6.2, simple slope analysis revealed that when individuals were exposed to a workplace situation where employee needs were high and the task was challenging, individuals rated consideration as more effective than situations when needs were high but the task was easy (t = 2.59, p < .05).

Figure 6.2 - Interaction for Task × Needs on Consideration
For the two-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Time illustrated in Figure 6.3, simple slope analysis revealed that individuals high on attachment anxiety deemed consideration as significantly more effective than individuals low on attachment anxiety, but only in situations when the task timeline was flexible \((t = -1.98, p = .05)\).

![Figure 6.3 - Interaction for Anxiety × Time on Consideration](image)

**6.4.2 Interpretation of results for follower ratings of effectiveness for consideration leadership behaviour.**

In hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety would be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration when follower needs were both high and low. Conversely, follower attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration leadership when follower needs were both low and high.
Results partially supported the hypotheses. Anxiously attached individuals rated a leader displaying consideration as significantly more effective compared to securely attached and avoidantly attached individuals. These findings support the suggestion that attachment anxiety is associated with a preference for relationship-oriented leadership. Moreover, the findings are in line with research by Schirmer and Lopez (2001) and Boatwright et al. (2010) who suggested that anxiously attached individuals believe a leader is effective when they display reassurance and consider their needs in a compassionate manner. It is suggested that this form of leadership is regarded by anxious individuals as meeting their needs for validation and approval (Boatwright et al., 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In contrast to expectations however, the effects of attachment anxiety and avoidance on perceptions of the effectiveness of consideration leadership behaviour were not moderated by follower needs.

In hypothesis 2.1 and 2.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety would be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration when the task was both easy and difficult. With regards to attachment avoidance, it was hypothesised that follower attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with consideration ratings of effectiveness when the task was both easy and difficult. Results did not support these hypotheses as task condition was not found to moderate the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and consideration leadership behaviour. Instead, results indicated that when the task was challenging and follower needs were high, followers’ rated consideration as more effective than when the task was easy and follower needs were high. Attachment played no role in this interaction. These results suggest that followers, irrespective of attachment, regard a leader as more effective when they assist the team to navigate a challenging task and alleviate follower concerns regarding task difficulty by displaying considerate leadership.
In hypothesis 3.1 and 3.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety would be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration leadership when timeline was both flexible and tight. Conversely, follower attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership under timeline manipulations. Results partially supported these hypotheses. Specifically, individuals high in attachment anxiety rated consideration as significantly more effective compared to individuals low in attachment anxiety, but only when the timeline was flexible. However, when the timeline was tight, there were no differences for ratings of effectiveness for consideration between individuals scoring low and high on attachment anxiety.

These results suggest that individuals high and low on attachment anxiety can judge considerate leadership as less effective in situations where tight timelines may require a more task-focused approach. However, individuals high in attachment anxiety rate consideration as more effective than individuals low in attachment anxiety in situations without timeline pressures. This finding supports prior research suggesting that anxiously attached followers prefer relationship-oriented leadership (Boatwright et al., 2010), and seem to do so even in situations where pressures around such variables as tight timelines are not present. This finding may be explained by anxiously attached individuals incessant need for approval and validation – feedback that they desire irrespective of the stressors and strains associated with a given situation – a reason commonly given for anxious individuals’ desire for emotional support across threatening and non-threatening contexts (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Feeney & Collins, 2004).
### 6.4.3 Hierarchical regression for attachment and situational manipulations on follower ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership behaviour.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the effects of situational manipulations and attachment on ratings of effectiveness of leadership behaviour pertaining to structure. The hierarchical regression model consisted of five steps. In step 1, all predictor variables were entered into the model (i.e., testing for main effects). In step 2, all two-way interactions were entered into the model while in step 3, all three-way interactions were included. In steps 4 and 5, all four-way interactions and the five-way interaction were entered into the model respectively.

Only steps 1 and 3 resulted in accounting for significant variance explained by the model. Therefore, a significant model was found at Step 1, $F (5, 233) = 5.40, p < .001, R = .32, R^2 = .10, \Delta R^2 = .10$, and Step 3 of the hierarchical regression analysis, $F (24, 214) = 2.31, p < .05, R = .57, R^2 = .21, \Delta R^2 = .07$. The models at Steps 2, 4 and 5 were not significant. The relative contribution of the predictor variables at all steps of the model are presented in Table 6.8. As presented in Table 6.8, the model resulted in two significant three-way interactions which subsumed all significant main effects (step 1). No other interactions were found to be significant.
Table 6.8

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Attachment and Situational Manipulations Predicting Effectiveness Ratings of Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Needs</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-4.62</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-4.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Time</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task × Needs</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Needs</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Time</td>
<td>-9.85</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Time × Needs</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-9.32</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-3.80</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-8.06</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Anxiety                        | 1.41    | 2.13    | .16     |
| Avoidance                         | -.08    | 1.98    | -.01    |
| Task                              | -1.13   | 1.56    | -.09    |
| Timeline                          | 5.61    | 1.56    | .43***  |
| Needs                             | .30     | 1.63    | .02     |
| Anxiety × Avoid                   | 3.90    | 1.87    | .33*    |
| Task × Time                       | -2.03   | 1.83    | -.14    |
| Task × Needs                      | .88     | 1.84    | .06     |
| Time × Needs                      | -.27    | 1.83    | -.02    |
| Anxiety × Task                    | -1.70   | 2.80    | -.15    |
| Anxiety × Time                    | -1.16   | 3.36    | -.09    |
| Anxiety × Needs                   | -4.18   | 3.15    | -.34    |
| Avoid × Task                      | .09     | 3.04    | .01     |
| Avoid × Time                      | 1.69    | 3.12    | .12     |
| Avoid × Needs                     | 2.11    | 3.04    | .15     |
| Anxiety × Avoid × Task            | -2.27   | 2.67    | -.16    |
| Anxiety × Avoid × Time            | -6.59   | 4.20    | -.37    |
Table 6.8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5.31</th>
<th>3.95</th>
<th>.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-9.42</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Needs</td>
<td>-4.31</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Time × Needs</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time</td>
<td>-7.34</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Needs × Time</td>
<td>-3.38</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>-8.92</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety × Avoid × Task × Time × Needs</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p = .06$, ** $p \leq .05$, two-tailed, *** $p < .01$, two-tailed, **** $p < .001$, two-tailed.
In relation to the three-way interactions, a significant interaction was found for Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Time on structure ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$) and Attachment Avoidance × Task × Needs on structure ($\beta = .33, p < .05$). Simple slope analyses were conducted to decompose the effects of all significant three-way interactions on ratings of effectiveness for structure. Each of these analyses are described in turn.

For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Anxiety × Attachment Avoidance × Time illustrated in Figure 6.4, simple slope analysis revealed significant differences in the ratings of the effectiveness for structure were found across the attachment dimensions, but only under conditions where the task timeline was flexible. Specifically, fearful individuals (slope 1) rated structure as a significantly more effective form of leadership when the timeline was flexible compared to anxious individuals (slope 2, $t = -2.53, p = .01$), avoidant individuals (slope 3, $t = -2.32, p < .05$), and secure individuals (slope 4, $t = -2.54, p = .01$).

Furthermore, anxious individuals (slope 2) rated structure as significantly more effective when the timeline was flexible compared to secure individuals (slope 4, $t = -2.05, p < .05$). Lastly, avoidant individuals (slope 3) rated structure as significantly more effective when the timeline was flexible compared to secure individuals (slope 4, $t = -2.29, p < .05$).
For the three-way interaction involving Attachment Avoidance × Task × Needs illustrated in Figure 6.5, avoidant individuals rated structure as more effective when the task was challenging and employee needs were high compared to individuals low on attachment avoidance (slope 1). The trend of this slope was significantly different from all other slopes – (slope 2: attachment avoidance, challenging task and low follower needs, $t = 2.30, p < .05$); slope 3: attachment avoidance, easy task and high follower needs $t = 1.76, p < .05$); slope 4: attachment avoidance, easy task and low follower needs $t = -1.69, p < .05$).
6.4.4 Interpretation of results for follower ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership behaviour.

In hypotheses 1.1 and 1.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety and follower attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure when follower needs were low, but positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure when needs were high. Results partially supported the hypotheses. No significant interactions were found for follower attachment anxiety and structure across high and low needs conditions. However, results indicated that followers high on attachment avoidance rated structure leadership as more effective when follower needs were high compared to individuals low on attachment avoidance. This finding supports literature suggesting that avoidant individuals are thought to prefer a more task-focused leadership approach as this approach maintains emotional distance between leader and follower and fosters effort in achieving tasks rather than building relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Furthermore, this finding supports the argument that avoidantly attached individuals
endorse structure leadership even in situations which are stressful or challenging (i.e., follower needs were high). This may be due to avoidant individuals’ preference for instrumental support and impersonal leadership rather than emotional support (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Karantzas & Cole, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

In hypotheses 2.1 and 2.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety and follower attachment avoidance would be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure when the task was easy, but positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure when the task was difficult. Results indicated that follower attachment avoidance was positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership when the task was challenging. This again supports past research suggesting that avoidantly attached individuals prefer leadership associated with achieving an instrumental outcome, even when they may be under stress and require assistance on a difficult task (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). No significant interaction was found for attachment anxiety and ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership across task manipulations.

In hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2, it was expected that follower attachment anxiety and avoidance would be negatively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure when timeline was flexible. However, when timeline was tight, attachment anxiety and avoidance would be positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership. Results indicated that regardless of attachment, structure was rated as less effective when timeline was tight compared to flexible – this did not support the hypotheses. Individuals high on attachment anxiety and avoidance rated structure as significantly more effective compared to their anxious, avoidant and secure counterparts when timeline was flexible – this did not support the hypotheses. However, the findings indicated that securely attached individuals demonstrated the least difference in ratings of effectiveness for structure leadership across tight and flexible timeline manipulations, indicating their flexibility in ratings of leadership
effectiveness despite changing situational circumstances. It is assumed that secure people are largely self-sufficient and comfortable delivering a task with minimal leadership intervention (Popper et al., 2000; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007) but are also comfortable with, and open to, a leader who wants to build relationships, foster growth and development of followers (Mayseless, 2010). Therefore, it can be argued that irrespective of the situation (in this case, task timeline), secure individuals sense of autonomy and self-efficacy, as well as their comfort with closeness, influences their perceptions such that both forms of leadership are deemed as appropriate.

As Boatwright et al. (2010), Game (2011) and Keller (2003) suggested, avoidantly attached individuals prefer minimal assistance and interference when they are in a non-stressful situation. Furthermore, it has been argued that anxiously attached individuals prefer relationship-oriented leadership given their desire for emotional assistance. Yet the current findings indicated that individuals high on attachment anxiety and avoidance rated structure leadership as most effective when the situation was relatively neutral, i.e., there was no timeline pressure. This finding may be explained by the argument that fearful individuals are characterised by competing attachment needs and behaviours – on the one hand, fearful individuals desire approval and intimacy, but on the other hand fear closeness (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Thus, fearful individuals may deem task-focused leadership as effective, because it provides a form of guidance and support but limits the risk of dealing with emotional discomfort if a leader were to attend to the socio-emotional needs of followers as can be the case with relationship-oriented leadership (Vogel & Wei, 2005). Furthermore, individuals high on anxiety and avoidance may seek structure, direction and clarity even when there is no pending timeline in an attempt to achieve a sense of validation and reassurance regarding the task they are engaging with.
6.5 Summary

In conclusion, these findings provide support for the argument that the extent to which a follower rates consideration and structure leadership as effective across situational manipulations can be attributed, in part, to their attachment orientation. Attachment anxiety was positively associated with ratings of effectiveness for consideration when task timeline was flexible, suggesting that even when there are no pressures or challenges for task completion, anxiously attached individuals prefer leadership associated with providing emotional support and assistance. Additionally, individuals high on attachment anxiety and avoidance prefer structural leadership when no timeline pressures exist, potentially a reflection of the competing attachment needs of fearful individuals, thus desire to seek proximity to a leader through any means. Secure individuals do not deviate as greatly in their ratings of leadership effectiveness and this may be attributed to a secure follower’s ability to get things done without needing a leader’s constant guidance and support, yet also seeing the benefit of consideration leadership when required.

Interestingly, in situations characterised by tight timelines, structural leadership was not endorsed as highly by participants, irrespective of their attachment, however significant variability in the endorsement of this leadership behaviour was found when timeline was flexible. This finding may suggest that when task deadlines approach, even structural leadership behaviour may be deemed as a form of interference during these time sensitive periods irrespective of attachment style. Finally, avoidantly attached individuals rated structure leadership behaviours as effective when follower needs were high and the task was difficult, presumably given avoidant individuals’ inability to recognise the needs of others potentially requiring assistance from a leader. In general, the findings of Study 2 provide some support regarding an interactionist perspective of follower’s endorsement of effective leadership behaviour.
Chapter 7 – Study 3

7.1 Introduction

In an attempt to address shortcomings of earlier research which has largely failed to investigate leadership from a dyadic perspective (Harms, 2011), Study 3, examined the associations between leader and follower attachment style and perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness. In taking a dyadic perspective, Study 3 again examined the associations between attachment and leadership from an interactionist perspective, such that perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness can be regarded as jointly determined by the perspectives of the leader and the follower(s) (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Harms, 2011; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001).

In line with research reviewed in Sections 4.2 to 4.4, it has been suggested that attachment security (i.e., low anxiety and low avoidance) is associated with transformational leadership behaviours such as consideration of follower’s needs, the motivation and coaching of followers, and nurturing of follower competencies (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Popper et al., 2000). Conversely, attachment avoidance and anxiety have been found to be negatively associated with transformational leadership behaviours (Mayseless, 2010; Popper et al., 2000). It is argued that given that highly avoidant individuals prefer to distance and disengage themselves from others due to their discomfort in dealing with interpersonal issues (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003), avoidantly attached individuals are unlikely to engage in transformational leadership behaviours (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper et al., 2000; Popper & Mayseless, 2003). While driven by self-focused worries and a need for validation and approval, anxiously attached individuals are similarly believed to be ill-equipped to
engage in transformational leadership behaviours, given their inability to genuinely empathise with the needs of followers (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

In terms of transactional leadership, it can be argued that highly avoidant individuals may be more likely to engage in transactional leadership behaviours characterised by an emphasis on task completion given their inclination is to focus on tangible outcomes and minimise the need to engage interpersonal closeness with others across all contexts including the workplace (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Moreover, the value that avoidantly attached individuals place on the achievement of tasks over fostering relationships (e.g., Feeney et al., 1994; Karantzas et al., 2010) means that these individuals may be more geared to engage in transactional leadership behaviours (Popper et al., 2000). Conversely, individuals high on attachment anxiety are unlikely to engage in task-focused, transactional leadership, given that anxiously attached individuals are unlikely to divert their attention from their own relationship needs to concentrate fully on directing others towards task completion (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

In terms of follower attachment, follower attachment anxiety and avoidance may be negatively associated with follower ratings of transformational leadership. An avoidant follower’s inclination for emotional distance may impact their ability to detect leader’s transformational behaviours given their inclination to retreat from considerate, one-on-one leadership (i.e., as displayed by transformational leaders, Boatwright et al., 2010; Keller, 2003). Furthermore, an anxious follower’s continual attempts to gain proximity to their leader and receive approval and validation for their actions may influence the extent to which they rate their leader as engaging in transformational or transactional leadership behaviour (Game, 2011). With regards to transactional leadership, avoidantly attached followers have a preference for task-focused, impersonal leadership characterised by offering instrumental
assistance (Boatwright et al., 2010; Collins & Feeney, 2000), thereby may be more likely to rate a leader as transactional.

7.2 Research Aim and Hypotheses

The aim of Study 3 was to investigate the extent to which leader and follower attachment style is associated with leader and follower perspectives of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness. On the basis of this aim, and the research reviewed in Sections 4.2 to 4.4 and 7.1, the following hypotheses were derived:

1. Leader attachment anxiety and avoidance would be negatively associated with leader ratings of transformational leadership behaviours, which in turn, would be positively associated with leader ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

2. (a) Leader attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with leader ratings of transactional leadership, which in turn, would be negatively associated with leader ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness. (b) Leader attachment avoidance would be positively associated with leader ratings of transactional leadership behaviours which in turn would be negatively associated with leader ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

3. Leader attachment anxiety and avoidance would be negatively associated with follower ratings of transformational leadership behaviours which in turn would be positively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

4. (a) Leader attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with follower ratings of transactional leadership which in turn would be negatively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness. (b) Leader attachment
avoidance would be positively associated with follower ratings of transactional leadership behaviours which in turn would be negatively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

5. Follower attachment anxiety and avoidance would be negatively associated with follower ratings of transformational leadership behaviours which in turn would be positively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

6. (a) Follower attachment anxiety would be negatively associated with follower ratings of transactional leadership which in turn would be negatively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness. (b) Follower attachment avoidance would be positively associated with follower ratings of transactional leadership behaviours, which in turn, would be negatively associated with follower ratings of satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness.

No relationships were hypothesised between follower attachment anxiety and avoidance and leader ratings of transformational and transactional leadership as it is unclear from theory or the literature whether follower attachment would influence how a leader rates their own leadership.

7.3 Method

7.3.1 Participants.

A total of 106 leader-follower dyads recruited from four Australian organisations participated in the current study. The sample comprised 38 leaders (including 22 males [58%], 16 females [42%]) aged between 33 years and 63 years ($M = 45.87$ years, $SD = 7.39$
years) and 106 followers (38 males [35%], 67 females [63%], 1 participant did not provide their gender [2%]) aged between 21 years and 62 years ($M = 41.94$ years, $SD = 9.24$). All participants were full-time employees. A total of 32 leader-follower dyads were from a Victorian tertiary education institution (30%), 8 dyads were from an Australian telecommunications company (7.5%), 2 dyads were from a Victorian real-estate agency (2%) and 64 dyads (60.5%) were from an Australian retailer.

In terms of leader’s education, most participants had completed a Bachelor degree (24 participants, 63%), followed by a Diploma / TAFE qualification (5 participants, 13%). A total of 7 participants had completed secondary school only (18%) and 2 participants had completed a Masters / Doctoral degree (6%). With regards to the education level of followers, most participants had completed a Bachelor degree (50 participants, 47%), followed by completed secondary school only (21 participants, 20%). A total of 13 participants (12.5%) attained a Diploma / TAFE qualification and 11 participants (10.5%) had completed a Masters / other Post-Graduate qualification. A total of 10 participants did not complete high school (9%) and 1 participant had completed a Trade qualification (1%).

Leaders were predominantly born in Australia (33 participants, 87%) with the remainder of participants from Europe / UK (5 participants, 13%). Followers were predominantly from Australia and New Zealand (87 participants, 82%) with the remainder of participants from Europe / UK (9 participants, 8%), North America and Canada (2 participants, 2%), Africa (2 participants, 2%), Asia (2 participants, 2%) and the Middle East (2 participants, 2%). A total of 2 participants did not indicate their birth country (2%). Leaders managed an average of 35 followers in their current role ($SD = 77$ followers) and had been in a leadership role for between 6 months and 23 years ($M = 12.70$ years, $SD = 7.94$ years). In situations where one leader had more than one direct report, multiple dyads were generated using the same data.
from the one leader paired with the data from each of their direct reports, hence the number of leaders who participated did not equate to the number of dyads derived.

### 7.3.2 Materials.

**Demographic Questions.** A series of background information questions were asked for the purposes of obtaining participant demographic information (Appendix A3). All participants were asked to record their gender, age, educational level, birth country and employee number (to allow the researcher to match the data of each leader with the data of their direct reports). In addition, leaders were asked to specify the number of employees in their team and the number of years in a leadership role.

**Attachment.** As per Studies 1 and 2, attachment was measured using the 29-item Attachment Style Questionnaire - Short Form (ASQ – SF, Karantzas et al., 2010, Appendix A4). In the current study, the attachment avoidance and anxiety subscales were found to have high internal consistencies with Cronbach alphas of .84 and .85 respectively.

**Leadership.** Transformational and transactional leadership and leadership outcomes (satisfaction, extra effort and effectiveness) were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5x, Bass & Avolio, 1995, Appendix A7). The MLQ5x is a 45-item questionnaire designed to measure the leader’s self-assessment of their leadership style and the follower’s appraisals of the leader’s performance. Consequently, the MLQ5x has been developed in two forms - a Leader version and a Rater version. Items on both versions of the questionnaire are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). Both versions of the questionnaire measure 9 dimensions of leadership behaviour (4 items per dimension) termed idealised influence (attributed), idealised influence (behaviour), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration,
contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire leadership. Additionally, the three outcome variables termed effectiveness (4 items), satisfaction (2 items) and extra effort (3 items) are measured.

The global scale of transformational leadership is calculated by averaging idealised influence (attributed), idealised influence (behaviour), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration. The global scale of transactional leadership is calculated by averaging contingent reward, management-by-exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive). The global scales of transformational and transactional leadership have moderate to high internal consistency with Cronbach alphas of .90 and .75 respectively (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The outcome variables of extra effort, satisfaction and effectiveness have high internal consistency with Cronbach alphas of .87, .88 and .83 respectively (Sosik & Megerian, 1999).

7.3.3 Procedure.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Chair of the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Subcommittee (Application DUHREC-HMNBS 74/07, Appendix A10). Four organisations were approached and invited to participate in the study through the professional networks of the researcher. A letter explaining the purpose of the research was sent to a contact within the organisation (Appendix A8). Phone and face-to-face meetings were then held with an organisation representative to further discuss the research and the potential involvement of the organisation. Once the representative from each organisation had informed the research of the organisation’s willingness to participate in the research, an introductory email inviting leaders and team members to participate in the study was circulated via company email lists provided to the researcher by the organisation representative. The email briefly described the research and included a URL address that was
linked to the Plain Language Statement (Appendix A9) and online questionnaire. A total of 755 participants were sent email invitations to participate. A total of 250 participants completed the online questionnaire resulting in a response rate of 33%.

Two versions of the online questionnaire were created for leaders and followers. The leader version included the demographics questions, the ASQ and the leader version of the MLQ5x whilst the follower version included the demographics questions, the ASQ and follower / rater version of the MLQ 5x. Each version of the online questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Participants were asked to enter their employee number when completing the questionnaire to enable the researcher to identify which leaders and which direct reports had submitted data, thus create leader-follower dyads. Upon completing the questionnaire, participants submitted their responses to a secure password protected Deakin server accessed only by the researcher.

The organisation representative provided the researcher with organisational charts which described the organisation’s reporting lines using employee numbers. Data from leaders and followers were matched to form dyads through triangulating the employee numbers on the organisational charts with the employee numbers of participants who had submitted questionnaires. Each leader could have multiple direct reports – data from one leader and one direct report was classified as one dyad. If multiple direct reports of the same leader submitted the questionnaire, the same leader’s data was matched with the data of each direct report to form dyads. Only matched leader and follower data could be used to create dyads. Leader and follower responses that could not be matched were excluded from the analysis.
7.4 Results and Discussion

The data was examined for missing values, univariate and multivariate normality, outliers, homoscedasticity and multicollinearity. No cases in the 106 leader-follower dyads had more than 15% missing data. One multivariate outlier was detected and through pairwise deletion was removed from the sample resulting in a sample size of N = 105 dyads. Table 7.1 presents the bivariate correlations, means, standard deviations, absolute and standardised skewness and kurtosis values for all variables.

As shown in Table 7.1, standardised skewness and kurtosis values did not exceed ±3.29, α = .001, absolute skewness values did not exceed ± 2.00 and absolute kurtosis values did not exceed ± 4.00 for all variables (Hu & Bentler, 1999). An Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) was conducted as it allows for the estimation of actor and partner effects in dyadic data. The APIM is a type of Multi-level Modeling (MLM) where the dyad is used as the unit of analysis. This analytic technique is based on the premise that partners in dyadic relationships (e.g., leader-follower relationships), influence each other’s cognitive-affective states and behaviours (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). The analysis to conduct an APIM is similar to Structural Equation Modelling (SEM); however, variables relating to each member of the dyad are included in the model in order to determine not only actor effects (the individual level of analysis), but also partner effects (the dyadic level of analysis, Kenny et al., 2006).
Table 7.1

Bivariate Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, Absolute and Standardised Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Attachment, Leadership and Leadership Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAnx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAv</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTransform</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTransact</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSat</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEffect</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAnx</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAv</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10FFTransform</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 FTransact</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FSat</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 FEE</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 FEffect</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Skew</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Skew</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Kurtosis</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 106 dyads. LAnx and LAv = leader ratings of their own attachment anxiety and avoidance; LTransform and LTransact = leader self-ratings of the extent to which they display transformational and transactional leadership behaviours; LSat, LEE and LEffect = leader self-ratings of the extent to which they lead a satisfied group that exerts extra effort and is effective; FAnx and FAv = follower ratings of their own attachment anxiety and avoidance; FTransform and FTransact = follower ratings of the extent to which their leader displays transformational and transactional leadership behaviours; FSat, FEE and FEffect = follower ratings of the extent to which their leader leads a satisfied group that exerts extra effort and is effective. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
An APIM was derived using AMOS 17.0 computer software and estimated using Maximum Likelihood Chi-Square Estimation (ML, $\chi^2_{ML}$). The ML estimation results in a “goodness of fit” index in the form of a chi-square statistic which measures discrepancies between the observed variances and covariances and those predicted by the researcher’s implied model (Everitt, 1996). The aim of ML estimation in an APIM is to generate a model where the residuals between observed and implied values are as close as possible, as represented by a small, non-significant chi-square value (Byrne, 2001; Hoyle, 1995).

In order to evaluate model fit, Hu and Bentler’s (1999) combination approach was adopted. As such, two absolute fit indices – the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) ≤ .05 and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) ≤ .06 – are used to determine the goodness of fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Additionally, two incremental fit indices – the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Tucker Lewis index (TLI) are used as estimates of model fit with values ≥ .95 representative of a good fitting model (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, Hu & Bentler, 1999).

In addition to evaluating a model on the basis of fit indices, post-hoc analysis using modification indices (MIs) and expected parameter change (EPC) can be employed to freely estimate paths not included in the initial model that may be of sound theoretical and empirical importance. MIs indicate the approximate reduction in the likelihood of $\chi^2$ statistic of a given fixed parameter was freed (Kline, 1998, Thompson, 2000). EPCs indicate the unstandardised coefficient that a pathway is likely have if the path were freely estimated. Using MIs and EPCs, paths can be added to the model sequentially – a method termed model building (Byrne, 2001). However, non-significant regression paths can be deleted from the model sequentially thus creating a more parsimonious model. The process of model respecification
whereby non-significant regression paths are removed from the model in the interest of parsimony is termed model trimming.

The initial model included leader and follower attachment anxiety and avoidance regressed onto leader and follower ratings of transformational and transactional leadership, which in turn were regressed onto and leader and follower ratings of extra effort, satisfaction and effectiveness. To account for the dependency of the data (a key assumption of APIM), the leader and follower ratings of each variable in the model were correlated. The initial model demonstrated marginal to good fit, $X^2(34, N = 105) = 56.38$, $p > .001$, CFI = .976; TLI = .935; RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .067. Inspection of the regression weights identified 27 non-significant paths which were subsequently trimmed to create a more parsimonious model. The redundant pathways were deleted sequentially, commencing with the least significant path. The deletion of each pathway was accompanied by the calculation of a chi-square difference test ($\Delta X^2$) to ensure that the omission of each path did not significantly alter the model. The pathway deletions and associated fit for each of these model respecifications are presented in Table 7.2.

The final respecified model presented in Figure 7.1 yielded marginal to good fit, $X^2(50, N = 105) = 77.81$, $p > .001$, CFI = .968; TLI = .951; RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .092. As illustrated in Figure 7.1, leader attachment anxiety was negatively related to leader ratings of transformational leadership ($\beta = -.40$, $p < .001$) and follower ratings of transformational leadership ($\beta = -.60$, $p < .001$). These findings partially support hypotheses 1 and 3 and are consistent with past research (e.g., Popper et al., 2000) suggesting that managers high on attachment anxiety are unlikely to rate themselves as transformational leaders and also unlikely to be rated as transformational by their direct reports (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In line with prior research, the findings of the present study may suggest that anxiously
attached leaders are not perceived as security-enhancing figures that communicate a strong vision to followers, nor are they deemed attentive to the individual needs of their followers – leadership behaviours characteristic of transformational leaders. Furthermore, the results of the present study support the findings of Davidovitz et al. (2007) who found that because anxiously attached leaders are preoccupied with their own competencies and concerns regarding self-efficacy, these individuals are not confident in their own leadership abilities or ability to attend to the needs of followers. In turn, followers do not rate anxiously attached leaders as highly transformational.

Leader attachment anxiety was negatively related to follower ratings of transactional leadership \((\beta = -.58, p < .001)\), partially supporting hypothesis 4. This finding suggests that anxious leaders are not regarded by their followers as task-focused leaders who engage in transactional, reward–for-effort leadership. Moreover, this finding is in line with suggestions by Mayseless (2010) and Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) that anxious leaders are not inclined to concentrate on task-focused management of followers.

Leader attachment avoidance was positively related to leader ratings of transactional leadership \((\beta = .33, p < .001)\) and follower ratings of transactional leadership \((\beta = .20, p < .05)\). These findings partially support hypotheses 2 and 4 and are in line with prior research suggesting that attachment avoidance is associated with task-focused leadership (Popper & Mayseless, 2003; Popper et al., 2000). As Popper et al. (2000) noted, avoidantly attached leaders distance and disengage themselves from others due to their discomfort with closeness, and thus have a preference for transactional behaviours that do not require them to have close contact with team members.
Table 7.2

Fit Indices and $\Delta \chi^2$ for the Respecifications of the Hypothesised Model of Attachment, Leadership and Leadership Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (M1)</td>
<td>56.38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(M2 – M1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implied / Hypothesised model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 (M2)</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(M3 – M2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltransact -&gt; FEE deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 (M3)</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>(M4 – M3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoidance -&gt; Ltransact deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 (M4)</td>
<td>56.44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>(M5 – M4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanxiety -&gt; Ltransact deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5 (M5)</td>
<td>56.64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>(M6 – M5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltransact -&gt; Leffectiveness deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6 (M6)</td>
<td>56.86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>(M7 – M6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanxiety -&gt; Ltransact deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7 (M7)</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>(M8 – M7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanxiety -&gt; Ftransact deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 8 (M8)</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>(M9 – M8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ftransform -&gt; Leffect deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 9 (M9)</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>(M10 – M9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanxiety -&gt; Ltransform deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 10 (M10)</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>(M11 – M10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoid -&gt; Ftransact deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 11 (M11)</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>(M12 – M11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ftransact -&gt; LEE deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 12 (M12)</td>
<td>59.06</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>(M13 – M12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ftransact -&gt; FEE deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 13 (M13)</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>(M14 – M13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoid -&gt; Ltransform deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 14 (M14)</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>(M15 – M14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltransform -&gt; Fsatisfaction deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 15 (M15)</td>
<td>60.80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>(M16 – M15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltransact -&gt; Leffectiveness deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 16 (M16)</td>
<td>61.39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>173.39</td>
<td>-8.19 (M17 – M16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltransform -&gt; Leffectiveness deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Anx or Avoidance</th>
<th>Transform or Transact</th>
<th>Satisfaction or Effect</th>
<th>Extra Effort or Effectiveness</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio</th>
<th>ΔΔLogLikelihood</th>
<th>ΔΔdf</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fanx -&gt; FTransform deleted</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>157.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lavoid -&gt; LTransform deleted</td>
<td>54.07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.14 (M19 – M18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LTransact -&gt; LSatisfaction deleted</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.44 (M20 – M19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FTransact -&gt; LSatisfaction deleted</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.58 (M21 – M20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LTransform -&gt; FEE deleted</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.64 (M22 – M21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LTransact -&gt; LEE deleted</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2.43 (M23 – M22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FTransact -&gt; Leffectiveness deleted</td>
<td>62.30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>154.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LTransact -&gt; FEffectiveness deleted</td>
<td>64.98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>2.97 (M25 – M24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FTransform -&gt; LSatisfaction deleted</td>
<td>67.95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>3.34 (M26 – M25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>FTransform -&gt; LEffect deleted</td>
<td>71.29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>3.12 (M27 – M26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>FTransact -&gt; LEffectiveness deleted</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>3.40 (M28 – M27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lavoid -&gt; FTransform deleted</td>
<td>77.81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 106 dyads. LANx and LAv = leader ratings of their own attachment anxiety and avoidance; LTransform and LTransact = leader self-ratings of the extent to which they display transformational and transactional leadership behaviours; LSat, LEE and LEff = leader self-ratings of the extent to which they lead a satisfied group that exerts extra effort and is effective; FAnx and FAv = follower ratings of their own attachment anxiety and avoidance; FTransform and FTransact = follower ratings of the extent to which their leader displays transformational and transactional leadership behaviours; FSat, FEE and FEffect = follower ratings of the extent to which their leader leads a satisfied group that exerts extra effort and is effective.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 7.1. Final Re-specific Actor-Partner Interdependence Model of Leader and Follower Attachment, Ratings of Leadership and Leadership Outcomes

Note. N = 46. Mav = manager attachment avoidance; Manx = manager attachment anxiety; FformR = follower ratings of their leader’s transformational leadership; FtransactR = follower ratings of their leader’s transactional leadership; FsatisR = follower ratings of satisfaction with leader; FeffectR = follower ratings of perceived leadership effectiveness. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
Furthermore, leaders’ attachment avoidance is thought to be visible to followers through leader’s somewhat cold and distant means of interacting with followers and focusing on task-related aspects workplace projects (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Contrary to expectations however, no significant association was found between leader avoidance and leader ratings of transformational leadership.

Follower attachment avoidance was negatively related to follower ratings of transformational leadership ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$), partially supporting hypothesis 5 and suggesting that avoidantly attached followers do not rate their leader as transformational, regardless of whether the leader is rating themselves as engaging in transformational leadership behaviours. Like avoidantly attached leaders however, avoidant followers are thought to maintain interpersonal distance, engage in excessive self-reliance and desire minimal interference from their leader (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper et al., 2000). Furthermore, avoidant individuals are not attuned to recognising when others are engaging in empathic, caring, close interpersonal behaviours (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Therefore, avoidant followers may not have the capacity to recognise when their leader is engaging in transformational behaviours. Furthermore, avoidantly attached followers may experience discomfort when exposed to relationship-oriented behaviour such as transformational leadership given their preference for instrumental assistance over emotional support (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Karantzas & Cole, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Thus as a means of suppressing this discomfort, avoidantly attached followers may downplay their leader’s engagement in transformational leadership behaviours.

No significant associations were found for follower attachment avoidance and follower ratings of transactional leadership behaviour or follower attachment anxiety and follower ratings of transformational or transactional leadership. As expected, no associations were
found between follower attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance and leader ratings of transformational and transactional leadership.

Leader ratings of transformational leadership were positively related to leader effectiveness ($\beta = .39$, $p < .001$), satisfaction ($\beta = .61$, $p < .001$) and extra effort ($\beta = .58$, $p < .001$), supporting hypothesis 1. Follower ratings of transformational leadership were also positively related to follower ratings of leader effectiveness ($\beta = .90$, $p < .001$), satisfaction ($\beta = .97$, $p < .001$) and extra effort ($\beta = .82$, $p < .001$), supporting hypothesis 3. Follower ratings of transactional leadership were negatively related to ratings of leader satisfaction ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .001$), supporting hypothesis 4. These findings support the wealth of evidence to date that transformational leadership is more effective compared to transactional leadership and indeed a more preferred leadership style by followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Berson et al., 2006; Bycio et al., 1995; Sivanathan & Fekken, 2001). Together, follower ratings of transformational and transactional leadership explained 77% of the variance in follower ratings of leader satisfaction. Leader attachment anxiety and follower attachment avoidance explained 41% the variance in follower ratings of transformational leadership. Leader attachment avoidance and anxiety explained 25% of the variance in follower ratings of transactional leadership.

7.5 Summary

In summary, these results suggest that attachment is linked to leadership behaviour for both leaders and followers. First, the extent to which leaders rate themselves as transformational and transactional is influenced by their self-reported attachment anxiety and avoidance, which in turn, is associated with their perceptions of leadership effectiveness, satisfaction and their perceptions of follower extra effort. Second, followers’ perceptions of leadership behaviour are influence by their own attachment style. In turn, their perceptions
regarding their leader’s behaviour also shapes their perceptions of their leader’s satisfaction, leader effectiveness and a leader’s aptitude to engage followers in extra effort. Therefore, leader and follower attachment clearly shape perceptions regarding leaders’ demonstration of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours.
Chapter 8 – General Discussion

8.1 Overview of Thesis

In this three-study investigation, it has been argued that the study of leader and follower behaviour can be couched within an attachment theory framework (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007; Popper, 2004). In this regard, it has been proposed that principles of attachment theory can be used to understand a leader’s inclination to build close, supportive, nurturing bonds with team members and manage conflicting situational demands – a skill regarded as critical to effective leadership. Whilst researchers have begun exploring the associations between attachment and leadership, research has largely: (a) focused on measuring a leader’s general leadership style and thus approached leadership from a more dispositional rather than interactionist perspective, (b) studies have been primarily undertaken in a military context, and (c) the majority of research has examined the attachment and leadership nexus from the perspective of the leader with less emphasis on follower perspectives. Thus, research has not systematically explored the associations between attachment styles and leader and follower perspectives of leadership across different workplace situations within the corporate sector.

As a result of these limitations in past studies, the broad aim of this thesis was to apply attachment theory to the study of leadership from both leader and follower perspectives. Importantly, the thesis examined the link between attachment and leadership behaviour from an interactionist perspective investigating the effect of individual differences in the form of attachment style, alongside situational factors (i.e., task difficulty, task timeline and follower needs) on leadership behaviour. This broad aim was addressed across three studies – with each study comprising of a more specific aim. The aim of Study 1 was to examine the links between attachment and leadership from the leader perspective under various workplace
situational demands. In contrast, the aim of Study 2 was to examine the associations between attachment and follower perceptions of effective leadership under various workplace situational demands. The aim of Study 3 was to investigate the extent to which leader and follower attachment style is associated with leader and follower perspectives of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness. This study took a dyadic perspective in the study of attachment and leadership. Therefore, Study 3 again examined the association between attachment and leadership from an interactionist perspective, such that perceptions of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness can be regarded as jointly determined by the perspectives of the leader and the follower(s) (Boatwright et al., 2010; Davidovitz et al., 2007; Harms, 2011).

In this chapter, a discussion of the results addressing the overall aims of the thesis across the three empirical studies is presented. The implications of this research for leadership and attachment research are also presented. Furthermore, the strengths, limitations and suggestions for future research are discussed and the chapter concludes with a summary of the major findings.

8.2 Major Findings related to Leadership and Attachment Literature

In Study 1, attachment anxiety was associated with greater fluctuation in leadership behaviour. Specifically, attachment anxiety was positively associated with consideration leadership when the situation did not demand such leadership behaviours (i.e., follower needs were low, the task was easy and the timeline was flexible). Attachment anxiety was negatively associated with consideration when the situation required such leadership (i.e., follower needs were high). Furthermore, attachment anxiety was associated with the endorsement of less structural leadership behaviours under conditions when this form of leadership was required (i.e., the timeline was tight). Negative associations were found
between attachment avoidance and consideration when the task was challenging. Additionally, positive associations were found between attachment avoidance and structure when follower needs were high. In contrast, individuals with a secure attachment (i.e., low attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance) demonstrated the least deviation in the endorsement of consideration and structure leadership across conditions.

The findings of Study 1 support research by Davidovitz et al. (2007) – the only published research to date on leadership and attachment that focused in part on situational aspects of leadership by assessing leadership self-efficacy tendencies in relation to task-focused and relationship-focused situations. Davidovitz et al. demonstrated that attachment insecurities (i.e., attachment anxiety and avoidance) were related to self-focused motives regarding leadership behaviour. In particular, anxiously attached individuals expressed doubt about their ability to lead task-focused situations and avoidantly attached individuals expressed doubt about their ability to lead in relationship-focused situations.

The findings from Study 1 support Davidovitz et al.’s (2007) research that attachment anxiety interferes with the ability to lead in situations requiring attention to follower needs. Specifically, in Study 1, individuals high in attachment anxiety (i.e., anxious or fearfully attached) demonstrated significantly less consideration leadership behaviour when follower needs were high than when they were low. Thus, anxiously attached individuals have the capacity to display consideration leadership, argued by attachment researchers to be driven by a desire to gain closeness to other and fulfil their unmet relationship needs (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). However, the display of this leadership behaviour is mitigated when anxiously attached leaders are forced to genuinely attend to the needs of followers when required – a situation that can heighten self-focused worries and concerns regarding competency to genuinely assist others (Popper et al., 2000). Furthermore, attachment anxiety was found to be associated with the highest endorsement of consideration
leadership even when follower demands were low. This finding supports past claims that anxious individuals may provide support to others during situations when it is not required, as a means to fulfil one’s needs for validation and proximity, despite the fact that such behaviour may be deemed as intrusive or inappropriate by followers who require no assistance (Keller, 2003).

The findings regarding negative associations between avoidance and consideration are consistent with prior research that attachment avoidance is associated with an inclination to maintain interpersonal distance and inability to recognise when others require assistance, thus lead in an empathic, helpful way (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper et al., 2003). Additionally, the findings regarding positive associations between avoidance and structure support research suggesting that avoidant individuals prefer to focus on impersonal, structure, or outcome-oriented leadership instead of offering guidance and assistance in a close, considerate manner even when followers require this form of relationship-oriented leadership (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper et al., 2007).

With regards to secure individuals, findings from Study 1 support the argument that secure individuals are best equipped to balance the use of task-focused and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours dependent on situational requirements. Low attachment anxiety and avoidance was associated with the least deviation or change in leadership across different situations. It can be argued that secure individuals were not as affected by situational demands placed on them compared to anxious individuals who fluctuated greatly in leadership across situations. The current findings suggest that secure leaders have the ability to recognise when the situation requires a relationship-oriented style of leadership due to their tendencies to act in a sensitive and supportive manner to meet the needs of others (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Popper & Mayseless, 2003). Thus, securely attached individuals are well-equipped to occupy the role of a stronger, wiser figure in guiding and helping others (Popper
et al., 2000). Furthermore, given secure people’s sense of self-competency and goal-oriented approach to achievement (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), these individuals have the capacity to foster task-focused behaviour in followers to meet workplace tasks and demands (Mayseless, 2010).

In Study 2, anxious individuals rated a leader as more effective if they demonstrated consideration leadership, avoidant individuals rated structure as most effective and secure individuals were more neutral in their ratings of effective leadership behaviour. With regards to attachment anxiety, this supports the argument that anxious individuals seek to satisfy their own relationship needs through gaining proximity to others, hence believe a leader is effective when they reassure an anxious follower, consider their needs and look after them (i.e., display considerate leadership, Boatwright et al., 2010; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001).

With regards to attachment avoidance, avoidant individuals rated structure leadership behaviours as significantly more effective than secure individuals when the task was challenging and employee needs were high. This finding suggests that avoidant individuals prefer a leader to maintain interpersonal distance and focus on directive, task-focused behaviours even when followers require assistance to problem solve a difficult task. This supports claims made by Shalit et al. (2010) that avoidant individuals desire distant, impersonal, unemotional interactions with a leader and focus mainly on the task and hand.

In line with expectations, results indicated that secure individuals were more balanced in their ratings of leadership effectiveness and did not deviate as greatly as avoidant or anxious followers across ratings of structure leadership. It is assumed that secure people are largely self-sufficient and comfortable delivering a task with minimal leadership intervention (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), yet are also comfortable with, and open to, a leader who wants to build relationships, foster growth and development and offer
help in an empathic manner. Therefore, it can be argued that secure individuals do not require overt displays of structure of consideration leadership dependent on the situation. Instead, secure people are generally comfortable with any style of leadership and therefore do not differ as much in their ratings of effectiveness.

In Study 3, leader anxiety was negatively associated with leader and follower ratings of transformational and transactional leadership. Leader attachment avoidance was positively associated with leader and follower ratings of transactional leadership. In line with suggestions by Popper et al. (2000), these findings indicated that anxious individuals appear hampered in their ability to motivate, coach, guide and transform others and this is in fact recognised by followers as inhibiting the display of transformational leadership. Again, the anxious individual’s preoccupation with themselves interferes with their ability to display transformational leadership behaviours, which is noticed by followers (Mayseless, 2010). Furthermore, attachment anxiety interferes with a leader’s ability to demonstrate transactional leadership, as rated by followers. That is, attachment anxiety also interferes with a leader’s ability to display task-focused leadership with a focus on providing supervision and instruction with minimal input to guide the development of others. Given that anxious individuals are so focused on gaining the acceptance of others, it is expected that they will be seen as unable to drive and monitor task performance, hence rated by followers as less likely to engage in transactional leadership (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

Leader avoidance was positively associated with leader and follower ratings of transactional leadership. These findings support claims made by Mayseless (2010) that avoidant individuals suppress their emotions and consequently ignore their own and others relationship and attachment needs. In Study 3, avoidant leaders rated themselves as more likely to engage in transactional leadership behaviours which include directing, monitoring and instructing others with minimal input required to attend to follower needs. This is not
surprising given that avoidant individuals prefer to rely on themselves and maintain interpersonal distance (Popper et al., 2000; Mayseless 2010). Interestingly, the avoidant leader’s excessive self-reliance was also noticed by followers who rated avoidant leaders as more likely to engage in transactional leadership. Research has suggested that avoidant individuals tend to be insensitive and uncaring towards others’ emotional needs (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Leadership research suggests that avoidant individuals will prefer to focus on the task at hand only in an attempt to maintain tight control and avoid interpersonal closeness (Johnston, 2000). In line with Collins and Feeney (2000), the current findings suggest that avoidant individuals’ preference for task-related behaviours and instrumental outcomes is recognised by followers, hence ratings of transactional leadership.

In terms of leadership outcomes, the findings from Study 3 support past research that leader and follower ratings of transformational leadership are associated with effectiveness, satisfaction and extra effort. A wealth of studies have suggested that transformational leaders are more effective, encourage the exertion of extra effort and lead a group that is more satisfied. Study 3 supported the argument that followers of transformational leaders rate their leader as more effective, are more satisfied and likely to display extra effort. Congruently, transformational leaders also rated themselves as higher on these outcome variables. Interestingly, followers of transactional leaders were significantly less satisfied with their leader supporting research by Sivanathan and Fekken (2001). This finding suggests that a transactional leader’s inclination to direct and monitor other with minimal supervision is not regarded as favourably by followers hence followers are less satisfied.

Findings across the three studies provide support for the argument that attachment security is associated with effective leadership from both the leader and follower perspectives. Where Study 1 provided support for the links between attachment and leadership from a situational perspective, Study 3 also provided evidence of the links between attachment style and
leadership using the full-range leadership model. Both studies provided support for the argument that attachment anxiety would be associated with an inclination to engage in relationship-oriented leadership behaviour, even when followers did not necessarily need a relationship-oriented leader (i.e., needs were low). However, when measuring leadership according to the FRLM, attachment anxiety was negatively associated with transformational leadership. This is interesting given that consideration and transformational leadership are both relationship-oriented by definition.

The findings from Studies 1 and 3 suggest that leaders high on anxiety view themselves less positively than secure individuals and negatively assess their competence to engage in transformational leadership. Research has suggested that anxious individuals rate themselves less positively compared to secure individuals in a number of domains (Brennan & Morris, 1997; Cooper, Shaver, & Collins, 1998). In the current research, anxious individuals were likely focused on their own feelings of self-worth and feelings of inadequacy to believe they could truly engage in the leadership of others. These findings support past research (e.g., Popper et al., 2000) that attachment anxiety interferes with a leader’s ability provide sensitive coaching and guidance, passionately communicate a vision and inspire others (all elements of transformational leader).

Across both studies 1 and 3, attachment avoidance shared consistent positive associations with task-focused leadership, measured in Study 1 as structure leadership and in Study 3 as transactional leadership. Taken together, these findings provide clear evidence that avoidance in close relationships influences an inclination to engage in avoidant leadership behaviours, characterised by predominant focus on the impersonal leadership task at hand (Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).
In examining findings related to the follower, Studies 2 and 3 measured attachment and leadership from the perspective of the follower and parallels can be drawn across both studies. Specifically, as per Study 2, follower attachment shapes follower leadership ratings of effectiveness whereby anxious followers rated relationship-oriented leadership as more effective. Conversely, avoidant followers prefer structure-oriented leadership behaviours.

However, Study 3 expanded the investigation of follower perspectives of leadership beyond follower ratings of effectiveness by focusing on how follower attachment shapes leadership perceptions of leadership. The findings linking leader attachment with follower ratings of leadership provide support for two key arguments. Firstly, leader anxiety was negatively associated with transformational leadership from both the leader and follower perspectives. This indicates that leaders and followers both agreed that attachment anxiety was negatively associated with transformational leadership. It can be argued that anxious leaders were obvious in their inability to display transformational leadership as it was recognised by the leaders and the followers. Similar results were found for leader avoidance in that both self-ratings and follower ratings of leadership avoidance were positively associated with transactional leadership indicating congruence in the effects of leader attachment on leader and follower ratings of leadership. Secondly, leadership is in the eye of the beholder in that followers recognise how attachment insecurities affect the display of certain leadership behaviours which in turn have consequences for important outcomes associated with follower performance.

Davidovitz et al. (2007) provided support for how follower attachment shapes ratings of leadership, specifically noting that leaders who scored high on attachment avoidance were rated by followers as less socialised in their leadership and less able to lead emotion-focused situations. Leaders who scored high on attachment anxiety were rated by followers as exhibiting more personalised leadership and less able to lead task-focused situations.
Furthermore, Davidovitz et al. found that followers’ attachment avoidance was associated with negative appraisals of their leader’s personalised leadership and negative assessments of their leader’s ability to lead in task-focused and emotion-focused situations. Davidovitz et al. alluded to the notion that leadership is in the eye of the beholder in that follower avoidance was associated with poorer ratings of their leader. However, the findings of this thesis provide further evidence of what followers actually regard as effective leadership and how attachment shapes perceptions of ideal leadership behaviour.

8.3 Strengths of Current Investigation

The current findings significantly contribute to the attachment and leadership literature in a number of ways. First, this three-study investigation provides strong support for the application of attachment theory to understand leader and follower perspectives of leadership. A number of researchers have suggested that couching leadership research within a broader framework of how individuals relate to each other could assist researchers identify and interpret the patterns of interpersonal relationships between the leader and follower (Bresnahan & Mitroff, 2007; Popper, 2004). The current findings provide evidence that a leader’s relationship history, as determined by attachment style, influences relationship-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour as perceived by both the leader and follower. Furthermore, follower attachment style is an important individual difference variable shaping how followers regard leadership within the leader-follower dyad.

Second, the current investigation was the first attempt to examine attachment and leadership across multiple conceptualisations of leadership (i.e., situational leadership and the FRLM which draws on elements of dispositional and situational frameworks of leadership). That is, the current study highlights how attachment shapes leadership across different but
nevertheless related conceptualisations of leadership (i.e., a leader’s ability to manage various situational demands and also engage in transformational leadership).

Third, the use of dependent data in Study 3 allowed for the investigation of actor-partner effects. Given that the leader-follower interaction is classified as an interdependent relationship (Dansereau et al., 1982; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), it is important to examine how the personal characteristics of each dyad member impacts on the self and other ratings regarding behaviour and related outcomes. Despite this, the majority of studies in the leadership arena have either investigated leaders or followers (Harms, 2011). As noted by Harms, unless the perceptions and behaviours of both leaders and followers are mutually considered, then research into the study of leadership remains incomplete. Thus, Study 3 was an attempt to capture the interdependent nature of leader-follower relations.

8.4 Limitations

There were a number of limitations with the present investigation that need to be considered when interpreting the findings of the present investigation. Firstly, the vignettes presented in Studies 1 and 2 to assess the ways in which leaders manage situational variables were hypothetical workplace situations. Whilst attempts were made to ensure the vignettes reflected real situations and were piloted with a small sample, some participants may have questioned the authenticity of the vignettes and not fully embraced the character of a ‘leader’ or ‘follower’ when responding to the leadership items. Furthermore, leadership behaviour was not directly observed; instead self-report data was collected measuring what participants would perceive as effective under various contextual manipulations. Furthermore, the manipulation of follower needs may have been interpreted as a manipulation of task difficulty. For instance, the excerpt from the high follower needs condition in Study 1 read… “two of the team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to
carry out the detailed auditing process. You overhear these two employees express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.” Thus while there is an emphasis on follower needs, the manipulation of followers anxiety and concerns regarding their competencies are couched within the task. Future studies should ensure that situational manipulations are treated as mutually exclusive to minimise such ambiguity. Furthermore, as a means around such methodological issues, future studies could be conducted in an organisational context such that leaders and followers can reflect on actual workplace situations in which various contextual demands can be recalled that may have influenced perceptions of leadership effectiveness and the role of attachment style across these contexts. An additional limitation of Studies 1 and 2 was the increased chance of a false positive result in the interpretation of significant interactions. Future research should aim to replicate the experimental designs of Studies 1 and 2, thus reducing the likelihood of reporting a false positive result.

In reviewing the results of Studies 1 and 2, interestingly the biggest effects were for the weakest situations, i.e., individual differences (as measured by attachment orientation) were more predictive when situations were less constraining, that is timeline was flexible, the task was easy and employee needs were low. These findings may be explained by Mischel’s (1977) research on the role of individual differences across strong and weak contexts. Specifically, Mischel noted that strong situations (i.e., where performance pressure is high), limit the extent to which individual performance can be attributed to individual differences (i.e., personality), and he referred to trait consistency as a personality characteristic associated with prototypic behaviours across various contexts.

Secondly, in Study 3, the model fit was modest and therefore there is a need to replicate the model with a larger sample to validate the relationships between leader and follower attachment, leadership behaviour and related outcomes. Furthermore, causation cannot be
inferred or established as the APIM was based on cross-sectional data. Longitudinal studies are likely to provide a clearer sense of how attachment influences perceptions leadership behaviour over time for both leaders and followers.

Thirdly, the measures used in Studies 1 and 2 were self-report measures and therefore response bias effects such as social desirability or common method variance may have been a factor in participants’ responses (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). A multi-method approach was employed in Study 3 (i.e., collecting data from both the leader and follower perspectives) and future studies may wish to include either observer ratings or interview-based assessments in addition to self-report, thereby providing a multi-method approach to the study of leadership.

Finally, the effect of personality factors and other individual difference variables (e.g., emotional intelligence) was not controlled for to understand if attachment explains variance above and beyond other psychological variables that are increasingly found to be associated with leadership behaviour (Bono & Judge, 2004). While this study had a specific focus on attachment, it is important for future studies to include these emerging individual difference variables alongside attachment style, to determine the relative contribution of these variables to leadership behaviour.

8.5 Implications and Directions for Future Research

The findings from the present study have theoretical and practical implications for understanding how attachment style and situational factors influence perceptions of leadership behaviour in the workplace. As this investigation has demonstrated, attachment style plays a role in shaping leadership behaviour however, attachment style is not considered as a measure of interest by organisations in informing targeted approaches to the
development of leaders. This is partially because the application of attachment theory to the
study of leadership is still in its infancy and more empirical evidence is required to
substantiate claims that attachment predicts leadership above and beyond other widely
assessed personality measures. However, the findings of the present study highlight that
examining the individual difference variables related to relationship functioning, such as
attachment style, is likely to provide valuable insights into how to best tailor the development
of leaders in the workplace.

Furthermore, in terms of leadership development, attachment theory may provide a
complimentary framework to existing leadership models such as the FRLM, in which to
couch leaders in how to work with followers who exhibit different attachment styles. For
instance, while relationship-oriented leadership behaviours may be effective in promoting
positive outcomes for followers generally, an attachment theory framework suggests that
followers with an avoidant attachment may be better served by leadership that is task-focused
(even when follower socio-emotional needs are high). Avoidant individuals’ excessive self-
reliance and discomfort with closeness means that relationship-oriented leadership is unlikely
to be responded to in a positive manner. Thus task-focused leadership may be of greater
benefit to these individuals as it minimises emotional closeness, and rewards followers’
efforts for their achievements. Similarly, integrating an attachment theory perspective as part
of leadership training may also alert leaders as to how their attachment style influences their
leadership behaviour across various workplace contexts. This information can then be used
as part of the leadership development plans derived for leaders to ensure that they engage in
leadership that is both authentic and effective in the contexts in which they are asked to
undertake leadership roles (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Luthans, Norman, & Hughes, 2006).

A key strength of Study 3 was the use of dependent data allowing for the analysis of actor-
partner effects. Future research should continue to take a dyadic approach to the study of
leadership. Research to date has largely taken an ‘either/or’ approach to the study of leadership, with studies focusing either on the reports of leaders or the reports of followers. Future research would be well placed to continue to probe the interdependent nature of leader follower relations. Moreover, future dyadic studies into the association between attachment and leadership can focus on how similarities and differences between the attachment styles of leaders and followers influences leader-follower workplace interactions. Keller and colleagues (Keller, 1999; Keller, 2003; Keller & Cacioppe, 2001) propose theoretical assumptions regarding the degree to which similarity between leaders and followers’ attachment styles are likely to influence leader and follower interactions and workplace outcomes. According to Keller and colleagues, it is assumed a secure leader paired with a secure follower is likely to result in a dyadic characterised by high quality workplace relations and effectiveness. Specifically, Keller and Cacioppe (2001) and Keller (2003) argued for the importance of studying leaders and followers’ attachment styles given the compatibility issues that could arise if leaders and followers harbour different expectations about how relationships should function, as predicted by their attachment style. The researchers noted that a secure leader trying to build a relationship with an anxious follower may become overwhelmed with the follower's incessant need for attention and reassurance of worth (Keller & Cacioppe, 2003). Thus, the secure leader may come to view this follower as a burden and withdraw further emotional support. Likewise, a secure leader trying to build a relationship with an avoidant follower may become frustrated by the follower's cool self-reliance (Keller & Cacioppe, 2003). Accordingly, the secure leader may intensify his or her efforts to win over this follower.

Whilst Keller’s research is appealing from a theoretical perspective, its application to the workplace may not be practical given the low likelihood of ideal attachment pairings between leaders and followers. Furthermore, the practicality of matching leader and follower
attachment is an issue given that not all employees in an organisation are securely attached. However, investigation of workplace outcomes and job performance associated with different attachment pairings of leaders and followers provides for a very interesting area for future research that may have further implications for leadership training and development.

8.6 Conclusion

In this investigation, leadership and follower behaviour across situational contingencies and the FRLM were studied from an attachment theory perspective. Very little research had examined the influence of attachment on leader and follower behaviour across experimental manipulations in a corporate context. Additionally, few studies had adopted a dyadic approach to the study of leadership with equal emphasis on predictors of leader and follower behaviour from a relationships perspective. Therefore, this thesis examined the associations between attachment anxiety and avoidance and the use of task-focused and person-oriented leadership behaviours across various workplace situations that vary in terms of workplace demands (Study 1). In Study 2, the associations between follower’s attachment style and their perceptions of the effectiveness of task-focused and person-oriented leadership behaviours across workplace situations that vary in terms of workplace demands were studied. In Study 3, the extent to which leader and follower attachment style was associated with leader and follower perspectives of leadership behaviour and leadership effectiveness was examined as part of a dyadic model. Findings from Study 1 provided general support for the argument that attachment anxiety interferes with a leader’s ability to enact consideration leadership when the situation requires a focus on follower needs. Attachment security (i.e., low attachment anxiety and low attachment avoidance) was associated with the least deviation in the endorsement of leadership behaviour across situational manipulations,
reflecting a balance of both structure and consideration leadership across situational demands. Attachment avoidance was associated with the endorsement of structure leadership.

Findings from Study 2 provided further support for the association between attachment anxiety and considerate leadership and attachment avoidance and structure leadership, but from the follower perspective. The findings suggest that anxiously attached followers regard leaders displaying considerate leadership as most effective, whereas avoidantly attached followers regard leadership displaying structure leadership as most effective in situations when follower needs are high and the task is difficult. Attachment security was associated with largely equal endorsement of structure and consideration leadership as effective. Findings from Study 3 provided evidence that attachment anxiety is negatively related to leader and follower ratings of transformational leadership whereas attachment avoidance is positively related to leader and follower ratings of transactional leadership. These forms of leadership were, in turn, associated with outcomes regarding leadership effectiveness, satisfaction and extra effort.

Taken together, the studies that comprise this investigation provide support for the application of attachment theory to the study of leadership and builds on prior research conducted largely in a military context. However, this study extends on past research by taking an interactionist approach to the study of attachment and leadership, and examines this nexus from both the leader and follower perspectives. Therefore, the findings have applicability regarding the development and training of leaders in a commercial environment, highlighting the benefits of examining effective leadership through the lens of a relationships framework and emphasising the complexity of skilled leadership by emphasising an interactionist perspective.
Appendix A1

Vignettes - Study 1

Instructions: Please take a moment to read the scenario below. While reading the scenario, please imagine yourself in the situation described.

Vignette 1

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

Your team members must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their findings to you in a detailed document which you will review before handing over this document to the CEO of Starmoney Finances. The team have approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project and you are happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). You are more focused on the quality of the work rather than your team producing a lower standard document by the completion date.

However despite this flexible timeline, two of the team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. You overhear these two employees express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.

Vignette 2

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

Your team members must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their findings to you in a detailed document which you will review before handing over this document to the CEO of Starmoney Finances. The team have approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project and you are happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). You are more focused on the quality of the work rather than your team producing a lower standard document by the completion date.

Your team seems to be progressing well. All team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting
formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.

Vignette 3

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of one client company.

Team members simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has approximately a week to complete this straightforward project however you are happy for the team leader to take an extra week if need be. You are more focused on the quality of the work rather than your team producing a lower standard document by the completion date.

However, despite the flexible timeline and apparent ease of the task, two team members are having serious problems with the project. They cannot grasp the simple accounting calculations and are spending large amounts of time on basic computer formatting matters. These two team members are having great difficulty understanding the basics of the project thus are not contributing much to the task.

Vignette 4

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of one client company.

Team members simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has approximately a week to complete this straightforward project however you are happy for the team leader to take an extra week if need be. You are more focused on the quality of the work rather than your team producing a lower standard document by the completion date.

The team seems to be progressing well. All team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.

Vignette 5

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.
Your team members must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their findings to you in a detailed document which you will review before handing over this document to the CEO of Starmoney Finances.

The team only have three weeks to complete this challenging project. This deadline is non-negotiable. They must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three weeks as you have a phone meeting with the clients on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

However, an issue are arisen within the team. Two of the team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. You overhear these two employees express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.

Vignette 6

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

Your team members must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis to each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their findings to you in a detailed document which you will review before handing over this document to the CEO of Starmoney Finances.

The team only have three weeks to complete this challenging project. This deadline is non-negotiable. They must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three weeks as you have a phone meeting with the clients on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

Your team seems to be progressing well. All team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.

Vignette 7

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of one client company.
Team members simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has three days to complete this straightforward project. This deadline is non-negotiable. They must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three days as you have a phone meeting with the client on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete. However, despite the apparent ease of the task, two team members are having serious problems with the project. They cannot grasp the simple accounting calculations and are spending large amounts of time on basic computer formatting matters. These two team members are having great difficulty understanding the basics of the project thus are not contributing much to the task.

**Vignette 8**

You are employed as a senior finance manager in Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. You lead a team of six employees who are currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of one client company.

Team members simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has three days to complete this straightforward project. This deadline is non-negotiable. They must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three days as you have a phone meeting with the client on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete. Your team seems to be progressing well.

All team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.
Appendix A2

Vignettes - Study 2

Instructions: Please take a moment to read the scenario below. While reading the scenario, please imagine yourself in the situation described.

Vignette 1

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

The team must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their final report to the senior finance manager. Your team has approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project, and your manager is happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). S/he is more focused on the quality of the work rather than producing a document of poorer quality by the completion date.

However, despite this flexible timeline, two of your fellow team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. Furthermore, the senior finance manager to whom you report, overheard your team members express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.

Vignette 2

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

The team must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their final report to the senior finance manager. Your team has approximately 2 months to complete this challenging project, and your manager is happy for the team to take extra time if needed (i.e., one week). S/he is more focused on the quality of the work rather than producing a document of poorer quality by the completion date.
The team seems to be progressing well. Your fellow team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.

Vignette 3

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditure of one client.

Your team simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has approximately a week to complete this straightforward project however your manager is happy for the team to take an extra week if need be. S/he is more focused on the quality of the work rather than producing a document of poorer quality by the completion date.

However, despite the flexible timeline and apparent ease of the task, two team members are having serious problems with the project. They cannot grasp the simple accounting calculations and are spending large amounts of time on basic computer formatting matters. These two team members are having great difficulty understanding the basics of the project thus are not contributing much to the task.

Vignette 4

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditure of one client.

Your team simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. The team has approximately a week to complete this straightforward project however your manager is happy for the team to take an extra week if need be. S/he is more focused on the quality of the work rather than the team producing a lower standard document by the completion date.

You and your fellow team members seem to be progressing well. Your fellow team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.
Vignette 5

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

The team must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their final report to the senior finance manager. Your team only have three weeks to complete this challenging project. This deadline is non-negotiable. You must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three weeks as your manager has a phone meeting with the clients on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

However, an issue are arisen within the team. Two of your fellow team members are stressed and appear highly concerned about their ability to carry out the detailed auditing process. Furthermore, the senior finance manager to whom you report overheard your fellow team members express their high level of anxiety over the project in the tearoom.

Vignette 6

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditures of ten client companies.

The team must obtain financial records of each client and reconcile these records with bank statements and financial reports. Additionally, the team must present a forecast analysis for each client detailing factors that may affect future financial performance.

The team must then present their final report to the senior finance manager. Your team only have three weeks to complete this challenging project. This deadline is non-negotiable. You must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three weeks as your manager has a phone meeting with the clients on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

You and your fellow team members seem to be progressing well. All team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.
**Vignette 7**

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditure of one client.

Your team simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. Your team has three days to complete this straightforward project. This deadline is non-negotiable. You must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three days as your manager has a phone meeting with the client on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

However, despite the apparent ease of the task, two team members are having serious problems with the project. They cannot grasp the simple accounting calculations and are spending large amounts of time on basic computer formatting matters. These two team members are having great difficulty understanding the basics of the project thus are not contributing much to the task.

**Vignette 8**

You work in a team of six accountants at Starmoney Finances, a large-scale Australian accounting firm. Your team is currently working on a project which involves investigating the expenditure of one client.

Your team simply have to spend a couple of days with the client going over their financial records and then enter the client's expenses into the IT system. Your team has three days to complete this straightforward project. This deadline is non-negotiable. You must have the work done by close of business Thursday in three days as your manager has a phone meeting with the client on the Friday morning to let them know the audit is complete. This meeting cannot be rescheduled therefore there is no option but for the audit to be complete.

You and your fellow team members appear competent with the auditing process, entering the data into the computer system and using the correct accounting formulas. None of the team members appear distressed or concerned with the task at hand. One team member was a little bit worried with the technical side of things however another team member helped him out and now everyone is working well together.
Appendix A3

Background Information Questionnaire

**Studies 1 and 2**

1. Gender: M or F
2. Age in years:
3. Occupation
4. Educational level
5. Birth country:

**Study 3**

1. Gender: M or F
2. Age in years:
3. Educational level
4. Birth country:
5. Employed in a managerial (M) or non-managerial (NM) role: M or NM
6. If responded ‘M’ to Questions 5, how many employees do you manage?
7. If responded ‘M’ to Question 5, how long have you been in a managerial position?
8. Please provide your employee number. All information will remain in the confidential possession of the researcher on a secure password protected server. You will not be identified – the purposes of obtaining an employee number is to draw comparisons across different levels of management and staff.
Appendix A4

Attachment Style Questionnaire – Short Form (ASQ – SF, Karantzas et al., 2010)

Instructions:

Show how much you agree with each of the following items by rating them on the following scale: 1 = totally disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = slightly disagree; 4 = slightly agree; 5 = strongly agree; 6 = totally agree.

1. I feel confident that other people will be there for me when I need them.
2. I prefer to depend on myself rather than other people.
3. I prefer to keep to myself.
4. Achieving things is more important than building relationships.
5. Doing your best is more important than getting on with others.
6. If you’ve got a job to do, you should do it no matter who get hurt.
7. It’s important to me that others like me.
8. I find it hard to make a decision unless I know what other people think.
9. My relationships with others are generally superficial.
10. Sometimes I think I am no good at all.
11. I find it hard to trust other people.
12. I find it difficult to depend on others.
13. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
14. I find it relatively easy to get close to other people.
15. I find it easy to trust others.
16. I feel comfortable depending on other people.
17. I worry that others won’t care about me as much as I should care about them.
18. I worry about people getting too close.
19. I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.
20. I have mixed feelings about being close to others.
21. I wonder why people would want to be involved with me.
22. I worry a lot about my relationships.
23. I wonder how I would cope without someone to love me.
24. I feel confident about relating to others.
25. I often feel left out or alone.
26. I often worry that I do not really fit in with other people.
27. Often people have their own problems so I don’t bother them with mine.
28. If something is bothering me, others are generally aware and concerned.
29. I am confident that other people will like and respect me.
Appendix A5

Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ-XII, Fleishman, 1957; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill, 1957, 1962)

Modified for Study 1

Instructions:

Given the situation you have just read, think of how you would respond to this scenario as team leader. In doing so, please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the following scale 1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. In this situation, I would accept delays without becoming upset
2. In this situation, I would be able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty
3. In this situation, I would wait just so long, then blow up
4. In this situation, I would let group members know what is expected of them
5. In this situation, I would encourage the use of uniform procedures
6. In this situation, I would make my attitudes clear to the group
7. In this situation, I would decide what should be done and how it should be done
8. In this situation, I would assign group members to particular tasks
9. In this situation, I would make sure that my part in the group is understood by the group members
10. In this situation, I would maintain definite standards of performance
11. In this situation, I would ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations
12. In this situation, I would permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems
13. In this situation, I would encourage initiative in the group members
14. In this situation, I would let members do their work the way they think best
15. In this situation, I would assign the task, then let the members handle it
16. In this situation, I would be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action
17. In this situation, I would allow the group a high degree of initiative
18. In this situation, I would trust the members to exercise good judgement
19. In this situation, I would permit the group to set its own pace
20. In this situation, I would be friendly and approachable
21. In this situation, I would do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group
22. In this situation, I would make suggestions made by the group into operation
23. In this situation, I would treat all group members as equals
24. In this situation, I would keep to myself
25. In this situation, I would look out for the personal welfare of group members
26. In this situation, I would act without consulting the group
27. In this situation, I would encourage overtime work
28. In this situation, I would needle members for greater effort
29. In this situation, I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace
30. In this situation, I would push for increased production
31. In this situation, I would ask the members to work harder
32. In this situation, I would keep the group working up to capacity
33. In this situation, I would keep the group working together as a team
34. In this situation, I would settle conflicts when they occur in the group
35. In this situation, I would see to it that the work of the group is coordinated
36. In this situation, I would help group members settle their differences
37. In this situation, I would maintain a closely knit group
Appendix A6

Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ-XII, Fleishman, 1957; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill, 1957, 1962)

Modified for Study 2

Instructions:

Given the situation you have just read and imagined yourself in, please decide how effective you would rate the senior finance manager to whom your team reports if s/he engaged in the following behaviours. Please rate the effectiveness of these behaviours on a scale of 1-5 where 1 = very ineffective and 5 = very effective.

1. In this situation, your leader accepts delays without becoming upset.
2. In this situation, your leader tolerates postponement and uncertainty.
3. In this situation, your leader waits just so long then blows up.
4. In this situation, your leader lets team members know what is expected of them.
5. In this situation, your leader encourages the use of uniform procedures.
6. In this situation, the leader makes her/his attitudes clear to the group.
7. In this situation, the leader decides what should be done and how it should be done.
8. In this situation, the leader assigns group members to particular tasks.
9. In this situation, the leader makes sure that her/his part in the team as a manager is understood by the team members.
10. In this situation, the leader maintains definite standards of performance.
11. In this situation, the leader asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
12. In this situation, the leader permits the members to use their own judgement in solving problems.
13. In this situation, the leader encourages initiative in the group members.
14. In this situation, the leader lets members do their work the way they think best.
15. In this situation, the leader assigns the task, and then lets the members handle it.
16. In this situation, the leader is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.
17. In this situation, the leader allows the group a high degree of initiative.
18. In this situation, the leader trusts the members to exercise good judgement.
19. In this situation, the leader permits the group to set its own pace.
20. In this situation, the leader is friendly and approachable.
21. In this situation, the leader does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
22. In this situation, the leader puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
23. In this situation, the leader treats all group members as equals.
24. In this situation, the leader keeps to herself/himself.
25. In this situation, the leader looks out for the personal welfare of group members.
26. In this situation, the leader acts without consulting the group.
27. In this situation, the leader encourages overtime work.
28. In this situation, the leader needles members for greater effort.
29. In this situation, the leader keeps the work moving at a rapid pace.
30. In this situation, the leader pushes for increased production.
31. In this situation, the leader asks the members to work harder.
32. In this situation, the leader keeps the group working up to capacity.
33. In this situation, the leader keeps the group working together as a team.
34. In this situation, the leader settles conflicts when they occur in the group.
35. In this situation, the leader sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated.
36. In this situation, the leader helps group members settle their differences.
37. In this situation, the leader maintains a closely knit group.
Appendix A7

Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1995)

Presentation of this measure was excluded in accordance with Mindgarden Pty Ltd Copyright Laws
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Invitation Emails and Letters

Study 1

Dear potential research participant,

My name is Marcele De Sanctis and I am currently completing my Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at Deakin University. My research is being supervised by Dr. Gery Karantzas, a lecturer at Deakin University.

The purpose of this project is to investigate leadership. Specifically, we are examining whether people differ in the types of leadership behaviours displayed across varying hypothetical workplace situations. This research will provide information on the factors that promote good leadership across a variety of contexts in society.

You are invited to participate in this research. If you agree to participate, you will be required to complete an online survey. The online survey includes items asking you about how you interact with others. You will also be asked to read a short scenario and then asked to rate the types of leadership behaviours you would enact in the context of the scenario you have read. The online questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete and can be accessed at http://www.deakin.edu.au/psychology/research/situationalleadership. To participate in this research, you must be over 18 years.

If you decide to participate in the research you will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time while answering the questionnaire and your data will not be recorded. However, once you submit your responses, you have consented to be part of the research because participation is anonymous and therefore the researchers cannot identify your individual answers. All data remains confidential and participation is voluntary.

A summary of the research findings will be available from the researchers following data analysis. Your individual responses will not be identified in the report as only the responses of the group will be reported. It is possible that the findings may be presented in a journal publication; however only group data will be presented therefore your individual responses will not be made public.

We would greatly appreciate your assistance in this valuable research. If you have any enquiries, you may contact either me via email (mde@deakin.edu.au) or Gery Karantzas (geryk@deakin.edu.au) or phone (03) 9244 6959.

Yours faithfully,

Marcele De Sanctis                                      Gery Karantzas
Study 2

Dear potential research participant,

My name is Marcele De Sanctis and I am currently completing my Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at Deakin University. My research is being supervised by Dr. Gery Karantzas, a lecturer at Deakin University.

The purpose of this project is to investigate how people rate different leadership behaviours. Specifically, we are examining whether people differ in their ratings of effective leadership across varying hypothetical workplace situations. This research will provide information on the factors that promote good leadership across a variety of contexts in society.

You are invited to participate in this research. If you agree to participate, you will be required to complete an online survey. The online survey includes items asking you about how you interact with others. You will also be asked to read a short scenario and then asked to rate how effective a series of leadership behaviours are in the context of the scenario you have read. The online questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete and can be accessed at http://www.deakin.edu.au/psychology/research/situationalleadership. To participate in this research, you must be over 18 years.

If you decide to participate in the research you will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time while answering the questionnaire and your data will not be recorded. However, once you submit your responses, you have consented to be part of the research because participation is anonymous and therefore the researchers cannot identify your individual answers. All data remains confidential and participation is voluntary.

A summary of the research findings will be available from the researchers following data analysis. Your individual responses will not be identified in the report as only the responses of the group will be reported. It is possible that the findings may be presented in a journal publication; however only group data will be presented therefore your individual responses will not be made public.

We would greatly appreciate your assistance in this valuable research. If you have any enquiries, you may contact either me via email (mde@deakin.edu.au) or Gery Karantzas (geryk@deakin.edu.au) or phone (03) 9244 6959.

Yours faithfully,

Marcele De Sanctis          Gery Karantzas
Study 3

Dear [name of organisation],

We are writing to you in the hope that you can assist us with an important research project that is being conducted in fulfillment of the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Deakin University. This project will investigate the extent to which leaders interpersonal relationship behaviours predict their ability to motivate, inspire, support, intellectually stimulate and develop relationships with individuals in a non-managerial role. The research is being conducted by Gery Karantzas and Marcele De Sanctis of Deakin University.

While research has examined a multitude of positive consequences of leadership (for example employee satisfaction, motivation, leadership satisfaction and organisational commitment), less in known about the antecedents predicting an individual’s ability to engage in transformational leadership behaviours including motivating, inspiring and intellectually stimulating employees. In addition, very little work has been done applying a relationship theory to the transformational leadership field despite the fact that a key characteristic of transformational leaders is their ability to emotionally relate to and understand their employees.

Therefore in order to improve the efficacy of existing transformational leadership packages thus potentially enhancing employee performance and organisational effectiveness, it is imperative to understand what drives transformational leadership behaviours.

It is hoped that [insert organisation name] may assist in the recruitment of upper level/senior managers and employees to take part in this important study. Should [insert organization name] be willing to assist in the study, both the organisation and the research participants will be provided with detailed feedback regarding the study findings. Both employees and managers will be required to complete a computer questionnaire which will take approximately 20 minutes. For managers, questions will be asked determining attachment orientation and leadership style. For employees, questions will be asked relating to attachment and ratings of their leader’s behaviour. The computer questionnaire will be accessed via a URL address with the results being anonymously submitted to a secure database in the School of Psychology at Deakin University. It can be completed where internet access is attainable. The researcher will not disclose any identifiable information from the responses of employees and managers to either party or the organisation.

All information will be treated as strictly confidential and participants will participate anonymously. Participants will be free to withdraw from the study at any time and any information obtained will not be used.

We would greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the potential involvement of [insert organisation name] in this research project. If you have any inquiries, you may contact either Gery Karantzas or Marcele De Sanctis on the contact details listed above.

We look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

Marcele De Sanctis                                      Gery Karantzas
Appendix A9

Plain Language Statements

Study 1

1. Your Consent

You are invited to take part in this research project.

This Plain Language Statement contains detailed information about the research project. Its purpose is to explain to you as openly and clearly as possible all the procedures involved in this project so that you can make a fully informed decision whether you are going to participate.

Please read this Plain Language Statement carefully. Feel free to ask questions about any information in the document. You may also wish to discuss the project with a relative or friend or your local health worker. Feel free to do this.

Once you understand what the project is about and if you agree to take part in it, you will be asked whether you agree or disagree with the Plain Language Statement. Due to the online administration of the questionnaire, if you agree you will be directed to the start of the questionnaire. It is not applicable to sign a Consent Form as your consent is implied once you submit your questionnaire responses. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time in which case your responses will not be submitted. By agreeing to the Plain Language Statement, completing the questionnaire and submitting your responses online to the secure Deakin server, you indicate that you understand the information and that you give your consent to participate in the research project.

2. Purpose and Background

The purpose of this project is to investigate how people’s interactions with others predict leadership behaviours. Specifically, we are examining whether people are likely to use different leadership behaviours in different situations. This research is being completed in partial fulfilment of the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Deakin University. This research will provide information on the factors that promote good leadership across a variety of contexts in society.

A total of 400 people will participate in this project.

Previous experience has shown that managers and leaders in the workplace may engage in different behaviours depending on the situation they are working in. For example, research has suggested that some managers may be more inclined to take the time to teach team members a task if it is very challenging. However, research has not examined why people may be able to use different leadership behaviours in different situations. Therefore, this
research is important because it will expand on the current leadership literature in explaining why some people use different leadership behaviours compared to others.

The results of this research may be used to help researcher Marcele De Sanctis to obtain a Doctor of Philosophy degree.

3. Funding

This research is totally funded by Deakin University.

4. Procedures

Participation in this project will involve spending 10-15 minutes completing an online questionnaire accessible from any location with internet access. Potential participants will be given a copy of this Plain Language Statement with the URL address from which the questionnaire can be accessed. The online questionnaire can be accessed from http://www.deakin.edu.au/psychology/research/management.

Once participants read this Plain Language Statement and access the URL, they will see a copy of this Plain Language Statement on the internet and then be able to click whether they ‘agree’ with the statement. Upon clicking the link, participants will be transferred to the online questionnaire. Participants can then complete the questionnaire items and submit their responses to a secure password protected Deakin web server. Gery Karantzas and Marcele De Sanctis will be monitoring the web server to determine how many participants have taken part thus determine the conclusion of data collection.

5. Possible Benefits

Participation in this research is voluntary and we cannot guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this project. However, participants may find the content of the research interesting in their everyday work environments.

6. Possible Risks

- It is unlikely that you will experience any psychological pain or discomfort as a result of taking part in this study, however in the event that you experience emotional discomfort during or after the completion of the questionnaire you are encouraged to contact either a counselling service or Lifeline on 13 11 14.

7. Privacy, Confidentiality and Disclosure of Information

- Any data you supply will be stored on a secure password protected computer and locked cabinet at Deakin University for a minimum of six years from the date of the research publication. Your responses will not be identified as research participation is anonymous.

8. Results of Project

- It is possible that the results of the study may be published in a scientific journal however individual responses will not be identifiable as only group data will be submitted. A summary of the major findings will be available in December, 2010.
If you would like a summary of the results, please contact the student researcher, Marcele De Sanctis on mde@deakin.edu.au.

9. Participation is Voluntary

Participation in any research project is voluntary. If you do not wish to take part you are not obliged to. If you decide to take part and later change your mind, you are free to withdraw from the project at any stage in which event your participation in the research will immediately cease and any information obtained by you will not be used. However, you must be aware that because the online questionnaire is anonymous, you will not be able to withdraw once you have submitted your responses.

Your decision whether to take part or not to take part, or to take part and then withdraw, will not affect your relationship with Deakin University nor with the researchers conducting this project. You are not obliged or required in any way to participate.

Before you make your decision, a member of the research team will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project. You can ask for any information you want. Register your consent by agreeing to the Plain Language Statement and completing the questionnaire only after you have had a chance to ask your questions and have received satisfactory answers.

10. Ethical Guidelines

This project will be carried out according to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) produced by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies.

The ethics aspects of this research project have been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Deakin University.

11. Complaints

If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact Secretary HEAG-H, Deans Office, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, VIC, 3125, Telephone (03) 9251 7174, Email hbs.research@deakin.edu.au.

Please quote project number HEAG-H 101_08: Attachment and the manipulation of leadership.

12. Reimbursement for your costs

You will not be paid for your participation in this project.

13. Further Information, Queries or Any Problems

If you require further information, wish to withdraw your participation or if you have any problems concerning this project (for example, any side effects), you can contact the principal researcher or the student researcher. The researchers responsible for this project are:
Study 2

1. Your Consent

You are invited to take part in this research project.

This Plain Language Statement contains detailed information about the research project. Its purpose is to explain to you as openly and clearly as possible all the procedures involved in this project so that you can make a fully informed decision whether you are going to participate.

Please read this Plain Language Statement carefully. Feel free to ask questions about any information in the document. You may also wish to discuss the project with a relative or friend or your local health worker. Feel free to do this.

Once you understand what the project is about and if you agree to take part in it, you will have the opportunity to voluntarily complete the study and submit your responses. By submitting your responses, you indicate that you understand the information and that you give your consent to participate in the research project. Due to the anonymous nature of the questionnaire, you will not be able to withdraw from the study once your responses have been submitted. Your consent to take part is implied once you have submitted your responses to the questionnaire. You can print a copy of the Plain Language Statement for your records.

2. Purpose and Background

The purpose of this project is to investigate how people rate different leadership behaviours. Specifically, we are examining whether people differ in their ratings of effective leadership across varying hypothetical workplace situations. Marcele De Sanctis is completing her Doctor of Philosophy at Deakin University and this research is being completed in fulfilment of the thesis requirement for this course. This research will provide information on the factors that promote good leadership across a variety of contexts in society.

A total of 280 people will participate in this project.

Previous experience has shown that managers and leaders in the workplace may engage in different behaviours depending on the situation they are working in. For example, research has suggested that some managers may be more inclined to take the time to teach team members a task if it is very challenging. However, research has not largely examined whether a leader’s preferential use of different leadership behaviours in different situations is actually effective from a team member perspective. Therefore, this research is important because it will expand on the current leadership literature in explaining 1) the extent to which people rate different leadership behaviours as effective and 2) the factors that may influence these ratings of leadership effectiveness.

The results of this research may be used to help researcher Marcele De Sanctis obtain a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree.

3. Funding

This research is totally funded by Deakin University.

4. Procedures
Participation in this project will involve spending 10-15 minutes completing an online questionnaire accessible from any location with internet access. Potential participants will be given a copy of this Plain Language Statement with the URL address from which the questionnaire can be accessed. The online questionnaire can be accessed from http://www.deakin.edu.au/psychology/research/situationalleadership.

Once participants read this Plain Language Statement and access the URL, they will see a copy of this Plain Language Statement on the internet and then be able to click whether they ‘agree’ with the statement. Upon clicking the link, participants will be transferred to the online questionnaire. Participants will be asked questions including:

‘I prefer to keep to myself’

‘I find it easy to trust others’

‘In this situation, your leader lets team members know what is expected of them’

‘In this situation, the leader lets members do their work the way they think best’

Participants can then complete the questionnaire items and submit their responses to a secure password protected Deakin web server. Dr. Gery Karantzas and Marcele De Sanctis will be monitoring the web server to determine how many participants have taken part thus determine the conclusion of data collection.

5. Possible Benefits

Participation in this research is voluntary and we cannot guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this project. However, participants may find the content of the research interesting in their everyday work environments.

6. Possible Risks

It is unlikely that you will experience any psychological pain or discomfort as a result of taking part in this study, however in the event that you experience emotional discomfort during or after the completion of the questionnaire you are encouraged to contact either a counselling service or Lifeline on 13 11 14.

7. Privacy, Confidentiality and Disclosure of Information

Any data you supply will be stored on a secure password protected computer and locked cabinet at Deakin University for a minimum of six years from the date of the research publication. Your responses will not be identified as research participation is anonymous.

8. Results of Project

It is possible that the results of the study may be published in a scientific journal however individual responses will not be identifiable as only group data will be submitted. A summary of the major findings will be available in December, 2011. If you would like a summary of the results, please contact the student researcher, Marcele De Sanctis on mde@deakin.edu.au.

9. Participation is Voluntary
Participation in any research project is voluntary. If you do not wish to take part you are not obliged to. If you decide to take part and later change your mind, you are free to withdraw from the project at any stage in which event your participation in the research will immediately cease and any information obtained by you will not be used. However, you must be aware that because the online questionnaire is anonymous, you will not be able to withdraw once you have submitted your responses.

Your decision whether to take part or not to take part, or to take part and then withdraw, will not affect your relationship with Deakin University nor with the researchers conducting this project. You are not obliged or required in any way to participate.

Before you make your decision, a member of the research team will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project. You can ask for any information you want. Register your consent by agreeing to the Plain Language Statement and completing the questionnaire only after you have had a chance to ask your questions and have received satisfactory answers.

10. Ethical Guidelines

This project will be carried out according to the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (2007) produced by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies.

The ethics aspects of this research project have been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Deakin University.

11. Complaints

If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

Secretary HEAG-H, Dean's Office, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences, 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, VIC 3125, Telephone: (03) 9251 7174, Email hmnbs-research@deakin.edu.au.

Please quote project number HEAG-H 16/10.

11. Reimbursement for your costs

You will not be paid for your participation in this project.

12. Further Information, Queries or Any Problems

If you require further information, wish to withdraw your participation or if you have any problems concerning this project (for example, any side effects), you can contact the principal researcher or the student researcher. The researchers responsible for this project are:

Marcele De Sanctis (mde@deakin.edu.au)
Study 3

The research is being conducted by Marcele De Santis under the supervision of Gery Karantzas in fulfilment of the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy.

The leadership style utilised by managers when interacting with individuals in a non-managerial role has large implications for organisational effectiveness and employee performance. The purpose of the study is to examine how attachment theory, a relational framework for understanding interpersonal interactions between individuals, predicts leadership behaviour in senior managers.

Research to date has largely focused on the consequences of leadership rather than examining what drives leadership behaviour. Therefore this research seeks to apply a framework for understanding relationships (being attachment theory) to understand the dynamics of leader follower relations and how ideal transformational leadership behaviours (like motivating, inspiring and intellectually stimulating employees) develop.

This research hopes to provide insight into what drives transformational leadership behaviour and its direct consequences to then potentially develop training packages for organisations so that they may achieve higher organisational success with the utilisation of transformational leadership.

You are invited to participate in this research. If you agree to participate you will be required to complete an online questionnaire that follows this plain language statement. You will be asked questions about your interpersonal behaviour in relationships with non-managerial individuals and your leadership behaviour.

Examples of some of the questions you will be asked include: “Achieving things is more important than building relationships”, “I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts”, “I reveal how I feel to others”, “Attendance at work is above the norm”, and “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.”

The online questionnaire will take you about 20 minutes to complete. According to Deakin University research practices you are not required to fill in a consent form to take part in an anonymous questionnaire. However you must be aware that by answering and submitting the online questionnaire you imply to the researchers that you have consented to be part of this study. To participate, you must be aged 18 years and over and currently be employed in either a managerial or non-managerial role within a company.

Any data you supply will be stored on a secure password protected computer and locked cabinet at Deakin University for a minimum of six years from the date of the research publication. You are free to withdraw at any time during the study in which event your participation in the research will immediately cease and any information obtained by you will not be used. However you must be aware that because the online questionnaire is anonymous you will not be able to withdraw once you have submitted your responses.

It is possible that the results of the study may be published in a scientific journal however individual responses will not be identifiable as only group data will be submitted. A summary of major findings will be given and presented to your organisation.
In the unlikely event that you experience emotional discomfort during or after the completion of the questionnaire you are encouraged to contact either a counselling service within your organisation or Lifeline on 13 11 14.

If you have any queries about the research study please contact:

Gery Karantzas (Research Supervisor) on 9244 6959 or Marcele De Sanctis (Research Assistant) on 9244-6959.

Should you have any concerns about the conduct of the research project, please contact:

Professor Caryl Nowson

Chair – Deakin University Ethics Subcommittee - HMNBS

221 Burwood Highway

Burwood VIC 3125
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Ethics Approval Forms

Study 1

Human Ethics Advisory Group – Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences

221 Burwood Highway,
Burwood Victoria 3125 Australia
Telephone: 13 22 17 74
Facsimile: 61 3 9244 6019
hmbs-research@deakin.edu.au

Memorandum

To
Dr Gery Karantzazas
School of Psychology

From
Secretary – HEAG-H
Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing, and Behavioral Sciences

Subject
HEAG-H 101_08: Attachment and the manipulation of leadership

Approval has been given for Dr Gery Karantzazas, School of Psychology, to undertake this project for a period of 2 years from 8 August, 2008 subject to the following conditions.

Procedure:
(i) The researcher should leave copies of the PLS at the exit from the lecture theatre for interested potential participants to collect, rather than hand out.

Plain language statement:
(i) Please reword section 8, to make it clear that participants should contact the student researcher. E.g. A summary of the major findings will be available in December 2008. If you would like a summary of the results please contact the student researcher on … (Provide a Deakin phone contact or email).
(ii) Please include the correct complaints clause in the PLS:
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the research, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a participant then you may contact: Secretary HEAG-H, Dean’s Office, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences, 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, VIC 3125, Telephone: (03) 9251 7174, Email hmbs.research@deakin.edu.au

The approval given by the Deakin University HEAG-H is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Secretary immediately should any of the following occur:
- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time
- Any events which might affect the continuing ethical acceptability of the project
- The project is discontinued before the expected date of completion
- Modifications that have been requested by other Human Research Ethics Committees

In addition you will be required to report on the progress of your project at least once every year and at the conclusion of the project. Failure to report as required will result in suspension of your approval to proceed with the project.

HEAG-H may need to audit this project as part of the requirements for monitoring set out in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). An Annual Project Report Form can be found at [http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/admin/ethics/human/forms](http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/admin/ethics/human/forms) which you will be required to complete in relation to this research. This should be completed and returned to the Administrative Officer to the HEAG-H, Dean’s office,
Health, Medicine, Nursing & Behavioural Sciences, Burwood campus by Monday 17th November, 2008 or when the project is completed.

Good luck with the project!

Steven Sawyer
Secretary
HEAG-H

Cc. Marcele De Sanctis
Study 2

Human Ethics Advisory Group – Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences

DEAKIN UNIVERSITY
221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125 Australia
Telephone +61 3 9251 7174
Facsimile +61 3 9251 7425
hmsb-research@deakin.edu.au

Memorandum

To: Dr Gery Karantzias
School of Psychology

From: Secretary – HEAG-H
Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences

Subject: HEAG-H 16/10: Determining the effectiveness of situational leadership using attachment therapy

Approval has been given for Marcele De Sanctis, under the supervision of Dr Gery Karantzias, School of Psychology, to undertake this project for a period of 3 years from 4 June 2010.

The approval given by the Deakin University HEAG-H is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Secretary immediately should any of the following occur:

- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time
- Any events which might affect the continuing ethical acceptability of the project
- The project is discontinued before the expected date of completion
- Modifications that have been requested by other Human Research Ethics Committees

In addition you will be required to report on the progress of your project at least once every year and at the conclusion of the project. Failure to report as required will result in suspension of your approval to proceed with the project.

HEAG-H may need to audit this project as part of the requirements for monitoring set out in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). An Annual Project Report Form can be found at http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/admin/ethics/human/forms/ which you will be required to complete in relation to this research. This should be completed and returned to the Administrative Officer to HEAG-H, Dean’s office, Health, Medicine, Nursing & Behavioural Sciences, Burwood campus by Tuesday 23 November 2010 and when the project is completed.

Best wishes for your research.

Vicky Bates
Secretary
HEAG-H
Memorandum

To: Gery Karantzis  
School of Psychology

From: Chair – DUHREC Subcommittee,  
Faculty of Health Medicine Nursing and Behavioral Sciences

Subject: DUHREC-HMNBS 74/07 'An interpersonal relations perspective on leadership  
and related outcomes'

The application by Marcele De Sanctis has been considered by the DUHREC-HMNBS Subcommittee members,  
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