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DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother and father – the original Secure Bases in my life. They provided me with safety and love, so that I might explore the world.

At a more general level, this dissertation is dedicated to love...love for others, love for self, love for our planet, love of work and love for others at work.

I believe that love is the source of individual and collective well-being and that the more we allow love to express itself through us, the more gracefully we will live our lives and organize ourselves as a human species.

As was taught to me: “Every action is either an act of love, or a call for love. Either way, the appropriate response is always love.”

I hope that this dissertation is both an act of love, and a call for love.
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Abstract

By

DUNCAN D.COOMBE

This research proposes the notion of Secure Base Leadership through a multi-method approach incorporating two separate research studies. The research sought to first inductively explore the concept of Secure Base Leadership through a qualitative study and then to deductively test those conceptions in a quantitative study. Secure Base Leadership is a direct reference to Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original conceptions of Secure Base as it relates to the dual control systems of attachment and exploration as described in Attachment Theory. Secure Base Leadership is an explicitly ‘positive’ relationship based approach to leadership in that it seeks to understand the behaviors of an exemplar type of ‘leadership as relationship’. The qualitative results indicate that Secure Base Leadership has eight dimensions. However, the quantitative analysis indicates three factors underpinning these eight dimensions. The three factors correspond theoretically to the Attachment and Exploration control systems of Attachment Theory but also stress the importance of a positive style of problem solving. The three factors are referred to as the Safety, Exploration and Positive Dealing Factors and taken together represent a positive theoretical and practical approach to leadership. The results show that Secure Base Leadership predicts the outcomes of leadership effectiveness, psychological safety and follower job satisfaction (rated by followers) and leadership effectiveness
(rated by manager of the leader). This research further suggests that aspects of Secure Base Leadership resonate with a broader conception of Love, especially the notion of Acceptance and Safety. This thesis makes a contribution to the literatures of Positive Organizational Scholarship, Leadership as Relationship, Attachment Theory and Love in Organizations.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This multi-method study proposes and explores the concept of Secure Base Leadership. It demonstrates that Secure Base Leadership is a legitimate and distinct leadership construct that makes an important contribution to existing leadership theory and research. Secure Base Leadership is a ‘positive’ approach to leadership theory that seeks to describe the behaviors associated with being a Secure Base to others. This study will show that Secure Base Leadership predicts variance in the outcome variables of Psychological Safety, Leader Effectiveness and Job Satisfaction (all follower rated) and leader effectiveness rated by the manager of the leader. Importantly it does so in a manner distinct from variance predicted by Leader Member Exchange.

Secure Base Leadership has its origins in Attachment Theory. While Attachment Theory has seen extensive development theoretically and empirically, Ainsworth’s (1967, 1971, 1978) and Bowlby’s (1969, 1988) original conceptions of Secure Base, as relates to the attachment and exploratory control systems of Attachment Theory have, on the whole, seen less attention in organizational research. Since Ainsworth’s important contribution to Attachment Theory through the Strange Situation Experiment, the focus in organizational studies has tended to be on attachment styles, and attachment dimensions, with the avoidance and anxiety dimensions becoming the focus of empirical research. That said, organizational literature has paid some attention to the concept of Secure Base.
Popper and Mayseless (2003) suggested how the notion of Secure Base could be relevant to the leadership context (as opposed to the secure attachment style) and this dissertation empirically extends their conceptual work.

As a result of the prevailing emphasis in organizational studies on attachment styles, the question “what are the behaviors associated with being a Secure Base?” is not fully developed in organizational literature. We know more about avoidant and dismissive styles (two of the attachment styles originating from the strange situation experiment) than we do about the behaviors associated with being a Secure Base. In effect, the default, at least in organizational studies, has become that secure means being low on anxiety and avoidance - which is arguably something of a deficit approach. The contribution of this research is to revisit Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original theory of the Secure Base and to suggest that it is different to the secure attachment style as typically defined in current organizational research. The original conception of Secure Base, as it related to the attachment and exploration control systems has thus received little attention in organizational research. This research advances that original notion of Secure Base concept into the leadership arena.

Importantly, deeper explorations of the behaviors and roles of Secure Bases have occurred in the domains of developmental psychology and psychotherapy (Main, 1991; Wallin, 2007; Fosha, 2000;) and neurobiology (Cozolino, 2006). This dissertation seeks to extend these insights into the organizational domain.
Given that Attachment Theory is a relational lens and describes a person’s habits and patterns in relationships, or their ‘propensity to relate’, reference will also be made to relevant bodies of relational literature. Furthermore, as we are focusing on positive relationships, the literatures covered have a positive bias. The literatures of relatedness, positive relatedness, love, positive relationships at work and leadership as relationship will be examined in order to provide a broader context for Secure Base Leadership. These literatures will enable this study to establish the broader domain of relational leadership and therefore provide guidance on issues of discriminant validity. In essence it is through understanding these literatures that we will be able to establish the extent to which Secure Base Leadership is similar and/or distinct from existing relationship-based theory.

With an understanding of Secure Base Leadership and its relevant literatures, an emerging research agenda will emerge. Three primary research questions emerge from this review of the literature:

1) What are the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership?
2) Does Secure Base Leadership lead to beneficial organizational outcomes?
3) Is Secure Base Leadership distinct from existing ‘leadership as relationship’ theory?

It is these three core questions that this dissertation seeks to address. Two studies were conducted to investigate these questions.
Study one is an inductive, qualitative study that seeks to explore the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership. Through fifty semi-structured interviews with executives, the study aims to better understand the behaviors and actions of Secure Base leaders. An analysis of these interviews produced the following eight dimensions of Secure Base Leadership:

- Acceptance of the person as legitimate (acceptance)
- Seeing the potential of the other (potential)
- Allowing risk and opportunity (opportunity)
- Available and accessible, ‘anywhere anytime’ (accessible)
- Calm, dependable, predictable in a crisis (calm)
- Favors inquiry over advocacy (inquiry)
- Favors Intrinsic Motivation (intrinsic)
- Shifts the other’s ‘mindset’ to the positive/opportunity (minds eye)

These findings provide a tentative answer to the first research question.

To answer the second and third research questions, and to further deepen the understanding of question one, a second study was conducted. Study two is a quantitative study to extend the findings of study one by developing a Secure Base Leadership instrument that measures the 8 dimensions and determine whether these dimensions are positively related to the organizational outcomes of:

- Job Satisfaction of Followers
• Leadership Effectiveness as rated by Followers
• Psychological Safety as rated by Followers
• Leadership Effectiveness as rated by Manager of the Leader
• Results Orientation of Leader as rated by Manager of the Leader
• Relationships Orientation of the Leader as rated by Manager of the Leader

In addition, measures of Leader Member Exchange and Leader Organizational Power were administered to examine issues of discriminant validity. In other words, the study aims to show that not only does Secure Base Leadership contribute to the above organizational outcomes, but that it does so in a manner distinct from existing ‘leadership as relationship’ models.

The results of study two show adequate reliability statistics for the eight dimensions, and that taken together, they do indeed contribute unique variance to the dependant variables. There is therefore support for the majority of the primary hypotheses.

However an exploratory factor analysis reveals only three factors – not eight. Theoretically, two factors correspond well to the control systems of “attachment” and “exploration”, indicating that the instrument is measuring a construct akin to that envisaged by Bowlby and Ainsworth. The third factor describes a positive problem solving style of the leader. In the discussion, these three factors are referred to as the Safety Factor (corresponding to the attachment system), Exploration Factor (corresponding to the exploration system) and the Positive Dealing Factor. The results of
the study show that these three factors are generally positively associated with the various
dependent variables and therefore while leading to some questions about the eight
dimensions as empirically distinct dimensions, this analysis does provide support for the
total set of items. In summary, Secure Base Leadership predicts variance on the outcomes
variables in a manner distinct from existing leadership as relationship constructs.

As noted, with reference to Ainsworth and Bowlby, we will suggest that two of the
factors correspond to the control systems of Attachment and Exploration. In that sense,
Secure Base Leadership performs an interesting balancing act between providing safety
(attachment) and encouraging risk (exploration). This is of particular relevance to the
organizational context where we see an increasing focus on learning, innovation and
change. This research suggests the need for innovation needs to be balanced by the need
for providing safety. It will be suggested that this is not unlike the notion of ‘support’ and
‘challenge’ (Sanford, 1967), ‘zones of proximal development’ (Vygotsky, 1978) and
Maslow’s (1943) ‘love’ and ‘esteem’ basic needs, as found in developmental and
learning literatures. Within organizational studies, it will further be suggested that this not
unlike the relationship between ‘exploitation’ and ‘exploration’ argued in organizational
literatures (March, 1991). March (1991) considered the ways in which organizations
manage the dynamic between ‘exploitation’ of current resources, which is considered
more predictable and known (safe), and ‘exploration’ which is linked to innovation and
change (risk). This dissertation argues that Secure Bases are critical for helping
organizational members manage the dynamics between safety, attachment (exploitation)
and innovation, risk and learning (exploration).
Furthermore, it will be shown that the end result of Secure Base Leadership, when considering the three factors in light of all the above-mentioned literatures, suggests a particular approach to leadership that is grounded in a positive orientation to the role of leadership. We will see a leader who has a positive approach to people, and a positive approach to tasks. It will even be suggested that in describing such a leader, one is reminded of the notion of love as intentional positive other regard.

The concluding definition of Secure Base Leadership is: **Secure Base Leadership, a positive relationship based theory of leadership, has three components: a) providing safety through valuing, accepting and appreciating, b) providing exploration through emphasizing growth, development and potential and c) dealing with tasks and situations in a positive manner.**

The conclusion of the discussion section argues that the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership are well supported in existing literature and combined with the supporting empirical evidence suggest that Secure Base Leadership is a useful and distinct leadership theory. Secure Base Leadership is a contribution to leadership studies in general, to the specific domain of leadership studies known as leadership as relationship, to Attachment Theory in organizational settings and to the growing field of Positive Organizational Scholarship.
Finally this thesis considers implications for practice. It will be suggested that the concept of Secure Base Leadership could be of great use and value to practitioners and educators. It is a concept that is theoretically and empirically sound, intuitively appealing, and highly applicable to organizational settings.
PERSONAL STATEMENT

If Attachment Theory concerns itself with how early relationships in life impact a person through their life, it seems appropriate to begin a personal statement with the early relationships in my life. I was fortunate to grow up in a stable loving home with two parents and an older brother and sister. I fit the typical description of the “youngest child in a happy home” and generally self report in the ‘secure’ attachment style (with a drift towards anxious when I am under pressure).

My mother ran a nursery school for 30 years and is a parenting teacher/coach. The nursery school was at our home in an outside building and my back lawn was thus dedicated to the slides, swings, bicycles, and jungle gyms of the school. As a result, our daily conversations around the dinner table were often about early education and the importance of parenting of young children. Furthermore my sister is a social worker and psychologist – again, bringing awareness of the role of psychology and social impacts on a person’s life into my daily conversations. It comes as no surprise then to see that I have become interested in Attachment Theory – a view on the world that stresses the importance of early childhood and key developmental relationships.

I should also say that I am fortunate to come at Attachment Theory from the perspective of feeling generally settled in my relationships and my understanding of my relationship style. I am by no means suggesting that I am without fault in the relationship domain (far from it!), but it is my perception that my curiosity and interest in the field comes from a
perspective of generally strong and healthy personal relationships, rather than trying to understand my own personal relationships based in deficit. I am not sure how this is relevant to my research in this dissertation, but it seems important to acknowledge my relationship history.

In a professional context, as an OD practitioner, it is my absolute conviction that relationships drive sustainable results. It is my experience in team building and leadership development workshops that when the relationship space shifts towards the positive and affirming, the individuals develop increased capacity to deal with their task oriented concerns. In other words, my bias in this work is that I am advocating for positive relationships at work. I should say at this point that I score strongly as a “humanist” in terms of value orientations. My work with executives has allowed me to work well with pragmatists and intellectuals, but I have a human lens as my primary lens.

My interest in the topic of love, although somewhat indirect in the dissertation should be explained. My theoretical roots are clearly within the human potential movement. The authors who I return to time and time again are Maslow, Buber, Fromm, May, Palmer, Shepard and Rogers. Of these authors, Carl Rogers’ notion of unconditional positive regard is the most personally resonant and powerful concept that I have encountered. I am quite happy to identify myself as Rogerian in orientation. These authors all speak to the notion of love in one way or another- whether explicitly or implicitly.

Related to this is my personal spiritual orientation. Informed by more mystical and inter-
faith conceptions of spirituality, I am clear that love is the most helpful orientation through which to approach the world. The notion of love that I reference spiritually is informed by the idea that as human beings we are not separate from each other. It is our shared connection to each other - whether through something as abstract as consciousness, to a more practical systems view of social interconnectedness - that is the essence of love as I understand it. It is what Martin Luther King was referring to when he said, “an injury to one is an injury to all.”

For me, love and unconditional positive regard go hand in hand. I am advocating for a ‘stance’ towards the world that is based in unconditional positive regard – where the basic goodness and potential in the other is seen and acknowledged.

It is quite clear to me that if we are talking about relationships and about positive relationships in the workplace, then the idea of love has to be considered. I have made a personal commitment to live my life as an expression of love, and while I have not been successful in making love the centrepiece of my dissertation, it is the deep undercurrent upon which this thesis flows.

In essence, it is my great belief and conviction that strong, healthy and loving relationships are at the heart of all successful outcomes – personally and professionally. It is my hope that in some way this dissertation will provide some insight into the development and maintenance of strong, healthy and loving relationships.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Literature Review

This review will first introduce the concept of Secure Base as envisaged by Ainsworth (1967, 1971, 1978) and Bowlby (1988). It will then examine the context of Secure Base, which is that of the broader literature of Attachment Theory. Attachment Theory’s origins will be explained, as will its development over time. It will be shown that Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original conceptions of Secure Base have not been well developed in organizational literature, especially in relation to the control systems of attachment and exploration. More specifically, Secure Base has been largely subsumed in the Secure Attachment style research, following the tradition of Ainsworth’s Strange Situation Experiment. Secure Base has almost become defined in terms of the two dimensions of Avoidance and Anxiety (or Self and Other). In other words secure has come to mean being low on avoidance and low on anxiety. One could describe this as a deficit orientation. Much like the Positive Psychology movement has sought to bring a more appreciative view to human psychology, I will suggest that a more positive investigation of the Secure Base concept is needed in organizational studies. Furthermore, the argument will be made that ‘being a Secure Base’ – as opposed to ‘having a secure attachment style’ – has not been well developed in organizational literature. In other words, there is a descriptive element missing from the Secure Base literature.
Importantly, deeper explorations of the behaviors and roles of Secure Bases have occurred in the domains of developmental psychology and psychotherapy (Main, 1991; Wallin, 2007; Fosha, 2000) and neurobiology (Cosolino, 2006). This dissertation seeks to extend these insights into the organizational domain.

Next it will review how Attachment Theory has been applied to Organizational Behavior, with particular reference to Leadership. The first part of the review will conclude by making the argument that while there has been tremendous work done on Attachment Theory in general, there has been little development on Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original conceptions of Secure Base – and certainly not in a leadership context. Popper and Mayseless (2003) made initial conceptual suggestions as to how the notion of Secure Base could be related to leadership, but this conceptual work has not been developed empirically. This is the gap in the existing leadership literature that this research seeks to fill through the introduction of the concept of Secure Base Leadership. Secure Base Leadership is an explicitly ‘positive’ approach to leadership studies.

Having made the case for Secure Base Leadership, the review will then consider bodies of literature that are potentially similar. In essence here, one is examining similarities and differences with existing organizational literature. As Attachment Theory is concerned with ‘relationships’ we will review ‘relationship literatures’ from the most general, to a specific examination of Organizational Behavior and Leadership. Furthermore, given the ‘positive’ nature of Secure Base Leadership, we will emphasize literatures that speak to positive relationships. Literature on ‘relatedness’ and ‘positive relatedness’ show us that
being in relationships, especially positive relationships, is a basic human need. This is relevant as it shows that Secure Base Leadership, as a positive leadership model, contributes to individual well-being, and thus speaks to the relevance and importance of this study. In simple terms it is suggested that Secure Base Leadership, as a positive relationship theory, contributes to well-being in the workplace.

The review will then take a somewhat surprising turn into the literature on love. It will be shown that there is a link between Attachment Theory and love and therefore when we consider Secure Base Leadership, it is possible that we are introducing the idea of loving relationships to the leadership literature. Turning to organizational studies, we examine the emerging body of literature that covers ‘positive relationships at work.’ The argument will be made here that Secure Base Leadership makes a contribution to this emerging body of organizational literature. Lastly, this review will examine leadership studies, specifically ‘leadership as relationship.’ The concept of Leader Member Exchange (LMX) (Graen and Scandura, 1987; Liden and Maslyn, 1998), as the dominant theory in this field, will be explored. LMX will be important to this study, as it will ultimately be important to show that Secure Base Leadership is distinct from existing ‘leadership as relationship’ theories – of which LMX is the most dominant.

Concluding this literature review, a research agenda emerges. The first step is to fully explore and develop the concept of Secure Base Leadership. The most sensible way to approach this is through a qualitative study that seeks to uncover a descriptive approach to Secure Base Leadership. This first step culminates in a model of Secure Base
Leadership. The second step of the research agenda empirically tests the model of Secure Base Leadership through a quantitative study. The study assesses whether Secure Base Leadership is materially different to other relationship-based leadership models such as Leader Member Exchange and also whether Secure Base Leadership contributes to beneficial leadership outcomes such as leadership effectiveness and employee job satisfaction. The construct of Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999) is introduced here as a hypothesized outcome variable in relation to Secure Base Leadership due to it conceptual link to the attachment-exploration control systems. Psychological Safety represents the extent to which team members feel safe to take risks, which would appear to be theoretically similar to the attachment-exploration dynamic. It is this research agenda that this dissertation seeks to address.

**Attachment Theory**

The concept of Secure Base sits within Bowlby’s broader work on Attachment Theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980). Bowlby developed Attachment Theory in response to the prevailing theories of infant development that held that personal relationships, initially to the mother, were only “secondary” drives to the “primary” drives of feeding and sex (Bowlby, 1988). Using concepts from ethological, evolutionary and control systems, Bowlby suggested an innate, biosocial behavioral system in the infant. The purpose of this system is to ensure proximity between the infant and his or her primary caregiver and thus has an evolutionary purpose to promote survival (Bowlby, 1969, 1988; Popper, 2002). This conceptualization marked a critical juncture in psychological theory
in that it gave a theoretical status to the infant-caregiver relationship that had not previously been recognized (Bowlby, 1988).

Attachment behavior was defined by Bowlby as “any form of behavior that results in a person attaining or maintaining proximity to some other clearly identified individual who is conceived as better able to cope with the world.” (Bowlby, 1988 p. 27). Attachment therefore is a set of behaviors (crying, smiling, clinging, moving, looking, etc.) that function together to achieve proximity to the primary caregiver. It is important to note that attachment is just one of the behavioral systems that Bowlby proposed. The second system centered on exploration and play behavior. As Ainsworth (1967) wrote, “Exploratory behaviors include locomotion, manipulation, visual exploration and exploratory play, which promote acquisition of knowledge of the environment and adaptation to environmental variations” Ainsworth, 1967, p.2.

Bowlby observed in infants these two distinct types of behaviors – attachment behaviors that brought the infant into closer proximity to the caregiver, and exploration or play behaviors that decreased proximity with the caregiver. Both are relevant in our consideration and form the very heart of this research study. It will be argued that it is this dynamic between the attachment and exploration, and the role of the Secure Base in mediating these two systems that distinguishes Secure Base leadership from existing Attachment Theory research.
There is some debate as to whether the attachment system is always activated. Bowlby suggested that it would only be activated in situations of stress, while Bretherton (1980) has argued that the attachment system is constantly in operation. If this point is uncertain, what is not disputed is that stress will certainly heighten and accentuate the attachment system (St. Clair, 1994). Bowlby (1988) also asserted that while attachment behavior is most obvious in early childhood, it persists throughout the lifecycle into adulthood.

The model of an attachment-exploration balance focuses on the two sets of behavioral systems, each with significant specific survival functions, which operate in dynamic equilibrium. Attachment behaviors include active behaviors such as approaching, following, reaching, grasping.

Ainsworth (1978), a colleague of Bowlby, took his notion of Attachment Theory a step further and through empirical studies, identified three ‘styles’ of infant attachment: secure, ambivalent and avoidant. This was based on observing infants in what was known as the “strange situation” experiment. In the strange situation, the infant is exposed to a series of timed and systematic events. First the infant is in a room with its mother, who subsequently leaves the room and the infant is left in the company of a stranger and a selection of toys. After a set period, the mother returns to the room. Throughout the experiment, the infant’s behavior is monitored and subsequently coded by researchers. Infants with a secure style had mothers who were consistently sensitive and responsive to their signals and thus the infants felt secure in exploring their environment. They appeared appropriately distressed when the mother left the room and sought comfort
upon her return. Once comforted, they returned to exploration behaviors. Infants with ambivalent attachment styles received inconsistent attention from their mothers. Sometimes the mothers were available and responsible and other times not. Subsequently, these infants were overly concerned with their mother’s availability. This concern resulted in reduced exploration. They also experienced high levels of distress upon separation and were less easily comforted upon her return. Infants with avoidant attachment styles had mothers who tended to reject their needs and ignored or were unresponsive to the infants’ attempts at closeness. When separated, these infants displayed little overt distress and did not seek contact upon the mother’s return. Instead they shifted their attention elsewhere, using exploration as a way to detach from the mother (Ainsworth, 1978; Prehar, 2001). A fourth style, disorganized, was developed in later research that replicated Ainsworth’s study (Maine and Hess 1990).

A key aspect of the Strange Situation Experiment that receives less attention in Attachment Theory was the analysis of the behaviors of the mother at home. Focus tends to be on the behaviors of the child in the laboratory experiment, but Ainsworth and her colleagues developed rigorous assessments of mother behavior. They assessed the mothers according to the following dimensions:

1) Sensitivity-insensitivity – the extent to which the mother is able to see things from the baby’s point of view.

2) Acceptance-rejection – the extent to which a mother accepts infant behaviors that others might find hurtful or irritating.
3) Cooperation-interference – measures the extent to which the mother engages in “co-
determining” rather than intrusive behaviors in relation to the child.

4) Accessibility-ignoring – the extent to which the mother is “tuned in and available”

5) Lack of Emotional Expression – the extent to which a mother lacks emotional
expression in her face, voice or bodily movements.

I suggest that these dimensions are of great import. The role of the attachment figure is
critical to the development of the child. Therefore one would expect that the field of
psychology should be especially focused on identifying the most helpful behaviors of
attachment figures – in this case the behaviors of a Secure Base. It appears, rather that the
field has tended to focus on the outcomes, or symptoms, by focusing on the child. For
example, Ainsworth concludes by stating that, “Mothers who are sensitive to their
babies’ signals tend to be accessible, cooperative and accepting.” (Ainsworth, 1978,
p.22). I would argue that these three dimensions have not seen sufficient attention in
Attachment Theory research and writing. She continues to say that, “To the extent that
the mother has been sensitively responsive to the baby’s communications and the
interaction is harmonious, the baby is able to use the mother to explore even an
unfamiliar situation...”(Ainsworth, 1978, p.25). I suggest that again, this focus on the
behavior of the mother, rather than the reaction of the child has received insufficient
attention.
It is also worth mentioning that while Ainsworth did identify types of attachment, she did not at the outset endorse a dimensional approach based in anxiety and avoidance: “To the extent that there is a single quantifiable dimension of mother infant interaction implicit in our hypothesis, this is a crude one of harmony-disharmony.” Ainsworth, 1978, p.26

Nonetheless, the idea of discrete attachment types as proposed by Ainsworth has been challenged by subsequent research. Bartholomew (1990) and Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) proposed a model of attachment that expanded upon the work of Bowlby and Ainsworth, but rather than discrete types, their model has two dimensions: self perception and perception of others. Each dimension can have a negative or positive value and four attachment ‘groupings’ emerge from this formulation – secure, dismissing, preoccupied and fearful. This conceptualization was validated using a multi-method and multi-source approach.

Continuing this line of research into dimensions of attachment, rather than types, Brennan et al (1998) factor analyzed numerous attachment instruments and showed that most of the items load onto one of two independent factors: anxiety and avoidance. The anxiety factor assesses concerns about abandonment and rejection, while the avoidance factor taps comfort with dependency and closeness. Making the link to Bartholomew’s attachment styles (1990), Brennan et al (1998) argue that the secure type is low on anxiety and avoidance; preoccupied types are high on anxiety and low on avoidance; dismissing individuals are low on anxiety and high on avoidance; and fearful types are
high on both anxiety and avoidance. The more current view of attachment is thus that people placed into different attachment categories do not display qualitatively different attributes. Rather, they display differing levels of these two attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance (Brennan et al, 1998; Fraley and Waller, 1998; Prehar, 2001). This view on attachment is most strongly now associated with the Experiences in Close Relationships Survey, which will be referenced later in this study.

A key feature of Attachment Theory is the notion of ‘schemas.’ Schemas, or internal working models, are developed through experiences with initial caregivers and consist of expectations regarding self and others. (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980). Keller (2003) argues that working models of attachment are comprised of three elements: (1) who the attachment figure is, (2) how the attachment figure is expected to respond, and (3) how acceptable the self is in the eyes of the attachment figure. These working mental models represent an individual’s attachment style. As noted, this internal working model persists into adulthood and guides one’s interactions with others and the world (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1988, Popper 2000). In this way, attachment can be considered as a tendency to relate, or predisposition to relate when entering a new relationship.

Research by Hazan and Shaver (1987) has shown that the internal models, or schemas, developed in infancy, persist into adulthood, especially in close relationships. The reason these working models persist is that they operate largely outside of conscious experience (Bowlby 1988). While attachment styles tend to persist, they are not fixed. When changes occur in caregiving, models of self and other are potentially revised, or later in life the
effect of a supportive relationship such as a friend, significant other, or therapist, can lead to changes in attachment behavior. Ainsworth (1989) showed that internal working models are also able to be revised through a process of reflection and heightened awareness of those models.

Having covered the basics of Attachment Theory we return to the notion of Secure Base.

*Secure Base*

Ainsworth (1967, 1971, 1978) who first coined the phrase Secure Base, described the role of the Secure Base very much in relation to Bowlby’s suggested attachment and exploration systems: “For some time it has been useful to view an attachment figure as providing a Secure Base from with a child may venture forth to explore the world (Blatz, 1966; Salter, 1940; Ainsworth 1963, 1967; Harlow, 1958). The more inclusive concept of a balance between exploratory and attachment behavior followed from Bowlby’s (1969) control systems account of the dynamic equilibrium of mother-infant interactions.”

Ainsworth (1971) p.2

This forms a key point of this research. The role of a Secure Base is to help a person successfully manage the dynamic interplay of the attachment and exploration systems. On the one hand a Secure Base provides comfort and safety (attachment), but this is always in the service of exploration, play and learning.

Bowlby (1988) described the concept of Secure Base in the following way:
“The provision of a Secure Base from which a child or adolescent can make sorties into the outside world and to which he can return knowing for sure that he will be welcomed when he gets there, nourished physically and emotionally, comforted if distressed, reassured if frightened. In essence, this role is one of being available, ready to respond when called upon to encourage and perhaps assist, but to intervene actively only when clearly necessary” (Bowlby, 1988 p.11).

While early Attachment Theory research focused on early childhood development, later research has shown that Secure Bases change in significance as the child grows older, as the attachment relationship shifts from one of actual protection and safety (physical proximity) to one of a feeling of protection and safety (psychological proximity) (Bretherton and Waters, 1985).

While it is true that the field of Attachment Theory has become somewhat oriented towards the dimensional approach, there has however been considerable examination of the role of the Secure Base in the field of psychotherapy in a manner that does not rely on the dimensional approach to Attachment Theory. These insights are potentially of great relevance to the leadership domain.

Fosha (2000), in describing a therapeutic approach based on Attachment Theory, named Accelerated Experimental Dynamic Psychotherapy (AEDP), inquires, “how can the therapist evoke a relational environment in which the transformational power of affective
experience can contribute to the emergence and development of the patient’s essential self?” Fosha 2000 p.4.

Fosha (2000) suggests that (AEDP) that has as its core elements:

1. We are healed through experience of core affect
2. We need to lower our defenses for this to happen
3. We are likely to lower our defenses when we feel safe and secure
4. A secure relationship/other will facilitate this lowering
5. The therapist therefore, through a deeply empathic and emotionally engaged stance, supports the patient in experiencing core affect

To do this, The AEDP therapist seeks greater attunement and emotional bonding than other traditional therapies – it is an active and engaged stance, rather than the “depressive stance” more commonly associated with classical Freudian approaches.

Through this engaged and attuned approach, the therapist attempts to “promote, nurture and develop the “green signal” affects of hope, anticipation of pleasurable consequence, excitement, trust and self confidence” Fosha, 2000 p.112.

Fosha (2000) stresses the importance of “affective state”. She argues that the “ongoing dialogue between self and other” generates an emotional climate that is either based in safety or threat.
Fosha (2000) suggests that “the roots of resilience and the capacity to withstand emotionally aversive situations without resorting to defensive exclusion are to be found in the sense of being understood by and existing in the mind and heart of a loving, attuned and self-possessed other” Fosha 2000 p. 60. It is the role of the therapist to perform the function of this “loving, attuned and self-possessed other.”

Fosha also introduces the dual coping mechanisms of ‘feeling’ and ‘dealing’. She says that healthy adult interactions and relationships occur when a person is able to both ‘feel’ their emotions and also to ‘deal’ with actions and behaviors. The possible combinations of dealing/feeling; dealing/not-feeling; feeling/not-dealing; and not feeling/not-dealing emerge from this rubric. The role of a secure base, according to Fosha, is to support the person to both feel and deal. This idea of dealing will become significant later in this dissertation. For now, it is important to not that dealing relates to action, behaviors and the successful completion of daily.

Fosha (2000) concludes by saying that the stance of the therapist is to 1) promote patient safety and 2) promote risk taking. We see then that Fosha makes a direct link back to Ainsworth and Bowlby’s conception of Secure Base and its relationship the attachment and exploration control systems.

Wallin (2007), along similar lines to Fosha, uses Attachment Theory to suggest the way in which a therapist can perform the role of a Secure Base: “In providing the patient with a Secure Base, we are offering a corrective relational experience that may be healing in
its own right. From this perspective, the attachment bond the patient develops in relation to the therapist may be the key therapeutic intervention.” Wallin 2007. P.257.

Continuing to explain the role of therapist as Secure Base Wallin (2007) says, “very much as the original attachment relationships allowed the child to develop, it is the new relationship of attachment with the therapist that allows the patient to change. Such a relationship provides a Secure Base that enables the patient to take the risk of feeling what he is not supposed to feel and knowing what he is not supposed to know” Wallin 2007 p.3.

How does the therapist do this? Wallin (2007), like Fosha (2000) suggests an approach that is highly engaged and personally involved. He speaks of the importance of “intersubjectivity” and non-verbal communications. Arguing for this proactively engaged stance of the therapist, he says, “our authentic personal involvement, emotional responsiveness and unavoidable subjectivity, far from interfering are essential features of every successful psychotherapy.” Wallin 2007. P.171.

How is the potentially relevant to leadership? Referencing Holmes (2001), Wallin (2007) says that, “what good therapists do with their patients is analagous to what successful parents do with their children.” As will be seen shortly, this provides a link to the work of Popper and Mayselless (2003) who considered how parenting can be considered as analogous to leadership. It would seem that an argument could be made that the notion of
leader as Secure Base could be informed by the knowledge and insights of parenting and psychotherapy.

Reviewing the development of Attachment Theory, it is striking that the Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original conceptions of Secure Base have not been operationalised in any form of measurement instrument. This is a gap that this dissertation seeks to address by creating a measurement of Secure Base Leadership that captures the dynamic interplay between safety and exploration.

It is also important to remember that Bowlby did not envisage styles and dimensions – he spoke about being a Secure Base, not having a secure attachment style. Therefore despite all of the extensive work we have just reviewed on Attachment Theory, we are not necessarily any closer to understanding the practical application of being a Secure Base. But does this matter? Should we not just accept that the field of Attachment Theory has developed beyond Ainsworth and Bowlby?

Waters et al (2002) make the argument clearly as to why Secure Base has to be considered separately from current notions in Attachment Theory:

“*We once suggested that "both the Strange Situation and the Adult Attachment Interview could dry up and blow away without great repercussions for the validity of Bowlby-Ainsworth Attachment Theory. We would simply find other methods. But demonstrating that Secure Base behavior is not characteristic of human's closest infant and adult relationships would end the whole enterprise. Bowlby would be wrong. We would need a*
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new theory (Waters, 1997).” Waters et al, 2002 p.5

Continuing their critique of the current focus on measurement and dimensions they state: “The same could be said of any attachment measure. Attachment Theory is a perspective on the Secure Base functions of close relationships. It shouldn't be built too much around the operating characteristics of specific measures.” Waters et al, 2002 p.5.

They continue to explain the importance of a deeper and more nuanced understanding and operationalization of Secure Base when they write: “The use of trait language to describe and discuss particular attachment patterns or styles is also complicated by the fact that many (most?) adolescents and adults maintain a number of close relationships that serve Secure Base functions in different contexts. Moreover, people are very often secure with some important figures in their lives and less so with others. They also change attachment status or style over time.” Waters et al, 2002. P. 8.

It becomes clear then that existing measures of Attachment Theory do not fully capture, or do justice to Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s notions of Secure Base. It is this significant gap in the theory and research that this thesis seeks to address.

Having reviewed the theoretical foundations of Attachment Theory, we turn now to its relevance and application to Organizational Behavior and leadership theory. At this point, I should make the initial comment that organizational literature have tended down a stylistic approach to Attachment Theory, and therefore despite having just made the
argument against Attachment styles, the following pages of literature review will
unavoidably revisit this approach.

Attachment Theory and Organizational Studies

Within the broader field of Organizational studies, there is increasing reference to
examined the way in which a change agent, in this case an OD consultant, helped an
organization reconfigure relationships and work processes through framing that role as
that of a Secure Base. Neilsen (2005) broke new ground conceptually, by proposing that
Attachment Theory could also be applied at the level of the organization. Neilsen (2007)
further proposed that Attachment Theory is important in explaining the power of the
‘relational-emotional’ institutional pillar that underpins many of the techniques of
‘positive organizing’ such as Appreciative Inquiry.

In the area of work and careers, Hazan and Shaver (1990) examined how
attachment styles impact the way that individuals view their attitudes to work and careers.
They found that securely attached respondents reported relatively high levels of work
satisfaction in terms of job security, co-workers, income, and opportunities for challenge
and advancement. Anxious/ambivalent attachment was associated with feelings of job
insecurity, lack of appreciation and recognition by co-workers, and not getting desirable
and deserved promotions. Avoidantly attached respondents reported dissatisfaction with
co-workers but were similar to secure respondents in their satisfaction with job security
and opportunities for learning. In a second study they found that secure respondents
reported higher overall work satisfaction, felt that they were good workers, and were confident that co-workers evaluated them highly. In contrast, anxious/ambivalent respondents expected co-workers to undervalue them, and avoidant respondents gave themselves lower ratings on job performance and expected similarly low ratings from co-workers.

In group settings, Smith et al (1999) found that higher scores on either group anxiety or group avoidant attachment predicted lower engagement in group activities, more negative evaluations of social groups, and lower perceived support from groups – this is highly relevant to group psychological safety.

Rom and Mikulincer (2003) found that a cohesive group could attenuate globally attachment anxious people’s group specific attachment anxiety. Cassidy and Shaver (2008) hypothesize that for attachment avoidant individuals, high group cohesion threatens a complete sense of self-reliance and instrumental performance.

Attachment Theory and Leadership

It has been noted by various authors (Popper and Mayseless, 2003; Popper, 2000; Avolio and Gibbons, 1998) that despite the work of early researchers such as Levinson (1968), Zaleznik (1970, 1977) and Kets de Vries (1984), there has been a general lack of attention paid to the developmental antecedents of leadership and that leadership studies have tended not to examine leadership from a lifespan approach. Given the plethora of
leadership research over the last 50 years, this is surprising. Nonetheless, there have been a handful of articles and studies that reference Attachment Theory directly.

Popper at al (2000) examined the relationship between becoming a transformational leader and having internalized a secure attachment style. Using Burn’s (1978) theory of transformational leadership, they examined leaders’ attachment styles. In three separate studies of a military leadership training course, the central hypothesis, that a positive correlation would exist between the dimensions of transformational leadership and the secure attachment style, was supported. They concluded that Attachment Theory provides a theoretical lens for the study of leadership that is more dynamic and interpersonal than the existing leadership literatures (Popper et al, 2000).

Most significantly for this dissertation, Popper and Mayseless (2003) provided a conceptual framework for the analogy of the leader as a parent. Explaining their framework, they state that like parents, the role of the leader includes, “guiding, directing, taking charge, and taking care of others less powerful than they.” (Popper and Mayseless, 2003 p.42)

Making the link between transformational leadership and parenting they argue that there are many similarities: “(a) Both are sensitive and responsive, showing individual consideration for their “protégées”; (b) both reinforce the protégés autonomy in a supportive, nonjudgmental way and by actively providing opportunities, promoting relevant experiences, giving explanations, and the like; (c) both set limitations and rules
which are flexible; and finally (d) both are positive examples to identify with and look up to..." (Popper and Mayseless, 2003 p.44)

Hypothesizing about the impact and consequence of different attachment relationships, they suggest that, “the leader’s provision of a sense of security, make possible the activation of other behavioral systems such as exploration. This might be manifested in the capacity of followers to take risks and be creative, leading to learning and personal growth” (Popper and Mayseless, 2003 p.48). They further suggest that the opposite would also be true in that should the followers feel insecure as a result of the leader’s behavior, risk-taking, exploration and learning will diminish (Popper and Mayseless, 2002). Continuing this line of thought, they propose that leader who is a Secure base will help followers develop new mental models as well as greater “self confidence, autonomy, competence, self efficacy, and self esteem” (Popper and Mayseless, 2002 p.51).

This dissertation most closely extends this conceptual work of Popper and Mayseless (2003) and should be considered as an attempt to develop their insights. Importantly, they make an attempt to describe the potential behaviors of a leader acting as a Secure Base rather than rely upon the traditional dimensional approach. Furthermore, in making the link to parenting, they are acknowledging the rich body of research described earlier in the social and developmental psychology literatures. As will be seen later, this dissertation effectively extends the conceptual work of Popper and Mayseless (2003) through two empirical studies.
A further direct reference to Attachment Theory in the leadership literature is by Keller (2003) where she explores the concept of implicit leadership theories and considers how Attachment Theory could inform these implicit theories. For example she posits that secure followers will expect their leaders to be “sensitive, supportive, and responsive” (Keller, 2003 p.148) and that they will enter organizations with these positive expectations. Keller (2003) concludes that, “attachment styles may account for greater variance in implicit leadership theories than personality traits. It is indeed possible that the most familiar leadership images are those that we take to work.” (Keller, 2003 p.156)

Cassidy and Shaver (2008) suggests that anxious individuals may seek the role of leader as a means of satisfying unmet needs for attention, closeness, and acceptance, rather than as a means of meeting followers needs and promoting their healthy development. Furthermore they could intrude on followers and help them when not needed. Furthermore, an attachment anxious person’s negative models of self can create doubts about his or her efficacy as a leader, which could arouse follower anxiety. (Cassidy and Shaver, 2008 p.442)

Cassidy and Shaver (2008) further argue that avoidant leaders lack of comfort with closeness and interdependence and their negative models of others are likely to interfere with empathic perception of followers needs and concerns. They are likely to view leadership as an opportunity to reinforce their sense of being strong, tough and independent. In addition since they tend to avoid emotion, they are likely to focus heavily on the task at hand, rather than emotional support. In this way, they may therefore
complete important functional tasks (making money, running a large company), but they fail to provide emotional support, empower their followers, and create optimal conditions for their followers growth and self actualization. (Cassidy and Shaver, 2008 p.443)

In a comprehensive study in a military setting, Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Ijzak and Popper (2006) investigated a number of issues relating to Attachment Theory and leadership. In their study, avoidant attachment of the leader was associated with lower levels of socialized leadership; higher levels of personalized leadership; higher levels of self reliance motives; and weaker prosocial motives. They further found that attachment anxiety was associated with lower self-perceived self-efficacy in task situations and avoidance with lower self-perceived efficacy in emotion focused situations.

Examining the interaction between leader and follower, Davidozitz et al (2006) found that follower avoidance was associated with lower appraisals of officer efficacy which is consistent with avoidant individuals more negative mental representations, or working models of others. Furthermore, the more avoidant the leader, the less the soldiers found him available and accepting and they felt more rejected and criticized by him.

Very powerfully, they also found that the leaders attachment style brings about a change in the followers mental health. The higher the officers avoidance score, the more the soldiers mental health deteriorated over 2 and 4 months of intensive combat training. Interestingly follower attachment played an important role. Secure followers were able to ‘resist’ the leader for 2 months, whereas insecurely attached followers saw a significant
deterioration of mental health. But after 4 months, they too had succumbed to the leader 
effect. (Cassidy and Shaver, 2008 p.449)

Concluding our review of Attachment Theory in organizations, we again make the point 
that apart from Popper and Mayeless (2003), Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s original 
conceptions of Secure Base have not been fully explored in organizational studies related 
to leadership. The core question of “what does it mean to be a Secure Base leader?” is not 
yet answered. It is this question that this thesis seeks to address.

We turn now to the next major body of theory, which is that of relatedness and positive 
relatedness. Attachment Theory is a theory of relationships and in focusing on the Secure 
Base component of Attachment Theory we are examining the most positive relationships. 
As we explore the concept of Secure Base as a positive relationship lens, we ought then 
to consider other bodies of ‘positive relationship literature’.

Relatedness and Positive Relatedness

The leading theories of psychological well-being all have some notion of 
‘relatedness’ (Ryan and Deci, 2001) or ‘positive relatedness’ (Ryff and Keyes, 1993). 
Well-being is the overarching term that covers constructs such as happiness, self-
actualization and self-realization. Ryff and Keyes (1993) describe Psychological Well 
Being (PWB) and presented a multidimensional approach to the measurement of PWB 
that taps five distinct aspects of human actualization: a) autonomy, b) personal growth, c) 
self-acceptance, d) life purpose, d) mastery and e) positive relatedness. Ryan & Deci’s
(2001) self determination theory (SDT) posits three basic psychological needs – autonomy, competence and relatedness – and theorizes that fulfillment of these needs is essential to psychological growth. Seligman (2000) has argued that well being occurs through a) being part of something bigger than yourself and b) using personal strengths. Finally, Diener and Seligman (2005) concluded from a study of college students that high quality social relationships are necessary for well-being.

There is a common thread of relatedness running through these theories of well-being. Ryan and Deci (1999 p. 157) suggest that, “so important is relatedness that some theorists have defined relatedness as a basic human need that is essential for well being (Baumesiter & Leary, 1990, Deci & Ryan, 1991). Furthermore, studies suggest that, of all factors that influence happiness, relatedness is at, or very near, the top of the list (Argyle ,1997; Myers, 1999)” According to Reis et al (2000 p 421), “nearly all theories of human motivation and development incorporate some sort of innate process by which people seek to establish and maintain satisfying connections with other persons.”

Along a similar line, Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggest that the need to belong, or interpersonal attachments is a fundamental human motivation. The argue that “human beings have a pervasive drive to form and maintain at least a minimum quantity of lasting, positive, and significant interpersonal relationships.” 497 They suggest two criteria to satisfy this need: a) frequent affectively pleasant interaction and b) these interactions must take place within a temporally stable enduring framework of affective concern for each other’s welfare (“frequent interaction plus persistent caring” p.497). In
this way it goes beyond affiliation (interaction that does not require caring) or intimate attachment (caring that does not require interaction). Referencing Donne, Freud, Maslow, Bowlby, Horney, Fromm, and others they make the point that positive relationships are central to human well-being. Unlike for example Freud, they suggest that human beings are naturally driven toward establishing and sustaining belongingness. They also suggest that the need to belong can be directed towards any human being – not just the traditional psychological object of mother or father. After a comprehensive literature review and discussion, they conclude by saying that “human beings are fundamentally and pervasively motivated by a need to belong, that is, by a strong desire to form and maintain enduring interpersonal attachments. People seek frequent, affectively positive interactions within the context of long term caring relationships.” (Baumeister and Leary, 1995. p.522)

How is this relevant to Secure Base Leadership? The literature on positive relatedness supports the relevance of Secure Base Leadership to organizational studies. We learn from the above that positive relatedness is not just a “nice to have” – it is essential to well-being. Therefore, as a theory of positive relatedness, Secure Base Leadership could contribute to well-being in organizations. If Secure Base Leadership promotes positive relatedness then I suggest that it becomes of great value to organizational scholars and practitioners.
Love

Another body of literature that ought to be considered within the context of Attachment Theory and positive relatedness is that of love. Peterson and Seligman (2004) make this connection when they say that the best theoretical lens through which to investigate the topic of love is Attachment Theory. Furthermore Cassidy and Shaver (2008) make reference to love in their discussions of Attachment Theory.

While we do not normally think of love in an organizational context, it seems fairly sensible to suggest that love could be included in a discussion about positive relationships and positive relatedness. I suggest that love could be considered as an ‘exemplar’ of positive relationships and thus worthy of study. Although, we often think about love in terms of romantic love, it is the purpose of this next section to suggest that love is also directly relevant to the topic of Secure Base Leadership. Before discussing this however, we need to consider love more generally.

What is love?

The meaning of love proposed here is the following: Love is the innate human capacity to be intentionally positively self and other regarding, which can be expressed through a variety of behaviors depending on the context.

This meaning of love is distilled from various bodies of literature including sociology (Sorokin, 1954), philosophy (Buber, 1971), humanistic psychology (Rogers 1995;
Fromm 1956; May 1969), social psychology (Sternberg, 1986) and biology (Maturana, 1999). From these literatures, certain themes emerge that informed the meaning proposed above. The first theme is that love extends beyond romantic love and love for family to include all people that a person encounters, and in the extreme all living beings. For example, the early Greeks, had as many as eight different versions of the word love - Eunoia, Physike, Xenike, Erotike, Eros, Philia, Storge and Agape (Post, 2003) with much of their understanding of love having to do with broader themes such as friendship, affection, kindness and goodwill. Academic scholars (Sorokin, 1954; Post, 2003) have further supported this broader conception of love that extends beyond the confines of romantic love or family love.

Buber’s (1971) notion of “I-Thou” describes the ideal relationship as being any situation where two people “take each other in with complete acceptance and without judgment” (Buber 1971, p.99). Opposite to I-thou is what Buber called “I-It”. In I-It relationships, people treat each other as objects, or very simply, the individual treats the other as no more than an ‘it’. Turning to biology for further support of a broad meaning of love that encompasses all people, even “things”, Maturana (1999) says that love “is the domain of those relational behaviors through which another (a person being or thing) arises as a legitimate other in coexistence with oneself” (Maturana, 1999 p. 59). Humanistic psychologists have also supported a broad conception of love. Fromm (1956), Frankl (1959), May (1969) and Rogers (1995) all wrote extensively about the importance and centrality of love for human well-being and flourishing. Rogers’ (1995) conception of “unconditional positive regard” is particularly relevant and describes a basic approach or
‘stance’ to others that involves an appreciative attitude and seeing the potential and worth in others. Even within the considerable body of romantic love research we discover that a key component of romantic love includes dimensions that could be applied to people in all relationships. Sternberg (1986) included high regard, mutual understanding, emotional support and valuing the other in his conceptions of romantic love; Davis (1985) argued that caring and liking are two of the three components of romantic love (physical attraction being the third) and companionate love is described by Hatfield and Rapson (1993) as “the affection and tenderness we feel for those with whom our lives are deeply entwined.” It is not a great leap to see how in an organizational appropriate non-romantic way, many of these elements could be expressed between colleagues, or between leader and follower. Finally within the realm of positive psychology, Peterson and Seligman (2004) support a broad conception of love by describing it as a disposition to “tend and befriend” and categorize it as a “strength of humanity.” The summary point from this is to conclude that love as an idea, when understood in its fullness in the literature, is perfectly well suited to organizational relationships.

The second theme to emerge from the literature is that love, and the capacity to love, is a natural human ability. Peterson and Seligman (2004) say that, “the capacity to love is an innate, species-typical tendency... ” (Peterson and Seligman 2004, p. 305) and Maturana (1999) argues that humans are fundamentally “loving animals” and that it is more commonplace and ordinary than we generally acknowledge. The implication here, is that love does not need to be created in organizations – rather it needs to be supported and brought to the surface.
The third theme is to suggest a distinction between the ‘behaviors’ of love and the ‘cognitions’ of love. The behaviors of love describe the actions and observable behaviors of a person engaged in acts of love, while the cognitions of love will describe the thought processes of the person. The reason I suggest making this distinction is in line with the literature. There is agreement on the cognitive aspects of love, but less so the observable behaviors. Love in the cognitive sense could be described as an attitude, an assumption, a mindset, a mental schema, a philosophy, an intention, a thought, a decision, or even a life perspective. This cognition at a very basic level involves valuing the ‘other’. This is described varyingly as accepting (Rogers, 1995), respecting (Fromm, 1956), legitimizing (Buber, 1951; Maturana, 1999) prizing (Rogers, 1995), granting significance (Sorokin, 1954) and affirming (Templeton, 1999). I have chosen to label this cognition broadly as “intentional positive other regard.” From a practical standpoint, cognitions associated with love as intentional positive other regard could include:

- "You and I are both legitimate beings"
- "You and I both have intrinsic value as human beings"
- "I am no better or worse than you at the deepest levels of being"
- "You and I are connected to each other”
- "My well being is linked to your well being"
- "You and I both have the potential to grow and flourish"
- “I see you as a human being first and foremost – before seeing you in your role as an employee or colleague.”
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As for the behaviors and actions of love, there is considerably less agreement. For example, Fromm (1956), Post (2003), Sternberg (1986) and Vanier (1964) all suggested different manifestations or behaviors associated with love. Rather than attempting to group these various behaviors into categories or factors, I propose that that the behaviors associated with love are going to vary depending on the context. In other words, there will not be a definitive ‘list’ of the love behaviors, or groupings of behaviors, as depending on the context and the people, it will get expressed differently. This is intuitively consistent with personal experience, which shows that the expression of love can take many forms depending on the situation. Sometimes love means doing a lot, sometimes a little, sometimes it means sitting quietly with a person, sometimes it means asking a question, sometimes it means being tough, sometimes it means making a bowl of soup! One might ask then whether the actions and behaviors should even be included in the meaning of love? In other words, if the cognition is clear and the behaviors are not, perhaps it is logical to only focus on the cognition? May (1969) made an important contribution to our understanding of love in this regard by encouraging us to not only think about it in the abstract, but also as an action – or what he called ‘will’. He argued that ‘will’ makes love active in the world. May (1969) points out that love is the foundation, but ‘will’ is necessary to actualize that love. For that reason I suggest that the actions and behaviors of love are essential and need to be included, even if they are harder to categorize or describe. In summary, the cognitions of “intentional positive other regard” are going to have multiple possible behavioral expressions.
Up to this point, we have not made much reference to the organizational context. Hopefully it is clear that given the broad working definition, the type of love advocated here is perfectly well suited to organizations. Intentional positive other regard could be expressed between colleagues, it could be expressed between a leader and followers, it could be expressed between organizational members and its customers and with any stakeholder group external to the organization. As will be argued later, intentional positive other regard could even extend to the environment.

A final point to make about the meaning of love is that when we talk about love in an organizational context, we are likely to hear about people “loving their jobs” or “loving their work.” This form of loving ‘what’ you do is not the focus of this paper. In terms of existing organizational literature, I suggest that loving ‘what’ you do will more closely correspond to topics like calling (Hall and Chandler, 2005; Dobrow, 2004), subjective career success (Arthur et al, 2005), engagement (Kahn, 1990) and job satisfaction (Hackman and Oldham, 1975). For the purposes of this paper we are talking about the relational or social aspects of love – loving other people.

I said earlier that it was an objective to introduce the idea of love to organizational literature. Before moving on therefore, we should examine the existing literature on love in organizations. There have been few references to love in organizational writing - largely in commentary articles (Maturana, 1999; Harrison, 2008) or in the practitioner press (Sanders, 2002; Hope Bryant, 2009). Interestingly Kouzes and Posner (2007) reference love in the conclusion to their authoritative book “The Leadership Challenge”
as “the secret to life” and consider it their “answer” to great leadership. As for journal articles, it is in the realm of leadership that we see references to love. Kouzes and Posner (1992) and Ferris (1988) argue that love is an important element of leadership effectiveness. However missing from these works is a thorough scholarly examination of the meaning of love. They make little or no reference to the existing literature and tend to rely on definitions and meanings borne from personal experience. While I agree with their perspectives at a high level, it is hoped that this review contributes by bringing a perspective grounded in a scholarly review of the construct.

Positive Relationships at Work

We turn now to a body of literature known as “Positive Relationships at Work” (PRW). Situated within Positive Organizational Scholarship, PRW seeks to explore the nature of positive relationships in organizational settings.

Dutton and Ragins (2007) ask: “what makes life living?” They suggest that the answer, for most people, is positive relationships. They envision PRW as a “rich new interdisciplinary domain of inquiry that focuses on the generative processes, relational mechanisms, and positive outcomes associated with PRW.” They propose that PRW builds off the literatures of positive psychology and positive organizational scholarships movements. Dutton and Ragins (2007) also make the point that PRW involves studying the role of relationships in organizational life by putting the relationship “front and center.” (Dutton and Ragins, 2007. P.4)
What is the definition of PRW? Dutton and Ragins (2007) suggest that it is too early in the development of the construct to have a definitive definition and therefore propose an “expansive approach” to defining PRW. They suggest, somewhat unsurprisingly, that the three basic elements of PRW are 1) Relationships; 2) positive relationships and 3) positive relationships within the context of work.

In an attempt to better understand PRW, scholars have investigated PRW in terms of High Quality Connections (Heaphy 2007, Higgins 2007, Baker and Dutton 2007), the experiences, processes and outcomes of PRW (Kahn 2007, Roberts 2007, Pratt and Dirks 2007), the context within which they reside (Ancona and Isaacs 2007 and McGinn 2007) and also within the specific nature of the relationship, such as leadership or mentoring (Fletcher 2007 and Ragins and Verbos 2007).

One of the most developed notions of PRW is that of High Quality Connections (HQC). Dutton and Heaphy (2003) first proposed HQC and its importance. They define HQCs in terms of whether they are “life-giving or life-depleting” and suggest that a HQC will be “flexible, strong and resilient.” They do not assume that a HQC needs to enduring or recurring, nor do they assume intimacy or closeness.

Dutton and Heaphy (2003) describe three features of High Quality Connections. The first is “higher emotional carrying capacity.” This is indicated by more expression of emotion within the relationship, whether positive or negative. They argue that HQCs have the capacity to withstand and support negative emotions and in this way have a broader
emotional spectrum. The second feature is what they call “tensility” which is the capacity of the relationship with withstand strain, conflict and setbacks. This could also be described resilience and promotes greater flexibility in response to changing conditions. The third feature of a HQC, according to Dutton and Heaphy (2003), is the “degree of connectivity.” This refers to the relationships generativity and openness to new ideas and influences.

Beyond these three features, Dutton and Heaphy (2003) suggest that the subjective experience of a HQC will be “feelings of vitality and aliveness, a heightened sense of positive regard for the other and mutuality.” (Dutton and Heaphy, 2003. P.267).

Finally, Dutton and Heaphy (2003) focusing on HQC, suggest four theoretical lenses that are pertinent – exchange; identity; growth and development; and learning.
For the purposes of this paper we will explore three of these in greater depth.
Exchange theory, with is roots in sociology and social psychology, suggests that social relations involve the exchange of value between parties. The value being exchanged could include numerous items such as money, time, physical work or ideas. Stronger and enduring relationships will occur where the value being exchanges is appreciated and significant. Within organizational literature, Leader Member Exchange (LMX) would be a good example of exchange. LMX (Graen and Scandura, 1987) proposes that the relationship between a leader and follower involves the exchange of value between the two. In a HQC, as described by LMX, the leader will receive engagement and effort and the follower will receive responsibility and autonomy. LMX will be examined in greater
depth later in this paper, but it is important to note at this point, that it is a possible lens through which to examine HQC.

In terms of a Growth and Development lens, Dutton and Heaphy (2003) suggest that HQCs are fundamental to human growth and development. Pointing to Attachment Theory, they argue that HQCs are central to an individual’s physical and psychological health. They also refer to the literates on relatedness and belonging to suggest that HQCs are indeed a basic human need and motive. They conclude by saying that “HQC’s enliven by providing growth fostering connections, secures bases of attachment for organizational caregiving, and developmental relationships.” (Dutton and Heaphy, 2003 p.273) We see here then a reference to Secure Bases and relatedness.

The third lens that Dutton and Heaphy suggest for examining HQCs is that of Learning and propose that HQCs form the supportive context within which people “acquire, develop, and experiment with new knowledge or ways of being.” This learning lens will be important when we consider Psychological Safety later in this paper, since the psychology safety research and theorizing also connects strongly to a learning lens.

If Attachment Theory examines an individual’s schemas and habits in relationship, in other words a person’s tendency to relate, which is formed early in life, then it seems sensible to suggest that it could be considered an antecedent to PRW which is concerned with the workplace. In other words, what we learn about relationships through our developmental years of childhood and young adulthood, precedes our relationship habits
in working life. PRW is a relationship construct and therefore since Attachment Theory
describes a person’s typical habits in relationships, it could be indicative of how a work
relationship will develop and evolve. Since attachment scores describe the more stable
and longer-term patterns of relating, it is logical to suggest that it would be the
independent variable. In other words, how a person relates to people in general (informed
primarily by earlier developmental relationships) is more logically an antecedent to how a
person relates to a specific person at work – rather than the other way around.

We turn now to consider the notion of leadership as relationship, which is the body of
organizational literature perhaps most relevant to Secure Base Leadership.

*Leadership as Relationship*  
Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) in their review of Leader Member Exchange (LMX),
describe the notion of “leadership as relationship” and argue that a relationship based
approach to leadership would focus on the dyadic relationship between the leader and
follower. LMX incorporates an operationalization of a relationship-based approach to
leadership. LMX had its origins in Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory (Dansereau at al, 1975)
which showed that leaders do not have equal relationships with all followers, but rather
differentiated relationships with each follower. This recognition of differing dyads led to
a long line of research in this domain and became known as LMX (Graen, Novak and
Sommerkamp, 1982). A large body of empirical work has developed examining the
characteristics of the LMX relationship as well as its relationship to other organizational
variables. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) conclude by saying that, “*findings documented*
significant, positive relationships between quality of the exchange (LMX) and many outcome variables of interest” and that, “effective leadership processes occur when leaders and followers develop and maintain high quality social exchange relationships.” (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995 p.229.)

LMX can be considered both transactional and transformational. Lower levels of LMX can be likened to transactional leadership. The final stage of mature partnership is more akin to transformational leadership (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

An area of controversy around LMX relates to its dimensionality. Some scholars have suggested that it is multidimensional, rather than unidimensional. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) conclude that the construct does have multiple dimensions, but they are so highly correlated that they can be tapped with the single measure of LMX. They theorize that there are three dimensions: respect, trust and obligation. Liden and Maslyn propose a 4 dimension, 12 item, measure of LMX that includes a dimension of affect. It is this measure of LMX that will be used in this study due to the ability to separate out the affect dimension. One would expect Secure Base Leadership, with its base in positive relationships to have an affect component and it will be useful to therefore have a comparable measure within LMX.

Importantly, LMX concerns itself specifically with the professional relationship and in this way differentiates itself from the liking based-based dimensions of interpersonal attraction and bonding (Liden and Maslyn, 1994).
Brower, Schoorman and Tan (2000) suggest that a high LMX relationship is characterized by mutual trust, loyalty and by behaviors that extend outside of the employment contract. Importantly, and significant to this research, there has been no work examining the relationship between Attachment Theory and LMX. Research has shown strong empirical relationships between LMX and the outcome measures of satisfaction with supervisor and overall satisfaction, turnover, performance, commitment and citizenship behaviors (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Popper, M. (2004) also describes the idea of leadership as relationship and says, “the relationship itself as the psychological essence, the important unit to analyze.” (Popper, 2004 p.111) Describing the evolution of leadership thinking from ‘great man’ theories of leadership (Carlyle, 1841) to calculative and instrumental approach (transactional leadership) to more holistic views, Popper (2004) argues that the inclusion of emotion was an important development in leadership theorizing. Studies have shown that the emotional presence is a key element in leaders influence (Zaleznik, 1977, Bennis and Nanus, 1985, Popper, 2001). *The conceptualization of leadership as relationship permits an integrative view of leaders, followers and circumstances and reduces the bias of giving too much weight to the leader.* (Popper, 2004 p.118)

Popper (2004) also argues that relationships regarded as developmental tend to deal with daily life “leadership in everyday life”. She suggests that developmental relationships are
more likely to flourish in situations where matters of safety and survival are not in play, nor issues of personal and social identity. Close leadership allows developmental relations – the highest form of relationship would be a developmental relationship, similar to transformational leadership, in that the followers “does more” than expected or than the norm (Popper, 2004, p.120).

Psychological Safety

We turn now to examine a body of literature that will be relevant to this study due to its hypothesized relationship to Secure Base leadership. If the role of a Secure Base is to mediate the dynamic between attachment and exploration (Ainsworth, 1978), or safety and risk in an organizational context, then we need to consider organizational constructs that potentially measure such an outcome. Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999) is such a construct. Team Psychological Safety is defined as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking (Edmondson, 1999).

“It is a sense of confidence that the team will not embarrass, reject, or punish someone for speaking up. This confidence stems from mutual respect and trust among team members. Trust is defined as the expectation that that others future actions will be favorable to ones interests, such that one will be willing to be vulnerable to those actions. Team psychological safety involves, but goes beyond interpersonal trust; it describes a team climate characterized by interpersonal trust and mutual respect in which people are comfortable being themselves.” (Edmondson, 1999 p.354)
It should be noted that Edmondson’s conception of Psychological Safety is an extension of other bodies of organizational literature. For example, Edmondson draws from the well-established work of Argyris (1961) and Schein (1993) in developing her conception of Psychological Safety.

From this description of Psychological Safety, it is sensible to hypothesize a relationship to Secure Base Leadership. Secure Base Leadership is essentially concerned with the dynamic interplay between the attachment and exploration systems, which are akin to safety and risk in terms of Psychological Safety.

What are the known antecedents of team Psychological Safety? According to Edmondson (1999) the role of the leader will be important: “context support should be important because access to information and resources is likely to reduce defensiveness. Team leader coaching is likely to be an important influence on team psychological safety. A team leaders behavior is particularly salient; team members are likely to attend to each other’s actions and responses, but to be particularly aware of the behavior of the leader. If the team leader is supportive, coaching oriented, and has non-defensive responses to questions and challenges, members are likely to conclude that the team constitutes a safe environment. In contrast, if team leaders act in authoritarian or punitive ways, team members may be reluctant to engage in risky behaviors” Edmondson, 1999 p.356.

Edmondson concludes by stating that further research is required to understand the antecedents of team Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999). Given the conceptual
overlap with psychological safety, it is sensible to suggest a relationship to Secure Base Leadership. Furthermore, this would be a contribution to the literature on Psychological Safety.
Literature Review Conclusion

It is worth revisiting the key points of this literature review.

First, we examined the concept of Secure Base and its broader context of Attachment Theory. The point was made that while Attachment Theory has seen tremendous empirical advancement, it has tended down a ‘dimensional’ path, most notably in organizational literature. Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s conceptions of Secure Base were not rooted in this dimensional approach. They did not define Secure Base as a state of low anxiety and low avoidance. Rather, their conception was that a Secure Base provides comfort and protection so that the other person can explore the world and take risks. The Secure Base plays a key role in helping the person manage the dynamic interplay between the attachment and exploration systems. It was furthermore shown that Bowlby’s concept of Secure Base is absolutely fundamental to the whole of Attachment Theory and therefore given the lack of development in organizational literature of the Secure Base concept as he suggested it, this is an appropriate and important avenue for research. It was also shown that there is a dearth of qualitative insights into the concept of Secure Base. It is clear from Bowlby and Ainsworth what function Secure Bases perform (safety and comfort in the service of exploration and risk taking) but it is less clear what behaviors and actions are associated with this function. In others words, Ainsworth and Bowlby told us clearly that Secure Bases are important, but we are less clear on how to actually be a Secure Base in an organizational context. Fortunately, there is insight to be gained from the literatures of developmental psychology and neurobiology which have
more thoroughly explored the role of the Secure Base, and it is upon these insights that this dissertation rests.

Next we examined the application of Attachment Theory to the organizational context. It was shown that apart from Popper and Mayseless (2003) organizational scholars have not developed the original conception of Secure Base concept as thoroughly as the dimensional approach to Attachment Theory. While there has been initial quantitative research making use of the dimensional approach (Davidowitz et al 2007, Popper and Mayseless, 2009) and some tentative theoretical suggestion of how Secure Base could be applied to leadership studies (Popper, 2003), a detailed qualitative understanding of Secure Base leadership is lacking.

In order to situate Secure Base Leadership in a broader context, the review also covered numerous relationship-focused literatures. The purpose here was to determine whether Secure Base Leadership is a distinct concept within the relationship literature, and especially within the organizational literature. It was suggested that since the Secure Base concept is an ideal type, it is something of a positive lens of relationships. Therefore we considered literatures of relatedness, positive relatedness and of love. It was suggested at the conclusion that a conception of SB as a source of safety and protection would potentially be similar to these notions of positive relatedness and love.

In organizational studies the review covered the literatures of Positive Relationships at Work and Leader Member Exchange. In terms of PRW it was suggested that SBL could
be a helpful additional lens to the PRW conversation. It was shown that since LMX is the most well established measure of leadership as relationship, it would be important to demonstrate empirically that SBL is distinct from LMX.

We also considered the notion of Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999) as it relates to Secure Base Leadership. If Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s conceptions of Secure Base involves provided safety in order to encourage risk taking, then it was argued that Psychological Safety, as a measure of safety and risk taking, would be an appropriate variable to consider in relation to SBL.

In summary, this review of the literature shows that a more detailed understanding and description of Secure Base Leadership would be a helpful addition to Attachment Theory and an important contribution to organizational studies.
RESEARCH AGENDA

From this literature review, a research agenda emerged.

First, it seems important to better understand descriptively the behaviors associated with Secure Base Leadership. Bowlby and Ainsworth indicated that the role of a Secure Base is to help manage the dynamic between attachment and exploration. But what does that look like in an organizational context? Developmental psychologists and clinical therapists have outlined the important role that Secure Bases play in child development and in therapeutic relationships. But again, what does that look like in organizations if a leader is a Secure Base? Popper and Mayseless (2003) suggested some of the elements of Secure Base Leadership, but this has not been developed through a study.

A qualitative study, aimed at developing a descriptive model of the behaviors associated with Secure Base Leadership is therefore the appropriate starting point. This qualitative study forms Study 1 of this dissertation.

The completion of Study 1, culminating in a descriptive model of Secure Base Leadership could then be tested empirically. This would involve developing a Secure Base Leadership measurement instrument and testing that instrument in relation to existing measures and relevant constructs such as LMX and Psychological Safety. The development and assessment of a Secure Base Leadership instrument forms Study 2 of this dissertation.
BACKGROUND NOTE

While these two studies are referred to as Study One and Study Two, there was a study that preceded this dissertation that should be noted. It is similar in many ways to the design of these studies and provides a context for some of the questions asked in this dissertation.

The study was conducted with the aim of examining the relationship between the attachment style of a leader (as measured by the standard ECR) and the outcome variables of psychological safety, leader effectiveness and job satisfaction. LMX was also measured to assess how a leaders attachment style would relate to the LMX score of followers.

The core hypothesis was that a leader reporting a secure attachment style (low in avoidance and low in anxiety as measured by the ECR) would correlate to higher levels of psychological safety, job satisfaction and leadership effectiveness. Furthermore, it was hypothesized, that the attachment orientation of the leader would predict the outcome variables over and above LMX.

Data was collected through an online survey of leaders from 3 domains - an investment bank, an MBA class and a non-profit organization. An email was sent to the manager inviting them to participate in the study and they in turn invited their team members (their direct reports) and their manager to also complete the survey.
Summary Results (only statistically significant results shown here):

1. Attachment

Leader Anxiety predicted:

- Follower job satisfaction (r^2 = 0.08)
- Follower psychological safety (r^2 = 0.09)
- Leader Effectiveness rated by follower (r^2 = 0.1)
- Leader Effectiveness rated by boss (r^2 = 0.32)

Leader Avoidance did not however predict any of these variables.

In other words, in terms of attachment styles, these data suggested that to be successful, a leader can be either Secure or Avoidant/Dismissive - but not Anxious/Preoccupied or Fearful. This was not then support for the Secure Attachment style and a challenge to existing research and theory.

2. LMX

- LMX was a stronger predictor of all the outcome variables than the attachment dimensions
- Leader anxiety was however shown as an antecedent to LMX.

The following questions emerged from this study:
• Why did the avoidance dimension not correlate to the outcome variables?
• Does the secure attachment style as measured by the ECR really not correspond to leadership?
• Was this a company specific effect, as the largest portion of the total sample came from the Investment Bank, where the culture could be described as avoidant/dismissive?
• Is being a Secure Base the same as having a secure attachment style?
• Does the ECR not translate well to the organizational context?
• Since Attachment analysis does not add anything over LMX, is it a redundant variable?

From this study, two overarching questions surfaced:

• Is being a Secure Base potentially different to having a secure attachment style?
• Would an organizational version of the ECR produce better results in terms of predicting outcome variables?

It is this study, and these two questions, that influenced the direction and design of this dissertation.
CHAPTER II

STUDY ONE - METHODS

Study Overview and Design

An inductive, qualitative research study aimed at identifying the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership. The objective is to bring greater insight into the behaviors and characteristics associated with Secure Base Leadership within the organizational context.

Participants

Fifty organizational leaders identified by a research team. The research team consisted of 8 coaches on a leadership training program at a European business school.

Participants are predominantly from Western Europe (Switzerland, United Kingdom) and the USA in terms of nationality and overwhelmingly work and reside in Western Europe and the USA.

Average age of Participants: 48

Number of Male participants: 36

Number of Female participants: 14
Procedure

A team of 8 executive coaches, who have worked on a leadership program at a Swiss business school for 7 years, involving 18 programs and over 800 participants, nominated people to be interviewed based on their experience and knowledge of the individuals. The term Secure Base Leadership had not been used before in the program, but Bowlby’s notion of Secure Base is a key element of the program and so the coaches were familiar with the Secure Base concept and of Bowlby’s core ideas of bonding and loss. Participants were chosen for having some potential qualities of Secure Base Leadership, but this was not assessed in a formal way and as will be discussed below, is in fact not material to the analysis and findings. Rather, the individuals were chosen by the research team as being high performing leaders, as defined by their experience of the individuals.

Importantly, while their potential status as ‘high performing leaders’ brings some consistency to the people interviewed, their standing as a leader, whether ‘good’, ‘bad’ or ‘high performing’ is not relevant to the findings of the study. The interview questions are asking about specific times when they experienced Secure Base Leadership. In most of the interviews, the most revealing data were about their experience of other people who were a Secure Base to them. In other words, the questions defined Secure Base Leadership, rather than saying that these are Secure Base Leaders whose behaviors were observed and described. Clearly until the characteristics of Secure Base Leadership are identified, participants cannot be selected according to any criteria. Therefore the selection of the participants was based on assumptions of appropriateness, rather than
clear data. This approach is however theoretically sound in terms of sampling, as based on Bowlby’s theory, if we are looking for stories of Secure Base Leadership, we should aim to speak to people who might prima facie be Secure Base leaders. Attachment Theory suggests these people are more likely to have encountered Secure Bases themselves in their development, and therefore should be a richer source of stories. So while it is not a case of saying they are Secure Base leaders to be observed, as an initial group, they were theoretically good candidates for supplying stories of Secure Base Leadership. This issue will be revisited in the limitations section at the end of the chapter as a possible critique could be of ‘circularity’ of the results.

The coaches conducted the interviews following a semi-structured interview protocol. An important part of the interviews was therefore series of additional explorative sub-questions asked in response to answers, in order to obtain depth and richness of data. These questions were focused on language, phrases, actions, stories, applications, and insights. Interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed.

The term Secure Base was not used in the interview. The phrase “built your self-confidence and encouraged you to explore, create and achieve” was used as the descriptor to prompt participants. This phrase is consistent with Bowlby’s conception of Secure Base outlined above in terms of a Secure Base providing 1) safety but 2) in the service of exploration. It is also consistent with Bartholomew’s ‘self” and ‘other’ dimensions of attachment. People who have been “most helpful” and “most influential” were also used as phrases to prompt participants. It should be noted that a broad definition of leadership
was used in the interviews in that some of the questions asked about childhood experiences with key authority figures such as parents and teachers. Therefore stories about teachers and parents were included in the interviews where they elicited useful data on the nature of Secure Base behaviors. The similar nature of parenting, teaching and leadership has been argued by scholars (Popper and Mayselless, 2003) and there is thus theoretical support for this approach. This could however be considered a limitation of the study and will be addressed below.

It should also be noted that some of the questions in the interview are not directly related to the study but to broader influences on participant’s leadership. These questions were excluded from the analysis. For the purposes of the analysis, the focus was only on stories of Secure Bases and Secure Base Leadership. Questions 3, 5, 9 and 12 of the protocol (below) were thus the focus of the analysis.

In terms of protecting the identity and confidentiality of the participants for the purposes of the Institutional Review Board, the following procedure was followed. The transcripts were sent to the researcher as the first step. The names of the interviewees did appear at the beginning of each transcript, but were not identifiable in the remainder of the transcript apart from the person’s initials. To make the transcripts unidentifiable, I immediately, upon receipt, numbered them from 1 to 50, and then discarded and shredded the first page where the person’s name appeared. In this way, when I performed the qualitative analysis, I simply had a number reference for each interview – thus providing no identifiable information to me as the researcher.
Measures

Interview Protocol:

1. Our research is exploring the various factors that influence leadership. There are many factors that could influence a person’s leadership – what do you consider to be the most significant factors to have influenced your leadership? People, events, dreams, ideas, religion, values….

Thank you, we will explore some of those points in greater depth as we continue. I would like to ask you now a few questions about your childhood and youth… later in the interview, we will talk about adult influences.

2. Who were the people in your childhood and youth that helped you the most – that built your self-confidence and encouraged you to explore, create and achieve?

3. Can you tell me a story about a specific time or moment when one of these peoples’ influence was particularly significant? What did they say, what did they do? What did you learn?

4. Apart from parents and immediate family members, who were some of the other people who were most influential when you were growing up?
5. Can you tell me a story about a specific time or moment when one of these peoples’ influence was particularly significant? What did they say, what did they do? What did you learn?

6. What were some of the most significant events to influence you when you were growing up? What was the influence? How did you change as a result? What did you learn?

7. We have spoken now about various people and events from your childhood and youth…do you see any connections between these people or events and how they have impacted you as an adult – and specifically as a leader?

Now lets turn to your adulthood…

8. As an adult, and as a leader, who were the people who have been most influential and helpful? Why? How?

9. Can you tell me a story about a specific time or moment when one of these peoples’ influence was particularly significant? What did they say, what did they do?
10. What were some of the most significant events to influence you as an adult? What was the influence? How did you change as a result? What did you learn? How did it impact your leadership?

11. Please tell me about a time of failure, loss or crisis. Who did you turn to and why? What did they say or do that was helpful at that time?

12. Please tell me about a time when you, as a leader, helped another person. Where you helped build their self-confidence and encouraged them to explore, create or achieve? What did you say and do? What was their response?

13. What do you consider your special talents? How did you learn these talents? And who were the people helping you to develop these talents?

14. How would you describe your leadership? What is your style? What are your strengths? What do you most need to develop as a leader?

15. As we begin to close this interview, are there any final comments or reflections you would like to make about anything we have spoken about? Or not spoken about in terms of factors that have influenced your leadership?

*Analysis of Data*
The interviews were analyzed in a multi-step process according to a Grounded Theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As the aim of this process was to identify the behaviors associated with Secure Base Leadership, it was not pure grounded theory in the sense that the researcher did have a focus to the analysis, rather than allowing the data ‘to speak’ in a completely unconstrained manner.

First, ten of the interviews were read multiple times. This was to allow the researcher to become immersed in the data and create first order codes (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). During the reading of the interviews notes were recorded around specific behaviors and actions. In this initial reading of the interviews, 37 first order behaviors were recorded. Examples of a first order behaviors would be:

- Asked a question
- Put hand on shoulder
- Encouraged risk

These 37 first order behaviors were then sorted to create second order groupings of behaviors (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Examples of these second order groupings would be:

- Inquiry and Listening
- Acceptance of the person
- Positive mindset
The interviews were then re-read by the researcher to check the validity of these groupings to ensure that all behaviors described in the interviews could be grouped into these categories.

The second order groupings were then described more fully, with a description of each and accompanying sample evidence. This information was then shared with three co-researchers verbally and in writing. The co-researchers then read the interviews with the intention of performing an inter-rater reliability analysis. Two of the co-researchers read all 50 interviews and one of the co-researchers read 5 of the interviews. Although they did not quantitatively ‘score’ this process, the groupings were qualitatively confirmed as being representative and easily identified in the interviews.

One additional grouping was suggested by a researcher that was described as “non-verbal exchanges.” These were behaviors in the data such as ‘putting a hand on a shoulder’, ‘a smile in a meeting’, ‘being silent on the telephone while I cried’. After discussion, it was agreed that while there was a large number of behaviors that clearly fell into this category, they could also be assigned to the original categories of “acceptance” and “inquiry” described below.

Following this process, eight dimensions of Secure Base Leadership were established. These results are described fully in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

STUDY ONE – RESULT

Chapter Overview
This chapter describes the results of the qualitative analysis of the study described in the previous chapter.

Results
There are eight primary dimensions of Secure Base Leadership to emerge from these data.

Dimension 1: Acceptance and acknowledgment of the person as a human being

The data suggest that a key component of being a Secure Base is a non-judgmental acceptance of the other person. Almost without exception, these data demonstrate that a Secure Base has an appreciation for the human being first – before focusing on the issue or problem or work. This means that the person feels legitimized and affirmed as a person, even though the dialogue with the Secure Base might be one of corrective feedback. We might refer to this in daily life as being able to separate the person from the problem.

Sample Evidence:
“he was showing interest, showing and making you feel special” IM p.10
“he was not recognizing a particular performance…he was recognizing a person. I was not the best by far…” IM p.10
“whatever you do, I will love you” IP p.2.
“they love me for what I am as a person, not a professional” IP p.14
“being approved of, being congratulated, being lifted up, raised up” IP2 p.12
“its about accepting the person for who they are and where they’re at” IJ p.25
“the mistakes were never used as a tool to put down” IC p.7
“I’ve always known that I am loved no matter what” IE p.1
“Leadership is about seeing the individual as an individual…” IE p.2
“you want to treat people the way you want to be treated…love is too big of a word, but respect and kindness.” IE p.8
“just be yourself…that’s the most important thing you need in these meetings” IVW p.6
and that makes a difference, because you do not condemn the person. You have to say something about the job they did, but the person stays where he or she is” IVW p.9
her personal development, her personal growth was far more important than the specific business situation” IVW p.10

Example Story:
A teacher taught a child, that even though he was not a very talented student (he had repeated a grade and was “not successful” as a student), he was able to learn. So it
became less about the result of results and scores, and more about acceptance, and the process of learning. This idea of the ability to learn as being more important than the result became a core empowering belief and that child is now a scientist. The teacher effectively validated the person, rather than focusing on the problem. IVW p.3

**Dimension 2: Seeing Potential in the Other**

The interview data suggest a clear theme of Secure Bases seeing the potential in the other person, many times even more than the person him or herself. This is sometimes shown as having a vision for the person’s career, or their life that is beyond what the person is able to envision.

**Sample Evidence:**

- “I always felt that my parents thought I could do anything, and there was no limitation on my ability to achieve and do “ IJ p.3
- “I had a dream when I was a child to win a Nobel Prize. And I always thought that he had a feeling that I would achieve it. He never told me “that’s nonsense”. No, No, no. He always told me “Yeah, sure you will win” IP p.2
- “But there were people around me who had more confidence in me than I did” IP p.8
- “You had confidence in me, and so I did it” IP p. 21
- “he just needed a lot of encouragement, encouragement, encouragement. And he came through it and has gone on to do extremely well” IJ p. 24
• “so its perhaps about being willing to give people the benefit of the doubt…when you start out from that basis that actually the intention is to do something positive. And lots of people, when you challenge them and give them the possibility, they will respond in a very positive way.” IJ p. 27

• “You can do what you want…you can do it and you should do what you want” IE p. 1

• she could see me in another way than perhaps other people in my little village” IE p. 3

• “you are here because you are good, you are talented, you are bright and I am very happy that you are here and I will support you and give you tasks that you will be able to solve in a good way” IE p. 22

• I am absolutely sure that you can do it. Give it a try” IM p.18

*Example Stories:*

1. High School Teacher of a young girl in a small European village pushing her to aim for more in her life: “Oh no, you shouldn’t be a high school teacher, its too boring for you…you should do something, you should be…” (she is now a very senior member of a European government. IE p. 5

2. A librarian who allowed a child access to the adult part of the library when she was bored with all the children’s books. In this way the librarian saw the potential of the little girl and didn’t constrain her to the ‘child’ section (metaphorically and literally) IJ p.6
Dimension 3: Allow Risk and Provide Opportunities

More than simply seeing the potential in others, the data show that Secure Bases also actively provide opportunity for risk taking. This is important because it implies that the Secure Base is willing to take some personal risk as well in terms of allowing the other person to potentially fail with associated consequences for both parties. It goes beyond seeing the potential in others to providing them with an actual opportunity to fulfill their potential (and also to fail). In this way, the data suggest that Secure Bases can also be tough and challenging in their feedback and encouragement to take risk.

Sample Evidence:

- “They always let me try things and sometimes venturing into doing things that were way beyond what someone of my age level would be considered safe” IP p.9
- “She really believed in me. She took a Spanish guy into HR who doesn’t know the language, but still she thought that I could do the job and she really trusted me” IP p.11
- “He took the risky path, but succeeded. He taught me that” IP p.23
- “He challenged me and pushed me out of my comfort zone” IP p.24
- “I don’t think I can do this, but you can Lord. And you just be behind me and I will go” IP p.9
- “when there are problems, the leader should be able to step back and delegate…” IC p.22
• what my father allowed me to do, we built a house together. He allowed me as a 12 year old, substantial wood working, of big heavy stuff and all the construction” IUB p.2

• 3 billion Gas turbine deals given as a rookie – “the trust in me was the most important” IUB p.7

• So you should do it, you should try it out and if it doesn’t work, then we can talk and find the best way out” IM p.12

Example Stories:

1. A flying instructor who when realizing that an emergency landing would be required due to a problem with the undercarriage, suggests to the flying student that the student land the plane! They spent an hour in the air preparing for the emergency landing, and then the student landed the plane successfully. IC p.21

2. A young child is allowed to use adult clothing scissors by her mother. The mother was a seamstress and after some ‘training’ was prepared to take the risk that her child use a potentially dangerous instrument. IJ p.5

Dimension 4: Supportive and Accessible – “Anywhere, anytime”

Subjects describe how they feel “supported” by Secure Bases who are “available”, but it turns out that physical proximity and frequency of interaction are less important. In fact, many of the Secure Bases are not in frequent contact, nor physically present and many of the most powerful conversations were in fact very brief. Therefore the idea of
being supportive and accessible has more to do with a sense of the person and of the
relationship, rather than the actual amount of communication. This could be described, as
the “invisible” aspects of being a Secure Base.

Sample Evidence:

- “its some feedback they give you, the confidence that they have, that is not
  necessarily expressed in words, but they make you feel it” IM p. 9
- “but he was saying that he was confident, that he was confident that I was doing
  the right thing. And this is huge to have a couple of words from him on a piece of
  paper. Its absolutely huge” IM p. 27
- “I can remember very clearly some examples where I would see something that I
  very much admired being done by someone, and it might have only been for a
  minute, or two minutes, or five minutes, but it would have such a powerful impact
  on me” IJ p. 2
- “they supported me in that moment, but not in an explicit way” IP p.19
- ‘but I knew they were always there and their support was, you know, a phone call
  now and again” IP p.11
- “I have this very good friend…I do not see her very often…but she has been part
  of my history all the way” IE p. 8
- he became a Secure Base for me…in fact still is, although he is dead” IUB p.9
- he always stepped in if you needed him, he was always available, open doors…”
  IM p. 9
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Example Story:

A swimming instructor who took a child aside and gave him some honey during a practise when he was struggling to keep up with the other swimmers. The coach didn’t say anything about it, but the child took it as complete support and was affirmed in a nonverbal way IM p.10

Dimension 5: Style - Calm, Dependable, and Predictable

The interviews provide evidence for the idea that Secure Bases tend to have a style that is calm and that they are dependable and predictable. In fact, the word “calm” would score high in a word count test. The dependable and predictable aspect does not imply a dull or uncreative Secure Base, but rather a person who can be relied upon in terms of support and calm behavior. They are not described as agitated and erratic. This is particularly evidence in stories related to failure or risk.

Sample Evidence:

- “And he reacted very calmly. He said, “okay, yeah, I am hearing you” IP p.13
- “He asked in a very nice way, without shouting and without making a big whatever” IP p.13
- “They would always think properly and treat people properly” IYW p. 7
- also that big ability…calm and support. I could cry in front of him IUB p.9

Dimension 6: Style - Tendency to favor Listening and Inquiry (over advocacy)
These data reflect a stylistic bias of Secure Bases towards listening and inquiry, rather than ‘telling’ and advocacy. Interviewees describe how Secure Bases listened to them and asked questions, rather than providing solutions or telling them what to do in difficult situations.

**Sample Evidence:**

- “It’s not about telling the other person what to do…its more about inspiring and asking the right questions so that the other can come to the conclusions themselves” IM p. 31
- “She was listening, understanding, available and understanding of the feeling. She didn’t say anything” IM p.36
- “I think just utter love…listening…they listened” IP p.3
- “He set standards and discipline by asking tough questions and then following up” IJ p.5
- “So its actually a transfer of power, of know how and a transfer of attitudes” IC p.
- “Well, actually listen most of the time and refrain from commenting or providing judgmental evaluation” IC p. 25

**Example Story:**

A colleague who asked open-ended questions to a direct report navigating a case of a supplier wanting payment of a bribe. He empowered her to find the solution and to work it out. “Well, do you want to tell me about it?”, “How do you want to handle it?” It is a story of risk with support. He made himself available to help her, offered advice and
even to accompany her to the meeting, but in the end allowed her to choose the course of action. IM p.10

**Dimension 7: Secure Bases use Intrinsic Motivation**

This finding is almost a reverse finding…there is not a single reference to money in any of the interviews. In other words, when people are invited to talk about the people and events that have influenced them, they do not reference money. There are however data showing how Secure Bases reference potential, passion, contribution and meaning. It is fair then to suggest then that Secure Bases understand the importance of intrinsic motivation, rather than relying on extrinsic motivation.

**Sample Evidence:**

- “They did not only teach knowledge, but also how to be a right person” IYW p. 6
- “They were a very ordinary teacher, you know in society, but they still whole heartedly do their work” IYW p.7
- it is meaningful work and therefore easy to motivate the team” IE p. 20

**Dimension 8: Secure Bases have a positive mindset, especially with regard to problem solving**

Within the interviews we see evidence of Secure Bases direct the mindset towards the positive. Whether to see their potential, the opportunity for learning, or most often in a crisis or time of difficulty, it appears that Secure Bases are particularly appreciated and remembered for their ability in this regard.
Sample Evidence:

- “You know this is painful, but it’s a sign you are moving onto something else. And she helped me to look forward” IP p. 22
- “Not to be afraid of the unknown and basically taking the unknown as a potential or opportunity” IC p. 6
- Father’s advice to a son before he went on military training when he shared his own experience and how much he had grown during his time in the military. IM p23
- “I know that in 3 weeks…now you are dying of fear, but in 3 weeks you will be the champion” IE p.16

Conclusion

This chapter has described the eight dimensions of Secure Base leadership discovered in the research. The following chapter will discuss these findings in greater detail.
CHAPTER IV

STUDY ONE - DISCUSSION

Chapter Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to review the findings of the previous chapter in light of the original research objective, which was to better understand the dimensions and behaviors of Secure Base Leadership. The chapter will consider the findings in relation to Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s conception of Secure Base; will review the findings at a meta level; will review the findings in terms of existing literature; will consider research questions to emerge from the findings; and finally also acknowledge the limitations of the study.

Discussion

First, a reminder of Bowlby’s original description of Secure Base:

“The provision of a Secure Base from which a child or adolescent can make sorties into the outside world and to which he can return knowing for sure that he will be welcomed when he gets there, nourished physically and emotionally, comforted if distressed, reassured if frightened. In essence the role is one of being available, ready to respond when called upon to encourage and perhaps assist, but to intervene actively only when clearly necessary. In these respects it is a role similar to that of an officer commanding a
military base from which an expeditionary force sets out and to which it can retreat, should it meet with a setback. Much of the time the role of the base is a waiting one but it is nonetheless vital for that. For it is only when the officer commanding the expeditionary force is confident his base is secure that he dares press forward and take risks.” P.11

Bowlby, J. A Secure Base

Table xx below compares Bowlby’s characteristics and descriptions of a Secure Base to those discovered in the data.

Table 1. Comparison of Data to Bowlby’s conception of Secure Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bowlby Secure Base Description</th>
<th>Comparable Research Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“...from which to make sorties into the outside world and to which he can return...”</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for risk; see potential; acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...welcomed...”</td>
<td>Acceptance; available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...nourished physically and emotionally...”</td>
<td>Acceptance; calm; see potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...comforted if distressed...”</td>
<td>Acceptance; calm; see potential; positive mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...reassured if frightened...”</td>
<td>Acceptance; positive mindset; see potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...available, ready to respond when called upon...”</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“...encourage and perhaps assist...”
Positive mindset; see potential; opportunities for risk

“...intervene actively only when clearly necessary...”
Inquiry; calm

“...the role of the base is a waiting one...”
Inquiry; calm

We see from table xx that many of the dimensions found in the research correspond well to Bowlby’s characterizations and are largely consistent with Bowlby’s description of Secure Base. The factor that does not correspond clearly to Bowlby would be intrinsic motivation.

It is also striking to revisit Ainsworth’s measurements of mother behavior in the strange situation experiment. Ainsworth dimensions of mother behavior were:

1) Sensitivity-insensitivity – the extent to which the mother is able to see things from the baby’s point of view

2) Acceptance-rejection – the extent to which a mother accepts infant behaviors that others might find hurtful or irritating

3) Cooperation-interference – measures the extent to which the mother engages in “co-determining” rather than intrusive behaviors in relation to the child

4) Accessibility-ignoring – the extent to which the mother is “tuned in and available”

5) Lack of Emotional Expression – the extent to which a mother lacks emotional expression in her face, voice or bodily movements.
We see immediately, not only some similarities in descriptions, but even the exact same labels (acceptance, accessibility) in two cases. It is important to note at this point, that the researcher was only reminded of the Ainsworth dimensions after doing the qualitative analysis. So, while it would be easy to suggest circularity here, in truth, this is a genuine coincidence (albeit one that is somewhat embarrassing for the researcher to admit).

The dimension of favoring listening and providing opportunities for risk taking would also correspond well to the dimension of cooperation-intrusion in that they describe a set of behaviors on the part of the leader that encourage the follower to discover his/her own solution in a situation rather than having one prescribed by the leader.

We see some support in the research data for what could be described as qualitative convergent validity – the findings correspond to both Bowlby’s and Ainsworth’s descriptions of Secure Base behavior in a manner that suggests substantial theoretical overlap. It is reasonable to suggest that respondents were describing something akin to what Bowlby and Ainsworth had in mind when describing Secure Base, but in a more detailed manner. It is also important to recognize that Ainsworth and Bowlby were theorizing specifically about the psychological context of young child development, while we are now seeing in these data, the similarities in an organizational context.

*The Safety – Risk Dilemma*

We also see evidence in the eight dimensions of two of the control systems of Attachment Theory that Bowlby described in terms of the attachment system and the
exploration system. A reminder that the Attachment system is related to safety and comfort and the exploration system is related to exploration and learning. As Ainsworth said, “attachment and exploration support each other” (Ainsworth, 1979 p.934) in that for exploration to occur, a person needs to know that it will be protected in a time of anxiety or fear. Ainsworth and Bowlby were very clear that it is the role of a Secure Base to manage the interplay between these two systems of attachment and exploration. Returning to the data, we see evidence of the interplay between attachment and exploration and the role of a Secure Base.

The attachment system is evidenced through the findings of:

- Acceptance
- Support – anywhere, anytime
- See potential
- Calm, dependable
- Listening and inquiring

The exploration system is evidenced through the findings of:

- Opportunity for risk
- See vision for person doing more
- Positive mindset

IVW (p6) is a good example of this interplay between attachment and exploration:
“It was clearly not a point in my mind that I was capable of doing so, or willing to do it. It was not in my vision. But he trusted me… and informed me he was confident in me… so he supported me, he gave me a chance… and also freedom. The only question he asked “if you encounter difficulties or important things, please come to inform me” that’s the only thing he asked me and beyond that gave me full control.”

In an organizational or leadership context, we might want to substitute the words attachment and exploration for “safety” and “risk” where the role of a Secure Base Leader is to provide both safety (attachment) and opportunities for risk (exploration). Providing safety and risk then becomes an interesting leadership dilemma in that these two ‘objectives’ would seem to be in contradiction to each other.

Something similar to this safety-risk dilemma was considered by Neilsen (2007) when he suggested that a ‘relational-emotional’ institutional pillar can be important in supporting exploration in organizational settings. I would also suggest that this safety-risk dilemma has resonance with March’s (1991) notions of exploitation and exploration. March wrote:

“A central concern of studies of adaptive processes is the relation between the exploration of new possibilities and the exploitation of old certainties (Schumpeter 1934; Holland 1975; Kuran 1988). Exploration includes things captured by terms such as search, variation, risk taking, experimentation, play, flexibility, discovery, innovation. Exploitation includes such things as refinement, choice, production, efficiency, selection, implementation, execution. Adaptive systems that engage in exploration to the exclusion of exploitation are likely to find that they suffer the costs of experimentation without
gaining many of its benefits. They exhibit too many undeveloped new ideas and too little distinctive competence. Conversely, systems that engage in exploitation to the exclusion of exploration are likely to find themselves trapped in suboptimal stable equilibria. As a result, maintaining an appropriate balance between exploration and exploitation is a primary factor in system survival and prosperity.” March 1991 p.71.

A number of questions emerge from this finding that could be explored in future research:

- Do safety and risk form opposite ends of a continuum, or are they separate dimensions?
- If a continuum, is there an optimal point between the two somewhere along that continuum?
- Is it a dynamic process of continually moving between the two?
- If different dimensions, could one create a typology of the two dimensions through a ‘two by two’ structure?
- Does the leader have the resources and ability to satisfactorily offer both safety and risk?

This final question could be viewed as emerging from Zaleznik’s Leadership Strategies (Zaleznik and Kets de Vries, 1975). Zaleznik and Kets de Vries (1975): “There are three basic leadership strategies: homeostatic, meditative, and proactive. The homeostatic strategy addresses the need for preserving the organization – to ensure its internal stability and continuity in the face of internal disruption. The meditative strategy aims at
change in the organization, made under the impact of external pressures. The proactive strategy, rather than reacting to environmental pressure, induces change in the environment to use creatively the resources of the organization. Proaction is the strategy of major innovation, which tends to induce resistance, aggression and in some cases outright hostility within the organization: it forces disruption of internal relations in the interests if changing the environment.” Zaleznik and Kets de Vries, 1975, p. 31

Neilsen (2009) in an email correspondence with this author wrote: “The argument was that leadership is a matter of getting three functions accomplished for a given person or group. The avuncular (uncle like in Latin) function (Abe called it homeostatic) involved essentially Secure Base behaviors. The proactive function involved knowing where the organization and its people were at the moment, having a vision for both, and knowing the distance currently between the two, in order to create both the tension to move forward and the direction to move in. The mediative function involved teaching, technical skills and the ability to buffer one’s group from outside interferences while it was doing its particular tasks. The functions can be done by one “golden” person, or a leadership coalition whose members’ qualities together address all three functions, or leadership in combination with the characteristics of the situation and the people recruited into it.

I would argue that the homeostatic strategy is akin to safety/attachment, while the meditative and proactive strategies are similar to exploration/risk. The key point to note in relation to the proactive strategy is that it is likely to evoke resistance and “outright hostility”. This implies that in the encouragement of risk/exploration, the leader needs to
be adequately prepared, and resourced, to contain and manage this resistance. For example, there is no point in a leader offering an opportunity for risk taking if he or she cannot also provide the necessary safety and support in the event of failure. Furthermore, the leader needs to have sufficient access to resources and organizational opportunities to even offer risk. In other words a leader who is not well placed in an organization, and does not have access to key decision makers or resources will be unable to offer opportunities for risk taking. This could be labeled as the ‘organizational power’ of the leader. Along this line of thinking, any future research into the safety-risk dilemma should consider this aspect of a leader’s organizational power. It could be hypothesized that the leader’s organizational power would act as a moderating variable on the ability to provide effective safety and opportunities for risk.

As a further consideration for future research, Psychological Safety, the “shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking” (Edmondson, 1999) could be a hypothesized dependent variable in relation to this safety-risk dilemma.

As we deepen our discussion of the dimensions of Secure Base leadership, a further noteworthy distinction is that between people and tasks. Attachment Theory, as currently typically measured through the avoidance and anxiety dimensions, concerns itself almost exclusively with the relationship domain. In other words, it is largely concerned with the habits of people in relationship. However, this qualitative study reminds us that the role of a Secure Base is also to encourage exploration and learning – the completion of tasks
and actions. The dimension of positive mindset and providing opportunities for risk taking, are not relationship-based dimensions, but rather task related dimensions. This would be consistent with Bowlby’s theoretical descriptions of attachment and exploration, but underscores how the task dimensions (exploration) is not fully captured in current attachment research. This suggests that Attachment Theory research in organizations, and the notion of Secure Base Leadership needs to go beyond purely considering relationships, to also considering tasks. Future research into the effectiveness of Secure Base leadership should therefore not only focus on relational outcomes, but also on task outcomes. Measurements akin to Blake and Mouton’s (1981) production/people matrix would be appropriate in such a study.

Next in this discussion chapter, we will examine each of the eight dimensions in greater detail to consider how they relate to existing organizational literature. The purpose of this is to consider whether these dimensions can be supported and referenced in theory.

*Acceptance Dimension akin to Love (Intentional Positive Other Regard)*

In the literature review in chapter 2, we examined the topic of love and concluded with a definition of love as “intentional positive other regard.” It was shown that at the core of love, is an acceptance and valuing of the other, as a basic stance or intention. Love as it was described is not dependent on results or preconditions – it is an approach to the others grounded in acceptance of the other. The acceptance dimension found in the research would appear to be very similar. One could therefore make the argument that one dimension of being a Secure Base is love, or intentional positive other regard.
Acceptance of the other is a key element of Rogers’ conception of unconditional positive regard.

_Sees Potential in the other_

The finding that Secure Base leaders see the potential in others would be well supported by McGregor’s (1960) work on Theory X and Theory Y managers. McGregor argued that Theory Y managers had a basic assumption that organizational members would perform best when their potential was supported. This is contrasted with Theory X managers who assume that organizational members would not perform to expectation unless closely monitored and controlled (McGregor, 1960).

Cooperrider (1990) also argues for the importance of seeing the potential in others, or having a “positive image” as a key element of organizational success. Referencing social constructionist theory (Gergen, 1985, 1999), and the Pygmalion effect (Rosenthal, 1966) Cooperrider (1990) suggests that the image that a leader has of others will be important in determining the outcome achieved by the individual and organization.

_Opportunities for Risk_

The next finding, that Secure Base leaders provide opportunities for risk taking has echoes in organizational theory. For example, learning theory speaks to the importance of active experimentation in learning (Kolb, 1984). Experiential learning posits that in order to fully integrate new knowledge, it is important to take action in relation to that learning. Furthermore theories of change (Boyatzis, 2002) and goal
achievement (Locke et al, 1981) stress the importance of practice, experimentation and action in learning and change. Finally, in the area of creativity and innovation, Byrd and Brown (2002) explored the relationship between innovation and risk taking, making the case that risk taking is essential to innovation and creativity.

We see therefore that the finding that Secure Base leaders provide opportunities for risk taking is well supported in organizational theory.

Supportive and accessible anywhere anytime

The research finding that Secure Base leaders are perceived to be available and accessible to others, although not immediately linked to current organizational theory, has support from Ainsworth’s view on Secure Bases. Ainsworth (1978) said that separation was not the issue that upset children, but rather their sense of availability of the Secure Base. In other words, a caregiver becomes a Secure Base, not through constant physical proximity, but through perceived availability in a time of need.

The research finding of Secure Base leadership is thus supported directly by Attachment Theory.

Listening

This dimension of Secure Base leadership, wherein the leaders seem to favor listening and inquiry over advocacy, is supported by Losada and Heaphy (2004), who found that teams that balance inquiry with advocacy perform better. This favoring of
listening and asking questions could also be likened to servant leadership (Greenleaf 1971), coaching leadership styles (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee, 2002), and Appreciative Leadership (Srivastra and Cooperrider, 1990).

_Calm_

Remaining calm and emotionally stable, especially when under pressure is well supported by the literature of Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995). Within emotional intelligence, the idea of the “amygdala hijack” is most relevant in relation to this research finding (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee, 2002).

_Intrinsic Motivation_

The finding that Secure Base leaders use intrinsic motivation, or perhaps more accurately do not seem to favor extrinsic motivation through financial incentives, is also well supported in existing literature. *Intrinsic motivation* refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable, and *extrinsic motivation* refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome (Ryan and Deci, 2000). When intrinsically motivated a person is moved to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external prods, pressures, or rewards (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation has been shown in numerous studies to contribute positively to learning outcomes (Ryan and Stiller, 1991). In organizational studies, empirical evidence suggests that financial reward, while being an element of motivation, is not the most important source of employee motivation (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006).
Positive Mindset

Finally, the research discovered that Secure Base leaders tend to have a positive mindset, and direct the mindset of the follower towards the positive. This could include focusing on the benefit, images of hope, possibility and the attainment of a goal. This positive mindset would be well supported in organizational literature. Rosenthal’s (1966) studies on the Pygmalion Effect seen through teacher expectations and later supported in an organizational context by Manzoni and Barsoux (2002) with the ‘set up to fail syndrome’ all show the importance of the attentional focus of the authority figure or leader. Essentially, these literatures make it clear that positive leader expectations contribute to improved follower performance. Similarly, the social constructivist organizational theories (Gergen, 1985, 1999; Cooperrider, 1990) would support the view that the mindset and focus of the leader can play a critical role in the development of organizational outcomes.

This positive mindset could also be likened to leader optimism. Popper and Mayseless (2007) state the importance of leader optimism: “One of the consistent characteristics in descriptions of leaders is their ability to present a vision of the future, to point to a new way, and to transmit inspiring messages (Mumford and Strange, 2002). This theme appears in all the biographies of outstanding leaders (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Gardner, 1995). To maintain a future-oriented outlook, to formulate it in terms of a vision, and to be convinced of the prospects of its success, thereby sweeping others along, a person has to be optimistic. A number of studies have dealt with the correlation between leadership and optimism.”
Having reviewed each of the eight dimensions separately in greater detail, a few more observations arise about the concept of Secure Base leadership as revealed in the research findings.

First, there are elements of Secure Base leadership that resonate with personality characteristic of ‘agreeableness.’ Agreeableness is described as “a tendency to be warm, trusting, gentle and kind” (Popper, 2009) and has been shown to be related to transformational leadership and leader emergence (Popper, 2009). The safety dimensions of Secure Base leadership (acceptance, calm, listening, seeing potential, available) would seem to correspond well to this broader personality characteristic. The relationship between Secure Base Leadership and different personality characteristics is something that could be examined in future research.

A second general observation of the eight dimensions would be that they have similarity to Greenleaf’s (1970) notion of Servant Leadership. The characteristics of Servant Leadership are listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth and building community (Spears, 2004). In a more qualitative sense, Greenleaf said, “caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built. Whereas, until recently, caring was largely person to person, now most of it is mediated through institutions - often large, complex, powerful, impersonal; not always competent; sometimes corrupt. If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving.
one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most open course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them."

There appear to be similarities between the underlying philosophy of servant leadership and the many aspects of Secure Base Leadership, most notably the acceptance and listening dimensions. As with agreeableness, the relationship between Secure Base leadership and servant leadership would be a sensible avenue for future research.

Overall then, we see that each of the 8 dimensions has support in existing organizational theory. This suggests that the findings are consistent with current theory. This lends some degree of face validity to the findings and suggests that the behaviors of Secure Base Leadership would indeed contribute to beneficial leadership outcomes.

At the same time we need to then ask if we have discovered anything new in these findings, or are they in a sense a repeat of existing theories? Put more critically, are these findings nothing more than a recapitulation and description of an appreciative, agreeable, emotionally intelligent, servant leader?

I suggest there are two possible arguments as to why these findings are important. The first is to return to Attachment Theory and the importance of the control systems of attachment and exploration, which we called safety and risk for organizational purposes. These research findings reference the dynamic interplay of Secure Base leaders providing
both safety and opportunities for risk taking. The other theories mentioned tend to reference more clearly the safety/comfort nature of leadership. We do not see them referencing risk taking, as much as being available and supportive. Secure Base Leadership suggests clearly the importance of providing opportunities for risk and exploration, in addition to safety and support.

On the other hand, given the importance of innovation and learning to modern organizations, theories that support innovation and learning are potentially of great relevance. In this way, I suggest that Secure Base Leadership, in providing rich descriptive behavior about the nature of being a Secure Base, suggests ways that organizations can succeed at both providing support and ensuring innovation. Secure Base Leadership is concerned with both relationships and tasks and considers the dynamic interplay between the two.

The second argument why Secure Base Leadership is distinctive would be to revisit the topic of love. I suggest that, yes, in the safety dimension, perhaps we are describing an appreciative, agreeable, emotionally intelligent servant leader. However, is it possible there is a mega factor driving these? Are they not indeed cross-referencing themselves through some other factor? I propose that mega factor to be love - defined as intentional positive other regard. An appreciative, agreeable, emotionally intelligent servant leader providing safety and comfort to followers is a person who has shifted the centre of their focus away from themselves, towards some kind of ‘other focus’. As was shown earlier, this ‘other focus’ is the essence of love. I am therefore suggesting that the attachment
control system, manifested as safety in an organizational context, is reasonably understood through a theoretical lens of love. Furthermore, it is this notion of love, as intentional positive other regard, that lies at the heart of many positive relationship based leadership theories such as servant leadership.

Limitations to Study

It is important to recognize that this study has limitations. The first potential limitation relates to sampling. The fact that participants were chosen as “high performing leaders with some prima facie evidence for being Secure Base leaders” could raise an argument of circularity. In other words, the argument would be that the findings of the research are related to the behaviors of this group of people – but we do not necessarily know that these are Secure Base leaders. The findings could simply be the behaviors of high performing leaders. Furthermore, is this group of participants generalizable to the broader organizational context?

As was mentioned in the methods chapter, the key response here is that the bulk of the responses analyzed related to the behaviors of the people towards the participants, rather than of the participants themselves. In fact, four of the five questions relate to other people’s behavior. Therefore, the actual ‘status’ of the participants in terms of their own leadership is not relevant to the findings.
A second, not dissimilar, limitation could be linked to the questions in the protocol. The challenge to the findings would be: Is it really Secure Base from Attachment Theory, or is it generalized helping and supportive behavior that has been identified?

The response here would be to recognize that the researcher face a legitimate and common dilemma at the outset of the study. If we had provided a full definition of Secure Base from Bowlby to participants, then the responses would be too similar to that definition. Therefore phrases and prompts were used that were theoretically aligned to Bowlby, but that would not lead to circularity. The results of the research show that there is sufficient convergent validity to Bowlby to indicate these are Secure Base behaviors, but since the questions in the interview were not restatements of Bowlby’s conception, it would seem that this potential limitation is well mitigated in the results.

A final limitation would be related to the subjective analysis of the researcher given familiarity with Bowlby’s work. In other words, the challenge would be that it is not a surprise that the research findings resemble Bowlby since that was the theoretical frame of the researchers.

A couple of points can be made in response. First, all qualitative studies by nature have limitations around subjectivity (Pratt, 2009). Therefore some degree of subjectivity is unavoidable and should not be considered a limitation per se. The second argument related to the role of the three external raters. Two raters were not familiar at a deep theoretical level with Bowlby, and one of the raters was not familiar with Bowlby’s work
at all. Their support for the research findings considerable lessens any concerns about researcher subjectivity.

Future Research

Given the discussion above, we turn now to consider avenues for future research and exploration.

The first place to start would be to develop an instrument that could measure Secure Base Leadership and its eight dimensions. We have established qualitative support for the concept of Secure Base leadership and it therefore appropriate to consider quantitative support. Questions to be considered in this research would be:

- Are the eight dimensions of Secure Base Leadership distinct dimensions?
- Do they contribute to beneficial leadership outcomes such as leader effectiveness and follower job satisfaction?

Second given the question of whether Secure Base Leadership is a unique contribution to leadership theory, it would be important to show that it contributes variance over and above existing theory. For example, a well-established relationship based theory such as Leader Member Exchange would be important to measure alongside Secure Base Leadership.

Third, given the discussion of the safety-risk dilemma, and the suggestion of the importance of organizational power to a leader being effectively able to deliver both
safety and risk, a measure of the leader’s organizational power would be a helpful addition to future research.

Fourth, as was suggested above, Psychological Safety could be an appropriate dependent variable for Secure Base Leadership as it is a measure of the amount of safety and risk taking in a team.

Study two below aims to develop the above findings and quantitatively explore the concept of Secure Base Leadership.

Conclusion

This chapter has raised a number of points of discussion. It was argued that the research findings show considerable overlap with Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s conceptions of Secure Base and in a qualitative sense, indicate convergent validity of the findings. It was also shown that Bowlby’s ideas of the attachment and exploration control systems are evident in the findings. The role of a Secure Base is to mediate these two systems.

A number of questions arose from this discussion related to organizational leadership. Most significantly, with reference to Zaleznik’s leadership triangle, the notion of organizational power was suggested as an important variable to be considered in future research.
The discussion then turned to an examination of each of the eight dimensions to consider how they relate to existing literatures. It was shown that each of the dimensions has support in current organizational theory, further suggesting that Secure Base Leadership could be considered a helpful leadership theory. In particular, emphasis was placed on the research finding of acceptance and its similarity to the construct of love. It was argued that in the acceptance dimension of Secure Base Leadership, there are many similarities to love – defined as intentional positive other regard.

The discussion then turned to consider whether Secure Base Leadership is a unique contribution to leadership theory, or rather simply a recapitulation of existing research. It was argued that in two ways it is distinct from existing research. First, in revisiting the safety-risk dilemma described in Attachment Theory, it was argued that Secure Base Leadership describes a dynamic not captured fully in other leadership theories. Second, it was suggested that the finding of acceptance, which was likened to love, is not so much a recapitulation of other theories as a description of a possible ‘mega factor’ upon which they in fact depend. This factor, love, is a basic orientation of intentional positive other regard.

Finally the chapter considered the limitations of the study, most notably related to sampling and whether the interview was assessing Secure Base Leadership, or rather a broader notion of “helping and supportive figures.” Both limitations were acknowledged, but evidence was forwarded as to why these limitations do not detract from the core findings.
CHAPTER V

STUDY TWO - METHODS

Overview

Study two is a quantitative study, exploring the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership discovered in study one. The study aims to show that a leader displaying the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership as discovered in study one will produce beneficial leadership outcomes. The study also seeks to create an organizational appropriate measure of the Attachment dimensions with reference to the ‘pre-study’ noted at the outset of this dissertation.

Participants

The participants in this study were participants in an executive education leadership program at a European business school. Participants took an online survey in advance of the leadership program as part of their preparatory work. In addition to participating themselves, they were asked to invite their direct reports, and their manager to participate in the study. There are therefore three separate groups of participants: Leaders (participants on leadership program), Followers (direct reports of the Leaders) and Managers (managers of the Leaders). Data was collected by means of an online software package called Surveymonky by the administrator of the leadership program. The data was thus collected under the auspices of the business school and subsequently provided to the researcher by the business school. Data was initially downloaded into Microsoft Excel and then transferred to SPSS and AMOS for analysis.
In line with requirements of the Institutional Review Board, to protect the privacy and identity of the respondents the following procedure was adopted. Immediately upon receiving the Excel spreadsheet, I numbered the participant responses from 1 to 60. I then deleted the column containing the names of the participants and re-saved the file without the names. Effectively, for the remainder of the analysis, I only then had a number as the identifier of each participant when I conduct the analysis.

Number of Leaders invited 55
Number of Leaders responded: 50
Leader response rate: 90%

Average Age of Leaders: 43
Gender of Leaders: 45 Males
Gender of Leaders: 5 Females

Number of Followers Invited: 230
Number of Followers responded: 218
Number of Followers included in study after deleting for missing data: 205
Effective Follower response rate: 89%

Gender of Followers: 147 Male
Gender of Followers: 71 Female
Number of Managers Invited: 57
Number of Managers responded: 37
Manager response rate: 66%

Measures

Independent Variable 1

- An instrument created for this study aimed at measuring the eight Secure Base Leadership dimensions (derived from study one), as rated by Follower. Items for each of the dimensions were created using phrases and words from study one.
  - A measure of acceptance
  - A measure of opportunities for risk
  - A measure of seeing potential
  - A measure of available and accessible
  - A measure of listening and inquiry
  - A measure of calm and dependable
  - A measure of use of intrinsic motivation
  - A measure of positive mindset

The instrument was initially piloted on a group of 50 executives on a previous version of the same leadership program at the same business school to assess reliability and ease of use. One important change from the pilot study was to the labels of the Likert Scale. In
the pilot study, responses were rated on a 5 point scale from “strong disagree” to “strongly agree.” Results indicated problems with Skewness and Kurtosis and it was therefore decided to change the scale to a more behaviorally ranked score in an attempt to produce a better distribution of results. The 5 point Likert scale in the final version thus ranged from “never” to “consistently”. After these modifications, the following items were administered in the actual study:

**Acceptance and Safety (ACC)**

1. My manager values me as a human being, not just as an employee performing a role
2. My manager accepts me for who I am, rather than always trying to correct me
3. I feel constantly judged and evaluated by my manager (R)
4. My manager understands and appreciates me as a person
5. My manager treats all people with high regard
6. My manager accepts people's limitations and weaknesses in a supportive way

**Risk and Opportunity (OPP)**

1. My manager provides me with significant opportunities to grow and develop
2. My manager is prepared to take risks in giving me opportunities
3. My manager micro manages me (R)
4. My manager gives me freedom to get on with my job
5. My manager pushes me out of my comfort zone
6. My manager gives me tough feedback when it is necessary

**Potential (POT)**

1. My manager sees my potential
2. My manager shows confidence that I can grow and develop
3. My manager suggests ways that I might develop within the organization
4. My manager has a vision for how I might develop and grow in my career
5. My manager challenges and stretches me to fulfill my potential

**Sense of Accessibility and Availability (ACCESS)**

1. My manager is available and accessible to me
2. I have a sense that I could contact my manager anywhere, anytime
3. I know that my manager supports me, even when we have less contact
4. I think of my manager as a supportive figure, even when I don't see him/her

**Intrinsic Motivation (INT)**

1. My manager uses financial reward as a key motivating tool (R)
2. My manager stresses the importance of my learning, growth and development
3. Conversations with my manager focus more on business goals and objectives
than on my learning and development (R)

4. My manager knows what is really important to me as a person, and uses that insight to motivate me

Listening and Inquiry (LISTEN)

1. My manager is a good listener
2. My manager asks questions before coming to conclusions
3. My manager asks for my opinion before giving me instructions
4. My manager gives solutions before asking for my input (R)

Calm, Dependable (CALM)

1. My manager is a calm person
2. My manager is dependable and predictable in terms of his/her moods and emotions
3. I feel that I can approach my manager for support, even in stressful situations
4. My manager remains supportive when under pressure

Positive Mindset (MEYE)

1. My manager finds the positive in situations
2. My manager re-frames difficult situations into opportunities
3. My manager focuses on problems and difficulties more than on opportunities
and solutions (R)

4. My manager keeps us focused on the goal when we are under pressure

All responses on a Likert scale:

- 1 = never
- 2 = rarely
- 3 = sometimes
- 4 = often
- 5 = consistently


Note: To adapt the original ECR, the words “at work” and “my colleagues” were included where in the original version the wording is “my close personal relationships”. Items 22 to 34 have been further adapted and are based on the experience of the researcher in working with executives. For example “I prefer not to take decisions by myself” is considered an appropriate statement for an anxious executive, and “people cannot be overly trusted” or “results matter more than relationships” would be considered indicative of an avoidant/dismissing executive.
1. I prefer not to show my deepest feelings at work AVO1
2. I worry about being ignored or discounted by my colleagues ANX1
3. I am very comfortable being close to other people at work AVO2R
4. I worry a lot about my relationships at work ANX2
5. I get uncomfortable when colleagues want to be very close to me AVO3
6. I often wish my colleagues’ commitment to the job was as strong as mine ANX3
7. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to others AVO4
8. I need a lot of reassurance that my colleagues support me and my work ANX4
9. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with colleagues AVO5R
10. Sometimes I feel that I try to encourage others to show more enthusiasm than they otherwise would ANX5
11. I try to avoid getting too close to others at work AVO6
12. I find that my colleagues don’t want to get as close to me as I would like ANX6
13. I find it relatively easy to get close to others at work AVO7R
14. When I don’t have colleagues’ support, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure ANX7
15. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on colleagues AVO8
16. I get frustrated when my key colleagues are not around as much as I would like ANX8
17. I tell my close colleagues just about everything AVO9R
18. I get frustrated when colleagues are not available when I need them ANX9
19. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my colleagues AV010R
20. When other people criticize or disapprove of me, I feel bad about myself ANX10
21. I feel comfortable depending on others AVO11R
22. I prefer not to take decisions by myself ANX11
23. I don’t mind asking my colleagues for advice or help AVO12R
24. I often wonder whether people like me at work ANX12
25. At the end of the day, results matter more than relationships AVO13
26. I worry that people in my team would rather work somewhere else ANX13
27. In my opinion, people cannot be overly trusted AVO14
28. I worry whether people think I am doing a good job ANX14
29. People must prove themselves to me before I trust them AVO15
30. I tend to be cautious at work and ‘play it safe’ ANX15
31. People are generally not loyal to organizations AVO16
32. I sometimes feel like I make more effort with others than they make with me ANX16
33. I prefer to work alone AVO17
34. I tend to focus on all the things that could go wrong in a situation ANX17

Dependent Variables:

1. Overall to what extent do you feel this manager is performing his or her job the way you would like it to be performed?
2. To what extent has he or she met your expectations in his or her managerial roles and responsibilities?
3. If you had your way, to what extent would you change the manner in which he or she is doing the job?


1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job
2. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work that I do in this job
3. I frequently think of quitting this job (reverse)
4. Most people on my team are very satisfied with their job
5. People on my team often think of quitting (reverse)

1. If you make a mistake on this team it is often held against you
2. Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues
3. People on this team sometimes reject others for being different
4. It is safe to take a risk on this team
5. It is difficult to ask other members of this team for help
6. No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts
7. Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized.


1. I like my supervisor very much as a person.
2. My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
3. My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with.
4. My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
5. My supervisor would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others.
6. My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.
7. I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job
description.

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

9. I do not mind working my hardest for my supervisor

10. I am impressed with my supervisor's knowledge of his/ her job

11. I respect my supervisor's knowledge of and competence on the job

12. I admire my supervisor's professional skills.

Results orientation (internally created scale)

1. My manager is known as someone who delivers results

2. I can depend on my manager to meet deadlines and deliverables

3. My manager is very task focused

4. My manager focuses on data, facts, numbers and deliverables

5. People can depend on this team to deliver results

Relationships orientation (internally created scale)

1. My manager has very good relationships within the organization

2. My manager is considered as a "people person"

3. My manager does not get on well with key stakeholders (R)

4. People in the organization like my manager

Control of Resources and Protection (internally created scale):

1. My manager is successfully able to navigate the organizational dynamics of our
organization

2. My manager has sufficient control over budgets and decision making to get things done in this organization

3. My manager has sufficient access to the main decision makers and decision making processes in our organization

4. My manager has the power to protect me and the team from unnecessary interference from other people in the organization

5. My manager is able to position me into good opportunities within the organization

Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1-3: Correlations between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Dependent Variables
Figure 1. Hypotheses 1-3 Positive Correlations between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Dependent Variables

Hypothesis 1: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Leadership Effectiveness

1a. A positive correlation between follower-rated Acceptance and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1b. A positive correlation between follower-rated Opportunity and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1c. A positive correlation between follower-rated Potential and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Accessible and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness
1e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Intrinsic and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Inquiry and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Calm and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

1f. A positive correlation between follower-rated Minds Eye and follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness

Hypothesis 2: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Job Satisfaction

2a. A positive correlation between follower-rated Acceptance and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2b. A positive correlation between follower-rated Opportunity and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2c. A positive correlation between follower-rated Potential and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Accessible and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Intrinsic and follower-rated Job Satisfaction
2d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Inquiry and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Calm and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

2f. A positive correlation between follower-rated Minds Eye and follower-rated Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Psychological Safety

3a. A positive correlation between follower-rated Acceptance and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3b. A positive correlation between follower-rated Opportunity and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3c. A positive correlation between follower-rated Potential and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Accessible and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Intrinsic and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3d. A positive correlation between follower-rated Inquiry and follower-rated Psychological Safety

3e. A positive correlation between follower-rated Calm and follower-rated Psychological Safety
3f. A positive correlation between follower-rated Minds Eye and follower-rated Psychological Safety

Hypothesis 4 – 6: Analysis of Secure Base Dimensions on Dependant Variables distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Figure 2: Secure Base Leadership and follower rated Dependent variables

Hypothesis 4: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Hypothesis 5: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Job Satisfaction distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange
Hypothesis 6: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Psychological Safety distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Next, we will consider the relationship between the SBL dimensions as outcome measures rated by the Manager of the Leader. The advantage of this measure is that they provide a further rater to the analysis which strengthens the potential argument for the value of the SBL dimensions, both at an applied practitioner level and also methodologically by avoiding issues of common method bias. In this study, the 3 outcome variables scored by the Manager of the participant are Leadership Effectiveness, Results orientation and Relationships orientation. The items were described earlier in the chapter.
Figure 3: SBL Dimensions and manager rated Dependent variables

Hypothesis 7: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Leadership Effectiveness distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Hypothesis 8: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Results orientation distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Hypothesis 9: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Relationships orientation distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange

We turn now to consider the attachment style of the leader as measured by the adapted version of the ECR. As a reminder, this is an extension of the study mentioned earlier in
the document that raised a number of questions about the standard ECR. It was suggested that an organizational version of the ECR would be a helpful contribution to organizational literature. In effect, this is an attempt to create and organizational version of the ECR and furthermore show that is positively related to the outcome variables.

Figure 4: Relationship between Attachment Orientation of Leader and Dependent Variables

Hypothesis 10: Leader Attachment Anxiety and Dependent Variables

10a. As Leader Anxiety decreases, manager rated Leader Effectiveness will increase
10b. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower rated Leader Effectiveness will increase

10c. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower Job Satisfaction will increase

10d. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower psychological safety will increase

Hypothesis 11: Leader Attachment Avoidance and Dependent Variables

11a. As Leader Avoidance decreases, manager rated Leader Effectiveness will increase

11b. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower rated Leader Effectiveness will increase

11c. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower Job Satisfaction will increase

11d. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower Psychological Safety will increase
CHAPTER VI

STUDY TWO – RESULTS

Overview

This chapter provides the results of the data analysis of the study described in the previous chapter.

Descriptive Statistics for Follower rated Scores:

Initial analysis of variables indicated that some variables were problematic in terms of Skewness and Kurtosis. On review of the responses by item, it was noted that there were very few scores of either 1 or 2 by respondents. It is suggested that the reason for this could be linked to the population of the survey. To attend this leadership program, attendees must already be high performing leaders. Therefore, this population is potentially biased towards strong performers. It is also possible that being direct reports of the attendees, the followers are likely to give more favorable ratings to their manager. Their identity was anonymous, but it is nonetheless fair to suggest that many people might have avoided giving a negative score to their ‘boss’.

To resolve this issue, scores were recoded as follows: The Secure Base Leadership items (5 point scales) were recoded as 1=1, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4 to create a 4 point scale and the outcome variables (7 point scales) were recoded as 1=1, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4, 6=5 7=6 to create a 6 point scale.
With the scores recoded, the descriptive statistics for the underlying SBL items are shown in the table below.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for SBL items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ1</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.2655</td>
<td>.76032</td>
<td>-.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.1858</td>
<td>.74295</td>
<td>-.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2.3230</td>
<td>.93671</td>
<td>-.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ4</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.2311</td>
<td>.68785</td>
<td>-.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.0311</td>
<td>.81499</td>
<td>-.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcceptanceQ6</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.9911</td>
<td>.74397</td>
<td>-.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.8155</td>
<td>.96523</td>
<td>-.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ2</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.6847</td>
<td>.90604</td>
<td>-.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.7050</td>
<td>.97092</td>
<td>-.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.3738</td>
<td>.64095</td>
<td>-.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1.9415</td>
<td>.78994</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpportunityQ6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.3267</td>
<td>.87655</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotentialQ1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.9659</td>
<td>.68155</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotentialQ2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.9109</td>
<td>.84169</td>
<td>-.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotentialQ3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.3600</td>
<td>.92991</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotentialQ4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>.95502</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotentialQ5</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.5323</td>
<td>.90565</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccessibleQ1</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3.2802</td>
<td>.74959</td>
<td>-.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccessibleQ2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>.77634</td>
<td>-.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccessibleQ3</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.2892</td>
<td>.67297</td>
<td>-.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccessibleQ4</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.1872</td>
<td>.71368</td>
<td>-.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntrinsicQ1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2.5596</td>
<td>.92298</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the scores recoded, the descriptive statistics for the outcomes variables are shown in the table below.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for follower rated outcome variables
We see that the recoding lead to an improvement across almost all variables in terms of skewness and kurtosis and thus permits further statistical analysis.

Common Method Bias

Since the design of this research study entailed the followers of the leader rating both the SBL behaviors of the leader (the independent variable), and the various dependent variables, there is an inherent concern about common method bias (CMB). To deal with this issue, a procedure was conducted to account for CMB (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Following Podsakoff et al (2003), this procedure involved including an additional latent factor was in the CFA of all items to account for CMB. This CMB factor was constrained to have equal loadings with all manifest items and equal covariances with all exogenous...
latent factors. The standardized regression weights from the constrained CMB model were used to create weighted average construct scores. Those scores, in turn, were used in subsequent analyses. Importantly, the remainder of this results chapter uses these CMB adjusted scores. In effect, while the design of the study could be considered as a limitation in terms of CMB, this has been accounted for in all of the subsequent analyses in this results chapter. Please see Appendix 1 for a detailed description of this CMB procedure.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Manager rated Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.834</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Orientation</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.634</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships Orientation</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These scores indicate adequate Skewnes and Kurtosis and permit further analysis. Note that the N of the Managers is lower than the N of the Followers. This is because not every manager completed the survey. In other words, some participants on the leadership program only got their direct reports to complete the survey. In such a case, there is not a corresponding score for “Manager”. In some cases this was because the participant on the program was the CEO of his/her organization and therefore did not have a manager.
Table 5: Reliability Scores (Cronbach Alpha) for 8 SBL Dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBL Dimension</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Mindset</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a guideline, a Cronbach Alpha of 0.7 or greater indicates satisfactory reliability (Byrne, 2001). The above scores thus indicate partial support for the eight dimensions of Secure Base Leadership as separate sub-scales. The Intrinsic scale is however noticeably below this guideline and indicates that the sub-scale needs development.

We now examine the relationship between the SBL dimensions.

Table 6: Correlation Matrix: Secure Base Leadership Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Opport</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Calm</th>
<th>Mindset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.735**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.735**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accessible Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>206</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>206</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intrinsic Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inquiry Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.498**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calm Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive Mindset Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Comment: The above correlation matrix shows that the dimensions of SBL are correlated to each other. While many of the correlations are high, a few are particularly noteworthy. Opportunity and Potential have a 74% correlation to each other; Acceptance and Accessible have a 62% correlation; and Intrinsic and Opportunity have a 56% correlation. An exploratory factor analysis is therefore necessary to assess the relationship between the dimensions more accurately.

**Factor Analysis**
An unconstrained exploratory Factor Analysis of all of the Secure Base items produced an initial 5 factor solution. Upon review of the items and interpreting the 5 factors in relation to Attachment Theory and the notion of Secure Base, it was determined that 2 of the factors could not be explained theoretically. Through a series of subsequent EFA’s, removing items where appropriate, a final 3 factor solution was deemed the most theoretically and statistically justified. That 3 factor solution, including the underlying item descriptions is described below.

Table 7: Factor Analysis of SBL items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity2 - My manager is prepared to take risks in giving me opportunities</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential2 - My manager shows confidence that I can grow and develop</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential4 - My manager has a vision for how I might develop and grow in my career</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential5 - My manager challenges and stretches me to fulfill my potential</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic2 - My manager stresses the importance of my learning, growth and development</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance1 - My manager values me as a human being, not just as an employee performing a role</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance4 - My manager understands and appreciates me as a person</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance6 - My manager accepts people's limitations and weaknesses in a supportive way</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible1 - My manager is available and accessible to me</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry2 - My manager asks questions before coming to conclusions</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm2 - My manager is dependable and predictable in terms of his/her moods and emotions</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Mindset1 - My manager finds the positive in situations</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive Mindset3 - My manager focuses on problems and difficulties more than on opportunities and solutions (reverse coded) - .093 .116 .625

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

**Total Variance Explained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadingsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.513</td>
<td>34.715</td>
<td>34.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>11.652</td>
<td>46.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>9.934</td>
<td>56.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>6.634</td>
<td>62.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>6.466</td>
<td>69.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>5.566</td>
<td>74.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>4.644</td>
<td>79.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>4.164</td>
<td>83.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>87.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>3.732</td>
<td>91.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>94.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>97.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Comment: The EFA thus produces three factors, not the eight dimensions established in the qualitative study. This will be discussed in the following chapter.
A reliability analysis of these 3 factors produces the following results:

Table 8: Reliability Scores (Cronbach Alpha) for 3 SBL Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBL Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Dealing</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The Exploration and Safety Factors have adequate reliability statistics (Byrne, 2001) while the Positive Dealing factor could be improved.

Continuing with the analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the EFA produced the following model:
Figure 5: CFA of 3 Factor SBL Model
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ChiSQ=81.195
df=62;p=.051
CFI = .978, TLI = .972
NFI = .913, RMSEA = .037
Examining these three factors in greater detail (see underlying items in table below), we see that two of the factors correspond theoretically well to the ‘attachment’ and ‘exploration’ control systems of Attachment Theory. Factor 1 (a combination of items from Opportunity, Potential and Intrinsic) appears to be associated to exploration, and Factor 2 (primarily acceptance items) appears to be associated with attachment. In addition, there is a third factor (a combination of items from minds eye, calm and listen) that seems to be about the style of the leader, especially in dealing with situations and tasks. I suggest that this third factor is akin to the "dealing" dimension of feeling/dealing as described by Fosha (2000) in that it represents less of a relational factor and more about how the person deals with actions, tasks, situations – ‘the world’ independent of the follower. Therefore the three factors of SBL are suggested as Safety (acceptance), Exploration (potential/opportunity) and Positive Dealing (positive mindset and style in situations).

Safety and Exploration describe how the leader relates to the follower in terms of safety and exploration (they are about the relationship, or ‘leadership as relationship’), but the third factor (Positive Dealing) is describes how the leader deals with tasks, problems and actions. As evidence of this, the first two have many "me" words – whereas Positive Dealing has no "me" words and instead refers to “situations.” This Positive Dealing factor could also be viewed as ‘modeling’ behaviors in that the leader is demonstrating to the follower ways to achieve positive task related outcomes.
So, it would appear that SBL is primarily about relational leadership in that it shows how a leader must provide safety and exploration to the follower, however it also stresses the task aspects of leadership. In other words, as a leader it is not only about relationships, but also how you deal with issues and situations and problems. In this case, SBL emphasizes a particular style of dealing with problems and situations that could be described as a positive dealing style. Or put more simply, SBL emphasizes the relational nature of leadership, but within the context of getting work done in a positive manner.

Table 9: Description of 3 Factor SBL items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBL Factor</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY FACTOR:</td>
<td>Key words: Valuing, accepting, appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC1. My manager values me</td>
<td>My manager values me as a human being, not just as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a human being, not just as an employee performing a role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC4. My manager</td>
<td>My manager understands and appreciates me as a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC6. My manager accepts</td>
<td>My manager accepts people's limitations and weaknesses in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people's limitations and</td>
<td>a supportive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaknesses in a supportive way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS1. My manager is</td>
<td>My manager is available and accessible to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available and accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLOREATION FACTOR:</td>
<td>Key words: Growth, Potential, Develop, Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP2. My manager is</td>
<td>My manager is prepared to take risks in giving me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared to take risks in</td>
<td>opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving me opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT2. My manager shows</td>
<td>My manager shows confidence that I can grow and develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence that I can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grow and develop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT4. My manager has a</td>
<td>My manager has a vision for how I might develop and grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision for how I might</td>
<td>in my career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop and grow in my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT5. My manager</td>
<td>My manager challenges and stretches me to fulfill my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges and stretches</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me to fulfill my potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2. My manager stresses</td>
<td>My manager stresses the importance of my learning, growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the importance of my</td>
<td>and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning, growth and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE DEALING</td>
<td>Key words: positive, calm, inquiry, focus on opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR:</td>
<td>A positive style/mindset, especially in dealing with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTEN2. My manager asks</td>
<td>My manager asks questions before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

153
coming to conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALM2.</td>
<td>My manager is dependable and predictable in terms of his/her moods and emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEYE1.</td>
<td>My manager finds the positive in situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEYE3.</td>
<td>My manager focuses on problems and difficulties more than on opportunities and solutions(R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three factors will be fully explored later in the results section where the relationships between these factors and the dependant variables will be analyzed.

An additional step was taken in relation to the 3 SBL factors, and to the 4 LMX factors, which was to create second order constructs for both SBL and LMX that allowed for the creation of a total score for each. These total scores will be used later in the analysis, especially when examining the impact of the control variables. The CFA and the weightings used to calculate the total scores are shown in the following two figures. Note that within the LMX analysis, 2 items were removed from the original 12 item measure. This was done in accordance with the CFA analysis of this particular data set.
Figure 6: CFA of SBL Total Score with weightings

Chi\(\text{SQ}\) = 81.195
\(\text{df} = 62, p = .051\)
CFI = .978, TLI = .972
NFI = .913, RMSEA = .037
The second order portion of this model was just-identified when the SEM was run unconstrained. Following the procedure outlined by Byrne (2001, pp123-124), an additional degree of freedom for this part of the model was gained by equating the variances of the error terms for two of the component latent variables, Exploration and Dealing.
Figure 7: CFA of LMX Total Score with weightings

LMX Total
  \[ \chi^2 = 23.134 \]
  \[ df = 32, p = .874 \]
  \[ CFI = 1.000, TLI = 1.021 \]
  \[ NFI = .970, RMSEA = .000 \]
Having created the necessary scales, and given the acceptable reliability scores of the original eight dimensions of SBL, I return to the original hypotheses to complete the analysis.

Hypothesis 1a – 1f: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Leadership Effectiveness

Hypothesis 2a-2f: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3a -3f: A positive correlation between Secure Base Leadership Dimensions and Psychological Safety

Table 10. Correlation Matrix for Hypotheses 1 – 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psych Safety</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Correlation table shows:

- Confirmation of hypotheses 1a-1f
- Confirmation of hypotheses 2a-2f
- Confirmation of hypotheses 3a-3f

The above correlations indicate that the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership are positively related to the predicted outcome variables. This is prima facie support for the relevance and value of the 8 dimensions as found in the qualitative analysis of Study One.

Since the EFA produced 3 factors and not 8, it is worth analyzing the correlations between the 3 factors and the 3 outcomes variables.

### Table 11. Correlation Matrix of EFA Dimensions to Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Psychological Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Factor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Mindset</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Correlation table shows:

- Confirmation of hypotheses 1a-1f
- Confirmation of hypotheses 2a-2f
- Confirmation of hypotheses 3a-3f

The above correlations indicate that the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership are positively related to the predicted outcome variables. This is prima facie support for the relevance and value of the 8 dimensions as found in the qualitative analysis of Study One.

Since the EFA produced 3 factors and not 8, it is worth analyzing the correlations between the 3 factors and the 3 outcomes variables.

### Table 11. Correlation Matrix of EFA Dimensions to Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Psychological Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Factor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration Factor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Dealing Factor</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Safety Factor</th>
<th>Exploration Factor</th>
<th>Dealing Factor</th>
<th>SBL Total</th>
<th>LMX Affect</th>
<th>LMX Loyalty</th>
<th>LMX Contribution</th>
<th>LMX Total</th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Psychologic al Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Factor</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.837**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.330**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration Factor</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.217**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing Factor</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL Total</td>
<td>.837**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.706**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX Affect</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.770**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMX Loyalty</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.252**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMX Contribution</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMX Total</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.706**</td>
<td>.770**</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.368**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Safety</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</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></td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Comment: All 3 factors derived from the EFA are positively correlated to the 3 outcome variables

To better examine the relationship between the 3 SBL factors and the 3 outcome variables, the following analysis was conducted.
Figure 8: Structural Model: SBL 3 Factors and 3 Dependent Variables

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>5.856</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>4.339</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>3.788</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The specification of correlated error terms is acceptable only when justified by a strong substantive and/or empirical rationale (Joreskog, 1993, cited in Byrne, 2001, p. 110). In this case, specifying a correlation between the error terms of follower job satisfaction and follower psychological safety, and between follower job satisfaction and leader effectiveness as defined by the follower’s satisfaction with the leaders behavior seems justified, since all three variables deal with the follower’s subjective world and can by hypothesized as highly intertwined regardless of the followers experience of specific secure base elements in the leader’s behavior.

The outcome variable of Leader Effectiveness is predicted by all 3 SBL factors with the Positive Dealing factor being particularly strong. The outcome variable of Follower Job Satisfaction is only predicted by the Exploration Factor. Finally the outcome variable of psychological safety is predicted by the Safety Factor. One initial observation from these results is that each of the SBL factors predicts an outcome variable and in that sense it indicates that all 3 factors have relevance.

The following diagram shows the total score for SBL (rather than the 3 factors separately), in relation to the 3 outcome variables.
Figure 9: Structural Model: SBL Total and 3 Dependent Variables

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

\[\text{Chi}^2 = 2.334, \quad df=1, p=.127\]
\[\text{CFI} = .992, \quad \text{TLI} = .920\]
\[\text{NFI} = .987, \quad \text{RMSEA} = .077\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>4.939</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>5.615</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>11.168</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: As was seen in the previous model, SBL predicts all 3 outcome variables, with a particularly strong relationship to Leader Effectiveness.

We continue now to consider the original hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4 – 6: Analysis of Secure Base Dimensions on Dependant Variables distinct to that explained by Leader Member Exchange

_Hypothesis 4: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Leadership Effectiveness, distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange_
Figure 10: SBL and LMX predict Leadership Effectiveness

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Dealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>LMXAffect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>LMXContribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;----</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>LMXLoyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- LMXProfRespect</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>5.052</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.705²</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.51510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXProfRespect, LMXContribution, LMXLoyalty, Dealing, LMXAffect, Exploration, Safety

Comment: We see support for Hypothesis 4. Secure Base Leadership predicts follower rated Leadership Effectiveness distinct from that explained by Leader Member Exchange.

Note that Positive Dealing is particularly strongly associated with Leadership Effectiveness. Interestingly within the LMX dimensions, the dimension relating to job competence (Professional Respect) is the most strongly predictive of leadership effectiveness. Items within this LMX factor include, “I am impressed with my supervisor's knowledge of his/ her job”, “I respect my supervisor's knowledge of and competence on the job” and “I admire my supervisor's professional skills”. In this way, one can see that there is a link between Positive Dealing and Professional Respect in that they both relate to job performance, rather than being about the leader-follower relationship.

*Hypothesis 5: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Job Satisfaction beyond that explained by Leader Member Exchange*
Figure 11: SBL and LMX predict Job Satisfaction

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- LMXAffect</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- LMXContribution</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- LMXLoyalty</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-1.344</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- LMXProfRespect</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.69852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXProfRespect, LMXContribution, LMXLoyalty, Dealing, LMXAffect, Exploration, Safety

Comment: We see support for Hypothesis 5. Secure Base Leadership predicts follower Job Satisfaction distinct to that explained by Leader Member Exchange. Note that of the three SBL factors, Exploration is particularly strongly associated with Job Satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 6: Secure Base Dimensions will explain significant variance in follower-rated Psychological Safety beyond that explained by Leader Member Exchange*
Figure 12: SBL and LMX predict Psychological Safety

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- Dealing</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- Exploration</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- Safety</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- LMXAffect</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- LMXContribution</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety&lt;---- LMXLoyalty</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>Std. Error of the Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.387(^a)</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.65431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), LMXProfRespect, LMXContribution, Dealing, LMXLoyalty, LMXAffect, Safety, Exploration

Comment: We see support for Hypothesis 6. Secure Base Leadership predicts follower rated Psychological Safety distinct to that explained by Leader Member Exchange. Note that Safety is most strongly associated with Psychological Safety, although the statistical significance could be stronger.

If we combine hypotheses 4, 5 and 6 into a single diagram, using a total score for both SBL and LMX, we see the following model:
Figure 13. SBL Total and LMX Total predict the 3 Outcome Variables

![Diagram showing the relationships between SBL Total, LMX Total, Leader Effectiveness, Follower Job Satisfaction, and Follower Psychological Safety.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>4.937</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi^2=2.005
df=1; p=.157
CFI = .997, TLI = .950
NFI = .994, RMSEA = .067

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsychSafety</th>
<th>&lt;--- SBLTotal</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness</td>
<td>&lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction</td>
<td>&lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety</td>
<td>&lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The above diagram confirms support for hypotheses 4, 5 and 6 with particular support for the hypotheses in relation to Follower Job Satisfaction and Psychological Safety.

Having established how SBL and LMX relate to the outcome variables, we now want to consider the control variables of organizational power and gender.

*Organizational Power*

We now examine the variable of Organizational Power as a control variable in the analysis. As a reminder, it was suggested that it would be important to consider the extent to which a leader has sufficient organizational power to effectively provide safety and opportunities for exploration. In this case, it is the organizational power of the leader as perceived by the followers.

**Table 12. Correlation Analysis between Organizational Power and Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBL Total</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.262**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX Total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.249**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: The above table shows there is indeed a positive correlation between the outcome variables and Organizational Power.

Adding Organizational Power to the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership and the 3 outcomes variables provides the following model. Note again, that at this point, to simplify the diagrams, I have created weighted average construct variables in the model.
Figure 14: Organizational Power as a control variable

ChiSQ=1.420
df=1,p=.233
CFI = .999, TLI = .973
NFI = .996 RMSEA = .043

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.
Comment: We see that while Organizational Power does indeed predict Job Satisfaction and Leadership Effectiveness, and therefore confirms the suggestion that it ought to be considered as a relevant variable, it does not do so to an extent that overrides the effect of SBL.

*Gender as a Control Variable*

To complete the analysis, we also consider the impact of gender on the model. There was no hypothesized relationship prior to running the study.
Figure 15: Gender as a Control Variable

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Chi^2=2.880
df=3;p=.411
CFI = 1.000, TLI = 1.003
NFI = .991 RMSEA = .000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- Gender</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadEffectiveness &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>4.963</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety &lt;--- Gender</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-4.109</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction &lt;--- Gender</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychSafety &lt;--- LMXTotal</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: We see from the above diagram that while gender does not impact Leader Effectiveness and Job Satisfaction, it does impact Psychological Safety. Females score higher on Psychological Safety with respect to SBL. This point will be discussed in the discussion chapter that follows.

We turn now to consider the relationship between SBL and the Manager-rated outcome variables of Leader effectiveness, Results orientation and Relationships orientation. By introducing a second data source (the manager of the leader), the limitations around CMB are better managed. We proposed the following hypotheses in this regard:

*Hypothesis 7: Secure Base Leadership will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Leadership Effectiveness distinct to that that explained by Leader Member Exchange*

*Hypothesis 8: Secure Base Leadership will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Results orientation distinct to that explained by Leader Member Exchange*
Hypothesis 9: Secure Base Leadership will explain significant variance in Manager-rated Relationships orientation distinct to that explained by Leader Member Exchange

Table 13: Correlation Matrix: SBL Factors and Manager rated outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Results Orientation</th>
<th>Relationship Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.312**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Dealing Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: This above table indicates a positive relationship between the Safety and Positive Dealing factors of SBL and all 3 of the manager rated outcomes of Leader Effectiveness, Results and Relationships. The Exploration Factor of SBL only correlates weakly to Leader Effectiveness. The SBL Total also correlates positively to all 3 outcome variables.

Returning to the hypotheses, the following analyses were conducted:
Figure 16: Structural Model: SBL Factors predict Manager Rated outcomes

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ChiSQ=37.559  
df=1, p=.000  
CFI = .881, TLI = .951  
NFI = .885, RMSEA = .405
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>2.704</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The first point to note is that the model fit is not very good. The chi-square is significant, indicating that the covariances predicted by the model do not correspond to the covariances in the data. Moreover, none of the other fit indices meet the criteria of minimal acceptability – FCI, TLI, NFI > .9, RMSEA < .05. Therefore any conclusions based on the estimates should be made with extreme caution. It should be noted that we specified a correlation among two pairs of the manager ratings. These can be justified, as they are all aspects of the manager’s subjective experience of the leader.

Furthermore, it is only the Positive Dealing factor that has significant relationships to the 3 outcome variables. Encouragingly, this finding supports the conceptual understanding of the Positive Dealing factor in that this factor describes the way that the leader deals with the world – more than the relationship between leader and follower. Since the manager of the leader will be more exposed to how the leader ‘deals with the world’ than to the quality of the relationship between the leader and followers, it is not surprising that this is the factor that would be correlated to manager-rated outcome variables.
The structural model also shows that the Safety factor impacts manager rated Relationship orientation. Again, significance could be better, but one would expect a positive correlation between the Safety factor and Relationships orientation.

To take the examination of manager-rated outcomes one level further, we now include LMX in the analysis. To simplify the diagram, we use a Total score for SBL and for LMX.
Figure 17: Structural Model: SBL Total predicts Manager Rated outcomes, including LMX

Standardized Parameter Estimates are in the diagram above. Unstandardized Parameter Estimates are in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results &lt;--- SBLTotal</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated S.E. C.R. P Label
---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead -&gt; SBLTotal</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate -&gt; SBLTotal</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead -&gt; LMXTotal</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results -&gt; LMXTotal</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate -&gt; LMXTotal</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: While the fit indices are not acceptable, the above diagram suggests a positive relationship between SBL and manager-rated outcomes. The paths between SBL and the outcome measures are significant enough to suggest that a larger sample might provide confirmation of these relationships. In relation to the original hypotheses, it is important to note that none of the paths between LMX and the outcome variables are significant. This supports the overall hypotheses that SBL predicts outcome variables in a manner that is different to LMX.

Since the model fit indices were not quite good enough, the following series of regression analyses were conducted to better understand the relationship between SBL, LMX and the manager-rated outcome variables. In SPSS, a stepwise regression was conducted on the 3 outcomes variables. LMX was entered first and SBL second, thus effectively controlling for the impact of LMX.

Table 14: SBL Factors predict Manager Rated Leader Effectiveness, controlling for LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.8378806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.8120844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal
ANOVAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>6.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>80.033</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.753</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.232</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.116</td>
<td>7.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>74.521</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.753</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal
c. Dependent Variable: Leadership Effectiveness

Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>7.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>6.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBLTotal</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Leadership Effectiveness

Comment: We see from the above analysis support for Hypothesis 7 – The SBL Factors predict manager rated Leader Effectiveness when controlling for LMX.

Table 15: SBL Factors predict Manager Rated Results orientation, controlling for LMX

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.188(^a)</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.58003421638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.288(^b)</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.56800105513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal

ANOVA\(^c\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>4.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

186
Residual 38.354 114  .336
Total 39.758 115

1 Regression 3.301 2  1.651 5.116 .007b
Residual 36.457 113  .862 12.840 8.187 .005a
Total 191.636 115
2 Regression 28.546 2  14.273 9.889 .000b

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal
c. Dependent Variable: Results Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.271</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>13.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>12.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBLTotal</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Results Orientation

Comment: We see from the above support for Hypothesis 8 – The SBL Factors do predict manager rated Results orientation while controlling for LMX.

Table 16: SBL Factors predict Manager Rated Relationships Orientation, controlling for LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.259a</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.25235245645E-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.386a</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1.20136663432E-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>12.840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.840</td>
<td>8.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>178.796</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191.636</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>28.546</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.273</td>
<td>9.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA"
Residual 163.091  113  1.443  
Total 191.636  115  

a. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal  
b. Predictors: (Constant), LMXTotal, SBLTotal  
c. Dependent Variable: Relationships Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) 2.884</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal .882</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>2.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) 2.065</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMXTotal -.079</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBLTotal 1.690</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>3.299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Relationships Orientation

Comment: We see from the above analysis support for Hypothesis 9 – The SBL Factors predict manager rated Relationships orientation when controlling for LMX.

Attachment Style of Leader

We turn now to consider the Attachment style of the leader as measured by the adapted version of the ECR. As a reminder, this is an attempt to create an organizationally appropriate version of the ECR that would be positively related to the outcome variables.

Hypothesis 10: Leader Attachment Anxiety and Dependent Variables

10a. As Leader Anxiety decreases, manager rated Leader Effectiveness will increase
10b. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower rated Leader Effectiveness will increase
10c. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower Job Satisfaction will increase
10d. As Leader Anxiety decreases, follower psychological safety will increase
Hypothesis 11: Leader Attachment Avoidance and Dependent Variables

11a. As Leader Avoidance decreases, manager rated Leader Effectiveness will increase
11b. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower rated Leader Effectiveness will increase
11c. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower Job Satisfaction will increase
11d. As Leader Avoidance decreases, follower Psychological Safety will increase

Analysis of Attachment Dimensions

An unconstrained exploratory Factor Analysis of all of the ECR items failed to converge. Since the theoretical outcome of the ECR is a two factor model (anxiety and avoidance from Attachment Theory), subsequent EFA’s were run, but fixing the number of factors at 2. With each EFA, items were removed as appropriate. The final 2 factor EFA, containing 15 of the original 34 items, is shown in the table below.

Table 17. Factor Analysis of Attachment Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix*</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX1 I worry about being ignored or discounted by my colleagues</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX2 I worry a lot about my relationships at work</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX7 When I don’t have colleagues’ support, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX8 I get frustrated when my key colleagues are not around as much as I would like</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX12 I often wonder whether people like me at work</td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX16 I sometimes feel like I make more effort with others than they make with me</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANX17 I tend to focus on all the things that could go wrong in a situation
AV02R I am very comfortable being close to other people at work
AV03 I get uncomfortable when colleagues want to be very close to me
AV04 I don’t feel comfortable opening up to others
AV05R I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with colleagues
AV06 I try to avoid getting too close to others at work
AV07R I find it relatively easy to get close to others at work
AV09R I tell my close colleagues just about everything
AV010R I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my colleagues

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.721</td>
<td>18.143</td>
<td>42.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>12.796</td>
<td>55.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>7.455</td>
<td>62.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>7.350</td>
<td>70.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>76.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>4.764</td>
<td>81.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>85.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>89.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>3.456</td>
<td>92.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>94.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>96.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>98.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>99.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.
We now examine the relationship between the two Attachment dimensions and the outcome variables.

Table 18. Correlation Matrix – Attachment Dimensions and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Psych Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Factor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Factor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Hypotheses 8 and 9 not supported. There is no relationship between the Attachment style of the leader and the 3 outcome variables.

*Analysis of Attachment Dimensions and Secure Base Leader Dimensions*

Although not a part of the original hypothesis testing, Table x below shows the correlations between the 3 Secure Base Leadership factors and the 2 Attachment dimensions. In terms of convergent validity, one might expect a relationship between some of the Secure Base factors and the secure Attachment style derived from the Attachment dimensions. For example, one might hypothesize a relationship between the Safety Factor and both Attachment dimensions, where a person scoring higher on Safety might be expected to score lower on anxiety and avoidance. This would be expected as the Safety Factor, being a basic positive predisposition to others, would likely correspond
to Attachment schemas low in avoidance and low in anxiety.

Importantly though, there is no overall hypothesized relationship between the SBL factors and the Attachment dimensions. The very point of Secure Base Leadership is to bring a detailed behavioral description of Secure Base leaders – distinct from the traditional Attachment Theory dimensional approach. Therefore one would expect some overlap, but this is not a formal test of convergent validity and there is no theoretical expectation that the 3 factors would ‘map’ onto the Attachment dimensions.

Table 19. Correlation Matrix – Attachment and Secure Base Leadership Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safety Factor</th>
<th>Exploration Factor</th>
<th>Positive Dealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidance Factor</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety Factor</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: There are no relationships between the Attachment dimensions and the SBL factors.

*Chapter Conclusion*

As a summary, this chapter has produced the following results:
1. When considering the 8 dimensions of Secure Base Leadership, we observed:
   - Prima facie support for the 8 Dimensions in terms of reliability scores
   - Confirmation of the correlation hypotheses numbered 1-3
   - Confirmation of the hypotheses numbered 4-6
   - Confirmation of hypotheses 7 and 9, but not 8 (Manager rated scores)
   - Non – confirmation of hypothesized relationships numbered 10 and 11 in terms of the attachment dimensions

2. The three Factors that emerged from the EFA indicate:
   - The 8 Dimensions are not independent sub-scales, but highly correlated
   - 2 of the SBL factors (Safety and Exploration) correspond to Bowlby’s notions of Attachment and Exploration and indicate theoretical support for the Secure Base concept.
   - In addition to Safety and Exploration as relationship based factors, an additional factor of Positive Dealing emerged. This factor describes the way in which the leader deals with tasks and problems, specifically in a positive manner.

3. SBL predicts the three outcome variables when controlling for Organizational Power.

5. Gender may be relevant in respect of psychological safety.

The following discussion chapter will examine these results in greater detail.
CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION - STUDY TWO

Chapter Overview
This chapter discusses the previous results chapter. Three points will form the bulk of the chapter. First we will revisit the results of the analysis and the hypotheses. Second, we need to consider the discrepancy in the number of dimensions resulting from the exploratory factor analysis. Essentially, does Secure Base leadership have 3 or 8 dimensions? Third, given their prominence in the statistical results, we will discuss the 3 factor model of SBL in greater detail.

Discussion
We first revisit the results of the original hypotheses.

Table 20. Correlation Matrix for Hypotheses 1 – 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psych Safety</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, Table 20 demonstrates overall support for Hypotheses 1 – 3, that there would be a positive relationship between the eight Secure Base dimensions and the core outcome variables of Leadership Effectiveness, Job Satisfaction and Psychological Safety.

It is particularly encouraging to note that Secure Base dimensions are all positively associated with Psychological Safety. Psychological Safety is theoretically the most important outcome variable in relation to the Secure Base dimensions in that it captures the essence of the safety-risk dilemma.

The overall support for Hypotheses 1-3 suggests that the dimensions of Secure Base leadership identified in the Study One are positively associated with desired organizational outcomes of leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction and psychological safety.
Hypotheses 4-6 were considering whether SBL contributed variance distinct from the well-established ‘leadership as relationship’ construct of Leader Member Exchange. This is an important part of the analysis as it indicates whether SBL is indeed a contribution to the field of leadership studies, or simply a restatement of existing theory.

It is therefore encouraging to report that SBL does indeed contribute unique variance in addition to Leader Member Exchange. It is important to note that the Safety Factor most strongly predicted Psychological Safety, the Positive Dealing Factor most strongly predicted Leadership Effectiveness, and the exploration Factor most strongly predicted follower Job Satisfaction.

With regard to Psychological Safety, this makes theoretical sense as one would expect that the factor that contains safety, protection and comfort would be most associated with Psychological Safety (Edmondson, 1999).

In terms of Leadership Effectiveness, it is not a surprise that the Positive Dealing factor dominates as the Leadership Effectiveness items tend to focus on task performance more than relational quality.

On the other hand, the Job Satisfaction measure, which items inquire into a more generalized sense of job satisfaction (without reference to the leader), suggests that opportunity, growth and development are most appreciated by followers. In other words, with regards to job satisfaction, followers are more concerned that their leader provides
them with opportunities for exploration, development and growth, than with safety and protection.

Overall then, we see from the support from hypotheses 4-6 that SBL predicts variance in a manner distinct to LMX and in this way the argument can be made that SBL makes an original contribution to existing ‘leadership as relationship’ theory.

We also examined the importance of Organizational Power and suggested that the extent to which a leader had organizational power could impact SBL’s effect on the outcome variables. This was suggested in relation to the safety-risk dilemma in that it is necessary for a leader to have sufficient organizational power in order to meaningfully provide safety and opportunities for risk taking.

The analysis supported the conceptual notion that organizational power is important, but when controlling for organizational power, SBL continued to predict the three outcome variables of Psychological Safety, Job Satisfaction and Leadership Effectiveness.

This Organizational Power dimension is important from a practical standpoint, as it brings a pragmatic dose of realism to the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership. In a sense it is a warning to say that it is not simply a matter of “providing safety and exploration” as a leader. A leader should also have the requisite Organizational Power to effectively manage the organizational context. In other words, the leader needs to have
sufficient organizational power to effectively provide safety and opportunities for exploration.

Hypotheses 7-9 were concerned with the relationship between SBL and the Manager rated outcome variables of Leader Effectiveness, Results orientation and Relationships orientation. These hypotheses are particularly important because they provide an alternative data source to that provided by the followers of the leader. In this way, the methodological issue of common method bias is avoided and furthermore, from an applied perspective, the view of the manager on leader effectiveness is perhaps more telling and significant to the leader in question than the view of his/her direct reports. I am suggesting that from a purely hierarchical, career growth perspective, the view of a manager is critical to an employee, perhaps even more so than his/her direct reports.

In terms of the results, there was confirmation of the relationship between SBL and manager rated leader effectiveness.

It is also worth noting that in showing a positive relationship to Leader Effectiveness and Relationships, the analysis is emphasizing that SBL is capturing the relationship element of “leadership as relationship”. This provides some element of construct validity to the concept of SBL. Also significant is that SBL contributed variance distinct to LMX, thus indicating discriminant validity from the dominant “leadership as relationship” construct.
Hypotheses 10-11 were aimed at testing an organizationally appropriate version of the ECR. As noted, a previous study (Coombe, 2008) had shown that the original ECR did not translate well to the organizational context. In this study a modified version of the ECR was tested, but it too did not correspond to hypothesized organizational outcomes. These combined findings pose a serious challenge to existing leadership research using Attachment Theory. Studies (Davidowitz et al, 2008; Popper 2009; Shaver 2003) have reported success with measuring attachment dimensions in military contexts. However they have all used modifications of the ECR or other measures. It is puzzling as to why the ECR, the most recognized measure of attachment in psychology does not translate to the organizational context, even in modified form. I would suggest two possible explanations.

First, the ECR scores leader’s individual style at work in general, not his/her relationship with that particular subordinate. Other studies (Ghazal, 2010) have shown that when the leader-follower relationship is the focus, attachment measures (although not the ECR) have been predictive of outcomes such as job satisfaction. Ghazal (2010) essentially found that the specific relationship was more predictive than the global attachment style.

Second, we might expect the ECR correlations to be lower as the rating source was different. In this study the leaders rated their own style, rather than the followers rating the leader’s style. Nonetheless, the studies cited above in military contexts involved a leader self-report, so this should not by itself have been a problem. This is certainly grounds for future study and research.
I would however argue that the non-support for Hypotheses 10 and 11 strengthens the argument for Secure Base Leadership. In a sense, it shows that a ‘dimensional’ approach to Attachment Theory is too reliant on measurement instruments and that the focus has become on the avoidance and anxiety dimensions. Secure Base Leadership however focuses exclusively on the desired form of attachment and raises up the behaviors and characteristics of Secure Base Leadership. In that sense it is suggested that it is a more helpful and practical way to approach leadership from an attachment perspective. It is less diagnostic and more descriptive of an ideal type.

Discussion on results of EFA

In the second part of this discussion chapter, we turn to a discussion of the results of the exploratory factor analysis that revealed 3 factors rather than 8. First, a reminder of the items underlying each of the factors:

Table 21. Description of 3 SBL Factor items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBL Factor</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY FACTOR:</td>
<td>Key words: Valuing, accepting, appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC1.</td>
<td>My manager values me as a human being, not just as an employee performing a role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC4.</td>
<td>My manager understands and appreciates me as a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC6.</td>
<td>My manager accepts people's limitations and weaknesses in a supportive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS1.</td>
<td>My manager is available and accessible to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLORATION</td>
<td>Key words: Growth, Potential, Develop, Opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I suggest that there are 8 dimensions to Secure Base Leadership as shown in the qualitative study and partially supported in the quantitative study. However, as one gets deeper into the quantitative analysis, 3 factors emerge. Two of the factors are theoretically consistent with Bowlby and Ainsworth’s conception of being a Secure Base (attachment and exploration), while the third factor is more concerned with a positive style towards problem solving.

*Attachment, Exploration and Positive Dealing – the core of Secure Base Leadership*

We turn now to a more detailed discussion about 3 factors of SBL.
If we return to the original theoretical description of Secure Base as conceptualized by Bowlby we see links to the two factors of Safety and Exploration.

“The provision of a Secure Base from which a child or adolescent can make sorties into the outside world and to which he can return knowing for sure that he will be welcomed when he gets there, nourished physically and emotionally, comforted if distressed, reassured if frightened. In essence the role is one of being available, ready to respond when called upon to encourage and perhaps assist, but to intervene actively only when clearly necessary. In these respects it is a role similar to that of an officer commanding a military base from which an expeditionary force sets out and to which it can retreat, should it meet with a setback. Much of the time the role of the base is a waiting one but it is nonetheless vital for that. For it is only when the officer commanding the expeditionary force is confident his base is secure that he dares press forward and take risks.” P.11

Bowlby, J. A Secure Base

The Safety Factor, which is all about acceptance, valuing and appreciating makes sense in terms of “welcoming” and “nourishing” others. In order to be a Secure Base as Bowlby envisaged, clearly one would need to provide this requisite safety, protection and support. The Safety Factor is also consistent with Bowlby’s descriptors of “comforted” and “reassured”. Furthermore, Bowlby speaks about “pressing forward and taking risks.” This would seem to fit well with the Exploration Factor identified in the EFA. It would appear therefore that the two factors are consistent with Bowlby’s conception of Secure Base.
Furthermore if one considers the attachment and exploration control systems of Attachment Theory as described by Bowlby and Ainsworth, we see further support for the two factors. Ainsworth spoke clearly about the role of a Secure Base in this regard:

“For some time it has been useful to view an attachment figure as providing a Secure Base from with a child may venture forth to explore the world (Blatz, 1966; Salter, 1940; Ainsworth 1963, 1967; Harlow, 1958). The more inclusive concept of a balance between exploratory and attachment behavior followed from Bowlby’s (1969) control systems account of the dynamic equilibrium of mother-infant interactions.” Ainsworth (1971) p.2

As has been noted The Safety Factor corresponds to the provision of comfort and safety in the attachment control system and The Exploration Factor corresponds to the exploration control system. It is therefore suggested that these two factors identified in the EFA and confirmed in the CFA can be justified and supported by theory. It further therefore argued that these two factors appear to capture the essence of what Bowlby and Ainsworth envisaged with their notion of a Secure Base.

In an organizational context we referred to the attachment/exploration dynamic as being that of safety and risk, where safety is the provision of comfort by a leader to followers, and exploration is the encouragement of risk taking. These two SBL factors would appear to correspond well to this safety-risk dynamic if we suggest that the Safety Factor would support the provision of safety and the Exploration Factor would support risk taking.
One could potentially consider a two dimensional matrix combining Safety and Exploration. The dimensions would be:

- High Safety to Low Safety
- High Exploration to Low Exploration

Figure 18: A possible conceptual model of Safety and Exploration

It might be possible in future research to conceptualize and even measure these two dimensions showing how leaders who score differently might represent different types of leadership.

Overall then, the Secure Base leadership factors of Safety and Exploration are well supported theoretically and correspond to Ainsworth’s and Bowlby’s conceptions of Secure Base.
I would like to make one further point with respect to the Safety Factor and Exploration factors – and that is to revisit the notion of love. In the discussion chapter of Study One (p. 121), I argued that the Acceptance dimension is notionally akin to love as “intentional positive other regard” in that it is an acceptance and valuing of the other as a legitimate being that underpins the essence of love. As has been noted, the Safety factor is comprised largely of the Acceptance items and therefore if the earlier argument has any worth, then it makes sense to suggest that the Safety factor is akin to love. Note that I made the argument earlier that: “An appreciative, agreeable, emotionally intelligent, servant leader providing safety and comfort to followers is a person who has shifted the centre of their focus away from themselves, towards some kind of ‘other focus’. As was shown earlier, this ‘other focus’ is the essence of love. In essence then, I am suggesting that the attachment control system, manifested as safety in an organizational context, is best understood through a lens of love” p.121 of this document

Staying with the topic of love, I would even suggest that the Exploration factor has resonance with love. A reminder that the items underlying the Exploration factor are dominated by the Potential dimension of SBL. Furthermore, we have seen that the Exploration factor has as its core the themes of growth, development and seeing potential in the other. In other words, the potentiality of the other is fundamental to this Exploration factor. How is this related to love? Templeton (1999) made direct reference to potential when he said that, “underlying all the expressions of love is an affirmation of the goodness and potential in every life.”
I am not arguing that the Safety and Exploration factors are equivalent to love in all respects. But I am suggesting that in the provision of Safety, which is clearly informed by the dimension of Acceptance, and in seeing the potential for growth and development (Exploration), a leader might well be displaying a stance of “intentional positive other regard” which is the essence of love. While the factor labels of Safety and Exploration do not necessarily suggest this connection, an examination of the underlying items does hint at the possible connection to love. It seems to me that the relationship between love and Safety and Exploration could be fruitfully explored in future studies.

We have explored the Safety and Exploration factors, but what then of the third SBL factor – Positive Dealing? If the Safety and Exploration Factors are focused on the relationship between leader and follower, this factor describes the way in which the leader deals with problems and situations. I suggest that this factor is a helpful addition to the SBL model in that it reminds us that ‘leadership as relationship’ is not the only concern of a leader. There is also the important aspect of tasks, actions and problem solving. In this way, one is reminded of the people/production dimensions described by Blake and Mouton (1961). This Positive Dealing factor, I would argue, appears to correspond to the production dimension. It emphasizes that leadership is not only about relationships (people), but also about the creation of desired organizational outcomes (production). It suggests that followers do not only appreciate a leader who is relationally strong and offers them safety and opportunities for exploration, but also a person who is able to manage tasks, situations and ‘production’ issues in a positive manner. In other
words, they are able to deal with the world. It is essential to remind ourselves that this factor is not simply Dealing, but Positive Dealing. The items underlying the factor describe not just a leader who is able to focus on tasks and production, but a leader who does so in a positive manner. The items describe a calm and positive leader with a tendency to favor inquiry over advocacy.

There is perhaps also an element of ‘modeling’ in this Positive Dealing factor in that the follower appreciates seeing the leader manage tasks and problems in a positive manner and is able to thus learn behaviors that will allow them to also successfully navigate task completion. In more plain English, one imagines here a leader who “walks his or her talk.”

A final lens through which to review this Positive Dealing factor is to revisit the topic of love. May’s (1967) idea of the importance of ‘will’ in relation to love, whereby he argued that love and action go hand in hand, resonates with this Positive Dealing factor. If, as I suggested above, Safety and Exploration as described by their underlying items is not dissimilar to a broad conception of love as “intentional positive other regard”, then it seems to me that the Positive Dealing Factor arguably represents ‘will’ – or the action component of love as envisaged by May. This is of course somewhat speculative, but I would suggest that a person presented with the items underlying the 3 factors, who knew nothing about Attachment Theory, and who was familiar with the work of May, might reasonably theorize that taken together they represent May’s conception of love and will. Again, this is a matter that could fruitfully be explored in future research.
Continuing the discussion of the results of the CFA, I would argue that the two factors of Safety and Exploration have similarity to a body of literature not yet discussed – that of developmental psychology and learning. For example, Sanford (1962, 1966), Vygotsky (1978) and Maslow (1943) forwarded ideas that could be considered as somewhat akin to the SBL Safety and Exploration factors. Sanford (1962, 1966), in his studies of college students argued that students need a combination of “support” and “challenge” if they are to learn optimally. On the one hand a student needs sufficient support from the teacher and learning environment in order to feel comfortable, but on the other hand needs to sufficient challenge to learn new ideas. If a student has too much support and not enough challenge, they might be complacent in their learning, while too much challenge without sufficient support can lead to frustration and lowering of confidence in the learning environment. Sanford later added a third dimension to his learning requirements which is that of ‘readiness’ whereby he suggested that the student also needs to have a certain level of ‘readiness’ to be able to handle the basic content of the learning program. For example, even a perfect balance of support and challenge would not equip a 5 year old to learn about advanced statistics. It seems sensible to suggest that the Exploration and Safety factors of SBL resonate with Sanford’s notion of support and challenge.

Vygotsky, a psychologist concerned with the social dimensions of learning forwarded the notion of “zones of proximal development” (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985). For Vygotsky, it was important to focus on the problem solving abilities of a person, and he
considered there to be an ideal learning “zone” between what a person can solve by themselves and what they can solve with the help of another more capable person. For optimal learning to occur, Vygotsky argued that the student needs to be in this zone. In other words, the ideal learning zone is when a person is attempting to solve problems beyond what they could solve on their own, but not so difficult that it requires the full contribution of the more capable person. Vygotsky’s formal definition of a zone of proximal development is, “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978 p.86).

In this way we see that Vygotsky, like Sanford, was focused on the dynamic tension between a person feeling safe and supported on the one hand, and feeling challenged and stretched on the other.

Maslow (1943), in his well known hierarchy of needs argued that for optimal development, a person needs to have certain basic needs met at the lowest levels of the hierarchy – mostly to do with safety and comfort. Interestingly, while Maslow described the very basic needs as being around survival and safety (food, shelter, etc), they increasingly become relational in nature. Once physiological and survival needs have been met, Maslow suggests that we have “love needs” about which he said, “if both the physiological and the safety needs are fairly well gratified, then there will emerge the love and affection and belongingness needs” (Maslow, 1943). Following the love needs,
are the “esteem needs” which Maslow described as “the desire for reputation or prestige (defining it as respect or esteem from other people), recognition, attention, importance or appreciation” and “respect from others” (Maslow, 1943). It is noteworthy then, that while Maslow used the word ‘safety’ in his hierarchy, the Safety and Exploration factors of SBL most closely correspond to the “love” and “esteem” needs.

Also relevant to the topic of Secure Base Leadership, Maslow described the conditions under which needs can be most easily satisfied: “There are certain conditions which are immediate prerequisites for the basic need satisfactions. Danger to these is reacted to almost as if it were a direct danger to the basic needs themselves. Such conditions as freedom to speak, freedom to do what one wishes so long as no harm is done to others, freedom to express one's self, freedom to investigate and seek for information, freedom to defend one's self, justice, fairness, honesty, orderliness in the group are examples of such preconditions for basic need satisfactions” (Maslow, 1943). Our descriptions of a Secure Base Leader, especially in terms of Safety and Exploration would seem to be well suited to providing an organizational context that supports these conditions.

As a final point, Maslow’s view is different to Sanford and Vygotsky in that he is not forwarding a dynamic tension between support and challenge, but rather arguing that there are basic needs that have to be satisfied for optimal development. I suggest that the Safety and Exploration factors of SBL seem to be consistent with Maslow’s theory, most notably in relation to “love” and “esteem” needs.
Taken together, the theories of Sanford, Vygotsky and Maslow resonate with the findings of SBL. While SBL is rooted theoretically in Attachment Theory, it appears that the findings of the study can be viewed through alternative theoretical lenses. If that is so, is there something broader that can be said about SBL?

I would argue that the common dimension of SBL and some of the developmental psychologists described above is that of growth and development. It is important to remember that the notion of Secure Base is only an element of Attachment Theory and that this study of SBL explicitly sought to explore positive relationships between leader and follower. A person who is a Secure Base is clearly in a highly developmental relationship with the other person. One could almost suggest that growth and development of the other is a defining aspect of being a Secure Base. Therefore SBL should represent something of a positive lens on Attachment Theory and it makes sense that the findings of SBL should resonate with psychological theories that are more developmental in nature and that emphasize learning.

I suggest that from a practitioner perspective, this similarity of SBL to aspects of developmental psychology is also is significant. Sanford and Vygotsky were particularly concerned with learning and learning environments and given the emphasis on learning, creativity and innovation in modern organizations, an approach to leadership that will foster learning could be considered as helpful. It would appear that SBL, if indeed supported by the ideas of Sanford and Vygotsky, could be just such an approach to leadership.
Appreciative/Positive Leadership

An alternative lens through which to view the 3 SBL factors is that of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS), and therein suggest that SBL represents something of a positive approach to leadership. The argument would be that when the 3 SBL factors are taken together, in very simple terms, we see a leader who seems to have a positive, or appreciative, approach to both people and production - to tasks and relationships. The Secure Base Leader sees the positive in others (Safety and Exploration) and the positive in situations (Positive Dealing).

Following this line of argument of reasoning, it could be suggested that the 3 SBL factors indicate an overall positive, or appreciative, stance towards:

a) the current state of the follower (Safety as acceptance of the other)
b) the future state of the follower (Exploration as potential of the other)
c) situations and tasks and getting things done (Positive Dealing)

As a side note, one could even speculatively suggest that the 3 SBL factors correspond to the Discovery, Dream and Deploy/Destiny elements of the 4D process of the Appreciative Inquiry Summit Methodology. Safety, like Discovery, is grounded in acceptance and valuing, and focuses on the existing strengths and basic ‘worth’ of the individual. Exploration, like Dream, focuses on the future growth, development and potentiality of the individual and Positive Dealing, like Deploy and Destiny, describes the manner in which the leader implements and executes tasks and achieves the desired
organizational outcomes.

We do not need to belabor this point, or show conclusively a link between SBL and Appreciative Inquiry, but it does add credence to the overall point that if one takes away the lens of Attachment Theory, and examines the underlying items of SBL, one is clearly presented with a leader who is grounded in a positive approach to leadership. A Secure Base Leader has a positive approach to the basic value of the other, a positive approach to their potentiality, and a positive style of acting and dealing with task related matters.

The final consideration in this discussion chapter is to ask a fundamental question: Does Secure Base Leadership have 8 dimensions or 3 factors? Study One found through qualitative analysis that there are 8 dimensions to SBL. The quantitative analysis of Study Two however showed that these 8 dimensions cross correlate with each other, with the result that there are only 3 Factors underlying SBL. The answer to this question has particular implications for the practitioner and educator, as it has consequences for how one would teach, learn and apply SBL.

The answer to this of course in one sense turns on one’s perspective, or views, on the relative importance of qualitative versus quantitative research. I would argue that the findings of Study Two do not discredit Study One and it is still important to consider the 8 dimensions identified in the first study. They reflect the experiences of the participants in the interviews and furthermore, the eight dimensions were validated by more than one
researcher. They provide a rich description of the behaviors associated with Secure Base leadership that is of great use to practitioners.

Furthermore, the following correlation matrix shows why the 8 dimension of SBL should not be discounted. Table x shows the relationship between a single score measure for SBL as 8 dimensions and SBL as 3 factors. This is calculated as the mean score of the underlying items. The 8 dimensions have a total of 24 items. The 3 factors have a total of 13 items. It shows that there is a 95% correlation between the two versions of SBL!

Table 22: Correlation matrix: SBL 8 Dimensions and SBL 2 Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBL_8 Dimensions</th>
<th>SBL 2 Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBL_8 Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.948**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL_2 Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.948**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

My conclusion is to suggest that when one is measuring SBL for the purposes of quantitative research, it is appropriate to use the 3 Factor model. It is more parsimonious and elegantly captures the two elements of safety and exploration that are core to the whole idea of Secure Base.

However, in an executive education setting, I suggest it might be more appropriate to use the 8 dimension version of SBL. It lends itself to a 360 degree feedback type instrument
and the 8 dimensions can be usefully understood and applied by executives in a classroom setting, as well as in the workplace.

Limitations of the Study

This study is of course not without limitations.

While the sample population is strong in terms of the diversity of nationalities and industries, it is possible that the sample of leaders is unusually “high performing” (the name of the leadership program). This is the flagship leadership program of one of the leading business schools in the world – participants are required to have demonstrated sustained leadership and organizational success to attend the program. This would potentially account for the initial problems with the skewness and kurtosis statistics. A broader sample of leaders, not from an ‘elite’ leadership program might therefore be an important element of future studies.

A larger sample size would also be helpful. This larger sample will allow the analysis to be conducted by grouping the followers of each leader, rather than considering the followers individually. Apart from analyzing the mean follower scores for each leader, this would also potentially allow Hierarchical Linear Modeling, which could provide strong insights. Fortunately this leadership program is ongoing and so there will be opportunities to continue to gather data in the coming years.
Finally, there is the issue of common method bias. While this was dealt with statistically, the research would be strengthened by including variables gathered from perspectives other than that of the followers. For example, the Secure Base behaviors of the leader could be collected. Most powerfully, an objective measure of the leader’s performance, rather the subjective measures employed in this study, would greatly enhance the analysis and findings. Again, due to the ongoing nature of this leadership program, these sources of data can be tapped in future rounds of data gathering.

At the same time, some of the design elements of the study can be defended. For example when considering the relationship between SBL and Psychological Safety, it seems sensible to have asked the followers to rate the SBL behaviors of the leader on the one hand, and also to have asked them to rate their experience of working in the team that the leader manages on the other hand. These two constructs are not overly overlapping in terms of expected CMB.

The final chapter will serve as the conclusion to this thesis.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Chapter Overview

This chapter will conclude the research program by reviewing the main points to emerge from the literature review; restating the findings of study one and study two; reviewing the primary discussion points from both studies; considering the research and practical implications of this study; and finally state the overall contribution of this research to the field of organizational behavior.

Review of Literature

The core point to emerge from the review of the literature was to state that the concept of Secure Base, as originally conceived by Ainsworth and Bowlby has not been fully developed in organizational behavior literature. Ainsworth said the role of the Secure Base is to mediate between the two attachment control systems of attachment and exploration. A Secure Base provides both comfort and safety, and also opportunities for exploration and risk taking. This was referred to as a safety-risk dilemma.

Attachment Theory literature, especially in the organizational setting, has tended down a ‘dimensional’ path and while this work has rigorous, it has lead to the original conception of Secure Base being ‘replaced’ by the secure attachment style – typically defined as being low in avoidance and anxiety. It was argued that a more detailed description of the
behaviors of a Secure Base would be a helpful contribution to the literature. It was noted that Popper and Mayseless (2003) made an initial conceptual contribution in this regard, and this research should be considered an extension of their conceptual work.

It was also shown in the review, that while organizational studies have favored the standard avoidance/anxiety dimensions, there has been considerable writing in fields of developmental psychology and psychotherapy describing the role – and behaviors – of secures bases in those settings. This research has attempted to bring the insights and perspectives from those domains to organizational literature.

Other relationship-based approaches to leadership and organizational behavior were considered in an effort to establish a broader context for the emerging notion of Secure Base leadership. As an explicitly ‘positive’ approach to leadership, Secure Base leadership was compared with the literatures of positive relatedness, love, positive relationships at work and high quality connections. The literature of love was given particular attention and concluded that a definition of love could be “intentional positive other regard.”

Considering avenues for research, three variables were considered as being theoretically relevant to Secure Base Leadership. Firstly it was suggested that Secure Base Leadership would need to distinguish itself from existing relationship based leadership theories. With Leader Member Exchange being the most recognized measure of leadership as relationship, it was suggested that LMX would be an important variable in future
research. Second, considering possible dependant variables for Secure Base Leadership, it was argued that Psychological Safety could be hypothesized to be theoretically linked to SBL. Psychological Safety is a measure of the extent to which organizational members feel safe to take risks – which is conceptually similar to the safety-risk dilemma described above. Third, it was suggested that if the provision of safety and opportunities for risk taking are a key feature of being a Secure Base, then it would be necessary to consider the extent to which a leader has sufficient organizational power to actually provide safety and risk. Reference was made to Zaleznik’s triangle of Leadership as a way to conceptualize this idea of requisite organizational power.

**Review of Research Findings**

Study one aimed to produce a qualitative description of the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership. The study revealed eight dimensions of Secure Base Leadership:

- acceptance of the other
- provide opportunities for risk
- seeing potential in the other
- available and accessible ‘anywhere anytime’
- favors listening and inquiry
- calm and dependable
- uses intrinsic motivation to motivate
- has a positive mindset

Each of these dimensions was reviewed in light of existing organizational literature,
concluding that these dimensions are conceptually logical and can be supported by literature as being positively associated with beneficial outcomes.

Study two aimed to develop the findings from study one by quantitatively assessing the dimensions of Secure Base Leadership. An instrument aimed at measuring the eight dimensions was created and assessed in relation to dependent variables of leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction and psychological safety. In addition the variables of Leader Member Exchange and organizational power were also included in the study. Results of the study indicated initial support for the eight dimensions, but deeper quantitative investigation through an EFA revealed 3 Factors underpinning these eight dimensions. Two factors correspond theoretically to Attachment Theory in that they represent the attachment and exploration control systems, which for the purposes of this research were named as Safety and Exploration. The third factor represents a Positive Dealing style towards problem solving.

The results of the ensuing analysis, using the 3 factor model, showed that Secure Base Leadership contributes unique variance to the outcome variables of psychological safety, follower job satisfaction and leader effectiveness – in a manner distinct from LMX. Further, while organizational power was indeed a significant variable, it did not ‘overpower’ SBL in the analysis.

Very importantly, SBL also predicted leadership effectiveness, the Relationships orientation, and the Results orientation of the leader as rated by his/her manager. This
finding adds methodological strength to the study and adds credibility to the argument for SBL in an applied context.

In the discussion of the results, focus was placed on the 3 dimensions of Safety and Exploration and reinforced how they reflect well the underlying theory of Secure Base and Attachment Theory. It was furthermore suggested that the Safety and Exploration dimensions have theoretical resonance with notion of love described as “intentional positive other regard” and that this relationship could be explored in future research. Reference was also made to developmental and learning literatures, which revealed that the SBL findings have resonance in these bodies of literature. Furthermore, it was argued that if one takes away the lens of Attachment Theory, it is also possible to conceptualize SBL as a theoretical approach to leadership grounded in Positive Organizational Scholarship. From this perspective, SBL describes a leader with a positive approach to both relationships (Safety and Exploration) and task completion (Positive Dealing).

Finally, it was suggested that the 3 factor version of SBL should be considered most useful in quantitative research, while the 8 dimension version of SBL could be of particular value in the arena of executive education.

**Research Implications and Next Steps**

A number of avenues for future research emerge from this work. First, as has been noted, the Secure Base Leadership instrument could be improved. Specifically some of the dimensions would benefit from new items in order to improve the reliability coefficients. Second, based on the non-support for Hypotheses 8 and 9, the organizational
version of the ECR needs further refinement. Despite the core argument of this research being to lessen the focus on the dimensions and rather focus on ‘being a Secure Base’, it would nonetheless be helpful to develop an organizationally appropriate version of the ECR, especially given the ongoing prevalence of the dimensional approach to Attachment Theory. One reason for doing this would be to consider the relationship between Secure Base Leadership and the attachment dimensions of avoidance and anxiety.

Third, there has been mention of numerous organizational constructs in the discussion sections such as innovation, organizational learning, exploration, exploitation, transformational leadership and servant leadership. Each of these could be thoroughly investigated in relation to Secure Base Leadership.

Fourth, it would be worthwhile considering individual level personality differences in leaders. For example, future research could consider the relationship between the personality variables of optimism and agreeableness and Secure Base Leadership. I would suggest that the Safety Factor in particular could be closely linked to agreeableness.

Finally, the subject of love in organizations is ripe for further exploration both theoretically and empirically.

*Practical Implications*
There are two primary considerations in terms of practical implications of Secure Base Leadership. The first is how Secure Base Leadership relates to practical organizational realities and objectives. The second is how Secure Base Leadership could be developed in terms of training and education.

In terms of the former, Secure Base Leadership most clearly has implications for organizational practitioners concerned with fostering innovation and learning. The major contribution of this research is to suggest that learning and innovation will be supported by leadership that provides Safety, but also opportunities for Exploration. The core message of this research is to suggest that innovation requires both safety and risk, and it is the leadership, as a Secure Base, potentially provides both of these elements.

Also from a practical perspective, the idea of a safety-risk ‘dilemma’ provides a helpful diagnostic framework for organizational leaders. In simple terms, asking questions such as “should I be providing more safety, or encouraging more risk?” or “what is the balance between safety and risk in my organization right now?” would be instructive and practically helpful inquiries for a leader.

The Positive Dealing factor is also highly relevant to practitioners in that it gives weight to the task related aspects of organizational life. In other words, this factor reminds us that while ‘leadership as relationship’ is essential, it should not be separated from the requirement to successfully achieve task related outcomes.
Finally, practitioners will also benefit from the insight derived from the analysis relating to Organizational Power. While SBL is an explicitly positive approach to leadership and suggests that a leader grounded in a positive approach to relationships and tasks is likely to achieve certain desired organizational outcomes, he or she ought also to be cognizant of the extent of their Organizational Power. Quite simply, a Secure Base leader will be even more successful if he or she has the necessary degree of Organizational Power to provide meaningful safety and opportunities for exploration.

In terms of training and development, the question becomes: how might one develop or increase levels of Secure Base Leadership? The SBL instrument – whether the 8 dimension version or the 3 factor version – lends itself particularly well to a 360 degree feedback process. This has already been done with success on subsequent versions of the leadership program. The 8 dimensions, being behavior based, are particularly useful to executives. It provides clear behavioral guidance, and in a 360 degree feedback process, also provides an opportunity to receive direct feedback on each of the dimensions.

In terms of the 3 factors of SBL, the implication for training and development is that one needs to develop both relationship based skills (Safety and Exploration) and also task related skills (Positive Dealing). While these might initially seem like different skill sets, it is their shared positive orientation that is perhaps most instructive in terms of training and development. This common theme suggests that a training program that was designed around developing positive attitudes and mindsets – to both people and tasks – could be beneficial. In other words, the objective would be to develop the underlying skill
of having an appreciative or positive lens to the world, that encompasses both people and tasks.

*Contributions*

This dissertation makes several contributions to the field of organizational behavior. First it makes a contribution by bringing clarity and depth to the important concept of Secure Base beyond existing conceptions of the construct.

Second it brings an approach to leadership that goes beyond existing theory. It is a direct contribution to the leadership as relationship body of literature and in being a positive lens on leadership, contributes to the field of Positive Organizational Scholarship, most notably the area of Positive Relationships at Work. In holding up the importance of Safety, Exploration and Positive Dealing and as the key elements of Secure Base Leadership, it has contributed to the field of positive organizational scholarship by demonstrating the power of this positive leadership approach to both relationships and tasks.

In not creating a successful measure of attachment dimensions it makes a contribution to the field by showing that more work is required to understand attachment dimensions in the organizational context.

At a more general level I believe this dissertation makes an important contribution to discussions about the nature of leadership and the role of relationships in
organizational life. In showing that practicing acceptance, providing safety and seeing the potential in others produces beneficial organizational outcomes, I hope that this work makes a significant contribution to efforts to humanize the workplace. It stresses that basic human relationships, that emphasize the fundamental value of the human being, are not just desirable from a humanistic perspective, but also in terms of driving organizational outcomes. In a world that seems to be filled with so much cynicism about organizational life, this research points to a more hopeful and optimistic view on leadership and relationships at work.

Finally, perhaps less directly, but certainly more personally, this research has indicated that love, defined as intentional positive other regard, and most closely associated with the dimension of acceptance and the provision of safety, is a contributor to leadership effectiveness, follower job satisfaction and psychological safety. There is a whole lifetime of work still to be done on the topic of love, but nothing feels like a more important contribution to organizational scholarship – and nothing feels like a more useful way to spend the rest of my life.
APPENDIX

Common Method Bias Procedure

The first step was to create a CFA of all of the variables used in the analysis. Following Podsakoff et al (2003) an additional latent factor was included in the CFA of all items to account for CMB. This CMB factor was constrained to have equal loadings with all manifest items and equal covariances with all exogenous latent factors. The standardized regression weights from the constrained CMB model were used to create weighted average construct scores. Those scores, in turn, were used in subsequent analyses. The first model below shows the CFA with the CMB variable included as well as the regression weights in the subsequent table. These regression weights were used to create the weighted average construct scores. While the chi-square is significant, most of the other indices are in the acceptable range. The normed fit index (NFI) is somewhat less than the ideal of >.9. However, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) is in the acceptable range of >.9. The comparative fit index CFI which takes sample size into account (Bentler, 1992) and indicates the percent of covariation in the data that can be reproduced by the model is acceptable (> .9 = >90%). The root mean square error of approximation is also in the acceptable range of <.05.

The second model shows the CFA of all variables, without the introduction of the CMB variable, and their standardized regression weights. To assess whether the impact of common method bias (CMB) was significant, the chi-square and degrees of freedom from the all variables model were subtracted from their counterparts for the model
constrained for CMB. The difference (chi-square 87, df 3, p .000) indicated that common
method bias was significant. Unlike many studies, however, controlling for CMB
increased most of the parameter estimates (31 out of 37), thereby strengthening support
for this study’s hypotheses.
Model Fit Measures:

chi-square = 715.1, df = 573, p = .000, CFI = .939, TLI = .925, NFI = .784, and RMSEA = .036

Standardized Regression Weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOPP2</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOP2</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOPOT4</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOPOT5</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC1</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC4</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC6</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACCESS1</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG3</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG4</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG5</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS1</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS2</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS3R</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS4</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE1</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE2</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE3R</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY1R</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY3R</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY4</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY6</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX2</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX4</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX5</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX7</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX8</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX9</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX10</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX11</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX12</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINT2</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLISTEN2</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCALM2</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Fit Measures

chi-square = 727.8, df = 576, p = .000 , CFI = .908, TLI = .888, NFI = .759, and RMSEA = .044
**Standardized Regression Weights:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOPP2 &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOT2 &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOT4 &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOT5 &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACC1 &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACC4 &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACC6 &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACCESS1 &lt;--- Safety</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG3 &lt;--- Org Power</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG4 &lt;--- Org Power</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORG5 &lt;--- Org Power</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS1 &lt;--- Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS2 &lt;--- Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS3R &lt;--- Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJS4 &lt;--- Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE1 &lt;--- Leader_Effectiveness</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE2 &lt;--- Leader_Effectiveness</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE3R &lt;--- Leader_Effectiveness</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY1R &lt;--- Psych Safety</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY3R &lt;--- Psych Safety</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY4 &lt;--- Psych Safety</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSY6 &lt;--- Psych Safety</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX1 &lt;--- LMX1</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX2 &lt;--- LMX1</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX4 &lt;--- LMX2</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX5 &lt;--- LMX2</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX7 &lt;--- LMX3</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX8 &lt;--- LMX3</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX9 &lt;--- LMX3</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX10 &lt;--- LMX4</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX11 &lt;--- LMX4</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMX12 &lt;--- LMX4</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINT2 &lt;--- Exploration</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLISTEN2 &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCALM2 &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMEYE1 &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMEYE3R &lt;--- Dealing</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These scores are higher on 6 of the relationships (6 out of 37)

Syntax used to create the weighted CMB scales that were used in the subsequent analysis.

```plaintext
COMPUTE SafetyCMB=(1.007*FACC1_recoded + 1.147 * FACC4_recoded + .949 * FACC6_recoded + .844 * FACCESS1_recoded)/4.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE ExplorationCMB=(.890 * FOPP2_recoded + .983*FPOT2_recoded+.648*FPOT4_recoded+.498*FPOT5_recoded+.791*FIN2_recoded)/5.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE DealingCMB=(.802*FLISTEN2_recoded+.960*FCALM2_recoded+1.249*FMEYE1_recoded+1.068*FIM2Recoded)/4.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE SBLTotalCMB=(.802*FLISTEN2_recoded+.960*FCALM2_recoded+1.249*FMEYE1_recoded+1.068*FMEYE3R_recoded+.890 * FOPP2_recoded + .98
3*FPOT2_recoded+.648*FPOT4_recoded+.498*FPOT5_recoded+.791*FIN2_recoded+1.007*FACC1_recoded + 1.147 * FACC4_recoded + .949
* FACC6_recoded + .844 * FACCESS1_recoded)/13.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE OrgPowerCMB=(1.083*FORG3_r+.332*FORG4_r+.081*FORG5_r)/3.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE JobSatisfactionCMB=(1.008*FJS1_r+.915*FJS2_r+.762*FJS3R_r+.683*FJS4_r).
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE LeadEffectivenessCMB=(1.073 * FLE1_r+.857*FLE2_r+.528*FLE3R_r)/3.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE JobSatisfactionCMB=(1.008*FJS1_r+.915*FJS2_r+.762*FJS3R_r+.683*FJS4_r)/4.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE PsychSafetyCMB=(.652*FPSY1R_r+.781*FPSY3R_r+.535 + FPSY4_r+.621*FPSY6_r)/4.
EXECUTE.
COMPUTE LMXTotalCMB=(1.025*FLMX1_r+.896*FLMX2_r+.768*FLMX4_r+.877*FLMX5_r+.621*FLMX7_r+ .963*FLMX8_r+.768*FLMX9_r+.001*FLMX10_r+1.01
*FLMX11_r+.860*FLMX12_r)/10.
EXECUTE.
```
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