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This research consists of two studies that measure the attachment relationships that exist at various levels of a work organization. The first study was a preliminary attempt at measuring and characterizing the attachment relationships at the interpersonal, group, and organizational levels along the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. The second study was an attempt to refine the attachment measures, confirm the findings from the first study, and explore the relationship between attachment and leadership. Organizational attachment was successfully assessed via attachment relationships with a closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team measured on a continuum of low to high anxiety and avoidance. Attempts to measure an individual's attachment relationship with their work organization as an abstract entity along the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance, did not yield significant results. The research showed that ongoing interpersonal attachments in organizations are in fact related to an individual's general attachment style but that they also can vary from relationship to
relationship based on whether the individual has a choice over their partner in the relationship. The less avoidant or anxious an individual feels with their closest colleague and immediate boss, the less avoidant or anxious they will feel with their work team. The experience of low attachment avoidance in a relationship with an immediate boss is an important predictor of viewing that individual as a transformational leader.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the two studies reported within this paper are to 1) create a means for measuring organizational and work group attachment, 2) to explore their relationships to attachment at the interpersonal and individual levels, as well as 3) to explore the relationship between attachment style and leadership style. It is well documented that individuals form psychological and emotional attachments with significant others from infancy through adulthood, and that their style of attachment is influenced by the attachment style they develop in childhood through interaction with their primary caregiver (Bowlby 1944, 1969, 1973, 1979, 1980, 1988; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, Wall 1978). Within organizations we hypothesize that a given individual forms a set of significant relationships with organization members, whether they are a closest colleague, immediate boss, or a work team, and it is these attachment relationships that this study wishes to focus on and measure. In addition, this study will explore the relationships between these various attachment measures. The attachment relationship that a given individual forms with their leader is further explored to examine the effect of the style of attachment with the individual on the style of leadership subordinates perceive them as exhibiting.
Opportunity for the Study

I came across the field of attachment theory while working with a team of researchers conducting an action research project with primary health care practices. Due to the enormous financial pressures of managed care many private practices had ceased to exist and had sold the business aspects of their health care practice to larger health care systems. The competing demands of financial pressures by health care systems and their personal desire to provide quality patient care caused many divisions among practice members and depleted their sense of belonging to a team, feeling valued, and feeling efficacious. These were genuinely caring individuals attempting their best to serve the health care needs of their patients, and yet feeling unable to keep up with the demands of their respective health care systems.

The research team I was working with was utilizing Appreciative Inquiry, a change management approach focused around building upon an organization’s strengths rather than using traditional problem solving approaches, which AI’s proponents say leads to deficit thinking. The Appreciative Inquiry approach required members to participate in an exercise identifying their current strengths and focused on building a collective vision of the future based on those strengths in hopes of providing practice members with a positive experience, aligning them both psychologically and emotionally with their organization’s goals and vision for the future. Ultimately, the project was designed to reinforce a renewed sense of belonging and security in knowing they were co-creators of the future vision for
their practice. By revitalizing practice members’ sense of belonging and trust in the system, they would subsequently be empowered to focus on the primary goal of caring for the community of patients they serve.

As my involvement in the project came to an end, I began to reflect on the theory behind the change management technique of Appreciative Inquiry within the practices. During a conversation with my Professor, Eric Neilsen, I learned of a paper he was presenting at Academy of Management. It explored attachment theory, its potential role in one’s relationship with their work organization, and the usefulness of Appreciative Inquiry, in particular, along with other organizational development interventions, in helping individuals within an organization to tap into their organizational attachments. Neilsen states,

The underlying issue as we see it, does not lie in whether a given situation is framed as a problem or as an opportunity, but rather, whether the actors involved experience the situation as something that bestirs them to think at their best, to achieve the highest level of collaboration, and to learn how to proceed in order to fulfill their needs and aspirations as fully as possible….In this article we suggest that the absence of such positive energy is not necessarily attributable to deficit thinking, to the cognitive logic of problem solving, but rather, to the quality of attachment people have to each other and to their organizations in the moments when phenomena that can be construed as problems or opportunities are encountered. Appreciative Inquiry approaches can have major advantages in such a situation because their earlier stages tend to involve activities which heighten what we will call secure organizational attachments, as a prelude to dealing with material that might raise individual and collective anxiety. But traditional action research activities that start with an attempt to create a clear problem definition and analysis process can be equally effective provided the individuals involved already have secure attachments and feel comfortable in fully collaborating with each other to achieve their objectives (p. 5).

The theory of attachment was first introduced by John Bowlby (1969) to describe the significance of the bond formed between mother and child. Bowlby indicated that the attachment relationship served an evolutionary purpose and
that the child maintains proximity with its primary caregiver for survival and protection from harm. There is also a psychological component to the attachment relationship, and depending on the responsiveness of the caregiver to the child’s needs, the child develops a positive or negative mental model of self as worthy of care and responsiveness and a positive or negative image of other as emotionally available to provide care. When the primary caregiver is sensitive and supportive the child can proceed with confidence to explore their environment and learn from its surroundings. The mother’s style of attachment sets the standard for the style of attachment that the child will develop. In fact the child’s need for attachment with the mother is so strong that it will come to process emotions and behave in the manner in which the mother demand’s of them in order to maintain that attachment. Depending on the level of emotional and psychological security experienced within the bond between mother and child, the child will form either a secure or insecure style of attachment that it will carry with it into adulthood.

In looking back and comparing my interviews with individuals within the primary care practices, prior to and immediately after the Appreciative Inquiry intervention, I found that members felt a renewed sense of belief in and belonging to their respective organizations. One could argue that their renewed sense of trust in the system and each other to work as a team, or framed alternatively, their renewed sense of secure attachments to their organization and each other, allowed them to believe that they could collectively create the
necessary change to not only feel vital again but productive in their work. This inspired me to think more deeply regarding the importance of organizational attachments and the contribution that I could make not only to my own understanding but to the field of attachment.

I began to reflect on a personal level regarding what intrigued me about the notion of organizational attachments. I realized that my personal journey to the doctoral program was in part due to my own experience of insecure organizational attachments prior to my acceptance into the program. After completing my undergraduate training in biology at Case Western Reserve University, my goal was to pursue a career in medicine, and I had spent significant time and effort to attain a medical school acceptance. In fact, I did receive acceptance into medical school and completed the first semester before subsequently choosing to leave. During my time there I found myself continuously disheartened by my experience. I could not comprehend how a profession whose stated goal was to produce physicians providing compassionate care for patients did not create an environment where compassion was a value that was integrated into its training and culture. The training was meticulous but cold and felt devoid of the human element that I craved.

This feeling was only amplified by a negative encounter with a fellow medical student. Mary was a good friend and someone that I studied with
regularly. Early one morning after completing a very rigorous week of exams, I was walking in late to lecture and found Mary curled up on the ground, in a corner of the room outside the lecture hall. Mary and I were the only two in the lobby and her crying was heartbreaking. I was shocked and frightened to find her lying there and realized very quickly that she was crying because she was in physical pain. She was saying something about how they “…treated us like animals”. After taking her to the nurse and staying with her until she was stable, I left her and was somewhat shaken by the experience. She called me later that evening and thanked me and said something that stays with me until this very day. She said that she was glad it was me who found her like that, because she knew that I would not judge her for having a moment of weakness and that she did not trust anyone else to help her the way that I did. That was shocking to me. I quickly indicated to her that I found it difficult to believe that no one else would have helped her. I believed that we all should be working to help one another, and if we could not do that then we had no business trying to work in a field geared towards helping others. Since that day, I have struggled to make sense of that experience and its meaning in my life and journey into the field of organizational behavior.

Upon discovering the theory of attachment and exploring my experience within the primary care practice as well as reflecting on my experience in medical school, I realized that individuals within organizations experience psychological and emotional attachments which are essential to not only surviving but also to
thriving. I also realized that the sense of detachment that I experienced as well as the physical pain due to stress and anxiety that Mary experienced could possibly have been alleviated by a secure psychological and emotional attachment. Looking back on the relationships that I cultivated in medical school, I could not find one that contributed to creating this secure sense of attachment. This realization inspired me to explore the opportunity to measure organizational attachment and the significance of the relationships an individual cultivates within an organization on how they experience organizational life.

**Background of the Study**

While the traditional attachment literature covers several aspects of childhood and adult relationships, a limited amount has been published on the attachment relationship between individuals and their work organization. Hazen and Shaver (1990) suggested that work provides a means for an attachment behavioral system much like that provided by attachment to a mother. Their research supported the notion that just as interpersonal attachments are secure and insecure so is attachment to one’s work. In her doctoral dissertation St. Clair (1994) hypothesized that if attachment styles are indeed mental models that we carry into the world, they should also apply to the workplace and to the relationship one has with one’s work organization. St. Clair found that subjects fell into one secure and two insecure attachment styles with respect to their organizations and concluded that it would be appropriate for future research to compare adult attachment styles to organizational attachment styles. In her
doctoral dissertation Prehar (2001) examined the notion of viewing employee relationships with their employing organization both in terms of attachment style and commitment. While she was able to demonstrate that secure and insecure attachment relationships occurred within an organizational context, she suggested that there was room for improvement with these measures, and that future research should look to include the most current attachment measures. This in part is the purpose of the current two studies.

This dissertation reports on two studies centered on measuring organizational and group level attachment and their correlates with two kinds of interpersonal attachments at work, specifically with one’s closest colleague and one’s immediate boss. The intent of Study 1 was to create questionnaire measures of attachment at each of these levels and to study their interrelations. Study 2 builds upon the findings of Study 1, refining the organizational attachment measures created, and further exploring the relationship between attachment with one’s leadership and their leadership styles. Whereas in earlier studies a four category I model of attachment was validated and utilized to measure attachment, the latest research conducted by Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000) has shown that attachment within relationships can be more accurately characterized as consisting of two dimensions, anxiety and avoidance. Both of the present studies attempt to further incorporate and explore the most current research done to measure attachment within personal relationships and
expand upon this work to measure attachment within work relationships in an organizational setting.

The aim of Study 1 was to measure organizational attachment in one’s relationship with one’s closest colleague, immediate boss, and one’s colleagues in general (what one might call attachment at the work group level), as well as with one’s employing organization conceived as a single entity. The outcome was the beginning of a workable set of measures for assessing organizational attachment with regards to one’s closest colleague, immediate boss, and one’s colleagues in general, but the researcher was unable to produce a workable set of measures for attachment to the organization as a single entity. Therefore, the latter pursuit was abandoned. In addition, the researcher was left with the desire not only to create a more robust set of measures for organizational attachment in general, but in particular to improve on the measurement for attachment anxiety.

Study 2 was designed to build upon the findings of Study 1, and to this end, a revised questionnaire was created providing a more rigorous set of questions measuring organizational attachment in one’s relationship with one’s closest colleague, immediate boss, and one’s colleagues in general. The outcome of this study did indeed produce a more robust set of questions measuring the attachment relationships within work organizations. In addition, special attention was paid to the attachment relationship that exists between an individual and their boss. In particular, the researcher wanted to explore an
individual’s experience of their boss’ attachment style and its relationship to that person’s leadership style. Leaders, much like adult and childhood attachment figures, have a role in creating secure or insecure attachments with their followers (Popper and Mayseless 2003). As such, this may impact whether followers experience them as transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire in their leadership style; this in turn may impact how they lead organizational change efforts and the general quality of their followers’ organizational lives. As predicted, the researcher found that Individuals designating their relationship with their immediate boss as secure also experienced their boss’ leadership style as more transformational, less transactional and less laissez-faire than those with an insecure attachment relationship with their immediate boss.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the relevant childhood and adult attachment literature, the literature on the measurement of attachment, as well as the literature on leadership as it pertains to attachment. Chapter 3 outlines the major hypotheses, questions, methods, and results for Study 1. Chapter 4 outlines the major hypotheses, questions, methods, and results for Study 2. Chapter 5 discusses how these study results help to fill the gaps in the literature that this dissertation addressed.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The literature on attachment theory is large in breadth and scope. The literature review that follows addresses the seminal readings on attachment theory, and focuses on the readings which lead up to the use of attachment theory within organizational settings. While attachment theory originated in the study of parent child-relationships and in subsequent years has been applied to romantic partnerships and patient-therapist relationships, it also has relevance to adult work settings and individuals' attachments to larger systems. The latter is the focus of this dissertation.

Childhood Attachment

Aspects of Attachment Relationship

The classic studies of attachment theory did much to establish the importance of the feelings of love and security in the primary relationship that an infant has with its mother and the effect that this relationship has on the child's future relationships. John Bowlby's theory of attachment posits an enduring affectional bond between mother and child. There were five original criteria associated with this affectional bond: 1) It is persistent and not fleeting, 2) It exists between the child and a specific individual (the mother or some other primary caregiver) who is not interchangeable with another individual, 3) It is an
emotionally significant relationship, 4) The child desires to maintain close proximity with the individual, 5) The child feels distress upon separation from that person. An additional characteristic, unique to an attachment bond is that the child seeks comfort and security within that relationship.

Bowlby’s initial work on attachment theory was based on observations he made working in a home for maladjusted boys (Bowlby 1944). Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1979, 1980) believed that a loss of maternal care in the early years led to a “disturbed personality development” characterized by delinquent character, fits of anxiety, or even depressive illness. After much exploration in the fields of evolutionary biology, ethology, developmental psychology, cognitive science, and control systems theory, he came to the conclusion that the attachment relationship between mother and child, and the subsequent desire the child has for physical proximity to the mother was a result of evolutionary pressures (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1980). Being in close proximity to the mother ensured the protection and subsequent survival of the child. Bowlby outlined three functions of an attachment relationship: proximity maintenance, secure base, and safe haven. Attachment behavior is defined initially by the goal of proximity maintenance in order to maintain feelings of felt security. The attachment figure serves as a secure base from which the infant feels safe to explore its environment. Upon perceiving a threat, a child will be more likely to return to the caretaker, who serves as a safe haven.
Based upon their initial interactions, a child forms a view of whether the attachment figure is someone who is responsive and whether the child itself is someone whom individuals respond to. This mental model becomes something the child carries with them into adulthood and has been shown to persist through time and is carried over into other types of relationships (Bowlby 1979). If the attachment figure is available and responsive when the child is in need, and the child comes to perceive itself as someone worthy of being responded to, it will form a secure sense of attachment to the caregiving other. On the other hand, if the attachment figure is someone who is not seen as being responsive when the child is in need, and the child in turn, views itself as someone who is not worthy of being responded to in a caring and concerned manner, the child will form an insecure attachment with that person. This insecure attachment will manifest itself in the response the child gives when its needs have not been met or if it does not feel the attachment figure is adequately responsive to its needs. In the case of the latter, the child may respond by displaying behavior in line with an increased sense of anxiety, or a clinging to the attachment figure in hopes of reestablishing contact with them. On the other hand, the child may react by displaying a defensive behavior. In this case, it would take a defensive or avoidant stance towards the individual, thereby managing its sense of distress by suppressing its anger.
Identification of Patterns of Attachment Behavior

Bowlby’s research strategy along with that of Mary Ainsworth was to observe children at the time and immediately after separation from their mother. This was in contrast to the more typical strategy used by other researchers in the 1960’s of identifying a suitable sample of adults and administering an instrument examining the aspects of personality thought to be affected by maternal separation and deprivation (Bretherton 1985, Bowlby 1973). Ainsworth looked at patterns of behavior associated with attachment in two longitudinal studies conducted in Uganda and Baltimore, Maryland. She developed the “strange-situation” technique. Infants and their mothers were observed over the course of a year, at intervals of three weeks beginning immediately after birth. At the end of the year, each infant and mother pair was brought into Ainsworth’s laboratory for the strange situation procedure. In this procedure, infant and mother are brought into a room filled with attractive toys and the child is allowed to play, a stranger enters and talks to the mother and then to the infant, the mother leaves the room and the infant is left along with the stranger, the mother returns and the stranger leaves them together, the mother leaves the infant alone in the room, the stranger returns, and finally the mother returns once more. Each of these episodes lasts for three minutes.

Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall 1978) identified three patterns of attachment behavior. Upon reunion with the mother, infants displayed one of the following patterns: 1) Ambivalent infants sought
proximity and contact with the mother but were also angry and resistant, expressed distress at separation and failed to be comforted upon reunion with the mother and continued to cry and cling to her, unable to resume playing. Ainsworth’s notes from her visits with their mothers over the preceding year, when she observed mother and child interacting with one another, typified these mothers as “insensitive and inconsistent” in their caretaking. 2) **Avoidant** infants sought proximity and contact with the mother but who also experienced no distress at separation or joy at reunion, displaying indifference to their mother. Their mothers were described as “rejecting and averse to contact” in their caretaking during the preceding year. 3) **Secure** infants sought proximity and contact with the mother with little or no avoidance or resistance, expressed distress at separation and comfort at reunion and were able to continue playing while once again in their mother’s presence. These mothers were described as being “available and responsive” to their child’s needs. These infants who displayed little or no resistance upon reunification with the mother were termed securely attached to their mothers, while those who displayed the other two sets of behavior were classified as being anxiously attached to their mothers.

**Fourth Pattern of Attachment Behavior**

Main and Solomon (1986) identified a fourth category of attachment behavior. Replicating the Ainsworth strange situation procedure on 55, 12-20 month old infants, they documented the Insecure-Ambivalent, Insecure-Avoidant, and Secure patterns of behavior, but also found instances where the behavior
could not be classified in any of these categories. The unclassifiable infants initially were disorientated or disorganized with respect to their immediate environment and the attachment figure; they often fell down, approaching the mother and then moving away before making contact, and only later sought proximity with the mother. Main and Solomon (1986) labeled them as Disorganized-Disorientated. Worth noting is that while Ainsworth’s study sample consisted of white, middle-class, Baltimore-area families the Main and Solomon sample consisted of similar subjects plus some children who were either maltreated or high risk for conduct problems. The children who fell into the new fourth category were from the latter group.

**Adult Attachment**

Both Bowlby and Ainsworth believed that attachment patterns are carried from infancy through adulthood, and therefore are present throughout the lifespan. While the term “attachment” referred initially to the affectional bond, which includes feelings of love between mother and child, attachment may also be seen as a label for a relationship or aspects of any relationship assessed over time where at least one party wants to remain in relationship with and seeks support and certainty from the other. Based on the definition of attachment (proximity maintenance, secure base, and safe haven), it is intuitive that adult and childhood attachment are similar (Hazen and Shaver 1987). When the attachment figure is available and responsive, feelings of security prevail. However, if unavailable, feelings of insecurity set in, and the individual is induced
to cope by adopting one of the three insecure attachment styles. Weiss (1982, 1986), in particular, found that the same three aspects of an attachment relationship between mother and child (proximity maintenance, secure base, and safe haven) were also applicable to adult relationships. Weiss (1982, 1986, 1991) conducted empirical studies on attachment relationships of individuals recently separated from their partners or widowed. He found that members remained lonely despite forming close friendships with other individuals. However, those who were steadily dating someone and therefore had established a relationship that resembled marriage, and were sharing their emotional lives with one another, were provided a sense of security, and therefore an adult attachment relationship. This love relationship served as a protective factor from the distress of loneliness. Weiss (1982, 1986, 1991) demonstrated that love was involved in an attachment relationship and involved, from an attachment perspective, not only feelings such as affection and security, but also fear, anger and sadness and the behaviors or behavioral tendencies that are associated with those feelings. This helped to contribute to the idea that attachment relationships involve a wide range of feelings as well as associated behavioral systems and/or responses for both infant – adult attachment relationships and adult – adult attachment relationships.

Adult attachment in romantic relationships differs in some ways from childhood attachment. With adult attachment, behaviors associated with reciprocal caregiving are exhibited. Each partner periodically takes turns
providing and receiving care throughout the relationship, whether that be emotional, physical, or material. Secondly, there is a sexual component to the relationship. Bowlby (1969) indicated that these three systems: attachment, reciprocal caregiving, and sexuality were necessary for the survival of the species.

**Love Relationships**

Hazen and Shaver (1987; Hazen and Shaver, 1988; Shaver, Hazen, and Bradshaw, 1988) believed that romantic love could be conceptualized as an attachment process, much like mother-infant attachment, while recognizing the fundamental differences between adult and infant attachment relationships. They conducted groundbreaking empirical studies on attachment style and adult romantic relationships. Hazen and Shaver used two study samples— one was a large sample derived from posting a questionnaire in a local newspaper and the other was derived from a population of undergraduate students. Subjects completed two forced-choice questionnaires that tested their general attitude towards close relationships and specific questions with regards to their “most important romance”. They found that the three attachment styles seen in infant-mother relationships (secure, avoidant, anxious/ambivalent) occurred with the same frequency in adults as in infants (56% secure in both samples, 23% and 25% avoidant in each of the samples, and 20% and 19% anxious-ambivalent in each of the samples). Secure subjects were defined as comfortable with intimacy and able to depend on and trust other people. Avoidant subjects were
defined as uncomfortable with closeness and having difficulty depending on others. Anxious-ambivalent subjects were defined as seeking extreme levels of closeness and fearing abandonment or a lack of love.

In the same study, self-described attachments in childhood correlated with the type of attachment style the subjects demonstrated in love relationships. Hazen and Shaver found, “People with different attachment orientations entertain different beliefs about the course of romantic love, the availability and trustworthiness of love partners, and their own love-worthiness” (Hazen and Shaver 1987). Those with a Secure orientation, describe their attachment history from childhood as consisting of an affectionate relationship with their parents as well as an affectionate relationship between their parents. The attachment mental model that they carried with them was that they were confident in themselves and that they were likable people. Secure types saw others as well-intentioned, and they maintained a belief that while romantic feelings could reach peaks of intensity at times and fade at others, that romantic love could last. They also viewed their most important love relationship as marked by happiness, friendship, and trust. Those with an Avoidant orientation viewed their mothers as “cold and rejecting”. The attachment mental model they carried with them was that romantic love rarely lasted and that it was likely to lose intensity over time. Their most important love relationship was characterized as being marked by a fear of intimacy and by difficulty with accepting their partner, and therefore a belief that they did not need a love partner to find happiness. Those with an
Anxious-Ambivalent orientation stated that their fathers were “unfair”. The attachment mental model they carried with them was marked by self-doubt as well as a feeling of being misunderstood by others. They stated that it was easy to fall in love and did so frequently, but true, enduring love was a rarity and they found that others were unwilling to commit. Their most important relationship was described as being marked by an obsessive preoccupation with their partner, sexual attraction, desire for union, and a desire for reciprocation.

Feeney and Noller (1990) replicated Hazen and Shaver’s 1987 study. A questionnaire exploring attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships was administered to a subject pool of undergraduate students. The goal of the study was to replicate Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) findings on attachment style, attachment history, mental models, and to explore attachment style differences using a number of measures of love (self-esteem, limerance, loving, love addiction, and love styles). They found that the relative frequencies of the three attachment styles were similar to those reported by Hazen and Shaver (1987). Moreover, when attachment history was measured along with their respondents’ beliefs about relationships, the latter were found to be directly related to attachment style. Secure subjects were found to be high in self-confidence and trusting within their relationships. In addition, they found that secure individuals tended to be more successful within their relationships. They also reported positive experiences with family relationships in early childhood. The Avoidant group of subjects was found to be avoidant of intimacy. They also
were more likely to report that they had been separated from their mothers at some point in time. They were also more likely to express mistrust of others in love relationships. The subjects in the Anxious-ambivalent group were found to be dependent and have a strong desire for commitment in relationships.

Simpson (1990) conducted a longitudinal study examining the impact of secure, anxious, and avoidant attachment styles on the quality of romantic relationships of 144 dating couples. Secure attachment as compared to insecure attachment was associated with greater relationship interdependence, commitment, trust, and satisfaction. In addition, those with a secure attachment style tended to experience more occurrences of positive emotion and less of negative emotion within their relationships than did insecure types. Collins and Reed (1990) also explored the relationship between attachment style and adult romantic relationship quality. They first explored the dimensions of adult attachment measured by Hazen and Shaver's (1987) categorical measure questionnaire. Instead of three factors emerging based on the three types-Secure, Avoidant, Anxious-Ambivalent, they found three factors had emerged based upon three dimensions- Close, Depend, and Anxiety. Each category in Hazen and Shaver's (1987) questionnaire refers to several aspects of a relationship which may not reflect their feelings on each dimension of the relationship. For example, one description of an attachment style may contain information on how one feels about closeness as well as being able to depend on someone. Therefore, Collins and Reed (1990) were able to identify three
dimensions underlying Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) categorical measure on the extent an individual is comfortable with closeness, feels they can depend on others, and is anxious or fearful of being abandoned or unloved. Secondly, they examined the relationship between the dimensions identified—extent to which an individual is comfortable with closeness and feels they can depend on others, and is anxious or fearful of being unloved or abandoned. Individuals with a secure orientation were characterized as being comfortable with closeness, having the ability to depend on others, and not worried about being abandoned or unloved by their romantic partner. Avoidant types were uncomfortable with closeness, having disbelief around whether they could depend on a significant other, and were not worried about being abandoned or unloved by their romantic partner. Anxious-ambivalent types were characterized as comfortable with closeness, more confident than avoidants in their ability to depend on others, and more anxious over being abandoned than avoidants.

Originally, Bowlby (1988) suggested that the working conceptual models of attachment were based upon images of self and of other (attachment figure) that involved positive and negative images of each. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) used this insight, and expanded Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) three-category model of attachment, to a four cell model and tested it with an empirical study (Figure 1). According to Bartholomew and Horowitz, the self can be viewed as either positive (worthy of love and attention) or negative (unworthy of love and attention). The attachment figure can be viewed as positive (available
and caring) or negative (rejecting, distant, and uncaring). A positive self image combined with a positive image of the other is associated with the secure attachment style. A negative image of the self combined with a positive image of the other yields a preoccupied style. A positive image of the self combined with a negative image of the other yields a dismissing attachment style and negative image of both self and other yields a fearful attachment style.

Figure 1: Categorical model of individual attachment based on positive and negative images of self and other (Bartholomew 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL OF SELF</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>PREOCCUPIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher self-esteem</td>
<td>lower self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher sociability</td>
<td>higher sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>DISMISSING</td>
<td>FEARFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher self-esteem</td>
<td>lower self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower sociability</td>
<td>lower sociability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along similar lines, several researchers (Brennan, Clark, and Shaver 1998; Fraley and Waller 1998; Fraley, Waller, and Brennan 2000) subsequently conducted a factor analysis of the results from several studies and found that the items in various questionnaires loaded onto to two fundamental dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. Anxiety reflects an individual’s sense of self-worth and degree of acceptance by others. It is closely related to an individual’s working
model of self, and the degree to which an individual is confident they are valued by the other. A person who scores high on the anxiety dimension fears rejection or abandonment and worries about the attachment figure’s availability and responsiveness in times of need. Avoidance reflects the degree to which an individual embraces rather than avoids closeness or intimacy with the attachment figure. It is closely related to an individual's working model of other. An individual who scores high on the avoidance dimension feels discomfort with closeness and is uncomfortable with depending on others for support. The secure type is low on anxiety and avoidance; the preoccupied type is high on anxiety and low on avoidance; the dismissing type is low on anxiety and high on avoidance; and the fearful type is high on both anxiety and avoidance.

**Figure 2:** Categorical model of individual attachment based on high and low anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANXIETY</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>PREOCCUPIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>DISMISSING</td>
<td>FEARFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapeutic Relationship

A useful way of utilizing attachment theory in therapeutic relationships with clients was proposed by Fosha (2000). Fosha (2000) viewed the attachment orientation of an individual as, “an internal working model of relationships in which the self is represented in dynamic relation to a specific caregiving other” (pp. 39). It is this view of self and other which determines how an individual relates. While an individual’s attachment orientation is first formed in childhood, Fosha theorized that when a parent, significant other, or even therapist finds themselves in the role of “other” they have a unique opportunity to reinforce or potentially change an individual’s attachment orientation.

Fosha examined the established styles of attachment in terms of yet another two dimensional model. One dimension represents the ability or inability to access one’s own and others’ feelings (“feeling”). The second dimension represents the ability or inability process feelings and act adaptively when the attachment bond is threatened (“dealing”).
Figure 3: Categorical model of individual attachment based on Fosha’s theory of “feeling” and “dealing”

Fosha (2000) describes the attachment styles in the following manner:

**Secure (feeling and dealing while relating):** The child cries at separation from the mother but then is comforted when she returns. The mother is attentive and responsive to the child’s needs, and can resume playing once the mother returns. A securely attached child has the ability to experience his feelings of separation and reunion with the attachment figure and does not become overwhelmed by them. The attachment bond is strengthened by this.

**Insecure-Preoccupied (feeling but not dealing):** The child cries at separation from the mother, but fails to be comforted upon her return. The child clings to the mother and cannot continue playing. The mother is experienced as insensitive and unreliable in her care giving, and as a result the child has very high anxiety.
regarding the availability of the caregiver. The child is constantly frightened that the caregiver will disappear, leaving them inconsolable.

Insecure-Dismissing (*dealing but not feeling*): The child displays no emotional reaction when the mother leaves or returns. The child is indifferent. The mother is experienced as being rejecting to the child, displaying minimal emotional contact with the child. As a result, the child becomes emotionally repressed, which leads to minimal relational engagement.

Disorganized-Disorientated (*neither dealing nor feeling*): The child is literally in shock in this situation. The mother is experienced as frightened and frightening. The fear and confusion manifested by the parent is transmitted to the child. Even a momentary threat to the attachment bond leaves the child feeling fearful and alone.

Operating under the assumption that attachment patterns continue on into adulthood, Fosha argued that adults also display these same affective orientations and therefore will have differing abilities to feel and deal within their attachment bonds to others. Those with insecure attachments, who have lost either their capacity to feel or deal effectively will seek help from a therapist. The role of the therapist becomes the role of a secure caregiver. Having the therapist maintain the role of the secure caregiver, allows the patient to deal with their anxieties and explore their feelings more fully. Therefore, the patient is
given the opportunity to create a more secure internal working model of attachment.

**Attachment Theory and Work**

Hazen and Shaver (1990) suggested that work provides a means for an attachment behavioral system much like that provided by attachment to a mother. One’s work serves as a base from which to draw psychological security. In addition, it can serve as a secure base from which to explore one’s surrounding environment, allowing learning to occur as well as personal gratification and competence. Just as interpersonal attachments are secure or insecure, so are attachments to one’s work. Hazen and Shaver (1990) predicted that the types of exploration associated with one’s work would be predicted by attachment type. In addition, the patterns of behavior associated with the types of exploration would be similar to the exploration behaviors described by Ainsworth et. al (1978) in their Strange Situation studies. Upon measuring adult attachment types and correlating them with individual attachments to work, Hazen and Shaver (1990) found that the proportion of three attachment types (secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant) occurred with the same frequency as they did within other studies. They also found that a secure relationship attachment orientation correlated with work satisfaction. Securely attached respondents were confident and unafraid of failure and reported high levels of satisfaction with job security, co-workers, income, and opportunities. They were also more likely to complete tasks, less likely to fear failure or rejection from
coworkers. They also reported being able to enjoy time away from work and believed that there were opportunities for growth and advancement within their work. Secure individuals placed personal relationships before work in importance and indicated they derived greater satisfaction from personal relationships than they did work. Hazen and Shaver (1990) hypothesized that due to their secure orientation they were more likely than those classified as insecure to find felt security within relationships. Anxious-ambivalent individuals feared rejection for poor work performance and reported feelings of job insecurity, lack of appreciation by coworkers, and not receiving deserved promotions. While they reported a preference for working with others they also reported feeling misunderstood and underappreciated. They also indicated that they were worried about gaining approval and feared rejection. Anxious Ambivalent types indicated that relationships interfered with work. Hazen and Shaver (1990) hypothesized that due to their attachment orientation their preoccupation with gaining felt security distracted them from exploration within their work environment. Avoidant individuals reported dissatisfaction with coworkers. However, they indicated high levels of job satisfaction and job security. Like Anxious-Ambivalent individuals, Avoidants emphasized work over love relationships. Hazen and Shaver (1990) hypothesized that work exploration allowed these individuals to avoid relationships.
**Attachment Theory and Groups**

Mental models of attachment are generalizable to group attachment styles (Smith, Murphy, and Coats 1999; Rom and Mikulincer 2003). Group attachment anxiety manifests itself as anxiety over being rejected by a group or beliefs of being unworthy of acceptance by a group. Group attachment avoidance manifests itself as avoiding dependence on a group or indicating a lack of need for closeness to a group. Smith et. al (1999) explored the feelings of anxiety and avoidance with regards to the most important social group in their lives. They found that, increased group attachment anxiety and avoidance were related to: 1) decreased identification with the social group, 2) increased negative emotion towards the group, and 3) decreased perceived support from the group. Moreover, general relationship attachment anxiety and avoidance were found to correlate with the experience of group attachment anxiety and avoidance, respectively.

Mikulincer and Shaver (2001) explored the idea of a group as a safe haven (a safe place from which to explore the world) and found that operating within a group that served as a place where an individual felt loved and supported allowed group members to feel less threatened by and to be more accepting of those who did not belong to their own group. Rom and Mikulincer (2003) examined individual attachment orientation and how it manifested itself in group related cognitions, emotions, and behaviors. They focused on examining task-related work groups. In addition, they explored the notion of the group
function as a safe-haven. They found that a high degree of group cohesion decreased the negative effects of relationship attachment anxiety on functioning during group tasks. This meant that a greater group attachment security allowed anxious group members to focus more readily on group tasks. They also found that individuals with high attachment anxiety within relationships possessed negative cognitive models of self, viewing themselves as ineffective in groups; saw the task-orientated group a threat, and that groups elicited negative emotion for them. In addition, those with greater anxiety provided greater endorsement for security-love goals within the group and demonstrated a decreased quality of performance with respect to group tasks. Rom and Mikulincer (2003) found that high anxiety individuals’ need for support and focus on comfort while performing group tasks diverted attention away from the task performance goals. Individuals scoring high on attachment avoidance within relationships held negative models of others within the group, dismissed any potential benefit of group interaction, demonstrated a tendency towards self-reliant goals, and displayed a lack of interest in promoting closeness and consensus among group members. Rom and Mikulincer (2003) indicated that this was consistent with the goal of those high in attachment avoidance negative model of others, and their subsequent need to avoid depending on others or with maintaining closeness with others.
**Organizational Attachment**

In her doctoral dissertation St Clair (1994) hypothesized that if attachment styles are indeed mental models that we carry into the world, they should therefore apply to different contexts besides romantic relationships, specifically the workplace and to the relationship one has with one’s work organization. St. Clair explored the relationship between individuals' attachments to their work organizations and what consequences, if any, resulted from threats to that relationship. In order to measure an individual's organizational attachment St. Clair utilized a modified version of Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) adult romantic attachment questionnaire, where the wording used was modified to apply to work organizations. Subjects were asked to indicate which of the three categories: secure, avoidant, anxious/ambivalent, were most characteristic of their relationship with their work organization. They were also asked, using a Likert-scale to indicate how characteristic each category description was of their relationship with their work organization. In addition, she utilized a 13-item attachment questionnaire created by Simpson (1990), which uses a Likert-scale format. The wording of the questions was revised to apply to work organizations. St. Clair found that subjects fell into three separate organizational attachment style categories: secure, avoidant, anxious/ambivalent, and that they were roughly equal to the proportions found in previous adult attachment studies. Therefore, she concluded that it would be appropriate for future research to compare adult attachment styles to organizational attachment styles.
In her doctoral dissertation Prehar (2001) examined the notion of viewing employee relationships with their employing organization both in terms of attachment style and commitment. She utilized a 22-item revised questionnaire derived from the Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire (ECR) developed by Brennan et. al (1998). The wording was revised to apply to the relationship an employee has with their work organization as compared to an adult romantic relationship. However, Prehar (2001) did not utilize the Hazen and Shaver (1987) adult romantic attachment questionnaire, which would have allowed for the comparison of adult interpersonal attachment styles to organizational attachment styles. Prehar’s factor analyses of her questionnaire data yielded the same two factors of avoidance and anxiety as found in other studies. However, she indicated that the fit indices in her confirmatory factor analysis indicated that there was room for improvement with these measures, and that future research should look to include the work of Fraley et. al (2000), which she did not include in her research.

In the field of Organizational Development, Eric Neilsen wrote a conceptual paper that posited a relationship between an individual’s attachment to their organization and the way they responded to feedback data in organizational development projects. He argued that just as insecure attachments with caregivers are at the core of poor individual development, “insecure organizational attachments lie at the root of poor or less than optimal organizational development” (p. 14). According to Neilsen,
…we know that individuals develop robust internal working models of both their formal and informal roles in their organizations, and that they include expectations about how others will respond to them under different conditions, what is acceptable behavior on their part and what is not, and what kinds of behavior will elicit empathic and supportive responses from other organization members. While such models may have been developed for multiple purposes, we would argue that they are shaped (at least in part) by a need for security. They are built up over time through the actor’s continuing experiences of acceptance and rejection by other organization members and the contingent enactment of organization policies and procedures that delineate the terms of acceptance (p. 16)

Neilsen went on to hypothesize that there are four different types of attachment orientations associated with organizational attachment, similar to those seen in interpersonal relationship attachments. Using anecdotal evidence from OD projects with two departments in a large health care organization, he argued that people with secure organizational attachments respond to interview feedback data with interest and inquiry. Those with dismissing attachments respond with a trite remarks and political infighting, especially if the feedback threatens what they consider to be their territory or prerogatives. Those with preoccupied organizational attachments respond with outrage and denial if the feedback threatens their relationships with superiors. Those with fearful organizational
attachments respond with apathy and skepticism, especially if they have experienced erratic management in the past. Placed within the context of organizations, interview feedback programs become a form of the Strange Situation Protocol utilized by Mary Ainsworth to determine childhood attachment orientations. The feedback at the organizational level evokes attachment anxiety and people respond according to their organizational attachment styles.

One objective of this dissertation is to develop a robust organizational attachment questionnaire that will allow for attachment styles to be more systematically characterized and tested in the future. While St. Clair (1994) and Prehar (2001) conducted their dissertation research exploring individuals’ attachment orientation to the work organization, St. Clair did not take into account the latest improvements in attachment measures developed by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000). And while Prehar’s dissertation built upon Fraley et. al’s (2000) work, she found that the RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) levels were slightly higher than desirable for a two-factor model (anxiety and avoidance) of attachment. This suggests that there is room for improvement in creating a questionnaire that measures organizational attachment. Based on the objectives of the present study to build a more robust questionnaire for the purposes of measuring organizational attachment, we will spend some time further reviewing the methodologies utilized to measure attachment along with the contexts in which they have been utilized. This will provide the reader with background on the history surrounding attachment
measurement, paving a clearer pathway for how this study will build upon the work already done in the area of attachment measurement, and more specifically create clarity with regards to the instruments utilized to measure organizational attachment.

**Measuring Attachment**

Attachment styles have been measured by means of observation, in-depth interviews, and written questionnaires. Childhood attachment styles have been measured primarily through observation of the parent-child relationship. This relationship has very clear caregiver and care receiver roles in which to observe the emotional reactions and behaviors within the attachment relationship. Adult-adult attachment is more complex since there are no such clearly defined roles and the attachment relationship is reciprocal so that at any given point in time either adult could act as the caregiver or care receiver. Therefore adult attachment relationships have typically been measured through interviews and self-report measures. Adult attachment interviews are utilized for the purpose of understanding from an adult perspective the resulting psychological defenses interviewees possess and linking them back to their experiences as a child with their primary attachment figure. Self-report measures were developed to assess attachment experienced within an adult relationship. The purpose of these measures is to assess an individual’s behaviors and feelings with regards to a romantic relationship or close relationship with an adult. This dissertation will focus on assessing adult attachment within a work organization. Therefore, a
self-report questionnaire will be adapted to an organizational context for the
purpose of exploring and measuring adult attachment relationships.

**Observation**

According to Bowlby, “attachment behaviors” are those observable behaviors which increase physical proximity or felt security of the child with the attachment figure. Children will shift from struggling to maintain physical proximity with the attachment figure to increase feelings of security when perceiving a threat and exploratory behaviors and back again. These attachment behaviors are typically displayed in infants aged 12 to 20 months. Attachment theory is less specific regarding the behaviors displayed beyond this age group. While attachment behaviors are displayed throughout a child’s life, children's display of them diminishes as they come to perceive fewer situations as being threatening and they become increasingly reassured by the parent’s accessibility.

Classification of infants has been done via Ainsworth’s Strange Situation technique. This laboratory procedure, described earlier, is designed to observe the incidence of exploratory versus attachment behavior displayed under conditions of increasing stress on the infant through a series of separations and reunions with the mother. The infant is classified as either secure, avoidant, resistant/ambivalent, or disorganized. Classification of the infant’s attachment style is determined from the infant’s reaction during the two reunion periods while keeping in mind their behavior during the intervening periods as well as the
behavior of the caregiver. The Ainsworth system of attachment classification requires an extensive amount of training. While the descriptions of each type of attachment behavior are clearly outlined, the ability to pick up on nuances requires a great deal of one-on-one training and practice.

There are observational methods that have been utilized to classify attachment behavior in preschool and kindergarten aged children. These approaches use the strange situation procedure and adapted the procedure to suit the older ages of the children due to the attachment and exploratory behaviors associated with their respective stage of development. One such approach was pioneered by Crittenden (1992) and termed the “dynamic-maturational approach”. In Crittenden’s Preschool Assessment (PAA) of Attachment, there exists one secure and five insecure categories. The Cassidy-Marvin system for preschool age children developed guidelines for classifying attachment behaviors into one secure style or four insecure categories. Main-Cassidy attachment classification for kindergarten-age children consisted of one secure and four insecure categories.

**Interviews**

The Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) was initially utilized with parents in conjunction with the observation of their infant’s behavior and classification of their attachment style. Main and Goldwyn (1984) found that the AAI served as a means to assess the parent’s mental models with regards to their own
attachment experiences and that this strongly correlated with the attachment style of their respective infants as assessed by the Strange Situation technique. The AAI is an hour long interview that consists of a series of 18 questions. The entire interview is transcribed verbatim. The interview requires the interviewee to describe their childhood relationship with both their female and male attachment figures, and requires that they provide specific episodic memories of various interactions with their parents. The interviewee is questioned regarding separations from parent figures, experiences of rejections, threats regarding discipline, and whether any abuse occurred. They are asked about how these experiences affected them as adults and why they believe their parents behaved as they did. Interviewees are asked whether they have experienced the loss of a parent through death, what feelings they may have about that, and how that affected them as adults. Finally, they are asked about their current relationship with their parents, and how that may have affected their parenting style. Conclusions about which category the parent is placed in depend upon a combination of the content of what they say and how they say it. Individuals are then classified into three categories: secure, dismissing, and preoccupied. As with the observation schemas reviewed earlier, the AAI takes extensive training to administer accurately. Therefore researchers have looked for quicker, simpler methods of assessment.
Self-Report Measures

Hazen and Shaver (1987) focusing on adult romantic relationships, were the first to utilize a questionnaire for measuring attachment. The subject is shown descriptions of three attachment styles and asked to indicate which description comes closest to them in style. Due to the forced-choice format of the survey and subsequent reliance on one item, the reliability of the measure was called into question. Subsequently, Hazen and Shaver changed the adult romantic attachment questionnaire to a Likert-scale format which would allow for a more complete description of an individual’s attachment style (Levy and Davis 1988). Instead of choosing just one attachment style, a subject could indicate the degree to which each style of attachment applies to them. Subsequently, researchers decided that it would be even more useful to take the description of each individual attachment style and break it up into a series of statements. Subjects could then indicate the degree to which each statement applied to them. This also would allow researchers to conduct factor analyses and therefore to analyze the data more thoroughly. Several studies have shown that when multiple-item questionnaires are used which closely resemble Hazen and Shaver’s original description of attachment styles, two major dimensions emerge upon factor analysis. The dimensions typically have been labeled 1) avoidance of intimacy and 2) emotional expression of anxiety over relationships due to fears of abandonment and insufficient love (Feeney, Noller, and Callan 1994; Griffin and Bartholomew 1994). Bartholomew (1990) provided an interpretation of these
two dimensions based upon Bowlby’s (1973) description of working models of self and attachment figures:

In the working model of the world that anyone builds, a key feature is his notion of who his attachment figures are, where they may be found, and how they may be expected to respond. Similarly, in the working model of the self that anyone builds a key feature is his notion of how acceptable or unacceptable he himself is in the eyes of his attachment figures...Confidence that an attachment figure is ...likely to be responsive can be seen to turn on two variables: (a) whether or not the attachment figure is judged to be the sort of person who in general responds to calls for support and protection; (b) whether or not the self is judged to be the sort of person towards whom...the attachment figure is likely to respond in a helpful way. Logically these variables are independent. In practice, they are apt to be confounded. As a result, the model of the attachment figure and the model of the self are likely to develop so as to be complementary and mutually confirming (203-204).

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) developed the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ), very similar to Hazen and Shaver’s questionnaire, except that it was based upon the four category model of attachment styles, as noted in Figure 1. Brennan et al. (1998) conducted a factor analysis of Hazen and Shaver’s questionnaire and found that the self-report attachment measures loaded upon two factors: avoidance (model of self) and anxiety (model of other). They also found that they could be measured well using the 36-item ECR questionnaire, that elaborated on Hazen and Shaver’s descriptions.

Researchers in the area of adult attachment theory have debated whether adult attachment styles should be conceptualized and measured in terms of dimensions or types. Fraley and Waller (1998) provided additional support for the conceptualization and measurement of adult attachment styles in terms of
dimensions. They reviewed the problems encountered by researchers utilizing the categorical approach to adult attachment styles and found that many researchers’ findings might have been stronger if they had used a dimensional approach to their research design and methodology. In an effort to continuously refine the instrument to measure adult attachment styles, Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) created the Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R) questionnaire, a revised version of the original ECR. It also is a 36-item self report questionnaire. The ECR-R also yields scores on the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance.

**Leadership**

Leadership is one of the few variables in the field of Organizational Development that have been studied in relation to attachment. While effective leaders have been known to provide a sense of empowerment to followers, enabling them to successfully attain their goals, very little is still known about the mechanisms that lie at the heart of these developmental processes. One of the goals of this research is to explore whether attachment theory can be used to understand the developmental and psychological processes at the heart of a transformational leader-follower relationship. To that end, this portion of the literature review will focus on exploring leader-follower attachment and it's similarities with parent-child attachment. We explore the parallels between the psychological and emotional characteristics of a good parent and secure leader and the pertinence of secure base and safe haven elements to the leader-
follower attachment relationship. An argument is made for the importance of a secure orientation in a leader figure. A secure attachment style is posited as allowing leaders to be more transformational in their effect on others. In addition, we hypothesize that leaders also have the ability to inspire secure or insecure organizational attachments which affects how they are experienced and perceived by followers and how they subsequently lead and motivate followers during times of change.

Secure Leader and Secure Parent

Popper and Mayseless (2003) contend that the attachment dynamic experienced within a leader-led relationship has several parallels with that of a parent-child relationship. Much like a good parent, an effective leader is one characterized as having charisma, with the ability to evoke emotion in others, allowing for establishment of an attachment relationship between two people. Both the roles of parent and leader involve providing guidance and direction, taking charge at times, and taking care of others that are less powerful than they and whose fate is dependent on them. This dependence on the other is what leads to the large influence the leader or parent figure has over the child or follower.

While little empirical research has been done on the developmental characteristics which embody an effective leader, it has been argued that they are very similar to those of a good parent (Keller 2003; Popper 2004; Popper and
Mayseless 2003; Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo 2000). An effective leader focuses on developing others, empowers followers, encourages them to aspire to be moral agents and is concerned with prosocial outcomes (Avolio and Yammarino 2003; Bass 1985; Popper and Mayseless 2003, Popper, Amit, Gal, Mishkal-Sinai, Lisak, 2004). Ideally, both effective parents and leaders will establish a positive emotional foundation for the relationship through communication. They will demonstrate a certain level of sensitivity and responsiveness, and provide individualized consideration. They provide structure and rules, but maintain a certain amount of flexibility. Both parents and leaders are positive role models one can aspire to become like, who engender trust in others and oneself. Both will reinforce the individual's autonomy and therefore encourage a positive sense of self and personal capability, helping to provide the emotional and psychological structure and encouragement to help others move towards their goals.

Support for the notion that a secure individual creates a more ideal leader can be found in several empirical studies. The first is a study done by Popper et. al (2004), examining the psychological traits associated with leadership. Leaders and peers were asked to rate subjects with regards to leadership traits and potential. The researchers utilized a sample of 402 soldiers who had completed basic training and asked their peers and commanders to evaluate them using a series of questionnaires for leadership capacities which were used to classify them as leaders or nonleaders. Leaders versus nonleaders were assessed
utilizing an instrument created by the research team to measure competence with regards to leadership traits. In addition, five instruments were administered to the soldiers to examine leadership potential (Locus of Control Scale (Rotter 1966); Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorusch, and Lushene 1970); GSE Scale (Chen and Gully 1997); Life Orientation Test to assess optimism (Scheier and Carver 1985); and the Attachment Style Questionnaire (Hazen and Shaver 1987). Leaders as compared to nonleaders were found more likely to be characterized as possessing greater internal locus of control, lower levels of anxiety, higher self-efficacy, and more optimism. Most importantly, leaders were characterized by higher levels of secure attachment style and lower levels of insecure attachment style as compared to nonleaders. Regression analysis suggested that anxiety, internal locus of control, and attachment style were significantly predictive of leadership. Much like the characteristics that typify a good parent, these positive characteristics arguably allowed the soldiers in this study to be viewed as leaders.

A second study supported the idea of secure attachment orientation being linked with leadership potential. In a study done on military recruits, Mikulincer and Florian (1995) provided empirical evidence that those individuals who rated themselves as secure were more likely to be nominated as leaders by their peers than those with an insecure orientation. The researchers set out to assess the relationship between individual attachment style and their reaction to military combat training in 92 military personnel. In the first three days of military training,
these soldiers were asked to complete Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) attachment questionnaire. After 4 months, near the end of their training, they were asked to complete the Way of Coping Checklist (Folkman and Lazarus 1980) which was used to assess their coping with stressful situations. In addition, at this time, they were asked to assess the leadership ability of their peers. Attachment patterns positively predicted coping with real-life stressful situations. As compared with secure individuals, those with an ambivalent attachment pattern saw themselves as less able to cope with stress of the training, appraised the training as more threatening, used more emotion-focused coping strategies to deal with the stress, and were rated by peers as less fit for leadership positions. While avoidants did not differ from secure individuals in their appraisal of their ability to cope with the stress or in nomination for leadership positions, they appraised the training in more threatening terms and used more distance-coping strategies to deal with stress. As compared with avoidant individuals, secures and ambivalents sought more support from others to help in coping with the stress of combat training. This behavior reflects the model of self and other described earlier with regards to attachment patterns. Secure individuals cope well with the stress of negative emotion and are able to reach out to others to help assist them in their coping. Insecure individuals lack the ability to process the negative emotion encountered and either cope by reaching out to others or apparently blocking their emotions and avoiding others.
A third study supported the link between secure orientation and leadership potential. This study focused on 127 MBA students and was conducted by Berson, Dan, and Yammarino (2006) and was designed to test whether self-described attachment style would predict the respondents’ view both of ideal leadership and what these authors labeled leadership emergence. Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) attachment questionnaire was utilized to assess individual attachment style. The authors measured ideal leadership perceptions utilizing the Prototypicality Scale (Lord et al. 1984). They measured emerging leadership by a ranking system. Each team member was asked to rank all team members, including themselves, with regards to dominance. The researchers demonstrated that securely attached individuals as compared with insecurely attached individuals viewed leaders as more considerate and sociable. Secure as compared with insecure individuals saw themselves as more effective team members and team members viewed securely attached members as team leaders more often than they did insecure members.

Secure Base and Safe Haven

Just like the parent-child relationship the elements of safe haven and secure base have application to the leader-follower relationship (Popper and Mayseless 2002, Popper 2004). In addition to emotional rapport, it is very important in both types of attachment relationships to establish a sense of security. This sense of security is necessary for an effective leader-led relationship but is largely overlooked within the leadership literature (Popper
When a secure base is provided, and felt security is sensed by an individual, this person becomes free to explore their surroundings, to explore the opportunities that exist in the world, to work towards one’s goals, to look for new positive experiences from which growth can occur which in turn positively influence one’s sense of self. The knowledge that a safe haven to return to exists allows for exploration to occur. The individual has a secure emotional base to return to and restore the feelings of felt security in times of stress before venturing out into exploration once again. Secure caregivers and leaders essentially not only possess an internal sense of security but also provide this to others. This secure image of self carries over into their view of other relationships. On the other hand, insecure caregivers or leaders possess an internally insecure sense of self. They in turn impose this insecurity on others’ development, and essentially inhibit an individual’s ability to feel they can safely explore their environment and the opportunities that might exist to promote their sense of self-confidence, and therefore they retreat from exploration because they are aware from past experience that there does not exist a safe haven to return to.

The concepts of secure base and safe haven are intimately tied to the notion of individual development. In a theoretical paper, Popper (2004) indicates that ideally, the leader-led relationship serves as a secure relationship, a developmental relationship allowing individuals to safely explore their environment and focus on opportunities allowing for self-development. This can
be witnessed in secure attachments within coach-coachee relationships. The elements required of a positive coaching relationship are: 1) establishing a personal relationship involving emotional exchanges with followers, and thereby establishing rapport and trust, 2) being a positive role model, 3) taking a genuine interest in the person, 4) maintaining an honest and open dialogue, 5) helping individuals identify their unique strengths and weaknesses and helping them to continuously work towards their personal and career aspirations, 6) creating structure so that long-term goals can be met, and 7) keeping individuals motivated to attain their goals (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee 2002). One of the most important aspects of the coaching relationship is encouraging developmental goals, helping the person to grow and attain their goals in the same instance. Coaching is about, “…developing others, which lets a leader act as a counselor, exploring employees' goals and values and helping them expand their own repertoire of abilities” (Goleman et. al 2002, pg. 62). A good coach cultivates a secure attachment with a follower, helping them to explore possibilities, grow as individuals, trust in themselves and others, and ultimately to attain their goals.

**Secure Attachment Pattern and Transformational Leadership**

Securely attached individuals possess the psychological and developmental orientation to help other individuals develop and grow and therefore they have the capacity to be transformational in their effects on others. Some of the most commonly cited transformational leaders of the 20th century
include figures such as President John F. Kennedy, Winston Churchill, Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela, and Ghandi. Consider the inspirational story of Mother Teresa of Avila. She served as the head of the Missionaries of Charity for over 50 years. While the numbers of those choosing to pursue a vocation of religious life in the Catholic Church have been dwindling, the numbers of those choosing to join the Missionaries of Charity sisters and brothers started with 13 and totaled more than 4,500 in more than 100 countries at the time of Mother Teresa’s death. While she lived a modest life and possessed very little with regards to belongings, she made a huge impact on the world. By using very simple principles she was able to raise people’s awareness of the poor in the world and inspire a generation of people towards action. She was truly a transformational leader who inspired people to devote their life to poverty; to live in poverty, and to understand the poor they served by living and working amongst them. She did this by example, by living the lifestyle that she invited her followers to live. Mother Teresa is one example of an individual who embodied many of the characteristics of a secure leader: a focus on developing others, empowering followers, encouraging them to aspire to be moral agents (Popper and Mayseless 2003). Through this positive cognitive and emotional orientation, she was able to create transformational change in the world. While it is not necessary that transformational leaders create an impact that is as far reaching and on the scale that Mother Teresa did, they possess the necessary emotional and psychological orientation to potentially cause this kind of change to occur.
Bass (1965) originally distinguished between transformational and transactional leadership by defining a transactional leader as one focused on the leader-follower relationship as an exchange of rewards in return for meeting expectations and goals. While transformational leadership entails an element of exchange, it also goes beyond this. Originally, Bass (1985) stated that there were three elements that comprised a transformational leader: 1) charisma, 2) individual consideration, and 3) intellectual stimulation. In subsequent research, it was determined that charisma could be differentiated into two elements, idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Taking both of these elements into account, transformational leadership entailed the following: 1) Idealized Leadership, where leaders are seen as positive role models to be modeled, respected, and trusted. The leader focuses on developing others and acts in a moral and socially responsible fashion; 2) Inspirational Motivation, demonstrated by a leader's commitment to shared goals and outcomes. Leaders inspire and motivate their followers toward this envisioned future with optimism and enthusiasm; 3) Intellectual Stimulation, demonstrated by the leader's encouragement of creativity in achieving goals; 4) Individualized Consideration, provided by special consideration for individual goals, needs, and feelings. Conversations between leader and follower as well as learning opportunities and experiences provided to followers are tailored to meet the needs and goals of each individual (Bass and Avolio 2004).
Bass (1985) observed that what mattered in the leader-follower relationship is that, “followers’ attitudes and behavior were transformed by the leader’s performance” (pg. 21). Much like a good parent, those capable of being transformational leaders display a secure emotional and cognitive psychological orientation (Popper and Mayseless 2003). Due to their secure orientation, the power of a transformational leader lies in their ability, within their relationships, to transform people with regards to: 1) motivation, 2) empowerment, and 3) morality. A transformational leader is an attachment figure that inspires positive emotion in others and harnesses this emotion to create positive ends to benefit the follower’s development. They focus on contributing to their followers’ psychological development in a positive manner. They empower individuals to seek out their own goals, and provide support in cultivating a strong belief in self, in their abilities, and in their judgment capabilities. They empower them with the belief in self and the belief that they have the ability to change their own lives. They motivate them in a positive manner, helping to attain their goals. Finally, not only do they provide motivation to move towards goals, they help create a link between motivation and morality. Therefore, they are motivated to create positive social outcomes that are empathetic in nature and take the feelings of others into consideration. In essence transformational leaders themselves are positive role models that embody the elements of self-empowerment, motivation, and morality, possessing the ability to provide the structure for followers to mirror them and to attain their own professed goals and therefore to provide the opportunity to contribute in a positive manner to their psychological development.
There is evidence, although limited, that transformational leadership correlates positively with a secure individual attachment style (Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo 2000). Three studies involving different all-male military cohorts were conducted. In the first study commanders were asked to characterize the military cadets’ attachment style utilizing the 30-item Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin and Bartholomew 1994), derived from Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) adult attachment questionnaire, Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) Relationship Questionnaire, and Collins and Reed’s (1990) Adult Attachment Scale. Their leadership style was assessed by utilizing a revised version of Bass’s (1985) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). In the second study, the cadets were asked to report on their own individual attachment style utilizing Griffin and Bartholomew’s (1994) Relationship Styles Questionnaire (RSQ). This questionnaire combines the Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) questionnaire used in the first study, along with Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) questionnaire, and Collins and Reed’s (1990), Adult Attachment Scale. Commanders were asked once again to utilize Bass’s (1985) MLQ to evaluate cadets with regards to their leadership style. In the third study, the RSQ and a 15-item questionnaire developed by Mikulincer et. al (1990) and based on Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) questionnaire were utilized by commanders to evaluate their own attachment style. The MLQ was used by cadets to evaluate their commanders with regards to leadership style. The study confirmed that regardless of who was rating whom, positive correlations existed between
attachment security and the various indices associated with transformational leadership, while not with those associated with transactional leadership. While various insecure attachment styles were found to correlate negatively with the transformational leadership style, this did not occur consistently.

Summary

Let us summarize the main arguments of the preceding review as a prelude to introducing our research questions. For the sake of brevity, references have been omitted from this section.

The primary attachment relationship created between parent and infant has an evolutionary purpose and children utilize it in order to ensure survival. The attachment relationship consists of three essential elements: proximity maintenance, secure base, and safe haven. Children maintain proximity with the attachment figure and use this person as a secure base in case of a perceived threat. The child returns back to the caregiver when and if feeling threatened to restore felt security. While the children maintain proximity for safety reasons, they also begin to develop a cognitive model regarding themselves and safety within a relationship. When a parent is consistently responsive to the child's needs the child forms a secure cognitive model by which they view relationships. In contrast, children with parents providing inconsistent responsiveness or who are unresponsive to their needs will form an insecure mental model by which they view relationships. The internal cognitive model or attachment pattern,
secure or insecure, that an individual carries with them is utilized to interpret and predict the attachment figure’s behaviors, thoughts and feelings.

Infant attachment can be characterized in terms of four styles. Secure infants express distress upon separation from their mother, but upon reunion with her they exhibit little or no avoidance or resistance, are comforted upon her return and are able to continue playing. This is indicative of an attachment style that allows the child access to her/his emotional life and simultaneously enables the child to act adaptively under emotionally stressful conditions. Avoidant infants express no distress at separation or happiness at reunion but do seek proximity to their mother upon reunion with her. This is indicative of a style in which the child has learned to block out her/his emotional world, gaining little access to it and in turn little appreciation of others emotional worlds, while at the same time, enabling the child to deal confidently and rationally in stressful situations. Ambivalent infants are distressed at separation and are upset, resistant, not comforted, and resist continued play upon reunification with their mothers. This style is indicative of an ongoing preoccupation with the emotional state of other important people in their lives and an ability to deal adaptively in emotionally stressful situations. Disorganized-disorientated infants respond to their mother’s departure and return in incoherent ways, sometimes freezing, sometimes moving toward her in a resistant manner and then away from the mother. This is indicative of an attachment style in which the child feels both dependent on and
terrified by their attachment figure and therefore is unable to relate to that person in a coherent manner.

Research has shown that the four infant attachment styles occur with the same frequency in adults as they do infants. The four categories can be organized conceptually as the four possible combinations of having a positive or negative view of the self in combination with a positive or negative view of the other: Secure (positive image of self, positive image of other), Preoccupied (negative image of self, positive image of other), Dismissing (positive image of self, negative image of other), and Disorganized-Fearful (negative image of self, negative image of other). Subsequently, the four attachment styles were examined in terms of the therapeutic relationship. There are two dimensions associated with the model – feeling and dealing. The dimension of feeling is associated with the ability to be aware of and understand one’s own feelings, while the dimension of dealing is associated with the ability to adaptively deal with strong negative feelings. The four attachment styles can be seen as the four possible combinations of feeling/not feeling and dealing/not dealing and are described as follows: Secure (feeling, dealing); Preoccupied (feeling, not dealing); Dismissing (not feeling, dealing); Fearful (not feeling, not dealing).

More recently, researchers examined various attachment questionnaires and identified two underlying dimensions, anxiety and avoidance, whose high and low combinations lead to a similar four cell model. The four types of attachment can be described as follows: Secure (low anxiety, low avoidance); Preoccupied (high
anxiety, low avoidance); Dismissing (low anxiety, high avoidance); Fearful (high anxiety, high avoidance). Anxiety reflects the degree to which an individual worries about the attachment figure’s availability and responsiveness in times of need. Low anxiety corresponds to a high self image and the ability to deal. Avoidance reflects the individual’s discomfort with closeness or intimacy with an attachment figure and corresponds with a low self image and inability to feel.

Based on anecdotal evidence it has been hypothesized that individuals can form an attachment bond with their employing organization. The organization acts as a secure base from which the individual draws security, both in the emotional and financial sense. When provided a sense of security, individuals are able to explore, grow, and learn, ideally allowing for increased collaboration among groups of colleagues, thereby ultimately increasing the effectiveness of the organization as a whole. Individuals with a secure attachment styles would in fact exhibit this behavior. On the other hand, just as there are insecure interpersonal attachment styles, so are there insecure organizational styles. Preoccupied attachment styles develop as a result of colleagues’ and superiors’ lack of consistent emotional support. The individual is left to guess when and if emotional support will be provided, leading them to feeling inhibited in completing work or ineffective at work. Dismissing attachment styles tend to develop when individuals’ emotional needs are completely ignored and when asking for emotional support is discouraged. Under this condition, individuals will learn to ignore the importance of cultivating essential working
relationships and will not work well in collaboration with others or the organization as a whole. Fearful styles will manifest when emotional support is lacking within an organization and the individual does not have the necessary skills to effectively deal with the lack of support. It is the interaction of attachment models of the individual and the organization, as represented by various relationships with colleagues and leaders, which leads to the development of the insecure attachment orientation towards the organization.

Individuals can also demonstrate an attachment with regards to work. Work can be viewed as a secure base from which to explore, demonstrate competence and learning, draw personal gratification, and a safe haven to return to. As compared with insecure types, secure types are more confident and unafraid of failure, report high levels of satisfaction with job security, coworkers, income, and opportunities provided them. They are more likely to complete tasks. They are less likely to fear failure or rejection from coworkers. In addition, they enjoy time away from work and believe that personal relationships are more important and enjoyable than work.

Additional support for organizational attachment can be found in the applicability of attachment theory to groups. Individuals manifest group attachment anxiety as fear of being rejected or by having feelings of unworthiness of acceptance by a group, while group attachment avoidance is manifested in avoiding dependence on a group or indicating a lack of need for
closeness to individuals within the group. Increased feelings of anxiety and avoidance increase negative emotion towards the group, decrease perceived support from the group, and decrease identification with the group. In exploring a work group as a safe haven, researchers have found that felt security within one’s group leads to feeling less threatened by group outsiders. Individuals within a group with low attachment anxiety are more able to focus on the task at hand than those with high anxiety. Those with high anxiety are instead distracted by either their negative model of self or insecurities around their ineffectiveness in groups, or by the perceived threat or negative emotion elicited by group members. Individuals high in attachment avoidance hold negative mental models of others and subsequently move away from promoting group goals and instead demonstrate behaviors and emotions indicating their lack of need for reliance on the group.

The psychological and emotional orientation characterizing a secure parent is similar to that of a secure leader. Like good parents, secure leaders have the ability to positively contribute to the relationship with followers, providing the latter with a sense of security, allowing them to explore opportunities for growth and development, to grow in self-confidence, resulting in a positive image of self and others. Those with a self-designated secure orientation are more likely to be seen by others as leaders as compared with insecure individuals. Much like insecure caregivers, insecure leaders are not able to emotionally contribute to the relationship in a positive way. Their lack of responsiveness and
support of the follower lead to self-doubt, heightened psychological defenses, and inhibition of growth and development. In these studies, insecure individuals were more likely to be seen as nonleaders. Moreover, leaders with secure attachments, whether ascribed by self or others, are more likely to be seen by others as being transformational in leadership style as compared with insecure individuals.

Besides the core findings of the current attachment research, it is also useful to reprise the settings in which attachment research has taken place, the degree of focus on individual versus other levels of analysis (interpersonal, group, organization), and the methodologies used for studying attachment. The bulk of attachment research has been done on children and in the context of family relationships. Romantic relationships comprise the second most typical focus, and therapeutic relationships the third. The amount of attention given to attachment relationships in formal organizations and work settings is very minor by comparison, and these studies have focused on military organizations.

Three basic methodologies have dominated the field of attachment research—observation, the structured interview, and the structured self-administered questionnaire. Observational techniques have been used primarily in studies of infants and children. The structured interview has had significant use in studies of families, romantic relationships, and mental health therapy. Most studies of attachment among adults outside of romantic relationships and
therapy have been done with self administered questionnaires. These questionnaires have been used predominantly to arrive at an assessment of an individual’s attachment style using their assessment of themselves in a romantic or intimate relationship as the primary source of data. This focus on assessing attachment as an individual style, rather than in the context of current relationships has dominated not only children’s but also the adult attachment literature. The few studies reported earlier on individuals’ attachment to their groups and to their organizations are among the rare exceptions. Yet, given what has been reviewed regarding the importance of secure relationships among adults, and that therapists have found individual attachment styles can be changed by experiencing new relationships throughout adulthood, one might argue that the current state of attachment in ongoing relationships, interpersonal relationships as well as between individuals and their groups and organizations, are also important phenomena to study.

**Relevant Gaps in the Literature**

As a byproduct of the initial medical practice consulting work I was involved in with, as mentioned in the introduction, I became interested in exploring whether attachment relationships among adults in organizational settings, and between individuals and their organizations, shape their energy and readiness to change their organizations toward greater vitality and productivity. My intent in this dissertation is to lay the ground work for answering this question in several ways: 1) to develop instruments to measure the
attachment styles people experience themselves as using in their ongoing relationships with their closest colleague, their immediate boss, their colleagues in general, and their organization as a whole; 2) to explore how, if at all, the attachment styles people experience in each of these pairings are related to each other, and to their general attachment styles, and 3) to explore how, if at all, these attachment styles are related to people’s views of their immediate bosses’ leadership style, with particular attention to whether they are related to the subordinate’s attribution of a transformational leadership style to that person. The importance of these tasks can now be seen in light of the foregoing literature review.

First, my review revealed that there are very few empirical studies focused on characterizing attachment relationships within a typical workplace context. The majority of empirical studies exploring attachment relationships have been conducted within a military setting, which may have yielded results that are not typical of other organizations because of the military emphasis on preparedness for and engagement in warfare and therefore the high preoccupation with personal safety, loyalty, acting under extreme pressure and conflict. The current study focuses on exploring attachment relationships within a more traditional work context, such as non-profit and for-profit entities and the impact these relationships have on how one experiences one’s work organization.
Second, the focus of research on adult attachment predominantly has been on studying attachment at the individual level and on treating attachment style as a relatively enduring individual quality that affects how people evaluate and relate to one another both holistically and in various roles such as romantic partners, leaders, followers, mental health patients, etc. More specifically, within a workplace setting, the empirical studies have been focused on how individual attachment styles, conceived as enduring qualities, affect people’s experience of their work and organizational life. In line with this, the most popular questionnaire methodologies ask respondents to use representative romantic partners and intimate friends as the reference point for rating themselves along the core attachment dimensions, under the assumption that these more primary relationships are the most indicative of the individual’s core relational qualities in general. This research strategy quite ignores the possibility that an individual's attachment style may vary from relationship to relationship (Trinke and Bartholomew 1997; LaGuardia, Ryan, Couchman, Deci 2000; Overall, Fletcher, Friesen 2003). The latter suggests that individuals may experience different social and task settings differently, and different individuals differently, with respect to the need for and the provision of support and sensitivity, and as a result, that they may act in ways consistent with different attachment styles when operating in these different contexts and relationships.

Third, as a result of the prior focus on using instruments designed to measure an individual's general attachment style based on this person's
relationship with important romantic partners, researchers interested in measuring the attachment styles of other adult relationships have been obliged to modify those instruments to fit non-romantic relationships. This work is only in its infancy and there is room for further work in this area in a dissertation. A main focus of this dissertation is to begin to fill the gaps in measuring adult attachment orientation by attempting to measure individuals’ attachment styles in five contexts: 1) one’s general individual attachment style, 2) one’s relationship with one’s closest colleague, 3) one’s relationship with one’s immediate boss at work, 4) one’s relationship with one’s work colleagues in general, 5) one’s relationship with one’s work organization as a whole. In addition, an attempt will be made to relate these variables to the leadership style, whether transactional, transformational or laissez-faire, of one’s immediate boss.

Fourth, while some studies have been done on the relationship between individuals’ self ratings of their attachment styles and their ratings of their attachment style with an important group, the study of relationships among attachment styles at different system levels (self in general, individual to individual, individual to group, individual to organization) is also in its infancy and invites further exploration, especially in organizational settings where coordination among system levels can be critical for organizational success.

Fifth, previous studies on organizational attachment have neglected to utilize the latest instruments tapping into the two attachment dimensions of
anxiety and avoidance. Fraley et al’s (2000) instruments, the ECR-R and its derivative, the RS questionnaire, are the latest instruments measuring attachment based on the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance and will be utilized to measure attachment within a workplace setting. They will be utilized for the purposes of this dissertation.

Sixth, while there are few studies of attachment dynamics in modern organizations, some headway has been made in relating the individual attachment styles of organizational leaders to attributions by others regarding their leadership styles. In particular, the secure individual attachment style as measured by a leader’s self ratings has been shown to be related to others’ attributions of the rater as a transformational leader. However, no research has been done on whether the attachment styles of the ongoing relationships between subordinates and leaders, as rated by subordinates, are related to those person’s attributions about their leaders’ leadership styles. It might be the case that such ratings of the ongoing relationship itself are better predictors of attributions about leadership style than are leaders’ ratings about themselves. A focus of this study, in contrast with previous studies on attachment and leadership, is an attempt to explore the attachment relationship and leadership style experienced from the perspective of the follower’s experience of attachment and leadership style within these relationships. In previous studies on attachment and leadership, follower-designated or leader-designated attachment styles were linked with leader-designated leadership styles. The studies on
attachment and leadership have laid the foundation for exploring the relationship between attachment style and leadership style (Berson, Dan and Yammarino 2006; Popper et al 2004; Popper Mayseless, and Castelonovo 2000; Mikulincer and Florian 1995). This study will attempt to explore the link between the attachment and leadership style by exploring the leader-follower attachment relationship as the individual follower experiences it.
Chapter 3: Study 1 Research Questions, Hypotheses, Methods and Results

The research for this dissertation consists of a series of two studies that build on one another. The primary objective of this first study was a preliminary attempt to create measures for three types of attachment relationships within work organizations- boss-individual, closest colleague-individual, and work team-individual- based on the two dimensions of attachment most thoroughly documented in the literature, anxiety and avoidance. The rationale for this was that the measures currently available in the literature for measuring attachment style at the individual level usually ask the respondent to think about themselves in the context of a romantic or intimate relationship and include questions dealing with the respondent’s concerns about fears of abandonment or the ability to depend on their significant other. The researcher’s challenge here was to devise questions that contained the basic themes of anxiety and avoidance while incorporating language geared towards the typical workplace setting. This required a lot of wordsmithing, and the first set of results was not entirely successful, therefore making the second study essential to improve on the questions utilized in the first study. The first study also involved two secondary objectives: 1) a comparative analysis of the quality of attachment across these three pairings, and 2) an exploration of the covariation, to the extent any existed, among these three pairings along the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. The rationale here was that each of these relationships represents an important way
in which a person is tied to their organization and therefore where attachment
dynamics might occur.

In the following section, the specific research questions and hypotheses, as well as methods and results for the first study are presented. In addition, a series of working hypotheses about how the study results might answer each question are included.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**Question #1:** Four attachments styles exist at the individual level: Secure, Dismissing Avoidant, Preoccupied, and Fearful-Disorganized. Moreover, regardless of the context, Hazen and Shaver (1987) found that, based on two studies, these styles occur in the following proportions: 56% and 56% secure, 23% and 25% avoidant, and 20% and 19% anxious-ambivalent. Evidence for similar distributions can be found in research on early caregiver-child attachment and on adult romantic and therapeutic relationships as well.

The question posed here is whether these same attachment styles can be found in the same proportions when assessing the attachment styles of individuals working in organizations today. As a null hypothesis, it seems reasonable to assume that the sample utilized for the current study, selected through a quasi-random procedure, will have the same distribution of individual styles as has been found in the general population.
Q1H1: An organizational member’s individual attachment style can be classified as Secure, Avoidant, Preoccupied, or Fearful, and will be found in the same proportions that have been documented in prior studies of parent-child and adult romantic relationships.

Question #2: Research by Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000) has provided evidence to suggest that the four attachment styles identified by Hazen and Shaver (1987) and others (secure, dismissing avoidant, preoccupied, and fearful/disorganized) can be conceived as combinations of low and high levels of avoidance and anxiety: 1) low anxiety in combination with low avoidance creates a secure attachment, 2) low anxiety in combination with high avoidance creates an insecure dismissing attachment, 3) high anxiety in combination with low avoidance creates an insecure preoccupied attachment, 4) high anxiety in combination with high avoidance creates an insecure disorganized or fearful attachment. The author is interested in whether these same combinations of low and high anxiety and avoidance can be found when assessing the respective attachment styles of an organization member’s ongoing relationships with 1) their closest colleague, 2) their immediate boss, 3) their work team and 4) their organization taken as a whole? The attachment literature offers no theory as to whether the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance vary across settings and time frames. The following working hypotheses are offered:
Q2H1 An organization member’s relationship with their closest colleague can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Q2H2 An organization member’s relationship with their immediate boss can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Q2H3 An organization member’s relationship with their work team can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Q2H4 An organization member’s relationship with their organization taken as a whole can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

**Question #3**: Bowlby (1969) argued that a child’s attachment style with his/her primary caregiver serves as a blueprint for later relationships throughout life. It can be altered through subsequent experiences with other important caregivers, but its influence on an individual’s adult attachment style can be strong. This raises the question of whether a person will develop the same kind of attachment style with all of their organizational colleagues, or alternatively, whether their attachment style will differ across their relationships with different organizational
members. Regarding the second alternative, one might argue that the attachment style of a person’s relationship with her/his closest colleague will not likely be the same as the attachment style of their relationship with their immediate boss. People usually have more choice in picking a closest colleague as opposed to an immediate boss. This may increase the chances of a person finding someone with whom they feel comfortable being open and psychologically accessible. Moreover, the control an immediate boss has over one’s organizational life is likely to be greater than the control one’s closest colleague has, and this might create more anxiety as a result. Therefore one can argue that the attachment relationship with one’s closest colleague will be different from the attachment relationship with one’s boss, and that the relationship one has with one’s closest colleague will be both less avoidant and less anxiety provoking.

**Q3H1** People tend to experience less anxiety in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.

**Q3H2** People tend to experience less avoidance in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.

**Question #4:** Human organizations are comprised of systems nested within one another (Agazarian and Gantt 2000). Individuals and their personalities are nested within interpersonal relationships and groups, which in turn are nested
within formal organizations, which are in turn nested within organizational fields and communities, etc… The boundaries among these systems are permeable and result in ongoing patterns of mutual influence. Therapists have long used this framework to justify one-on-one work in groups, where a therapist works with a single individual in the presence of others. What happens between the therapist and the individual in this situation is often observed as having a positive effect on the audience – generating new internal dialogues in the observers' minds, providing new insights about how to apply specific ideas to their own situation, and possibly helping them resolve issues that have parallels to those being resolved in the therapist-client interaction. Likewise, students of group dynamics have observed that dyadic relationships and larger subgroups often serve as sources of emotional and cognitive support that members use to disclose fears, work through and resolve difficult issues before sharing them with the larger group or with especially powerful members such as the trainer or formal leader.

In addition, Krackhardt and Stern (1988) explored the importance of trust in shaping behavior between groups of individuals. In conducting an experimental simulation with students they found that there was increased cooperation between groups of individuals when there were existing friendships between these groups. The reasoning was that friendships imply the existence of trust which led to increased cooperation. Krackhardt (1992) also found in a study of a failed unionization attempt, that it was the greater number of
friendships the nonunionization supporters generated that led to the defeat of the unionization attempt. The friendships generated enough trust that they were able to overcome the anxiety generated by the event and overcome it. Therefore, if the existence of friendships between individuals within separate groups or divisions implies the existence of trust which leads to increased cooperation or a decreased in anxiety, then one might argue that this same logic may indicate that an individual friendship with one individual within an existing group generates trust, which can lead to an increased sense of trust and decreased anxiety generated with the larger group.

This raises the question of whether attachment dynamics between pairs of members in a large formal organization have an effect on the quality of each partner’s attachment to larger subgroups within the organization, and to the organization as a whole. For example, one might hypothesize that the more two organization members can use each other as secure bases of attachment, the more they can resolve issues that are bothering them on a daily basis, thereby allowing them to be more open and less anxious with colleagues in general. Do attachment relationships with closest colleagues serve as a secure base, contributing to an individual’s ability to form a secure attachment with their work team?

**Q4H1** The less avoidant a person feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team
Q4H2 The less anxious a person feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their work team.

**Question #5:** If closest colleague relationships can be safe havens and secure bases for their members, could individuals’ relationships with their immediate bosses be secure bases that also contribute to an individual’s ability to form a secure attachment with their work team? One might argue that the quality of attachment here is less predictable. People often do not have a choice about who their immediate boss will be and might find themselves reporting to someone incompatible with them. Likewise, the boss’s support of the subordinate may be contingent on the quality of the latter’s performance and not necessarily responsive to that person’s need for support and sensitivity. Having a more anxious relationship with one’s boss can have an effect on how anxious individuals feel with their work environment, in general. Their boss is an individual who has control over the feeling of stability within their jobs. On the other hand, having a more secure attachment relationship with one’s boss might facilitate a more secure relationship with one’s work colleagues in general, because of the confidence building effect it might have on the subordinate.

Q5H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their work colleagues in general.
Q5H2 The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their work colleagues in general.

Question #6: Following the same logic noted above, what relationship, if any, exists between an individual’s attachment relationships with their closest colleague and their organization as a whole?

Q6H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.

Q6H2 The less anxious a person feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

Question #7: Following the same logic as above, having a more secure attachment relationship with one’s boss might facilitate a more secure relationship with one’s work organization, in general. However, in this case, the relationship hypothesized might be weaker than proposed for Question #5 and #6, since a person’s workgroup, or colleagues in general, might mediate one’s immediate boss’ influence over one’s experience of the organization as a whole. What relationship, if any, exists between the attachment style of a person’s relationship with their immediate boss and the attachment style of their relationship with their organization as a whole?
Q7H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.

Q7H2 The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

**Question #8:** Does how one gets along with one’s colleagues in general affect how one feels about one’s relationship with the organization as a whole? Arguably, having a more secure attachment relationship with one’s work colleagues in general will facilitate a more secure relationship with one’s work organization as a whole.

Q8H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their work team, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.

Q8H2 The less anxious a person feels with their work team, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

**Methods**

The methodology used in both of the studies in this dissertation involved online questionnaires administered to snowball samples intended to be representative of typical members of U.S. organizations.
**Assessment Instruments**

The initial online survey was derived from questions from various attachment instruments: Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991), 4 category attachment style called the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ); the attachment questionnaire created by St. Clair (1994) in her dissertation measuring organizational attachment; and Fraley, Waller, and Brennan’s (2000) Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R) and its derivative the Relationship Structures (RS) questionnaire.1 In the following sections, the questionnaires used to measure attachment for each level (individual, interpersonal, group, and organization) and for each pairing (closest colleague and boss) are reviewed.

**Individual Level.** Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) 4 category attachment style RQ (Figure 1) was used to assess each subject’s individual attachment style. Participants were asked to rate each of the four relationship styles (Style A, B, C, and D) to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponded to their general relationship style. Participants were not informed which attachment style each corresponded with: Style A (Secure), Style B (Fearful), Style C (Preoccupied), and Style D (Dismissing). Participants were then asked to indicate which of the styles best described them or was closest to the way they were in relationships, in general. The frequencies of these self-

---

1 The RS questionnaire is a survey used to target only one kind of relationship, such as that between an individual and their mother, father, best friend, or romantic partner, and can be used as a 10-item version of the ECR-R. This questionnaire has yet to be published, but was available on Dr. Fraley’s website: [www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/measures/ecrr.html](http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/measures/ecrr.html).
described attachment orientations were calculated to determine whether they were similar to findings in previous studies.

Figure 4. Individual Level Questionnaire for Study 1 based on Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) Relationship Questionnaire

First, on a scale from 1 to 7, please rate each of the four relationship styles below to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style. Second, please indicate the letter (A, B, C, or D) corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are in relationships, in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral/Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the letter (A, B, C or D) corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are in relationships: __________

**Team Level (coworkers, colleagues).** Two instruments were used to create the section of the questionnaire measuring attachment at the Team Level: St. Clair’s (1994) 9-item questionnaire on organizational attachment and Fraley, Waller, and Brennan’s (2000) 36-item Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R).
The intended purpose of this section of the questionnaire was to measure attachment at the team level or to one’s colleagues, in general. Participants were told that the statements concerned how they felt about the quality of life as a team member in their work organization, and to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements that followed. This section of the questionnaire consisted of 47 items (30 avoidance items and 17 anxiety items). The statements utilized included statements about feeling towards co-workers as well as their employing organization. The ECR-R was revised so that the questions applied to a work setting versus an intimate relationship. Many times the word “partner” could easily be replaced with “co-workers”. After rewording many of the items, each question was reviewed using a two-person team. At times when simply substituting the word “colleague” or “co-worker” for partner still seemed inappropriate, it was necessary to capture the essence of the question and create a new question based on that. For example, one statement from the ECR-R was, “I rarely worry about my partner leaving me”. The essence of this question is with regards to the individual’s sense of security within the relationship. In the organizational attachment survey the questions that replaced this were worded as follows: “I believe that I am often in danger of losing support from my colleagues at work” and “I worry a fair amount about losing my job”. Two or three questions in the ECR-R seemed inappropriate to the questionnaire because they would not translate from an intimate relationship to a workplace setting. For example, one of the statements in the ECR-R is, “When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else”.
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Since it was very difficult to translate this to a work setting, this item was discarded from the survey.

Overall, it was much easier to translate the wording of many of the avoidance items to apply to a work place setting. The avoidance items dealt with the ability to depend upon romantic partners and to confide in them. The anxiety items dealt largely with worries about how the romantic partner was viewing the relationship and feelings of abandonment. These were much more difficult to reword to apply to an organizational context. Therefore, many more anxiety items were left out than avoidance items. The remaining items in this section of the questionnaire were taken directly from the attachment questions created by St. Clair in her dissertation. This was done as an added measure to ensure overlap with St. Clair’s study. While at times questions from the ECR-R and St. Clair’s dissertations seemed similar, they were worded differently, and therefore both sets of questions were included in the questionnaire. The final questions are listed below (Figure 2).

Figure 5. Team Level Questionnaire for Study 1

The statements below concern how you generally feel within your work organization. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I am confident that the people I currently work with like me.
2. My organization is a place where the leadership listens carefully to what others have to say.
3. I believe that I am often in danger of losing support from my colleagues at work.
4. It’s easy for me to be honest with my co-workers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings.
5. I am confident that the people I work with have my best interests at heart.
6. I am comfortable depending upon my coworkers for support.
7. I do not feel comfortable sharing my ideas, opinions and feelings with my work colleagues.
8. I feel confident that I am essential to the success of my work group.
9. My organization is a place where people find it easy to share their day-to-day concerns with one another.
10. I often worry that I am easily replaceable at work.
11. My organization is a place where people are good at facing up to reality.
12. I usually discuss any problems and concerns I have with my colleagues.
13. I feel confident that I can depend upon my colleagues.
14. My colleagues at work make me doubt myself.
15. I feel confident that my co-workers like having me around.
16. My organization is a place where people have each other’s best interests at heart.
17. I am nervous when co-workers try to get too emotionally close to me.
18. I talk things over with my work colleagues.
19. My organization is a place where it is easy to offer your own opinions without fear of being attacked.
20. I often feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues.
21. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with my coworkers.
22. My co-workers seem to like working closely with me.
23. I feel comfortable asking my co-workers for help.
24. I worry a fair amount about losing my job.
25. I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and feelings with those with whom I work.
26. My co-workers do not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
27. My organization is a place where people do not have to watch their backs.
28. Sometimes co-workers change their disposition towards me for no apparent reason.
29. I enjoy working closely with my current colleagues.
30. I am sure my colleagues like having me around.
31. My coworkers only seem to notice me when I am upset or angry.
32. It helps to turn to my colleagues in times of need.
33. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable opening up to each other.
34. I find it difficult to completely trust my co-workers.
35. I tell my co-workers just about everything.
36. I feel comfortable showing my coworkers how I feel deep down.
37. My organization is a place where people don’t really like working closely with one another.
38. I find it relatively easy to identify with my co-workers.
39. I often worry that my coworkers don’t really care about me.
40. I’m comfortable having my co-workers depend on me at work.
41. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to my coworkers.
42. My coworkers want me to be more involved with them than I feel comfortable being.
43. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable asking one another for help.
44. My organization is a place where people rarely disclose their feelings to one another.
45. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable trusting one another.
46. I think my work colleagues really understand me.
47. My organization is a place where people can depend upon each other.

**Interpersonal Level (closest colleague and boss).** These two sections of the questionnaire explored the attachment of the participant to their closest colleague and to their boss, respectively. Questions in these two sections of the questionnaire were taken from two sources: Fraley, Waller and Brennan’s 10-
item Relationship Structures (RS) questionnaire and St. Clair’s 8-item attachment questionnaire. Participants were asked to think about their relationship with their closest work colleague (the person whom on balance they have to interact with most often and most intensely on a day to day basis) and to think about their relationship with their boss (while it is not unusual for people to have more than boss, they were asked to focus on the person who has the greatest immediate authority over them). They were then asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements that followed. The creation of this section of the questionnaire resulted in 18 items (9 avoidance and 9 anxiety). Each of the 18-items from the original questionnaires was reworded to apply to an organizational setting. The questions with regards to attachment to a closest colleague (Figure 3) and immediate boss (Figure 4) are listed below.

**Figure 6. Closest Colleague Level Questionnaire for Study 1**

With regards to your relationship with your closest work colleague, please indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following:

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
3. I believe that this person has my best interests at heart.
4. This person does not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person
6. I’m afraid that this person doesn’t really want me around.
7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support.
8. I talk things over with this person
9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.
10. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care about me.
11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
12. I find it difficult to completely trust this person.
13. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to this person.
14. This person wants me to be more involved with them than I am comfortable being.
15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person.
16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.
18. I’m comfortable having this person depend on me at work.

Figure 7. Boss Level Questionnaire for Study 1

With regards to your relationship with your boss, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral/Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
3. I believe that this person has my best interests at heart.
4. This person does not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person
6. I’m afraid that this person doesn’t really want me around.
7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support.
8. I talk things over with this person
9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.
10. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care about me.
11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
12. I find it difficult to completely trust this person.
13. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to this person.
14. This person wants me to be more involved with them than I am comfortable being.
15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.
18. I’m comfortable having this person depend on me at work.

Organizational Level as Differentiated from Team Level. The final section of the survey consisted of 18 items and asked participants to consider their relationship with their work organization. These items were differentiated from the 47 items utilized to measure attachment at the team level because they were specific to the individual’s relationship to their work organization and the primary reference point (the words actually used in the questions) was “organization” instead of “colleagues” or “co-workers”. This was an extra measure added to differentiate between the individual’s attachment specifically to
their organization versus attachment to their co-workers or bosses. The literature to date has focused primarily on attachment as an interpersonal phenomenon. The idea of being attached to an organization is more abstract and might evoke images in the respondent’s mind that go beyond evocations of social relationships. That might have been why St. Clair was unable to get clear measures of attachment styles at the organizational level. The questions were taken from St. Clair’s dissertation. Ten of the 18 items (7 anxiety, 6 avoidance, and 5 that could not be determined as being either anxiety or avoidance items) were directly from the questionnaire created by Simpson (1990), while St. Clair created 8 additional items to be added to the survey. The questionnaire for the organizational level is listed below (Figure 5).

**Figure 8. Organizational Level Questionnaire for Study 1**

With regards to your relationship with your employing organization, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel it is relatively easy to identify with my work organization.  
2. I rarely worry about being fired or laid off by my work organization.  
3. I find it difficult to completely trust the organization that I work for.  
4. My work organization does not seem to want me to become highly involved in it; everything is strictly business.  
5. I’m not very comfortable having to depend upon my work organization for support.  
6. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being highly involved in this organization.  
7. I often worry that my work organization doesn’t really care about me.  
8. I’m comfortable having my organization depend on me at work.  
9. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to my work organization.  
10. This organization wants me to be more involved in it than I feel comfortable being.  
11. I would rather work in an organization that feels like a “family” rather than in one that is more impersonal.  
12. I feel that I am more committed to this organization than it is committed to me.  
13. It is important to me that my relationship with this organization be for the long term.  
14. All organizations are about the same so working for this organization is no different than working for another organization.  
15. I feel as though this organization is just as strongly committed to me as I am to it.
16. Being an active participant in this organization is important to me.
17. This organization usually tries to contribute to my personal well-being.
18. I can usually count on this organization to be there for me when I need it.

Participants

An online link was sent via email to 150 graduates of the Master’s in Organizational Development program, with a letter describing the study to the participants. Additional participants were recruited through a snowball effect, by asking initial participants invited to participate in the survey to forward the website link and invited their acquaintances to participate in the survey.

Procedures

The survey was posted online at a university research site and responses to the survey were collected in a secure location that could only be accessed by the researchers. Participation was voluntary and conducted through an online assessment. Participants were informed of the study via an email description with a link to the website. Upon entering the website, participants were provided with an online consent form. In order to complete the survey, respondents were required to indicate that they consented to taking the survey and understood that their responses would remain confidential. Once the consent form was completed, participants continued on to complete the 118 question survey. With the exception of demographic data collected, the survey consisted of 108 questions derived from various attachment questionnaires, assessing attachment with their coworkers and colleagues in general, their closest colleague, their
boss, their individual attachment orientation, as well as attachment with their employing organization. Participants were asked to rate these statements on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree).

**Demographics**

Table 1 below outlines the sample characteristics for Study 1. A total of 114 participants completed at least part of the online survey. One hundred and twelve (112) participants completed the sections of the survey measuring general attachment with one’s colleagues, their attachment to their closest colleague and their boss in addition to the questions measuring individual attachment style. A total of 89 people completed the demographics section of the survey in its entirety. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 62 years of age. A total of 11 participants indicated that they worked part-time while 101 indicated that they worked full-time. With regards to the size of the organization they were employed by, 28 indicated a size of 100 employees or less, 19 a size of 1,000-10,000, and 24 indicated that they worked for an organization of greater than 10,000 people. With regards to length of employment with their current employer 10 indicated less than 1 year, 30 indicated 1-2 years, 19 indicated 3-5 years, 22 indicated 5-10 years, 8 indicated 11-15 years, 5 indicated 16-20 years, 11 indicated more than 20 years. With regards to race, 92 were Caucasian/White, 7 African-American, 4 Asian/Pacific Islander, 2 Hispanic, and 5 indicated other. In terms of gender, 76 were female and 36 were male. The sample was a
broadly diverse group of participants suitable for exploratory research on attachment in organizations.

**Table 1: Sample Characteristics for Study 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Organizaton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-10,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

In the section below each hypothesis is restated along with the result that either supported or refuted it.
**Question #1:** Four attachments styles exist at the individual level: secure, dismissing avoidant, preoccupied, and fearful-disorganized. Are these same attachment styles found when assessing the attachment styles of individual organizational attachment styles?

**Q1H1:** An organizational member's individual attachment style can be classified as secure, dismissing avoidant, preoccupied, or fearful avoidant, in the same proportions that would be found in prior studies of parent-child and adult romantic relationships.

The analysis supported the hypotheses that an organization member's individual attachment style can be classified in the same four categories as in prior studies and that the relative occurrences of each of these styles were similar to those found in prior studies. The first analysis conducted at the individual level consisted of determining the frequencies of each individual attachment style. The analysis of the frequency of distribution of attachment styles was based upon the designated attachment style respondents felt best described their individual attachment style. The following distribution of individual attachment style was found: 59.8% secure (low anxiety, low avoidance), 24.1% dismissing avoidant (low anxiety, high avoidance), 9.8% fearful avoidant (high anxiety, high avoidance), and 6.3% preoccupied (high anxiety, low avoidance) (Table 2). In their original study Hazen and Shaver (1987) found the following results from two studies: 56% and 56% secure, 23% and 25% avoidant, and 20%
and 19% anxious-ambivalent. The findings from this analysis of individual attachment orientations confirmed the results of Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) original study. The secure and dismissing attachment orientations were found to occur in relatively the same proportions as with Hazen and Shaver (1987). In addition, the anxious-ambivalent category can be viewed as a combination of the fearful (high anxiety, high avoidance) and preoccupied (high anxiety, low avoidance) categories, as demonstrated through the work of Ainsworth et. al (1978), Hazen and Shaver (1987), Bartholomew and Harowitz (1991), and Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000).

**Table 2:** Distribution of attachment styles as measured by Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) Adult Romantic Attachment Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Mean, Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>5.1, 1.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>3.0, 1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>4.2, 1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>2.4, 1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question #2:** The four attachment styles can be conceived as combinations of low and high levels of avoidance and anxiety: 1) low anxiety in combination with low avoidance creates for a secure attachment, 2) low anxiety in combination with high avoidance creates for an insecure dismissing attachment, 3) high anxiety in combination with low avoidance creates for an insecure preoccupied attachment, 4) high anxiety in combination with high avoidance creates for an insecure disorganized or fearful attachment. Are these same combinations of
low and high anxiety and avoidance found when assessing the respective attachment styles of an organization member’s ongoing relationships with 1) their closest colleague, 2) their immediate boss, 3) their work team, and 4) their organization taken as a whole?

The following three hypotheses related to question 2 were analyzed in a very similar fashion. With regards to analyzing the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance for closest colleague and boss, the initial frequencies were run on all 18 items in each section of the questionnaire (questions regarding attachment to closest colleague and boss). Any item with a standard deviation >1, or non-normal distribution, or abnormal kurtosis (≥ 9), or highly skewed (≥ 3) was taken out of the analysis. All avoidance and anxiety items were correlated with one another. Items that did not correlate significantly or were negatively correlated with one another were taken out of the analysis. Exploratory factor analyses for all remaining avoidance and anxiety items were conducted. All items were required to have a primary loading of no less than 0.4 or 0.5 and a secondary loading of < 0.3.

Q2H1 An organization member’s relationship with their closest colleague can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.
Factor analysis with oblimin rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 66% of the variance for the items measuring attachment to one’s closest colleague. After excluding items according to the criteria noted above, the remaining items had good Cronbach's alpha's (0.92) for closest colleague avoidance items, and (0.79) for closest colleague anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provide supporting evidence that an individual's relationship with their closest colleague can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.

Table 3: Results of factor analysis for attachment to closest colleague (anxiety and avoidance) for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17_9ANX</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_10ANX</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_13ANX</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_1AV</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_2AV</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_5AV</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_7AV</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_8AV</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_11AV</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_15AV</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_16AV</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_17AV</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
Colleague Anxiety: (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.79$)
17_9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.
17_10. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care about me.
17_13. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to this person

Colleague avoidance (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.92$)
17_1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
17_2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
17_5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person
17_7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support.
17_8. I talk things over with this person
17_11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
17_15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
17_16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
17_17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.

Q2H2 An organization member’s relationship with their immediate boss can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Factor analysis with oblimin rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 71% of the variance for the items measuring attachment to one’s boss. After excluding items according to criteria noted above, the remaining items had good Cronbach’s alpha’s (0.95) for boss avoidance items, and (0.74) for boss anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provide supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with their immediate boss can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.
Table 4: Results of factor analysis for attachment to immediate boss (anxiety and avoidance) for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18_6ANX</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_9ANX</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_1AV</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_2AV</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_5AV</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_7AV</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_8AV</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_11AV</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_15AV</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_16AV</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_17AV</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 4 iterations.

**Boss Anxiety: (Cronbach’s α = 0.74)**
18_6. I’m afraid that this person doesn’t really want me around.
18_9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.

**Boss Avoidance: (Cronbach’s α = 0.95)**
18_1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
18_2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
18_5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person
18_7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support
18_8. I talk things over with this person
18_11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
18_15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
18_16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
18_17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.
An organization member’s relationship with their work team can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Factor analysis with oblimin rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 49% of the variance. The remaining items resulted in good Cronbach’s alphas (0.93) for team avoidance items and (0.78) for team anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provides supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with their work team can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.

Table 5: Results of factor analysis for attachment to work team (anxiety and avoidance) for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16_9ANX</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_11ANX</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_25ANX</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_4AV</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_6AV</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>-.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_7AV</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_8AV</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_10AV</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_13AV</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_19AV</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16_20AV</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Team anxiety: (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$)
16_9. I feel confident that I am essential to the success of my work group.
16_11. I often worry that I am easily replaceable at work.
16_25. I worry a fair amount about losing my job.

Team avoidance: (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.93$)
16_4. It’s easy for me to be honest with my co-workers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings.
16_6. I am comfortable depending upon my coworkers for support.
16_7. I generally have close relationships with my colleagues.
16_8. I do not feel comfortable sharing my ideas, opinions, and feelings with my work colleagues.
16_10. My organization is a place where people find it easy to share their day-to-day concerns with one another.
16_13. I usually discuss any problems and concerns I have with my colleagues.
16_19. I talk things over with my work colleagues.
16_20. My organization is a place where it is easy to offer your opinions without fear of being attacked.
16_21. I often feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues.
16_24. I feel comfortable asking my co-workers for help.
16_26. I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and feelings with those with whom I work.
16_29. I enjoy working closely with my current colleagues.
16_33. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable opening up to each other.
16_36. I feel comfortable showing my co-workers how I feel deep down.
16_38. I find it easy to identify with my co-workers.
16_43. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable asking one another for help.
16_46. I think my work colleagues really understand me.
16_47. My organization is a place where people can depend on each other.
An organization member’s relationship with their organization taken as a whole can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

Initial frequencies were run on all 18 items in this section of the questionnaire. Any item with a standard deviation > 1, or non-normal distribution, or abnormal kurtosis (≥9), or highly skewed (≥3) was taken out of the analysis. All avoidance and anxiety items were correlated with one another. Items that did not correlate significantly or were negatively correlated with one another were taken out of the analysis. Factor analyses for all remaining avoidance and anxiety items were conducted. Two factors were extracted but only the first was interpretable, with high positive loadings for several anxiety items and high negative loadings for high avoidance loadings. No further analyses were conducted on this data set.

Since two discrete factors, one for anxiety and another for avoidance could not be extracted, the author concluded that attachment between the individual and the larger organization cannot be described using the dimensions of avoidance and anxiety in a statistically supportable manner. The attachment relationships within the organization, such as closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team, as compared to the organization itself, proved capable of being measured more than the attachment relationship an individual has with the organization by which they are employed.
**Question #3:** Is the attachment relationship with one’s closest colleague different from the attachment relationship with one’s boss with respect to the mean scores on the dimension of avoidance and anxiety?

**Q3H1** People tend to experience less anxiety in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.

On a Likert scale of 1 to 7, closest colleague anxiety averaged a mean of 2 with a standard deviation of 1, while boss anxiety averaged a mean of 2 and a standard deviation of 1.1. This indicates that there is a similar level of attachment anxiety associated with one’s closest colleague and immediate boss. This was not an expected result. However, the scales for boss anxiety were problematic and different items might be needed to better assess boss anxiety.

**Table 6:** Means for closest colleague and immediate boss attachment avoidance and anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CC_ANX</th>
<th>Boss_ANX</th>
<th>CC_AV</th>
<th>Boss_AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3H2** People tend to experience less avoidance in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.

On a Likert scale of 1 to 7, closest colleague avoidance averaged a mean of 2.33 with a standard deviation close to 1.33, while boss avoidance averaged a
mean of 2.9 and a standard deviation of 1.53. This is indicative of a slightly higher level of attachment avoidance with a boss as compared to the relationship with a closest colleague. Once again, this is not surprising since one normally has more choice over the person they consider their closest colleague as compared to an immediate boss. The mean for boss avoidance is nearer the middle of the scale than closest colleague avoidance. Therefore, half of the people appear happy with their bosses while the other half are not. In addition, the slightly greater standard deviation associated with boss as compared with closest colleague supports the idea that one can choose their closest colleague, while a boss is someone that one has no control over. Therefore their will be greater variation in terms of how much avoidance is associated with the attachment with a boss as compared to a closest colleague.

A paired sample t-test was conducted comparing the means for closest colleague avoidance and immediate boss avoidance. There was a significant difference in the means, \( t = -3.989, p < 0.001 \). This provides supporting evidence that these attachment relationships were significantly different from one another.

**Question #4:** Do attachment relationships with closest colleagues serve as a secure base, contributing to an individual’s ability to form a secure attachment with their work team?
Q4H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team.

Team attachment avoidance was regressed on colleague attachment avoidance. The relationship between colleague attachment avoidance and team attachment avoidance was both positive and significant (p < 0.001). Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.500$, $\beta = 0.456^{***}$) revealed that the less avoidant an individual feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team (Table 6). This suggests that if an individual feels that they can depend on their closest colleague for emotional and psychological intimacy, they will be more likely to feel this same attachment dynamic within their work team.

Q4H2 The less anxious a person feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their work team.

Team attachment anxiety was regressed on colleague attachment anxiety. The relationship between closest colleague attachment anxiety and team anxiety was insignificant.

**Question #5:** Do attachment relationships with immediate bosses serve as a secure base, contributing to an individual's ability to form a secure attachment with their work team?
The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their work colleagues in general.

Team attachment avoidance was regressed on boss attachment avoidance. There is a positive and significant relationship ($p < 0.001$) between boss avoidance and team avoidance. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.500$, $\beta = 0.244^{***}$) revealed that, while closest colleague attachment avoidance has a primary effect on team attachment avoidance, boss attachment avoidance had a secondary effect on team attachment avoidance (Table 6). The less avoidant an individual feels with their boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team. This suggests that if an individual feels that they can depend on their boss, as secondary to their closest colleague, for emotional and psychological intimacy, they will be more likely to feel this same attachment dynamic within their work team.

The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their work colleagues in general.

Team attachment anxiety was regressed on boss attachment anxiety. There is a positive and significant relationship ($p < 0.001$) between team attachment anxiety and boss attachment anxiety. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.237$, $\beta = 0.381^{**}$) revealed that the less anxious an individual feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their work colleagues in
general (Table 7). This suggests that the more an individual can count on acceptance by their boss, the more likely they will feel that same attachment dynamic within their work team. There is of course the possibility that the pattern of causation works in the opposite direction, with people who feel anxious with their colleagues in general being induced to feel anxious with their boss. The hypothesis that the attachment pattern with regards to the immediate boss relationship influences the attachment pattern among colleagues, rather than the other way around, will be addressed in the final chapter.

**Table 7:** Standardized regression coefficients for colleague anxiety, colleague avoidance, boss anxiety, and boss avoidance when regressed upon team anxiety and team avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Team Attachment Avoidance (R²= 0.500)</th>
<th>Team Attachment Anxiety (R²= 0.237)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Avoidance</td>
<td>0.456***</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Avoidance</td>
<td>0.244***</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Anxiety</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.381***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < 0.005

**Question #6:** What relationship, if any, exists between an individual’s attachment relationships with their closest colleague and their organization as a whole?
Q6H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.

The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.

Q6H2 The less anxious a person feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.

**Question #7:** What relationship, if any, exists between the attachment style of a person’s relationship with their immediate boss and the attachment style of their relationship with their organization as a whole?

Q7H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.
The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.

**Q7H2** The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.

**Question #8:** Does having a more secure attachment relationship with one’s work colleagues in general facilitate a more secure relationship with one’s work organization as a whole?

**Q8H1** The less avoidant a person feels with their work team, the less avoidant they will feel with their organization as a whole.

The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.
The less anxious a person feels with their work team, the less anxious they will feel with their organization as a whole.

The researcher was unable to extract two factors, one for avoidance and another for anxiety, from the data related to the questions measuring organizational attachment.

**Summary of Findings**

Listed below in Table 8 is a complete set of hypotheses for Study 1 along with the corresponding results. This study was successful in its attempt to create initial measures at various organizational levels along the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance: closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team. In addition, individual attachment style was successfully classified according to the four-category model of attachment style (Bartholomew and Horowitz 1991). The four attachment styles of Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, and Fearful occurred in similar proportions to the original attachment classification studies conducted on romantic partners by Hazen and Shaver (1987). In the process of analyzing the relationships between the various levels of organizational attachment, regression analyses revealed that avoidance with one’s closest colleague was the biggest predictor of experiencing avoidance with one’s work team. In addition, anxiety experienced with one’s immediate boss was the biggest predictor of anxiety experienced within one’s work team.
This study was unable to successfully create attachment measures along the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance with regards to the attachment relationship between an individual and their work organization on a whole. In contrast with questions asked with regards to attachment relationships with specific individuals within the work organization (immediate boss, closest colleague and work team), the reference to one’s attachment relationship with their work organization as an abstract entity did not yield significant results. In addition, the attachment measures along the anxiety dimension, specifically with regards to attachment anxiety experienced with one’s immediate boss did not yield very robust measures with only two items loading highly on this factor. Finally, while measuring attachment along the individual level of analysis proved to be a successful endeavor, the categorical model of classifying attachment styles was difficult to utilize within the research analysis. It proved difficult to relate individual attachment to the other levels of organizational attachment since the data for closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team attachment was analyzed according to the two dimensional model of attachment. Therefore the researcher was unable to characterize the relationship between individual style of attachment with the attachment style developed with one’s closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team.

Table 8: Hypotheses for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses for Study 1 and Study 2</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1H1</strong>: individual attachment style can be classified as Secure, Avoidant, Preoccupied, or Fearful</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2H1</strong>: individual’s relationship with closest colleague is a combination of two factors: anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Relationship with Immediate Boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H2</td>
<td>Anxiety and avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H3</td>
<td>Anxiety and avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H4</td>
<td>Anxiety and avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3H1</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3H2</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4H1</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4H2</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5H1</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5H2</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6H1</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6H2</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7H1</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7H2</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8H1</td>
<td>Less avoidance than with work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8H2</td>
<td>Less anxiety than with work team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 4: Study 2 Research Questions, Hypotheses, Methods and Results

The second study was most importantly an attempt to further refine the first study’s attachment measures of closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team attachment. Particular attention was paid to creating more robust measures with respect to attachment anxiety, which the first study’s measures did not tap into very well. The second study also provided an opportunity to include an instrument for measuring an individual’s general attachment style based on the two dimensions of avoidance and anxiety. A short four category measure of individual attachment had been included in the first study but proved too cumbersome to relate to the other data gathered. In addition, the second study provided an opportunity to explore the relationships among the attachment styles at the various organizational levels noted above, and in addition to leadership style, and in particular, to analyze whether attachment style was related to transformational leadership, as suggested in the literature (Popper and Mayseless 2003).

In the following section, the specific research questions and hypotheses, as well as methods and results for the second study are presented. In addition, a series of working hypotheses about how the study results might answer each question are included.
**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**Question #1:** While the first study focused largely on the relationship between two kinds of interpersonal attachments and their effect on an individual's relationship with colleagues in general, this follow-up study included systematic attention to the effect of people's individual attachment styles on their relationships with each of those larger systems. Bowlby (1979) suggested that as children, individuals develop a particular attachment style based on whether they experience the primary attachment relationship with their mother as secure or insecure. He also theorized that this attachment style acts as a blueprint for subsequent relationships. It can be changed through other powerful caregiver relationships the individual develops, but it can also predominate through adulthood if other important relationships where the caregiver fosters a different attachment style do not develop. The first study provided evidence to suggest that regardless of the causes, individuals do develop different kinds of attachment relationships with organization members. Here we ask whether an individual's general attachment style is reflected in his/her relationship with 1) their closest colleague, 2) their immediate boss, and 3) their workgroup. The relationship between the individual's general attachment style and their relationship with their organization as a whole was not explored in Study 2 since the data in Study 1 suggested that people do not develop an attachment style with their organization as a whole that can be measured as a combination of different levels of avoidance and anxiety.
Each of the hypotheses below posits a positive relationship between the individual’s general attachment style and what they are currently experiencing in a particular relationship at work. However, the researcher’s underlying hypothesis is that the more choice people have in picking the other partner in a relationship, the more likely they will be to pick someone who fits their general individual attachment style. Therefore one would expect the most evidence for the relationship between an individual’s general attachment style and their relationship with their closest colleague, and the least evidence for a relationship between an individual’s general attachment style and their relationship with their boss.

**Q1H1** There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment anxiety and the attachment anxiety experienced with a closest colleague.

**Q1H2** Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with a closest colleague than with people in general.

**Q1H3** There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment anxiety and the attachment anxiety they experience with their work team.

**Q1H4** Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than they do with their work team.
Q1H5 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment anxiety and the attachment anxiety they experience with an immediate boss.

Q1H6 Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than they do with their immediate boss.

Q1H7 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with a closest colleague.

Q1H8 Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with a closest colleague than they do with people in general.

Q1H9 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with their work team.

Q1H10 Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than they do with their work team.

Q1H11 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with an immediate boss.
Q1H12 Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than they do with their immediate boss.

**Question #2:** What is the relationship between the attachment style a person experiences in their relationship with their boss, and the extent to which that person will rate their boss as a transformational leader? Popper et al (2000) have argued that leader-led relationships are much like parent-child relationships and that there is a positive relationship between the extent to which a leader rates her/himself as having a secure general attachment style, and the extent to which that person will be rated by others as a transformational leader. Based on this reasoning, the researcher would hypothesize that in this study, people who experience a secure relationship with their immediate boss, also view this person as a transformational leader?

Q2H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transformational leadership style.

Q2H2 The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transformational leadership style.

**Question #3:** To what extent, if at all, do people who experience an insecure relationship with their immediate boss, also view this person as a transactional leader? Popper et al (2000) have argued that there is a positive relationship
between the extent to which an individual has an insecure attachment style, in
general, and the extent to which that person will be rated by others as a
transactional leader. The following hypotheses are in line with this proposition.

**Q3H1** The more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more
likely are they to rate the boss as having a transactional leadership style.

**Q3H2** The more anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more
likely are they to rate the boss as having a transactional leadership style.

**Question #4:** To what extent, if at all, do people who experience having an
insecure relationship with their immediate boss, also view that person as a
laissez-faire leader? From the lens of attachment theory, one might argue that
laissez-faire leadership involves the leader’s unavailability to the subordinate.
This might be fine for individuals with a highly secure individual attachment style
or those with highly avoidant styles who deny the need for strong interpersonal
relationships. On the other hand, it might be threatening for those who are
feeling the need for support and sensitivity on an ongoing basis. In line with this
argument we hypothesize that there is a positive relationship between
experiencing relationship with one’s boss and rating this person as a laissez-faire
leader.
Q4H1 The more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as someone who is a laissez-faire leader.

Q4H2 The more anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as someone who is a laissez-faire leader.

**Methods**

The second study was an attempt to further refine the measures created in the first study to assess closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team attachment. Specifically, particular attention was given to creating more robust measures for attachment anxiety. Measures for individual attachment, based on the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance, were included in the second study. This is in comparison to the forced-choice scale for individual attachment used previously in Study 1. Consequently, the use of a factor analyzed scale for individual attachment anxiety and avoidance allowed the researcher to conduct a comparative analysis of an individual’s general attachment style and their attachment with their closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team. Finally, an attempt is made to gain new insights into the significant role attachment style may play with regards to perceptions of leadership style.

**Assessment Instruments**

Study 2 drew questions from the same instruments used in Study 1: Fraley, Waller, and Brennan’s (2000) Experiences in Close Relationships
Revised (ECR-R); Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991), 4 category attachment style RQ, Relationship Questionnaire; items from the attachment questionnaire created by St. Clair (1994) in her dissertation measuring organizational attachment; and Fraley, Waller and Brennan’s Relationship Structures (RS) questionnaire. The items that were high loading on each dimension after factor analysis and CFA from Study 1 were utilized in Study 2, and items were revised and new items created by the researcher were added, as detailed in the discussion that follows. Leadership measures were added based on Bass and Avolio’s MLQ (5X short) (1993) questionnaire.

**Team Level (coworkers, colleagues).** Two instruments were initially utilized to create this section of the questionnaire measuring attachment at the Team Level: St. Clair’s (1994) questionnaire on organizational attachment; Fraley, Waller, and Brennan’s (2000) Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R). From these two questionnaires, the items remaining after factor analysis and CFA were utilized in the current questionnaire. In addition, items that resulted from the factor analysis and CFA of Fraley, Waller and Brennan’s Relationship Structures (RS) questionnaire, which were not originally utilized at this level of analysis but were included at the interpersonal level (attachment with closest colleague and boss) in the previous questionnaire, were included in the current survey. This was done to include the latest attachment measures tapping into the underlying dimensions of anxiety and avoidance, in addition to creating consistency in the questionnaire utilized at each level of analysis.
The intended purpose of this section of the questionnaire was to measure attachment at the team level. Participants were told that the statements concerned how they generally experienced their colleagues and coworkers within their organization, and did not refer to any specific person, and to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements that followed. This section of the questionnaire consisted of 26 items (17 avoidance items and 9 anxiety items). The statements utilized included statements about feeling towards co-workers and colleagues only. In addition, since the RS questionnaire was not previously utilized at this level of analysis, questions that did not appear to be repeats of questions taken from the ECR-R and St. Clair’s dissertation were also used. The questionnaire for the team level is listed below (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Team Level Questionnaire

The statements below concern how you generally experience your colleagues and coworkers within your organization and do not refer to any specific person.

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. It's easy for me to be honest with my coworkers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
2. I feel confident that I am essential to the success of my work group
3. I worry that I am easily replaceable at work
4. I feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues
5. I enjoy working closely with my colleagues
6. I worry about losing my job
7. I believe my coworkers really understand me
8. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to my coworkers
9. My organization is a place where people can depend on each other
10. I’m afraid that my colleagues don’t really want me around
11. I’m confident that my colleagues really care for me
12. I worry that my coworkers do not like me as much as I like them
13. I’m uncomfortable being close friends with my colleagues
14. I’m comfortable depending upon my coworkers for support
15. I trust my colleagues
16. My coworkers do not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business
17. It helps to turn to my coworkers when I’m in need
18. I talk things over with my colleagues
19. I worry that my coworkers would like for me to be replaced
20. I feel comfortable opening up to my coworkers
21. I’m confident in my professional standing with my work colleagues
22. I’m comfortable going to my coworkers with problems and concerns
23. I prefer not to show my colleagues how I feel deep down
24. I find it easy to depend upon my coworkers
25. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions and feelings with my colleagues
26. My organization is a place where it’s easy for me to offer opinions to my coworkers without fear of being attacked.

Interpersonal Level (closest work colleague and immediate boss).

These two sections of the questionnaire explored the attachment relationships of the participant to their closest colleague and immediate boss, respectively. In the initial survey questions in these two sections of the questionnaire were taken from two sources: Fraley, Waller and Brennan’s Relationship Structures (RS) questionnaire and St. Clair’s attachment questionnaire. From these two questionnaires, items that were high loading on each dimension after factor analysis and CFA were utilized in the current questionnaire. In addition, items that resulted from the factor analysis and CFA of ECR-R items utilized at the team level of analysis, which were not originally utilized at this level of analysis in the previous questionnaire, were incorporated into the current survey.

Participants were asked to think about their relationship with their closest work colleague and then to think about their relationship with their most
immediate boss. For each relationship, they were then asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements that followed. The creation of this section of the questionnaire resulted in 24 items (12 avoidance and 12 anxiety) measuring attachment with one’s closest colleague (Figure 10) and 22 items (11 avoidance and 11 anxiety) measuring attachment with one’s most immediate boss (Figure 11).

Figure 10. Closest Colleague Questionnaire

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your closest work colleague.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree [SD] Neutral [N] Strongly Agree [SA]

1. It helps to turn to this person when I'm in need
2. I talk things over with this person
3. This person doesn't want me to be close friends with them. Everything is strictly business
4. I'm confident that I measure up to this person's expectations
5. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to this person
6. I'm confident that I have this person's respect
7. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person
8. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
9. I worry that this person doesn't like me as much as I like them
10. It's easy for me to be honest with this person about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
11. I'm uncomfortable being close friends with this person
It's easy to offer opinions to this person without fear of being attacked
12. I worry about my relationship with this person
13. I enjoy working closely with this person
14. This person makes me doubt myself
15. I'm confident that I am essential to this person's success
16. I worry that this person will lose interest in me
17. I feel that I do not get the support I need from this person
18. I believe this person really understands me
19. I worry that this person will abandon me
20. I can depend on this person
21. It upsets me that I don't get the regard and support I need from this person
22. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
Figure 11. Immediate Boss Questionnaire

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your most immediate boss.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree [SD] Neutral [N] Strongly Agree [SA]

1. I'm comfortable depending on this person for support
2. It helps to turn to this person when I'm in need
3. I'm afraid that this individual doesn't want me around
4. I talk things over with this individual
5. I worry that this person doesn't like me as much as I like them
6. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
7. I worry about my relationship with this person
8. It's easy for me to be honest with this person about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
9. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
10. I'm confident that I measure up to this person's expectations
11. It's easy to offer my opinions to this individual without fear of being attacked
12. I'm confident that I have this person's respect
13. I feel that I don't get the support I need from this individual
14. I enjoy working closely with this individual
15. I worry that this person will lose interest in me
16. I believe this individual really understands me
17. I worry that this person will abandon me
18. I can depend on this individual
19. It upsets me that I don't receive the regard and support I need from this person
20. I'm confident that I'm essential to this person's success
21. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
22. I'm confident in my professional standing with this individual

Individual Level. In the original survey created (see Study 1), Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) was utilized to measure attachment at the individual level. These authors' measures were based on placing individuals into the four category model of attachment (Secure, Dismissing Avoidant, Preoccupied, and Fearful Avoidant). In the current survey, an attempt was made to break down the paragraphs used to
describe each style into a series of individual statements that could each be rated separately on Likert scales (Figure 12). Since each paragraph description included different combinations of statements that dealt conceptually with the separate underlying dimensions of avoidance and anxiety, this allowed an individual's style to be rated in terms of these two dimensions.

**Figure 12. Individual Level Questionnaire**

Indicate the extent to which the following statements apply to you in close relationships, in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree [SD]</td>
<td>Neutral [N]</td>
<td>Strongly Agree [SA]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I find it relatively easy to get close to others
2. I'm comfortable depending on others
3. I'm comfortable having others depend on me
4. I don't worry about being abandoned
5. I don't worry about someone getting too close to me
6. I'm uncomfortable being close to others
7. I find it difficult to trust others completely
8. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others
9. I'm nervous when anyone gets too close
10. Partners often want to be more intimate than I am comfortable being
11. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like
12. I worry that my partner doesn't love me
13. I worry that my partner will not want to stay with me
14. I want to merge completely with another person
15. My desire to get close to others scares people away
16. I'm uncomfortable getting emotionally close to others
17. I want close relationships but I find it difficult to trust others completely
18. I want close relationships but I find it difficult to depend on others
19. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others

**Leadership Style.** Bass and Avolio’s 45-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X short) (1993) questionnaire (Figure 13) was utilized to assess leadership style. This section of the questionnaire assessed three
leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire).

Participants were asked to assess the style of their most immediate boss by rating how frequently the statements in the MLQ fit that person.

**Figure 13. MLQ 5X Short used to assess Leadership Style.**

The statements below are used to describe the leadership style of your *most immediate boss* as you perceive it. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for advice
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious
4. Focuses attentions on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise
6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs
7. Is absent when needed
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems
9. Talks optimistically about the future
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
15. Spends time teaching and coaching
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved
17. Show that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group
19. Treats me as an individual rather than as a member of a group
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action
21. Acts in a way that builds my respect
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
24. Keeps track of all mistakes
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future
27. Directs my attention towards failures to meet standards
28. Avoids making decisions
29. Considers me a having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles
31. Helps me to develop my strengths
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
33. Delays responding to urgent questions
Participants

Initially, a web link was sent out to 250 graduates of the Master's in Organizational Development Program with an email invitation letter detailing the study. Additional participants were recruited through a snowball effect, by asking initial participants invited to participate in the survey to forward the website link and invited their acquaintances to participate in the survey.

Procedures

The survey was posted online at a university research site and responses to the survey were collected in a secure location that could only be accessed by the researchers. Participation was voluntary and conducted through an online assessment. Participants were informed of the study via an email description with a link to the website. Upon entering the website, participants were provided with an online consent form. In order to complete the survey, respondents were required to indicate that they consented to taking the survey and understood that their responses would remain confidential. Once the consent form was
completed, participants continued on to complete the 149 question survey. With the exception of demographic data collected, the survey consisted of 96 questions derived from various attachment questionnaires, assessing attachment with their colleagues in general, their closest colleague, their boss, and their individual attachment orientation. Participants were asked to rate these statements on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). In addition, they were asked to answer 45 questions regarding the leadership style of their boss. They were asked to rate these statements on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (Not at all) to 4 (Frequently, if not always).

Demographics

Table 9 below outlines the sample characteristics for Study 2. A total of 278 participants completed at least part of the online survey. A total of 65 participants indicated that their boss was also their closest colleague and were set aside for later analysis. The remaining 213 participants became the sample for Study 2 and completed the sections of the survey measuring general attachment with one’s colleagues, their attachment to their closest colleague, and their boss in addition to the questions measuring individual attachment style as well as the questions on their boss’ leadership style.

A total of 193 participants completed the demographics section of the survey. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 68. Of the respondents, 39 indicated that they were graduates of the Master’s program and 170 respondents
heard of the survey through an acquaintance. A total of 25 participants indicated that they worked part-time while 187 indicated that they worked full-time. With regards to the size of the organization they were employed by, 27 indicated a size of 21-100 employees, 41 indicated a size of 101-1,000 employees, 57 a size of 1,000-10,000, and 68 indicated that they worked for an organization of greater than 10,000 people. Regarding job sector, 48 were in education, 46 were in medical/ dental/ health, 25 in manufacturing, 18 were in business service/ consulting, 11 in banking, 15 in government, 9 in insurance/ real estate/ legal, 8 in finance/ accounting, 6 in wholesale/ resale distribution, 6 in marketing/ advertising/ entertaining, 6 research/ development lab, 3 computer related retailer/ wholesaler/ distributor, 2 in data processing services, 2 network/ computer consultant, 1 transportation/ utilities, and 1 construction/ architecture/ engineering. With regards to length of employment with their current employer 29 indicated less than 1 year, 44 indicated 1-2 years, 38 indicated 3-5 years, 48 indicated 5-10 years, 20 indicated 11-15 years, 12 indicated 16-20 years, 22 indicated more than 20 years. With regards to race, 180 were Caucasian/ White, 11 African-American, 10 Asian/ Pacific Islander, 4 Hispanic, 3 Multiracial, and 5 indicated that they would rather not say. In terms of gender, 131 were female and 81 were male.
### Table 9: Sample Characteristics for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Program Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-1,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-10,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Dental/Health</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Service Consulting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance/Real Estate/Legal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Accounting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Resale Distribution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Advertising/Entertainment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Development Lab</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer/Wholesaler/Distributor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network/Computer Consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Architecture/Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

In the section below each hypothesis is restated along with the result that either supported or refuted it.

**Question #1:** The four attachment styles identified by Hazen and Shaver (1987) and others can be conceived as combinations of low and high levels of avoidance and anxiety. Are these same combinations of low and high anxiety and avoidance found when assessing individual attachment style, the respective attachment styles of an organization member’s ongoing relationships with their closest colleague, their immediate boss, and their work team?

Each hypothesis related to question 1 was analyzed in a very similar fashion. With regards to analyzing the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance at the individual, closest colleague, boss, and work team levels of analysis, the initial frequencies were run on all items in each section of the questionnaire (questions regarding attachment to closest colleague, boss, and work). Any item with a standard deviation >1, or non-normal distribution, or abnormal kurtosis (≥ 9), or highly skewed (≥ 3) was taken out of the analysis. All avoidance and anxiety items were correlated with one another. Items that did not correlate significantly or were negatively correlated with one another were taken out of the analysis. Factor analyses for all remaining avoidance and anxiety items were conducted. All items were required to have a primary loading of no less than 0.4 or 0.5 and a secondary loading of < 0.3.
An individual’s attachment style can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

An initial exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1) with 10 items (4 anxiety, 6 avoidance) that explained 53% of the variance. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted and an acceptable fit was achieved by dropping 1 anxiety item (IANX6) and 1 avoidance item (IAV2) from the model. The final model produced the following fit statistics: $\chi^2 = 32.459, p < 0.05$, PNFI = 0.952, IFI = 0.980, CFI = 0.979, RMSEA = 0.058. Although the $\chi^2$ was significant, other indicators of comparative fit (e.g., CFI) and parsimony (e.g., PNFI) suggested that the hypothesized measurement model fit the data reasonably well.

Following confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), a second EFA with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 57% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the individual level. The items remaining after factor analysis had good Cronbach’s alpha’s (0.79) for individual avoidance items, and (0.73) for individual anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provides supporting evidence that an individual’s attachment orientation can be characterized as consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.
Table 10: Pattern matrix for individual attachment anxiety and avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IANX2</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IANX3</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IANX4</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV1</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV4</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV5</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV7</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV8</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization
a Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Individual avoidance (Cronbach’s α = 0.726)
IAV1: I find it relatively easy to get close to others (Reverse Coded).
IAV4: I don’t worry about someone getting too close to me (Reverse Coded)
IAV5: I’m uncomfortable being close to others.
IAV7: I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others.
IAV8: I’m nervous when anyone gets too close.

Individual anxiety (Cronbach’s α = 0.794)
IANX2: I worry that my partner doesn’t love me
IANX3: I worry that my partner will not stay with me
IANX4: My desire to get close to others scares people away

Q1H2 An organization member’s relationship with their closest colleague can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

An initial EFA with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1) with 18 items (7 anxiety, 11 avoidance) that explained 51% of the variance. CFA was conducted and an acceptable fit was achieved by dropping 2 anxiety items (CANX1, CANX10) and 7 avoidance item (CAV1, CAV2, CAV4, CAV6, CAV9, CAV11, CAV13) from the model. The final model produced the following fit statistics: $\chi^2 = 53.337$, $p < 0.01$, PNFI = 0.940, IFI = 0.969, CFI = 0.968,
RMSEA = 0.070. Although the $\chi^2$ was significant, other indicators of comparative fit (e.g., CFI) and parsimony (e.g., PNFI) suggested that the hypothesized measurement model fit the data reasonably well.

Following CFA, a second EFA with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 56% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the closest colleague level. The remaining items had good Cronbach’s alpha’s (0.86) for closest colleague avoidance items, and (0.87) for closest colleague anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provide supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with their closest colleague can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.

**Table 11:** Pattern matrix for closest colleague attachment anxiety and avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C_ANX2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_ANX3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_ANX4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_ANX7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_ANX8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_AV7</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_AV8</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_AV10</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_AV12</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization $^a$ Rotation converged in 3 iterations
Colleague avoidance (Cronbach’s α = 0.815)
CAV7: It’s easy for me to be honest with this person about my ideas, opinions, and feelings. (Reverse Coded)
CAV8: It’s easy to offer opinions to this person without fear of being attacked. (Reverse Coded)
CAV10: I enjoy working closely with this person. (Reverse Coded)
CAV12: I can depend on this person. (Reverse Coded)

Colleague anxiety (Cronbach’s α = 0.866)
CANX2: I worry that this person doesn’t like me as much as I like them.
CANX3: I worry about my relationship with this person.
CANX4: This person makes me doubt myself.
CANX7: I worry that this person will lose interest in me.
CANX8: I worry that this person will abandon me.

Q1H3 An organization member’s relationship with their immediate boss can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

An initial EFA analysis with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), with 20 items (10 anxiety, 10 avoidance) that explained 65% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the immediate boss level. CFA was conducted and an acceptable fit was achieved by dropping 6 anxiety items (BANX1, BANX2, BANX5, BANX8, BANX10, and BANX11) and 4 avoidance items (BAV1, BAV3, BAV5, BAV7) from the model. The final model produced the following fit statistics: $\chi^2 = 64.147$, $p < 0.01$, PNFI = 0.955, IFI = 0.971, CFI = 0.978, RMSEA = 0.065. Although the $\chi^2$ was significant, other indicators of comparative fit (e.g., CFI) and parsimony (e.g., PNFI) suggested that the hypothesized measurement model fit the data reasonably well.

Following CFA, a second EFA with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 65% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the closest colleague.
level. The remaining items had high Cronbach’s alpha’s (0.86 for closest colleague avoidance items, 0.87 for closest colleague anxiety items). The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provides supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with their immediate boss can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.

Table 12: Pattern matrix for immediate boss attachment anxiety and avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_ANX3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_ANX4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_ANX6</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_ANX9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV2</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV4</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV6</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV8</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV9</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_AV10</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization
a  Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Boss avoidance (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.932$)
BAV2: It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need (Reverse Coded)
BAV4: I feel comfortable opening up to this person (Reverse Coded)
BAV6: I’m confident I measure up to this person’s expectations (Reverse Coded)
BAV8: I enjoy working closely with this individual (Reverse Coded)
BAV9: I believe this individual really understands me (Reverse Coded)
BAV10: I can depend on this individual (Reverse Coded)

Boss anxiety (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.828$)
BANX3: I worry about my relationship with this person
BANX4: I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
BANX6: I’m confident that I measure up to this person’s expectations (Reverse Coded)
BANX9: I worry that this person will abandon me.
An organization member’s relationship with their work team can be measured as a combination of different levels of two underlying factors: anxiety and avoidance.

An initial EFA analysis with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), with 22 items (7 anxiety, 15 avoidance) that explained 43% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the work team level. CFA was conducted and an acceptable fit was achieved by dropping 3 anxiety item (TANX3, TANX4, TANX9) and 5 avoidance items (TAV2, TAV6, TAV7, TAV11, TAV17) from the model. The final model produced the following fit statistics: \( \chi^2 = 126.007, p < 0.01, \) PNFI = 0.906, IFI = 0.961, CFI = 0.960, RMSEA = 0.056. Although the \( \chi^2 \) was significant, other indicators of comparative fit (e.g., CFI) and parsimony (e.g., PNFI) suggested that the hypothesized measurement model fit the data reasonably well.

Following CFA, a second EFA analysis with promax rotation yielded two main factors (eigenvalue >1), one for anxiety and one for avoidance, that explained 49% of the variance for the items measuring attachment at the team level. The items remaining after factor analysis had good Cronbach's alpha's (0.90) for team avoidance items, and (0.73) for team anxiety items. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provides supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with their work team can be characterized as an
attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance.

**Table 13:** Pattern matrix for work team attachment anxiety and avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_ANX3</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_ANX5</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_ANX6</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_ANX8</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV1</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV3</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV4</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV5</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV10</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV12</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV13</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV14</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV15</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_AV16</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization
a Rotation converged in 3 iterations

Team avoidance (Cronbach’s α = 0.898)
- TAV1: It’s easy for me to be honest with my coworkers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings.
- TAV3: I feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV4: I enjoy working closely with my colleagues. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV5: I believe my coworkers really understand me. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV10: I’m comfortable depending on my coworkers for support (Reverse Coded)
- TAV12: I talk things over with my colleagues. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV13: I feel comfortable opening up to my colleagues. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV14: I’m comfortable going to my coworkers with problems and concerns. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV15: I find it easy to depend on my coworkers. (Reverse Coded)
- TAV16: I prefer not to show my colleagues how I feel deep down.

Team anxiety (Cronbach’s α = 0.726)
- TANX3: I worry about losing my job.
- TANX5: I’m afraid that my colleagues don’t really want me around.
- TANX6: I worry that my colleagues don’t like me as much as I like them.
- TANX8: I worry that my coworkers would like me to be replaced.

**Question #2:** What is the relationship between individual attachment style and attachment to boss, closest colleague, and work team?
Q2H1 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment style anxiety and the attachment anxiety experienced with a closest colleague.

In this second study, there was a positive and significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship between the level of anxiety a person normally experiences in relationships, in general, and the level of anxiety she/he experiences in a relationship with a closest colleague (Table 14). This provides support for the argument that individual attachment anxiety impacts the attachment anxiety experienced with a closest colleague.

Table 14: Correlations for individual and closest colleague attachment anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind ANX</th>
<th>Coll ANX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind ANX Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.381(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind ANX Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll ANX Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.381(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll ANX Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll ANX N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q2H2 Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with a closest colleague than with people in general.

In general, based on the lower mean for attachment anxiety with a closest colleague as compared to individual attachment anxiety, one can argue that individuals tend to find their relationship with their closest colleague at work to be
more secure than how they characterize their relationships in general (Table 15). This indicates that closest colleague relationships are very important sources of security in the workplace. One’s closest colleague often is the closest thing one has to a secure base in the workplace, and one can imagine that people use this relationship to “process” (interpret, talk through) a great deal of their organizational experience.

A Fischer’s test was conducted comparing the avoidance and anxiety means at the individual, closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team levels. There was a significant difference in the means, \( F = 65.959, p < 0.001 \). This provides supporting evidence that the attachment relationships are significantly different from one another

Table 15: Results (mean, standard deviation) from one-way ANOVA (\( p < 0.001 \)) for individual, closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team attachment anxiety and avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Closest Colleague</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Work Team</th>
<th>Immediate Boss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>1.80, 0.877</td>
<td>2.04, 1.20</td>
<td>2.25, 0.969</td>
<td>2.57, 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>2.00, 0.933</td>
<td>2.96, 1.04</td>
<td>3.09, 0.983</td>
<td>3.55, 1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2H3 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment anxiety and the attachment anxiety they experience with their work team.

There is a positive and significant (\( p < 0.05 \)) relationship between the level of anxiety an individual is used to experiencing in relationships in general and the level of anxiety she/he experiences in his/her relationship with work colleagues.
as a group (Table 16). While there is limited choice over who one’s colleagues are at work, individuals arguably have some ability to choose a closest colleague to interact with among the pool of colleagues available and will have a good likelihood of finding someone with whom they feel especially secure.

**Table 16: Correlations for individual and team attachment anxiety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind ANX</th>
<th>Team ANX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind ANX Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.316(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team ANX Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.316(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q2H4 Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than they do with their work team.

Based on the higher means for team attachment anxiety as compared to individual attachment anxiety, one can argue that individuals tend to find their relationships with their work colleagues in general less secure than how they characterize their relationships in general, but not as insecure as their relationships with their immediate bosses (Table 15). This may be due to the fact that individuals have less choice about whom they relate to among their work colleagues than they do among people in general but more choice than they have about their interaction with their immediate boss. The mean avoidance and anxiety scores at the team level were higher (more avoidant, more anxious) than
they were at the individual level but also lower (closer, less anxious) than they were for immediate boss.

**Q2H5** There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment anxiety and the attachment anxiety they experience with an immediate boss.

There is a small but significant and positive relationship between the level of anxiety a person is used to experiencing in relationships in general and the level of anxiety she/he experiences in his/her relationship with an immediate boss (Table 17). Therefore, one can argue that to the extent the subordinate tends to have an anxious attachment style to begin with, this will be brought out in the boss/subordinate relationship.

**Table 17:** Correlations for individual and boss attachment anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind ANX</th>
<th>Boss ANX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ind ANX</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boss ANX</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.180(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Q2H6** Individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than they do with their immediate boss.

In general, based on the lower mean for individual attachment anxiety as compared to boss attachment anxiety, individuals tend to find their relationship
with their immediate boss less secure than how they characterize their relationships in general (Table 15). This makes sense if one considers the fact that adults typically have less choice in who is to be their immediate boss at work than they do in picking partners in general. The means for both avoidance and anxiety for immediate boss are higher than they are for individual’s attachment style in relationships in general.

Q2H7 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with a closest colleague.

There is a positive and significant (p <0.01) relationship between the level of avoidance an individual is used to experiencing in relationships in general and the level of avoidance she/he experiences in a relationship with a closest colleague (Table 18). This may be because people take their individual attachment styles with them into the workplace, and when they have a choice, one might argue that they will find individuals with whom they can relate with in the manner they are used to.
Table 18: Correlations for individual and closest colleague attachment avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind AV</th>
<th>Coll AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.312(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q2H8 Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with a closest colleague than they do with people in general.

Based on lower means for closest colleague attachment anxiety, one can argue that individuals tend to find their relationship with their closest colleague at work to be even more secure than how they characterize their relationships in general (Table 15). This encourages one to conclude that closest colleague relationships are very important sources of security in the workplace. One’s closest colleague often is the closest thing one has to a secure base in the workplace, and one can imagine that people use this relationship to “process” (interpret, talk through) a great deal of their organizational experience.

Q2H9 There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with their work team.

There is a positive and significant (p <0.01) relationship between the level of avoidance a person is used to experiencing in relationships in general and the
level of avoidance she/he experiences in his/her relationship with work colleagues as a group (Table 19). This may be due to the fact that while there is a limited amount of choice of the colleagues at work they are able to choose to interact with, they have some choice over who those individuals are and they will most likely find several people to interact with that is similar to them in attachment style.

Table 19: Correlations for individual and team attachment avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind AV</th>
<th>Team AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ind AV Pearson Correlation | 1 | .372(**)
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000
| N | 213 | 213 |
| Team AV Pearson Correlation | .372(**)
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000
| N | 213 | 213 |

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

Q2H10 Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than they do with their work team.

Based on the higher means for team attachment avoidance, individuals tend to find their relationships with their work colleagues in general less secure than how they characterize their relationships in general, but not as insecure as their relationships with their immediate bosses (Table 15). This possibly is because they have less choice about whom they relate to among their work colleagues than they do among people in general but more choice than they have about their interaction with their immediate boss. The mean avoidance and anxiety scores at the team level were higher (more avoidant, more anxious) than
they were at the individual level but also lower (closer, less anxious) than they were for immediate boss.

**Q2H11** There is a positive relationship between an individual’s general attachment avoidance and the attachment avoidance they experience with an immediate boss.

There is a negative and insignificant relationship between the level of avoidance a person is used to experiencing in relationships in general and the level of avoidance she/he experiences in his/her relationship with an immediate boss (Table 20). An important reason for this might be that individuals have little choice over who their immediate boss is and therefore cannot pick a leader with a style that is either similar to or more secure than their own.

**Table 20:** Correlations for individual and boss attachment avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ind AV</th>
<th>Boss AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ind AV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boss AV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1H12** Individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than they do with their immediate boss.
Based on the higher means for boss attachment anxiety, individuals tend to find their relationship with their immediate boss less secure than how they characterize their relationships in general (Table 15). This seems reasonable if one considers the fact that adults typically have less choice in who is to be their immediate boss at work than they do in picking partners in general. The means for both avoidance and anxiety for immediate boss are higher than they are for individual’s attachment style in relationships in general.

**Question #3:** Is the attachment relationship with one’s closest colleague different from the attachment relationship with one’s boss with respect to the mean scores on the dimension of avoidance and anxiety?

The following hypotheses from Study 1 were retested in the second study, using improvements and a larger sample.

**Table 21:** Results (mean, standard deviation) from t-test ($t = -8.837, p < 0.001$) for closest colleague and immediate boss attachment avoidance and anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CC_ANX</th>
<th>Boss_ANX</th>
<th>CC_AV</th>
<th>Boss_AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3H1** People tend to experience less anxiety in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.
The data from Study 2 supported the findings from Study 1 with regards to this question. On a scale of 1 to 7, closest colleague anxiety averaged a mean of 1.60 with a standard deviation of 0.877, while boss anxiety averaged a mean of 2.25 and a standard deviation of 1.25. This is indicative of a slightly higher level of attachment anxiety with a boss as compared to the relationship with a closest colleague. This is not surprising since one normally has more choice over the person they consider their closest colleague as compared to an immediate boss. In addition, the slightly greater standard deviation associated with boss as compared with closest colleague supports the idea that one can choose their closest colleague, while a boss is someone that one has no control over. Therefore their will be more variation in terms of how anxious the attachment is with their boss as compared to their closest colleague.

A paired sample t-test was conducted comparing the means for closest colleague anxiety and immediate boss anxiety. There was a significant difference in the means, $t = -8.837$, $p < 0.001$. This provides supporting evidence that these attachment relationships are significantly different from one another.

**Q3H2** People tend to experience less avoidance in their relationship with a closest colleague than they do with their immediate boss.

The data from Study 2 supported the findings of Study 1 with regards to this question. On a scale of 1 to 7, closest colleague avoidance averaged a
mean of 2.00 with a standard deviation of 0.933, while boss avoidance averaged a mean of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 1.48. This is indicative of a higher level of attachment avoidance with a boss as compared to the relationship with a closest colleague. Once again, this is not surprising since one normally has more choice over the person they consider their closest colleague as compared to an immediate boss. The mean for boss avoidance is near the middle of the scale. Therefore, half of the people appear happy with their bosses while the other half are not. In addition, the slightly greater standard deviation associated with boss as compared with closest colleague supports the idea that one can choose their closest colleague, while a boss is someone that one has no control over. Therefore their will be greater variation in terms of how much avoidance is associated with the attachment with a boss as compared to a closest colleague.

A paired sample t-test was conducted comparing the means for closest colleague avoidance and immediate boss avoidance. There was a significant difference in the means, $t = 12.439$, $p < 0.001$. This provided supporting evidence that the attachment relationships are significantly different from one another.

**Question #4:** Do attachment relationships with closest colleagues serve as a secure base, contributing to an individual’s ability to form a secure attachment with their work team?
The following hypotheses from Study 1 were retested in the second study, using improvements and a larger sample.

Q4H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team.

Team attachment avoidance was regressed on colleague attachment avoidance. Regression coefficients (R² = 0.453, β = 0.352***). revealed that the less avoidant an individual feels with their closest colleague, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team (Table 22). This suggests that if an individual feels that they can depend on their closest colleague for emotional and psychological intimacy, they will be more likely to feel this same attachment dynamic within their work team. A secondary potential influencing factor allowing for this closeness and sense of attachment with your team is whether an individual’s boss (R² = 0.453, β = 0.342***)) is psychologically available to them and they sense a feeling of closeness and intimacy with that person as well. Since an individual has greater influence over who their closest colleague as compared to who their boss is, it makes sense that their sense of closeness to their closest colleague would have a greater influence over how close they feel to their work team. In addition to that, if they have a boss who allows for a sense of closeness and psychological availability to them, this is secondary but nonetheless might be a significant contributor to their sense of closeness with their work team. Finally, individual attachment (R² = 0.453, β = 0.277***)
developed from childhood, is potentially an added influence on team avoidance, and one’s ability to depend upon their work team.

**Q4H2** The less anxious a person feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their work team.

Team attachment anxiety was regressed on colleague attachment anxiety. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.424$, $\beta = 0.366^{***}$) revealed that the less anxious an individual feels with their closest colleague, the less anxious they will feel with their work colleagues in general (Table 22). This indicates that the more an individual can count on acceptance by their closest colleague, the more likely they will feel that same attachment dynamic within their work team.

**Table 22:** Standardized regression coefficients from regression of team anxiety and team avoidance on colleague anxiety, colleague avoidance, boss anxiety, and boss avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Team Attachment Avoidance ($R^2 = 0.453$)</th>
<th>Team Attachment Anxiety ($R^2 = 0.424$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Avoidance</td>
<td>0.277***</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Anxiety</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Avoidance</td>
<td>0.352***</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Anxiety</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.366***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Avoidance</td>
<td>0.342***</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Anxiety</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.417***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length Closest Colleague</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ***p < 0.005
**Question #5**: Do attachment relationships with immediate bosses serve as a secure base, contributing to an individual's ability to form a secure attachment with their work team?

The following hypotheses from Study 1 were retested in the second study, using improvements and a larger sample.

**Q5H1** The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team.

Team attachment avoidance was regressed on boss attachment avoidance. Regression coefficients ($R^2= 0.453, \beta= 0.342^{***}$) revealed that, while closest colleague attachment avoidance has a primary effect on team attachment avoidance, boss attachment avoidance had a secondary effect on team attachment avoidance (Table 22). The less avoidant an individual feels with their boss, the less avoidant they will feel with their work team. This suggests that if an individual feels that they can depend on their boss, as secondary to their closest colleague, for emotional and psychological intimacy, they will be more likely to feel this same attachment dynamic within their work team.

**Q5H2** The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their work team.
Team attachment anxiety was regressed on boss attachment anxiety. Regression coefficients \((R^2 = 0.424, \beta = 0.417***\) revealed that the less anxious an individual feels with their immediate boss, the less anxious they will feel with their work colleagues in general (Table 22). This indicates that the more an individual can count on acceptance by their immediate boss, the more likely they will feel that same attachment dynamic within their work team. As stated in Q4H2 above, a secondary potential influencing factor allowing for decreased attachment anxiety with one’s work team is whether an individual feels a decreased sense of anxiety with their closest colleague \((R^2 = 0.424, \beta = 0.366***\).

**Question #6:** Popper et al (2000) have argued that leader-led relationships are much like parent-child relationships and that there is a positive relationship between the extent to which an individual has a secure attachment style, in general, and the extent to which that person will be rated by others as a transformational leader. Based on this reasoning, to what extent, if at all, do people who experience a secure relationship with their immediate boss, also view this person as a transformational leader?

An initial exploratory factor analysis of Bass and Avolio’s MLQ with promax rotation yielded three main factors (eigenvalue >1) with 36 items (24 items related to transformational leadership, 4 items related to transactional leadership, 8 items related to laissez-faire leadership) that explained 49% of the variance for the items measuring leadership. CFA was conducted and an
acceptable fit was achieved by dropping 1 transactional leadership item (MEA2), 14 transformational leadership items (IIA1, IIA4, IIB1, IIB2, IIB4, IM2, IM3, IM4, IS1, IS3, IC3, IC4, CR2, CR3) and 5 laissez-faire leadership items (MEP1, MEP2, MEP3, MEP4, LF3) from the model. The final model produced the following fit statistics: $\chi^2 = 156.648$, $p < 0.01$, PNFI = 0.910, IFI = 0.966, CFI = 0.966, RMSEA = 0.051. Although the $\chi^2$ was significant, other indicators of comparative fit (e.g., CFI) and parsimony (e.g., PNFI) suggested that the hypothesized measurement model fit the data reasonably well.

Following CFA, a second EFA analysis with promax rotation yielded three main factors (eigenvalue >1) for the items assessing leadership (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) that explained 54% of the variance for the items measuring attachment to one’s closest colleague. The items remaining after factor analysis had high Cronbach’s alpha’s (0.92 for transformational leadership items, 0.81 for transactional leadership items, and 0.74 for laissez-faire leadership items).

Interestingly, the factor analysis results differed from Bass and Avolio’s in two ways, both of which involved taking one of the elements out of those comprising Transactional Leadership and putting it into either transformational or laissez Faire Leadership. Bass and Avolio characterized transactional leadership as comprising three elements: Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (Active) and Management-by-Exception (Passive). Together the three elements
present a picture of transactional Leaders as engaging in both constructive (Contingent Reward) and corrective (Management-by-Exception) behaviors. In the current study, it appears that the respondents associated Contingent Reward behaviors with Transformational Leadership, and Management-by-Exception behaviors of a passive variety (not taking action until things are really bad) with Laissez Faire Leadership. This left the Transactional leadership cluster with only one element, Management-by-Exception (Active), involving a focus on identifying and correcting mistakes. One might view this as punitive form of transactional leadership where the focus is on the idea that living up to the letter of a contract is all that matters.

Table 23: Pattern matrix for transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA2</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA3</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB3</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM1</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS2</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS4</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC1</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC2</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
Transformational Leadership (Cronbach’s α = .917)
IIA2: Goes beyond self interest for the good of the group
IIA3: Acts in a way that builds my respect
IIB3: Considers the moral and ethical consequences of a decision.
IM1: Talks optimistically about the future
IS2: Seeks different perspectives when solving problems
IS4: Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
IC1: Spends time teaching and coaching
IC2: Treats me as an individual rather than as a member of a group.
CR1: Provides me with assistance in exchange for advice
CR4: Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations

Transactional Leadership (Cronbach’s α = .805)
(Management-by-Exception [Active])
MEA1: Focuses attentions on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards
MEA3: Keeps track of all mistakes
MEA4: Directs my attention towards failures to meet standards

Laissez-Faire Leadership (Cronbach’s α = .742)
LF1: Avoids getting involved when important issues arise
LF2: Is absent when needed
LF4: Delays responding to urgent questions

Q6H1 The less avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transformational leadership style.

The transformational leadership variable was regressed on boss attachment avoidance. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.623$, $\beta = -0.690^{***}$) revealed that the less avoidant an individual feels with their immediate boss, the more likely they are to rate their boss as having a transformational leadership style. The biggest predictor of whether you experience your boss as transformational as a leader is whether you experience them as being psychologically available to you, allowing for a sense of closeness and dependency on them (Table 22). Transformational leaders influence followers by changing their awareness of what’s important and by inspiring them to view their reality in a different way. Transformational leaders are proactive, work to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation. They
look beyond merely meeting expectations. They have the ability to inspire followers to aim for higher level goals including moral and ethical ideals.

**Q6H2** The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transformational leadership style.

The scale for transformational leadership was regressed on boss attachment anxiety. The relationship between transformational leadership and boss attachment anxiety was insignificant (Table 22).

**Table 24:** Standardized regression coefficients for transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership (R² = 0.623)</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership (R² = 0.356)</th>
<th>Laissez-Faire Leadership (R² = 0.356)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Avoidance</td>
<td>-0.690***</td>
<td>0.501***</td>
<td>0.501***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Anxiety</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Avoidance</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Anxiety</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.217***</td>
<td>0.217***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Length</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question #7:** Popper et al (2000) have argued that there is a positive relationship between the extent to which an individual has an insecure attachment style, in general, and the extent to which that person will be rated by others as a transactional leader. To what extent, if at all, do people who
experience an insecure relationship with their immediate boss, also view this person as a transactional leader?

Q7H1 The more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transactional leadership style.

The transactional leadership variable was regressed on boss attachment avoidance. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.356$, $\beta = 0.501^{***}$) revealed that the more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss the more likely they are to view them as having a transactional leadership style. The biggest predictor of whether an individual experiences their boss as a transactional leader is the extent to which you experience them as being psychologically unavailable to you, preventing a sense of closeness and dependency on them (Table 22). This is heightened in the current study by the fact that the transactional leadership items focused on corrections in violating agreements and nothing else.

A secondary influence on whether someone sees their leader as transactional is the level of anxiety an individual experiences within their work team ($R^2 = 0.356$, $\beta = 0.217^{***}$). This would occur when an individual does not feel or experience a sense of acceptance and belonging to their work team. It would make sense that a transactional leader would not help to cultivate a sense of belonging and acceptance within a team since only certain behaviors are rewarded. Therefore it would be divisive to a team to have a transactional
leader. Only certain behaviors are rewarded and therefore only certain people are rewarded.

**Q7H2** The more anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as having a transactional leadership style.

The variable for transactional leadership was regressed on boss attachment anxiety. The relationship between transactional leadership and boss attachment anxiety was insignificant (Table 22).

**Question #8:** From the lens of attachment theory, one can argue that laissez-faire leadership amounts to not being there to have a relationship with the subordinate. Therefore, the attribution of laissez-faire leadership will most likely be negatively correlated with low anxiety and positively correlated with high avoidance in the attachment relationship the individual experiences with their immediate boss. To what extent, if at all, do individuals who experience their attachment relationship with their immediate boss as low on attachment anxiety and high on attachment avoidance, also view this person as a laissez-faire leader?

**Q8H1** The more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as someone who is a laissez-faire leader.
The laissez-faire leadership variable was regressed on boss attachment avoidance. Regression coefficients ($R^2 = 0.356$, $\beta = 0.501^{***}$) revealed that the more avoidant a person feels with their immediate boss the more likely they are to view them as having a laissez-faire leadership style. The biggest predictor of whether an individual experiences their boss as a laissez-faire leader is whether or not you experience them as being psychologically unavailable to you, preventing a sense of closeness and dependency on them (Table 22). This is heightened in the current study by the fact that the transactional leadership items focus of corrections in violating agreements and nothing else.

A secondary influence on whether someone sees their leader as laissez-faire is the level of anxiety an individual experiences within their work team ($R^2 = 0.356$, $\beta = 0.217^{***}$). This would occur when an individual does not feel or experience a sense of acceptance and belonging to their work team. It would make sense that a laissez-faire leader would not help to cultivate a sense of belonging and acceptance within a team since only certain behaviors are rewarded. Therefore it would be divisive to a team to have a laissez-faire leader. Only certain behaviors are rewarded and therefore only certain people are rewarded.

**Q8H2** The less anxious a person feels with their immediate boss, the more likely are they to rate the boss as someone who is a laissez-faire leader.
The variable for laissez-faire leadership was regressed on boss attachment anxiety. The relationship between laissez-faire leadership and boss attachment anxiety was insignificant (Table 22).

Summary of Findings

Listed below in Table 23 is a complete set of hypotheses for Study 2 along with the corresponding results. Individual attachment, along with closest colleague, immediate boss and work team attachment were successfully measured along the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. This facilitated the exploration and characterization of the relationships between individual attachment and closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team attachment. Individual attachment avoidance was related to the level of avoidance experienced in relationship with a closest colleague and work team. However, individual attachment avoidance was not related to the level of avoidance experienced in relationship with an immediate boss. Individuals tend to experience less attachment avoidance and anxiety with a closest colleague than with people in general, more attachment anxiety and avoidance with their work team than with people in general, and even greater attachment anxiety and avoidance with and immediate boss than with people in general. Individuals also tend to experience greater attachment anxiety and avoidance with an immediate boss than with a closest colleague.
In the process of analyzing the relationships between the various levels of organizational attachment, regression analyses revealed that avoidance with one’s closest colleague was a slightly better predictor than avoidance with one’s immediate boss of avoidance experienced with one’s work team. In addition, anxiety experienced with one’s immediate boss was a slightly better predictor than anxiety experienced with one’s closest colleague of anxiety experienced within one’s work team. In exploring the relationship between attachment style and perceived leadership style, the experience of low avoidance with one’s immediate boss was an important predictor of whether they were viewed as a transformational leader. In addition, the experience of high avoidance with one’s immediate boss was a modest predictor of whether that individual was viewed as either a transactional or laissez-faire leader. The experience of anxiety with an immediate boss was not a predictor of perceived leadership style, whether transformational, transactional or laissez-faire.

**Table 25:** Hypotheses for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses for Study 1 and Study 2</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1H1:</strong> individual’s attachment style can be measured as a combination of two factors: anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1H2:</strong> individual’s relationship with closest colleague is a combination of two factors: anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1H3:</strong> individual’s relationship with immediate boss is a combination of two factors: anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1H4:</strong> individual’s relationship with work team is a combination of two factors: anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2H1:</strong> there is a positive relationship between individual attachment anxiety and attachment anxiety experienced with closest colleague</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2H2:</strong> individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with a closest colleague than with people in general</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2H3:</strong> there is a positive relationship between individual attachment anxiety and attachment anxiety experienced with a work team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2H4:</strong> individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than with their work team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H5</td>
<td>there is a positive relationship between individual attachment anxiety and attachment anxiety experienced with an immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H6</td>
<td>individuals will experience less attachment anxiety with people in general than with their immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H7</td>
<td>there is a positive relationship between an individual’s attachment avoidance and attachment avoidance experienced with a closest colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H8</td>
<td>individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with a closest colleague than with people in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H9</td>
<td>there is a positive relationship between individual attachment avoidance and attachment avoidance experienced with a work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H10</td>
<td>individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than with their work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H11</td>
<td>there is a positive relationship between individual attachment avoidance and attachment avoidance experienced with an immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2H12</td>
<td>individuals will experience less attachment avoidance with people in general than with an immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3H1</td>
<td>individuals will experience less anxiety with closest colleague than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3H2</td>
<td>individuals experience less avoidance with closest colleague than with immediate boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4H1</td>
<td>the less avoidance an individual experiences with their closest colleague, the less avoidance they experience with their work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4H2</td>
<td>the less anxiety an individual experiences with their closest colleague, the less anxiety they experience with their work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5H1</td>
<td>the less avoidance an individual experiences with their immediate boss the less avoidance they experience with their work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5H2</td>
<td>less anxiety an individual experiences with their immediate boss the less anxiety they experience with their work team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6H1</td>
<td>the less avoidance an individual experiences with their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6H2</td>
<td>the less anxiety an individual experiences their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7H1</td>
<td>the more avoidance an individual experiences with their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7H2</td>
<td>the more anxiety an individual experiences their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8H1</td>
<td>the more avoidance an individual experiences their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as laissez-faire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8H2</td>
<td>the less anxiety an individual experiences their immediate boss the more likely they will rate their boss as laissez-faire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Discussion

Overview

**Study 1.** This study was a preliminary attempt at measuring the attachment relationships that exist within an organization at various levels: interpersonal (closest colleague and boss), group (work team or colleagues in general) and organization as a whole along the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. Likert scale items analyzed through exploratory factor analysis provided evidence for the two dimensions at the interpersonal and group levels. Each respondent’s general attachment style was also measured according to the four-category model used by Hazen and Shaver (1987). Our results showed that the respondents’ general attachment styles occurred in similar proportions as those found by these authors in two studies of romantic partners. Moreover, regression analyses suggested that respondents’ attachment styles in their relationship with their closest colleague and immediate boss were significant predictors of the attachment style they experienced with their colleagues in general, with closest colleague avoidance being the best predictor of avoidance at the group level and immediate boss anxiety the best predictor of anxiety at the group level.

This initial study surfaced three challenges. First, after exploratory factor analysis the final scale arrived at for measuring anxiety in one’s relationship with one’s immediate boss contained only two items. Second, the four category
scheme used to measure an individual’s general attachment style, while useful as a reference point for prior studies, turned out to be difficult to utilize for relating individual’s general attachment style to attachment style with a closest colleague, immediate boss and work team. Third the attempt to measure an individual’s ongoing attachment style with their organization as a whole using Likert scale item measures of avoidance and anxiety was unsuccessful.

**Study 2.** This study was an attempt to confirm the findings from Study 1, and in addition, to further explore and characterize the attachment relationships within a work organization. Several important modifications were made based on learning from Study 1. In place of using Hazen and Shaver’s (1987) categorical model to characterize individual attachment style, individual attachment was assessed using a questionnaire that tapped into the two dimensions of attachment anxiety and avoidance. Moreover, additional items were introduced for measuring anxiety in one’s relationship with one’s immediate boss and other improvements were attempted in the questions used at all levels. This was done not only to reconfirm and hopefully strengthen the findings of study 1, but also with the intent of more systematically exploring the relationships among an individual’s general attachment style and their ongoing attachment styles with their closest colleague, immediate boss, and colleagues in general. Another main goal of this second study was to relate individual attributions of attachment to an immediate boss with individual attributions with regards to that person’s leadership style.
Contributions

Workplace Context. In this section we will attempt to recapitulate the significant contributions of this research. These two studies were significant in their attempt to explore and characterize the attachment relationships within work organizations. As stated earlier, there are few empirical studies focused on characterizing attachment relationships within a workplace context. In fact, the bulk of studies done to date have focused on using subjects within a military setting (Mikulincer and Florian 1995, Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo 2000, Popper 2004). In part, this setting lends itself to effectively exploring attachment relationships due to its clearly structured environment of roles and responsibilities. This environment is similar to the original attachment studies done by Ainsworth (1978) due to its clarity with regards to the roles of the players, whether parent and child or that of military leader and follower. In addition, the settings for these studies are similar in their use of a stressful environment to activate the attachment emotional-behavioral system, such as with the Strange Situation protocol, which resulted in the display of the child’s emotional and behavioral reaction to the mother’s leaving and returning. Likewise, military settings are known for their emphasis on preparedness and engagement in warfare, and as a result the ability to effectively respond under extreme pressure and conflict. While these studies have proven insightful to attachment dynamics within particular environments such as military settings, there still remains a need for empirical research exploring attachment
relationships within more traditional work contexts and the impact these relationships have on one’s experience within their work organization. This research has attempted to begin to fill this gap.

**Viability of two dimensional approach of measuring attachment.**

Researchers interested in measuring adult attachment within other contexts besides intimate relationships have been limited by the intimate nature of the wording of adult attachment instruments. Further work is necessary to create attachment instruments allowing for the exploration of attachment relationships within adult settings of a non-intimate nature. This research has made significant progress towards creating an adult attachment instrument that can be used to explore relationships within a typical organizational setting. Organizational attachment was successfully assessed via attachment relationships with a closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team measured on a continuum of low to high anxiety and avoidance. The resulting two factors, one for anxiety and one for avoidance, provides supporting evidence that an individual’s relationship with individual’s in general, their closest colleague, immediate boss, and work team can be characterized as an attachment relationship, consisting of a combination of low or high anxiety and avoidance (Fraley, Waller and Brennan 2000). Attempts to measure an individual’s attachment relationship with their work organization as an abstract entity along the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance, did not yield significant results. Perhaps this is an indication that in order to tap into the individual’s mental models of attachment, reference to a
specific concrete individual or group of individuals is necessary. Given that an essential element of an attachment relationship is the existence of an affecional bond that is enduring, exists with a particular individual, and is an emotionally significant relationship, it is reasonable to conclude that measuring an attachment relationship with an abstract entity does not fit these criteria (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1979). Instead, when exploring an individual’s attachment to an organization, emphasis should be placed on the significant relationships within the organization that might in turn evoke emotional attachment to the abstract entity.

**Utility of Measuring Attachment Anxiety and Avoidance in Current Relationships.** Traditionally attachment research has focused on the notion that attachment styles are an enduring individual quality. As adults, individuals carry with them a mental model of attachment based on their initial interactions in childhood with their primary caregiver (Bowlby 1969). As a result, based on the responsiveness of the caregiver to the child’s needs, the child develops a positive or negative mental model of self as worthy of care and responsiveness and a positive or negative image of other as emotionally available to provide care. As a result, the individual also develops a particular level of avoidance and anxiety in relating to others. The supposition is that this mental model and these initial levels of avoidance and anxiety are relatively enduring and unchanging.
Contrary to this supposition, some research has shown that children can develop different attachment styles with different parents or primary caregivers (Fox, Kimmerly, and Schafer 1991). Other research outside of the workplace suggests that individuals may invoke different mental models with different individuals or groups of individuals (LaGuardia, Ryan, Couchman, and Deci 2000; Overall, Fletcher, Friesen 2003; Trinke and Bartholomew 1997; Smith et. al 1999). Moreover, mental health professionals have hypothesized that individuals often seek therapy because of the insecure attachment styles they have developed (Fosha 2000). The role of the therapist is to act as the secure primary caregiver the patient never had, thereby allowing the patient to internalize a more secure experience of being parented and in turn to develop in adulthood a more secure attachment style. However in much of the attachment research dealing with adults, especially in those related to studies in organizations, attachment style has been viewed as a relatively stable individual trait that can be used to predict such things as leadership style and ability to cope under pressure.

The research reported in this dissertation supports the idea that individual attachment styles developed in childhood are enduring, and simultaneously, that there is some variation across an adult’s relationships with different people in a work organization. The first point is supported by the finding that individual attachment anxiety was correlated with attachment anxiety in one’s relationship with one’s closest colleague, immediate boss and with colleagues in general,
while individual attachment avoidance was correlated with closest colleague avoidance and avoidance with colleagues in general. At the same time, quality of attachment along both the avoidance and anxiety dimensions did vary significantly across the closest colleague, immediate boss and colleagues in general pairings. Moreover, that variation arguably was related to the amount of choice a person had in picking the other partner(s) in each pairing, with greater choice being associated with less avoidance and less anxiety. Specifically, the individuals in this research tended to experience less attachment anxiety and avoidance with closest colleagues than with people in general; more anxiety and avoidance with their work team than with people in general; and even greater anxiety and avoidance with their immediate boss than with people in general.

This also allowed the researcher to conclude that while attachment styles within the work organization are related to individual’s own attachment style developed from childhood, individual’s also form attachment relationships with significant individuals in the work environment that are qualitatively different from their own individual style. We can conclude that individuals do not possess a single attachment style. Instead they hold multiple models of attachment and adopt different attachment styles with different partners. The research suggested, moreover, that when individuals have greater choice over which individual they develop an attachment relationship with, they are more likely to choose individuals with whom they are able to develop secure attachments,
attachments that can be even more secure than the one’s they see themselves as usually having.

**Important Interpersonal Attachments in the Workplace can Predict Attachment Style with Colleagues in General.** The study of relationships among various attachments at different system levels (self in general, individual to individual, individual to group, individual to organizations) is in its infancy and invites further exploration. However this topic is of particular importance in organizational settings where the coordination among various organizational system levels is critical for organizational success. The findings of this research indicate that individuals’ relationships with two typical partners - closest colleague and immediate boss- appear to have an important impact on their attachment relationships with colleagues in general. Overall, in this study, the less avoidant or anxious an individual felt with their closest colleague and immediate boss, the less avoidant or anxious they felt with their work team. On a more fine grained level, anxiety experienced with an immediate boss as compared to one’s closest colleague was a slightly better predictor of anxiety experienced with one’s work team. In addition, avoidance experienced with a closest colleague as compared to one’s immediate boss was a slightly better predictor of avoidance experienced within one’s work team. One hypothesis for explaining this contrast is that individuals are more likely to experience anxiety over a relationship with an immediate boss, but instead of experiencing anxiety over a relationship with a closest colleague they will simply avoid that individual and find another who
creates less anxiety for them. Since an individual has little choice over their superior, they are subject to the boss-subordinate hierarchy and it becomes very difficult to avoid one’s boss. Instead, an individual is left with a sense of anxiety when coping with the insecure attachment formed with their immediate boss.

Moreover, experiencing anxiety with an immediate boss as compared to one’s closest colleague has a greater impact on one’s mental model of self and their confidence that they are valued by the other. With an immediate boss they are more likely to fear rejection or abandonment and worry about the attachment figure’s availability and responsiveness in times of need. Due to the boss-subordinate hierarchy the individual may be more concerned with gaining the approval of their boss. This same sentiment, one might argue, then carries over into the team dynamics. In contrast, it appears that the attachment relationship with one’s closest colleague as compared to one’s immediate boss has a greater impact on one’s mental model of other and the degree to which they embrace rather than avoid closeness or intimacy with the individual. With a closest colleague an individual is on equal footing and not as concerned with gaining the individual’s approval, and therefore will cope with insecure attachments by avoiding closeness with those who create that insecurity. This same sentiment arguably then carries over into the team dynamics.

The findings above are supported by the theory of nested systems, where individuals and their personal attributes are nested within interpersonal
relationships, which in turn are nested within groups, which are in turn nested within organizations (Agazarian and Gantt 2000, Krackhardt and Stern 1988, Krackhardt 1992). Specifically, having a closest colleague that one feels they can depend on for emotional and psychological intimacy, may lead to this same positive dynamic within an individual’s work team, which can in turn lead to greater harmony between the team and the larger organization. Moreover, it is important to note that there is the possibility that the pattern of causation works in the opposite direction, with people who feel they can depend on their colleagues in general, being more likely to be comfortable feeling dependent on a closest colleague. This encourages the further examination of significant attachment relationships, such as those with a closest colleague and immediate boss, and their impact on work team dynamics. The proposed ability of secure attachments created within these significant relationships to positively influence or create secure attachments within a work team is an important topic for further research. Perhaps attachment styles with key individuals in a work environment can be assessed for whether they are secure or insecure, and interventions can be provided to create more secure relationships. This will hopefully contribute to creating more secure attachment styles within a work team, which may in turn, contribute to greater productivity and general effectiveness.

**Attachment Style as a Predictor of Attributions about Leadership Style.** Whereas past research on attachment style and leadership style linked how either followers or leaders rated their own general attachment styles with
how either party rated their own or the other’s leadership style, this study focused on how followers’ ratings of their ongoing relationship with their boss on the two attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance were related to how they rated their boss’ leadership style. We believe this latter linkage is important because attachment style is based on the interaction between one’s self concept and how one views other individuals. Specifically the quality of the emotional relationship one experiences with another individual can have a profound impact on one’s cognitive attributions about that person. This study showed that the experience of low attachment avoidance in one’s ongoing relationship with one’s immediate boss is an important predictor of viewing that individual as a transformational leader. The significant experience of high attachment avoidance is also a modest predictor of the follower’s attribution of their immediate boss as a transactional or laissez-faire leader. In addition, the follower’s experience of anxiety with within their relationship with their immediate boss appears to have little relationship to how the follower rates that person’s leadership style.

Experiencing low avoidance or felt psychological and emotional accessibility seems to be the most important predictor of attributions of transformational leadership. This is in contrast to the importance of experiencing low anxiety or feeling confident that a leader is satisfied with their relationship with you. One might hypothesize that in the relationship between a transformational leader and follower, the relationship becomes less about the follower trying to gain acceptance from the leader and more focused on the
development of the follower. The items resulting after factor analysis along the anxiety dimension for immediate boss attachment suggest that the individual is worried about being accepted or living up to the leader’s expectations. The nature of the transformational leadership style is such that it is characterized by the dimensions of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass and Avolio 2004). This leadership style does not lend itself to evoking feelings of anxiety by the follower or questioning of the relationship or acceptance by the leader. Instead the relationship is more centered on development and therefore the importance of the felt psychological and emotional availability of the leader becomes more paramount. Perhaps a more dictatorial or authoritative leadership style, as compared to the leadership styles evaluated in this study (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) would in fact evoke feelings of anxiety by the follower. It should be noted that while a well established leadership style questionnaire [MLQ (5X short)] was used in the present study, factor analysis of the results showed that the items clustered in ways that differed from the pattern documented by its authors in two ways, both of which involved taking one of the elements out of those comprising transactional leadership and putting it into either transformational or laissez faire leadership (Bass and Avolio 2004), leaving the one cluster of items in the transactional category that came closest to a rather negatively oriented style focusing on rule violations and mistake.
There is of course the possibility that the pattern of causation works in the opposite direction, with people who experience their boss as being a transformational leader being more likely to also experience their boss as less avoidant. In this researcher’s view, this alternative possibility is less convincing if one looks at the particular questions involved. The items dealing with avoidance in one’s relationship with one’s boss, and transformative leadership from the MLQ questionnaire that resulted after CFA analysis are listed below.

**Boss avoidance (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.932$)**
- BAV2: It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need (Reverse Coded)
- BAV4: I feel comfortable opening up to this person (Reverse Coded)
- BAV6: I’m confident I measure up to this person’s expectations (Reverse Coded)
- BAV8: I enjoy working closely with this individual (Reverse Coded)
- BAV9: I believe this individual really understands me (Reverse Coded)
- BAV10: I can depend on this individual (Reverse Coded)

**Transformational Leadership (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.917$)**
- IIA2: Goes beyond self interest for the good of the group
- IIA3: Acts in a way that builds my respect
- IIB3: Considers the moral and ethical consequences of a decision.
- IM1: Talks optimistically about the future
- IS2: Seeks different perspectives when solving problems
- IS4: Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
- IC1: Spends time teaching and coaching
- IC2: Treats me as an individual rather than as a member of a group.
- CR1: Provides me with assistance in exchange for advice
- CR4: Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations

We would argue that a subordinate who feels safe, comfortable, confident, understood by a superior is likely to see that person as worthy of respect, concerned with the good of other people (the group) as well as oneself, spending time teaching and coaching, etc. Whereas, a follower who sees a leader as concerned for the good of the group, spending time teaching and coaching, acting in ways worthy of respect might not necessarily feel personally safe, comfortable, confident and understood by that person, because other colleagues
might be seen by this person as the primary targets of the leader’s positive behaviors and not necessarily oneself.

In other words, one can argue that people make attributions about a leader’s style based in part on their interpersonal contact with that person, and that personal experience can often be the dominant source of their ratings. However, people can also make attributions about a leader’s style based on how they see that person behaving in general towards followers, and not necessarily towards themselves. Those attributions may be positive or negative but as yet unconfirmed by direct personal experience with the leader.

Nonetheless, it is possible that experiencing an individual as a transactional or transformational leader would lead to attributions of secure attachment. Transformational leaders are able to instill feelings of self-confidence, self-efficacy, and help develop and motivate individuals to achieve success. In the case of an insecure follower who expects a leader to be unresponsive or inattentive, experiencing a leader as transformational could serve as a corrective experience, much like that between a therapist and patient. As a result of the secure feelings created, individuals may in turn learn to adopt a secure attachment style with a transformational leader.
**Implications for Practice**

This research aids in creating awareness that individuals bring their psychological selves, including their mental models of self and other, into the workplace. More specifically, this research establishes that mental models of attachment that individuals develop from interactions with their primary caregiver, and presumably which they refer to when asked to rate their general attachment style, persist at least to some degree in the same two-dimensional form into adulthood as Bowlby (1969) predicted. However, the quality of the attachment styles formed, specifically, the level of avoidance and anxiety experienced, can vary significantly depending upon who the partner is. This accounts for the greater felt security in attachment relationships with closest colleagues as compared to work teams or immediate bosses. This research draws attention to the reality that attachment relationships, whether with one's closest colleague, immediate boss, or work team, are an important aspect of an individual's experience within the work environment. Quite often in the workplace, individuals become viewed only in terms of their formal role within an organization, instead of in terms of who they are as a person or individual. Such task orientation downplays the behaviors necessary to develop individuals and their emotional well-being, in ways that might motivate them to achieve the task at hand even more effectively.

Relationships with closest colleagues and immediate bosses are potentially important points of leverage for developing well-functioning teams.
The more secure the attachment style with a closest colleague or immediate boss, the more secure the attachment style will be with an individual’s work team. Arguably, creating an environment where resources are committed to investing in the development of individual employees’ interpersonal relationships will contribute to fostering a positive work team culture and therefore better team and organization wide coordination.

Leaders need to pay particular attention to the quality of attachment relationships with their subordinates, as these relationships have a significant impact on a leader’s ability to motivate or influence an individual’s development. Important to consider is the reality that modern organizational life is calling for more transformational leaders able to inspire effective organizational change. Cultivating low avoidance relationships with followers appears to be critical for the success of such endeavors. Investing in individuals’ emotional well-being and developing more secure leader-led relationships may aid in inspiring individuals to achieve beyond the expected and reach towards optimal performance. Transformational leaders have the ability to motivate individuals to strive to accomplish not only individual goals but group and organizational goals. The importance of this can be viewed in the growing body of literature exploring employee empowerment and its relationship to performance outcomes (Kahn 1990; Harter, Schmidt, Hayes 2002). Empowered employees are fully immersed in their work and inspired to go beyond what is expected in order to further the organization’s goals. It has been demonstrated that empowered employees
have a strong emotional attachment to their work organization. Transformational leaders may have a significant role in creating secure emotional attachments which in turn may lead to more empowered employees able to affect positive performance outcomes: increased productivity, greater client satisfaction, increased innovation, improved work efficiency, higher retention rates, and greater financial performance.

**Limitations and Future Research**

For purposes of this study, it was necessary to revise the wording of traditional instruments used for measuring attachment within intimate relationships, such as the ECR-R and RS Questionnaire, in order to make them more applicable for measuring attachment within a workplace setting. Many times the word “partner” could easily be replaced with “co-worker” or “boss”. At times when simply substituting the word “colleague” or “co-worker” for partner still seemed inappropriate, it was necessary to capture the essence of the question and create a new question based on that. Two or three questions seemed inappropriate to the questionnaire because they would not translate from an intimate relationship to a workplace setting. For example, one of the statements in the ECR-R is, “When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else”. Since it was very difficult to translate this to a work setting, this item was discarded from the survey. Overall, it was much easier to translate the wording of many of the avoidance items as compared to the anxiety items to apply to a work place setting. The avoidance items dealt
with the ability to depend upon romantic partners and to confide in them. The anxiety items dealt with feelings towards romantic partners and feelings of abandonment. This initial challenge with the anxiety items, perhaps contributed to the difficulties with developing robust measures along the anxiety dimensions within the first study. The second study allowed the researcher the opportunity to further refine these measures and ultimately yielded a successful outcome. In the future, researchers within the field of attachment will need to pay particular attention to developing attachment questionnaires that will be applicable within various contexts. There is much room for growth within this arena due to the classic approach of measuring attachment between romantic partners.

Also important for further consideration is how the reader might have defined “closest colleague” for purposes of this research. Within the online survey individuals were asked to consider a series of statements measuring attachment to their closest colleague and rate the extent to which they agree or disagree. However, the respondents to the survey were not provided any guidance with regards to who might qualify as a closest colleague. The researcher’s intent here was primarily to create a foil, a point of comparison, for the respondent’s subsequent ratings of their immediate boss, and ideally to identify some other organization member with whom they felt more secure than they did with their immediate boss. While the research was successful in that regard, it has left the unanswered question of who these other people are. Were they typically people below the respondent in the organizational hierarchy, or
peers, or at least two levels above the respondent in the hierarchy? Were they typically inside or outside the person’s organizational unit? Were they simply the person with whom the respondent was interacting most intensely on a day-to-day basis around the time they filled out the questionnaire? Or were the people identified as closest colleagues across the whole sample distributed evenly among all of these categories? Clearly, some useful research might be done to identify “closest colleague” in greater detail and to see whether the attachment pattern varies depending upon one or more salient characteristics of that person.

This study utilized an online questionnaire. There were several advantages to utilizing this method to administer the survey but also some disadvantages. Use of an online questionnaire allowed the researcher to reach a greater number of individuals than would have been possible utilizing a paper administered survey. In addition, there was a lower cost of administration, and the process involved with taking an online survey ensures that the researcher will receive the data quickly. Also, the use of an online survey, as compared to a paper survey helps to protect the anonymity of the individual taking the survey, which may have contributed to the respondents’ willingness to take the survey thereby providing higher response rates. In addition, in order to protect against duplicate responses, we required the use of a unique one-time password to log in to take the survey.
However, online surveys do have their limitations. One may be that sometimes individuals may not receive the email or perhaps it goes into the junk mail folder. Another issue is that individuals may not be technologically savvy and therefore may have issues logging onto the site to take the survey. The researcher for this study was not notified of any users experiencing these particular difficulties, but it is a possibility. In addition, some individuals may feel that there is less anonymity provided taking a survey over the internet, believing that their email address or IP address can be traced, and may be fearful that their identity will be linked with their responses. This could result in lower response rates.

Snowball sampling was used as a methodology for collecting data for this study. This approach to sampling is typically used to survey hidden populations such as drug users. However, the researchers in this study primarily used it as a matter of convenience, since we did not have the resources to randomly sample a large population. This raises the question of whether there were biases introduced into the study as a result of the individuals asked to start the snowball rolling. Our initial targets were Master’s in Organizational Development (MOD) graduates who were asked to recruit their acquaintances, and they were in turn asked to recruit their acquaintances to participate in the survey. It could be reasonably argued that the individuals enrolled in a master’s program focused on developing individuals within an organization might be more interpersonally skilled and socially oriented than the general population. MOD graduates
comprised 39 of the total 213 sample population. In order to check for this potential bias, the sample population was divided into two groups, based on how they learned of the online survey: whether they were MOD graduates themselves or heard of the survey through an acquaintance. A comparison was made with regards to the means of the attachment scores across these two groups (Figure 14). On an individual level and with regards to their closest colleague, graduates of the MOD program were in fact less avoidant than the rest of the sample. This supports the hypothesis that these individuals were more likely to be more interpersonally orientated than the rest of the sample. This newly created variable (MOD Graduate, non-MOD Graduate) was then entered as a control variable in the regression analyses for team attachment and leadership style. The variable had no effect on either set of regression analyses. Therefore, while the sampling method did yield a slightly less avoidant group of respondents than what one might have gotten from a more random sample, this arguably did not make a difference with respect to the patterns of covariation found among the study variables.
Figure 14: Results of the comparison of the means of the attachment scores for two groups: MOD graduates and non-MOD graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndAV</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndANX</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamAV</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamANX</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollAV</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>4.532</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollANX</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BossAV</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BossANX</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the empirical research presented in this study was based on quantitative methods, additional qualitative research could be utilized to help support the quantitative findings. Exploring possible qualitative methods could provide further insight into the emotional and psychological impact of secure or insecure attachment relationships. Perhaps this could also provide insight into how developing various attachment styles impacts an individual’s experience of their work environment, their productivity, effectiveness, and ability to advance in their career.

It would be beneficial to further explore various significant attachment relationships within organizations, the link between significant attachment relationships and group level dynamics, and the link between attachment style with one’s boss and attributions about other leadership qualities and outputs besides leadership style. Perhaps the finding that individuals who develop more secure attachments styles with their boss also perceive them as more transformational in their leadership style has implications for satisfaction with their job, commitment to their job or work organization, and even tenure within their current role or work organization. The relationship between secure attachment relationships and job satisfaction could be further explored to deduce whether secure attachment relationships inspire job satisfaction due to better communication, better emotional expression, more positively coping with conflict, or perceived support from the boss for the work team.
Concluding Thoughts

The completion of this research has prompted me to reflect upon the journey that led me to pursue a degree in organizational behavior and my initial experiences with my medical school colleague, Mary. The culture within medical schools historically has been one with a well-established structure of rules and regulations. It is very much a top-down culture where current and new initiatives are mandated versus co-created. This hierarchical model is one which may not necessarily be in the best interests of human development or of creating positive human interactions, whether they are amongst medical students, between medical students and faculty, or between future physicians and patients.

In a traditional and highly structured medical school culture much like the one Mary and I experienced, ideas like emotional attachment and development are often lost. I sometimes wonder if the presence of a secure attachment in my life at that time would have led to a different outcome for my medical studies. If I would have felt that I belonged, that there was room for my individual ideas and emotions, perhaps I could have successfully completed my medical training in such an environment, and developed into a competent and compassionate physician. Perhaps medical school education needs to be less focused on inducting new students into the culture of medicine and into the role of a medical student, and more focused on developing individuals capable of compassionately and effectively caring for the needs of patients as well as others within the medical community.
Without a doubt the stated goal of many, if not all medical education institutions, is to produce individuals who are well-informed, compassionate and ethical. This goal requires a certain level of competence with regards to medical knowledge, but also begs for an environment where students are immersed in a culture which supports these values, encourages good communication, the creation of effective relationships, and demonstration of professional ethics. It is well-documented that the attachment relationships that one is born into contribute to an individual's emotional and psychological development. My personal experience and current research helps to create awareness that, individuals also have a very important set of attachment relationships within their work organization. These attachment relationships significantly contribute to their emotional and psychological well-being and ability to thrive. As such, it is clear there is a strong need for mentors who are transformational in nature – mentors who can generate a culture of leadership that espouses an organization’s stated values. Perhaps this proposed change could contribute to medical students’ greater satisfaction with their medical school experience and their ability to successfully become leaders in patient care. Moreover, this shift could ultimately result in more satisfied patients and even greater numbers of positive health care outcomes.
Appendix

STUDY 1 QUESTIONNAIRE

First, on a scale from 1 to 7, please rate each of the four relationship styles below to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style. Second, please indicate the letter (A, B, C, or D) corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are in relationships, in general.

| Style A: | It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t worry about being alone or having others not accept me. |
| Style B: | I am uncomfortable getting emotionally close to others. I want close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend upon them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others. |
| Style C: | I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don’t value me as much as I value them. |
| Style D: | I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me. |

Please indicate the letter (A, B, C or D) corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are in relationships: ________
The statements below concern how you generally feel within your work organization. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral/Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am confident that the people I currently work with like me.
2. My organization is a place where the leadership listens carefully to what others have to say.
3. I believe that I am often in danger of losing support from my colleagues at work.
4. It’s easy for me to be honest with my co-workers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings.
5. I am confident that the people I work with have my best interests at heart.
6. I am comfortable depending upon my coworkers for support.
7. I do not feel comfortable sharing my ideas, opinions and feelings with my work colleagues.
8. I feel confident that I am essential to the success of my work group.
9. My organization is a place where people find it easy to share their day-to-day concerns with one another.
10. I often worry that I am easily replaceable at work.
11. My organization is a place where people are good at facing up to reality.
12. I usually discuss any problems and concerns I have with my colleagues.
13. I feel confident that I can depend upon my colleagues.
14. My colleagues at work make me doubt myself.
15. I feel confident that my co-workers like having me around.
16. My organization is a place where people have each other’s best interests at heart.
17. I am nervous when co-workers try to get too emotionally close to me.
18. I talk things over with my work colleagues.
19. My organization is a place where it is easy to offer your own opinions without fear of being attacked.
20. I often feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues.
21. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with my coworkers.
22. My co-workers seem to like working closely with me.
23. I feel comfortable asking my co-workers for help.
24. I worry a fair amount about losing my job.
25. I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and feelings with those with whom I work.
26. My co-workers do not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
27. My organization is a place where people do not have to watch their backs.
28. Sometimes co-workers change their disposition towards me for no apparent reason.
29. I enjoy working closely with my current colleagues.
30. I am sure my colleagues like having me around.
31. My coworkers only seem to notice me when I am upset or angry.
32. It helps to turn to my colleagues in times of need.
33. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable opening up to each other.
34. I find it difficult to completely trust my co-workers.
35. I tell my co-workers just about everything.
36. I feel comfortable showing my coworkers how I feel deep down.
37. My organization is a place where people don’t really like working closely with one another.
38. I find it relatively easy to identify with my co-workers.
39. I often worry that my coworkers don’t really care about me.
40. I’m comfortable having my co-workers depend on me at work.
41. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to my coworkers.
42. My coworkers want me to be more involved with them than I feel comfortable being.
43. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable asking one another for help.
44. My organization is a place where people rarely disclose their feelings to one another.
45. My organization is a place where people feel comfortable trusting one another.
46. I think my work colleagues really understand me.
47. My organization is a place where people can depend upon each other.

With regards to your relationship with your closest work colleague, please indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Disagree Neutral/Agree
Strongly Mixed Strongly

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
3. I believe that this person has my best interests at heart.
4. This person does not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.
6. I’m afraid that this person doesn’t really want me around.
7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support.
8. I talk things over with this person
9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.
10. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care about me.
11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
12. I find it difficult to completely trust this person.
13. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to this person.
14. This person wants me to be more involved with them than I am comfortable being.
15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person.
16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.
18. I’m comfortable having this person depend on me at work.

With regards to your relationship with your boss, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral/ Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with this person.
2. It helps to turn to this person when I’m in need.
3. I believe that this person has my best interests at heart.
4. This person does not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
5. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person
6. I’m afraid that this person doesn’t really want me around.
7. I’m very comfortable depending upon this person for support.
8. I talk things over with this person
9. I worry that this person does not like me as much as I like them.
10. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care about me.
11. I find it easy to depend upon this person
12. I find it difficult to completely trust this person.
13. I’m nervous about becoming highly attached to this person.
14. This person wants me to be more involved with them than I am comfortable being.
15. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
16. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person.
17. I’m somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with this person.
18. I’m comfortable having this person depend on me at work.

With regards to your relationship with your employing organization, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.
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1. I feel it is relatively easy to identify with my work organization.
2. I rarely worry about being fired or laid off by my work organization.
3. I find it difficult to completely trust the organization that I work for.
4. My work organization does not seem to want me to become highly involved in it; everything is strictly business.
5. I'm not very comfortable having to depend upon my work organization for support.
6. I'm somewhat uncomfortable being highly involved in this organization.
7. I often worry that my work organization doesn't really care about me.
8. I'm comfortable having my organization depend on me at work.
9. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to my work organization.
10. This organization wants me to be more involved in it than I feel comfortable being.
11. I would rather work in an organization that feels like a “family” rather than in one that is more impersonal.
12. I feel that I am more committed to this organization than it is committed to me.
13. It is important to me that my relationship with this organization be for the long term.
14. All organizations are about the same so working for this organization is no different than working for another organization.
15. I feel as though this organization is just as strongly committed to me as I am to it.
16. Being an active participant in this organization is important to me.
17. This organization usually tries to contribute to my personal well-being.
18. I can usually count on this organization to be there for me when I need it.
STUDY 2 QUESTIONNAIRE

The statements below concern how you generally experience your colleagues and coworkers within your organization and do not refer to any specific person.

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. Strongly Disagree [SD]
2. Neutral [N]
3. Strongly Agree [SA]

1. It's easy for me to be honest with my coworkers about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
2. I feel confident that I am essential to the success of my work group
3. I worry that I am easily replaceable at work
4. I feel that I do not get the support I need from my colleagues
5. I enjoy working closely with my colleagues
6. I worry about losing my job
7. I believe my coworkers really understand me
8. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to my coworkers
9. My organization is a place where people can depend on each other
10. I'm afraid that my colleagues don't really want me around
11. I'm confident that my colleagues really care for me
12. I worry that my coworkers do not like me as much as I like them
13. I'm uncomfortable being close friends with my colleagues
14. I'm comfortable depending upon my coworkers for support
15. I trust my colleagues
16. My coworkers do not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business
17. It helps to turn to my coworkers when I'm in need
18. I talk things over with my colleagues
19. I worry that my coworkers would like for me to be replaced
20. I feel comfortable opening up to my coworkers
21. I'm confident in my professional standing with my work colleagues
22. I'm comfortable going to my coworkers with problems and concerns
23. I prefer not to show my colleagues how I feel deep down
24. I find it easy to depend upon my coworkers
25. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions and feelings with my colleagues
26. My organization is a place where it's easy for me to offer opinions to my coworkers without fear of being attacked.
The statements below concern your relationship with your *closest work colleague*. Think about your relationship with your closest work colleague.

How long has this person been your closest colleague?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your closest work colleague.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SD]</td>
<td>[N]</td>
<td>[SA]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It helps to turn to this person when I'm in need
2. I talk things over with this person
3. This person doesn't want me to be close friends with them. Everything is strictly business
4. I'm confident that I measure up to this person's expectations
5. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to this person
6. I'm confident that I have this person's respect
7. I prefer not to share my ideas, opinions, and feelings with this person
8. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
9. I worry that this person doesn't like me as much as I like them
10. It's easy for me to be honest with this person about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
11. I'm uncomfortable being close friends with this person
12. It's easy to offer opinions to this person without fear of being attacked
13. I worry about my relationship with this person
14. I enjoy working closely with this person
15. This person makes me doubt myself
16. I'm confident that I am essential to this person's success
17. I worry that this person will lose interest in me
18. I feel that I do not get the support I need from this person
19. I believe this person really understands me
19. I worry that this person will abandon me
20. I can depend on this person
21. It upsets me that I don't get the regard and support I need from this person
22. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
23. I'm confident in my professional standing with this individual

The statements that follow are with regards to your most immediate boss. Please think about your relationship with your most immediate boss.

How long has this person been your immediate boss?

Less than 1 year
1-2 Years
3-5 Years
6-10 Years
11-15 Years
16-20 Years
More than 20 years

Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements with regards to your most immediate boss.

1. I'm comfortable depending on this person for support
2. It helps to turn to this person when I'm in need
3. I'm afraid that this individual doesn't want me around
4. I talk things over with this individual
5. I worry that this person doesn't like me as much as I like them
6. I feel comfortable opening up to this person
7. I worry about my relationship with this person
8. It's easy for me to be honest with this person about my ideas, opinions, and feelings
9. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced
10. I'm confident that I measure up to this person's expectations
11. It's easy to offer my opinions to this individual without fear of being attacked
12. I'm confident that I have this person's respect
13. I feel that I don't get the support I need from this individual
14. I enjoy working closely with this individual  
15. I worry that this person will lose interest in me  
16. I believe this individual really understands me  
17. I worry that this person will abandon me  
18. I can depend on this individual  
19. It upsets me that I don't receive the regard and support I need from this person  
20. I'm confident that I'm essential to this person's success  
21. I worry that this person would like for me to be replaced  
22. I'm confident in my professional standing with this individual

The statements below are used to describe the leadership style of your most immediate boss as you perceive it. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for advice  
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate  
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious  
4. Focuses attentions on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards  
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise  
6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs  
7. Is absent when needed  
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems  
9. Talks optimistically about the future  
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her  
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets  
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action  
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished  
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose  
15. Spends time teaching and coaching  
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved  
17. Show that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"  
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group  
19. Treats me as an individual rather than as a member of a group  
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking
21. Acts in a way that builds my respect
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
24. Keeps track of all mistakes
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future
27. Directs my attention towards failures to meet standards
28. Avoids making decisions
29. Considers me a having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles
31. Helps me to develop my strengths
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
33. Delays responding to urgent questions
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission
35. Expresses satisfactions when I meet expectations
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way
42. Heightens my desire to succeed
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements
44. Increases my willingness to try harder
45. Leads a group that is effective

Indicate the extent to which the following statements apply to you in close relationships, in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree [SD]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral [N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree [SA]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I find it relatively easy to get close to others
2. I'm comfortable depending on others
3. I'm comfortable having others depend on me
4. I don't worry about being abandoned
5. I don't worry about someone getting too close to me
6. I'm uncomfortable being close to others
7. I find it difficult to trust others completely
8. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others
9. I'm nervous when anyone gets too close
10. Partners often want to be more intimate than I am comfortable being
11. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like
12. I worry that my partner doesn't love me
13. I worry that my partner will not want to stay with me
14. I want to merge completely with another person
15. My desire to get close to others scares people away
16. I'm uncomfortable getting emotionally close to others
17. I want close relationships but I find it difficult to trust others completely
18. I want close relationships but I find it difficult to depend on others
19. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others
**The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) Questionnaire**

Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000)

Scoring Information: The first 18 items listed below comprise the attachment-related anxiety scale. Items 19 - 36 comprise the attachment-related avoidance scale. In real research, the order in which these items are presented should be randomized. Each item is rated on a 7-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. To obtain a score for attachment-related anxiety, please average a person's responses to items 1-18. However, because items 9 and 11 are reverse keyed (i.e., high numbers represent low anxiety rather than high anxiety, you'll need to reverse the answers to those questions before averaging the responses. (If someone answers with a “6” to item 9, you'll need to re-key it as a 2 before averaging.) To obtain a score for attachment-related avoidance, please average a person's responses to items 19-36. Items 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, and 36 will need to be reverse keyed before you compute this average.

**Generic Instructions:** The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by [web: clicking a circle] [paper: circling a number] to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

**Special notes:** You may wish to randomize the order of the items when presenting them to research participants. The ordering below is simply a convenient one for illustrating which items belong to which scale. Also, some people have modified the items to refer to others rather than romantic partners. This seems sensible to us, and in our own research we commonly alter the wording to refer to different individuals. For example, sometimes we reword the items to refer to others or this person and alter the instructions to say something like “The statements below concern how you generally feel in your relationship with your mother?” or “The statements below concern how you generally feel in your relationship with your romantic partner (i.e., a girlfriend, boyfriend, or spouse).

1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.
2. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
3. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.
4. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.

5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.

6. I worry a lot about my relationships.

7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.

8. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.

9. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.

10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.

11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.

12. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.

13. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.

14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.

15. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.

16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.

17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.

18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.

19. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.

20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.

21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.

22. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
25. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
27. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
29. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
30. I tell my partner just about everything.
31. I talk things over with my partner.
32. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
33. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
34. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.
35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.
36. My partner really understands me and my needs.
Relationship Structures (RS) Questionnaire

Derived from Fraley, C. website: www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/measures/ecrr.html.

This questionnaire is designed to assess the way in which you mentally represent important people in your life. You'll be asked to answer questions about your parents, your romantic partners, and your friends. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a number for each item.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
Please answer the following 10 questions about your mother or a mother-like figure

1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

3. I talk things over with this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

4. I find it easy to depend on this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

10. I don't fully trust this person.
    strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree
Please answer the following 10 questions about your father or a father-like figure.

1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

3. I talk things over with this person.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

4. I find it easy to depend on this person.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

10. I don't fully trust this person.
    strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

Please answer the following 10 questions about your dating or marital partner.

Note: If you are not currently in a dating or marital relationship with someone, answer these questions with respect to a former partner or a relationship that you would like to have with someone.

1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree
3. I talk things over with this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

4. I find it easy to depend on this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

5. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

7. I often worry that this person doesn’t really care for me.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

8. I’m afraid that this person may abandon me.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

9. I worry that this person won’t care about me as much as I care about him or her.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

10. I don’t fully trust this person.
    strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Please answer the following 10 questions about your best friend

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

3. I talk things over with this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

4. I find it easy to depend on this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

5. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to this person.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree
7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.
   strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree

10. I don't fully trust this person.
    strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  strongly agree
Questions Derived from St. Clair, L. S. (1994)

Thinking about your relationship with your employing organization please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (A separate section will ask you about your relationships with you co-workers and boss, so focus just on the organization itself in this section).

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with my work organization.
2. I rarely worry about being fired or laid off by my work organization.
3. I find it difficult to completely trust the organization that I work for.
4. My work organization does not seem to want me to become highly involved in it; everything is strictly business.
5. I'm not very comfortable having to depend on my work organization for support.
6. I'm somewhat uncomfortable being highly involved in this organization.
7. I often worry that my work organization doesn't really care for me.
8. I'm comfortable having my organization depend on me at work.
9. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to my work organization.
10. This organization wants me to be more involved in it than I feel comfortable being.
11. I would rather work in an organization that feels like a “family” rather than in one that is more impersonal.
12. I feel as though I am more committed to this organization than it is committed to me.
13. It is important to me that my relationship with this organization is for the long term.
14. All organizations are about the same so working for this organization is no different than working for any other organization.
15. I feel as though this organization is just as strongly committed to me as I am to it.
16. Being an active participant in this organization is important to me.
17. This organization usually tries to contribute to my personal well-being.
18. I can usually count on this organization to be there for me when I need it.

Using the same seven point scale as above, think about your relationships with your co-workers (including your boss) and indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement:

1. I find it relatively easy to identify with my co-workers.
2. I find it difficult to completely trust my co-workers.
3. My co-workers do not seem to want me to become close friends with them; everything is strictly business.
4. I'm not very comfortable having to depend upon my co-workers for support.
5. I'm somewhat uncomfortable being close friends with my co-workers.
6. I often worry that my co-workers don't really care about me.
7. I'm comfortable having my co-workers depend on me at work.
8. I'm nervous about becoming highly attached to my co-workers.
9. My co-workers want me to be more involved with them than I feel comfortable being.
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