The Attached Leader:

The Development of Trust and How it Influences Leadership Styles

by

Guiljaam (William) J. Klaassen

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Masters of Counselling (MC)

City University of Seattle
Vancouver BC, Canada site

March, 2016

APPROVED BY

Bruce Hardy, Ph.D., Thesis Supervisor

Steve Conway, Psy.D., R.C.C., Faculty Reader

Chris Kinman, M.Sc., M.Div., Faculty Reader

Division of Arts and Sciences

Abstract

Throughout the last century, much work and research has been done to identify the personality

styles and traits of effective leaders (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Towler, 2005; Lencioni, 2014;

Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014; Personality Types, 2016). However, it has become increasingly

clear that leadership is not purely trait-based and incidentally, research has also not shown any

significant correlation between traits and effective leadership (Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Lencioni,

2014). We have learned, however, that leadership is all about influence (Maxwell, 2007, 2011;

Prewitt, Weil, & McClure, 2011). There is also enough evidence to believe that the amount of

influence we have on others is based on levels and perceptions of trust (Greenleaf, 1970;

Lencioni, 2014). With this in mind, attachment theory emerged about 60 years ago and seems to

hold much promise in being able to predict leadership styles. We have also learned that trust,

towards both self and others, is a key component of attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz,

1991; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Furthermore, research has shown that there are correlations

between attachment styles and preferences for a particular type of leader (Riaz & Haider, 2010;

Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2010). This however, does not answer the question that I begin to

explore in this paper; does our attachment style predict our leadership style. Only a scant handful

of studies have been conducted to look at this particular question. Yet, this question is

paramount. One only has to visit the self-help section in a bookstore to know that a plethora of

literature exists that describes how to be an effective leader and how to influence others, but

there is very little literature on how our individual development influences the leaders we

become. Therefore, if we can answer that question, then the numerous possibilities of how to

train effective leaders suddenly become limitless.

Acknowledgements

This thesis could never have been possible without the continued encouragement of my family, both direct and extended, my friends, and the many clients that inspired me to keep going week after week during my year-long practicum. Thank you all so much!

Furthermore, I was privileged to be part of an amazing cohort of fellow-learners at City University, (Vancouver campus). I cannot imagine this journey being as rich without one of you. I hope our journey continues together as we put all our newfound theory into practice. I would also like to thank Dr. Bruce Hardy for being my thesis supervisor, for your critical feedback, your direction, and your continued patience with my submissions. Also for your inspiration during the conversations we have had over the past few years. Thank you for making each class a success. Also thanks to Dr. Steve Conway and Chris Kinman for being faculty readers and so much more. Both of you have left an indelible impression on my life with your individual teaching and therapy styles. I hope our paths will continue to cross.

I would also like to thank all the rest of the staff at City University for creating the environment that has allowed me to not only learn everything I could have hoped for, but also for making this journey extremely enjoyable.

Dedication

This effort is dedicated to my unceasingly patient wife, Elaine. Most days I could not understand your willingness to accept the massive sacrifice you continually made just to allow me to pursue my dream of getting my degree; of which this thesis is the culmination. This is also dedicated to our six beautiful, loving, and patient children; I love you! Thank you all so much for your support and encouragement. And yes, this means that your husband and daddy is back again!

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Topic Review

Although the development of great leadership qualities has always been an intriguing

subject for humans, it wasn't until the 1930s that Lewin (1939) first proposed a succinct and

fairly accurate leadership model that consisted of three leadership styles; namely, the autocratic,

democratic, and laissez-fair leaders. These styles were meant to be indicative of the leaders he

felt made up the core of all the leaders he had encountered. However, during the time of his

publication the worldview on leadership was still in the midst of what can be called trait theory;

leadership defined by certain traits or characteristics (Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014; Chand, 2015).

However, there was a movement and signs of a desire to shift to a model of leadership that

defined leadership as being all about influence; leadership styles should be defined by the

methods of influence that the leader uses to get their wishes known and executed in the most

effective way possible (Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Lencioni, 2014). During this time, this shift had

not yet been entirely embraced and it can even be argued that there are still remnants of the

movement today that insists there are certain personality traits which are critical to the success of

a leader. In opposition to this, Lewin (1939), and subsequently Popper, Mayleless, & Castelnovo

(2000), Maxwell (2011), Sinek (2013), Lencioni (2014), and others, focus on the idea that

personality and trait theory is a great indicator of the preferred method and style of working for

each individual leader and can help them in finding their own strengths and weakness, but trait

theory is not an indicator of whether or not a leader will be successful.

With Lewin's, and subsequent authors', work on leadership-as-influence, there has been a

shift away from categorizing leaders as either being qualified or not qualified based on their

traits. The premise of leadership today is on how to utilize the traits that each person exhibits to

their maximum in an influencing role, which then subsequently defines the true capacity of leadership (Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Sinek, 2013; Lencioni, 2014). With book stores filled with various self-help books on how to become a more effective leader, it is becoming increasingly difficult to effectively train leaders on a broader scale. With this in mind, there has been much work done on personality styles and traits since Freud first introduced them in the early 1900s (Maccoby, 2004). Countless tests can be purchased and administered to define any number of personality traits that may be deemed to be relevant; however, none of this literature has proven to have clarified the leadership styles of any one particular individual. But as mentioned before, when we view leadership as influence suddenly the leadership model seems to be more manageable. If leadership is not about the existence of certain inborn traits or qualities, but rather, leadership is about maximizing the traits we do have to affect the influence we have on our followers, then essentially anyone can be a leader. Research has also shown that influence is mostly about trust (Greenleaf, 1970; Maxwell, 2011; Lencioni, 2014). Naturally then, if we are able to affect the level of trust that a person has or carries, then we should also be able to have an impact on their future leadership potential. By knowing how to train leaders to be better influencers and by maximizing their own strengths and building reciprocating trust, then essentially we may just have stumbled upon the next greatest leadership training program. So what exactly can be done to ensure leaders are trained and developed so that they have the right level of trust and are able to nurture the right level of trust to be effective leaders? This is where attachment theory can play a role.

It has been shown that there are some key factors that affect an individual's level of trust towards themselves and others while they are growing up (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). These are defined as internal models of self and others, which

form the basis of attachment theory. Attachment theory postulates that the level of attachment a

person has developed with their primary care-giver during their youth is very indicative of the

behaviours and level of trust they display towards others. Furthermore, attachment is also very

indicative of the adaptive behaviours one employs to deal with adverse and stressful situations

(Cassidy & Shaver, 2008; Kurth, 2013). Even more importantly, research has also shown that

attachment styles are not only fairly stable; they are also fairly predictive of our adult attachment

styles (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Although the stability and

predictive qualities are comforting due to the foundational nature of attachment elements

(Bowlby 1982), a question remains of whether or not those with maladaptive or insecure

attachment styles are doomed for a lifetime of insecure attachment. Regardless of this, there is

hope; various studies show that certain types of therapy, the passage of time, overall increase in

self-esteem, and other contextual changes have shown to create fluidity in attachment styles

(Zhang & Labouvie-Vief, 2004; Golden, 2009).

Problem Statement

As indicated, leadership styles can be enhanced or restricted by the level of trust a person

can both give and nurture. If we are then able to affect the development of trust that a person

both displays and has, then we also should be able to affect the efficacy of a persons' leadership

style. Research has also shown that a person's attachment, which is nurtured during their

developmental years, plays a large role in how trusting they are in future relationships

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, 2007). To this end then, if we can

find a correlation between developed attachment styles and styles of leadership, we may just

have found the golden thread that allows us to influence the type of leaders we all have the

potential to become; even long before we are required to become leaders. Hence the all-

important question is asked; is there a correlation between one's attachment style and one's

future leadership style.

Hypothesis

   I propose that there is a positive correlation between secure and preoccupied attachment

styles and transformational and democratic leadership styles; this largely being due to the

positive internal model of others for both of these attachment styles.

   Inversely, I believe there is a negative correlation between dismissive and fearful

attachment styles and transformational and democratic leadership styles.

   I also believe there is a positive correlation between dismissive attachment styles and, to

a lesser degree, fearful attachment styles and autocratic and transactional leadership styles.

   Inversely, I believe there is a negative correlation between secure and preoccupied

attachment styles and autocratic and transactional leadership styles.

Nature of This Study

   For this study, I will first review the appropriate and relevant information as it pertains to

attachment theory. A detailed discussion of the history, current beliefs, and future implications

will be undertaken which should prove sufficient in laying out the core foundational elements as

well as the impact of attachment theory to my discussion. Following this, a detailed analysis of

the realm of leadership models will be presented. Future directions and implications will also

form part of this analysis. After having dealt with each of these topics individually, with the

limited amount of research that currently exists, this paper will endeavour to formulate a

response to the aforementioned hypotheses. However, due to the nature of the scant research that

has been done, several proposals and ideologies will be put forth that will hopefully serve to

guide future research in this extremely important field of study.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to bring about an opportunity for discussion regarding leadership development and an awareness that we have not yet reached any type of formulaic or general consensus on how tomorrow's leaders should be properly trained and nurtured. Granted, it is not my goal to create a formula, but should the data prove that there is a strong correlation between attachment styles and future leadership styles then really there is no question that we have stumbled upon the greatest discovery in the leadership training world since leadership styles were first introduced by Lewin in 1939.

Definition of Terms

Attachment: Attachment refers to the relational bond that human beings have with one another (Boyd, 2015). Originally, attachment was just defined as the type of emotional bond a child had with his/her primary caregiver (i.e mother) (Bowbly, 1982). The three original childhood attachment styles are defined as *securely attached*, *insecure-avoidant*, and *insecure-anxious/ambivalent*.

Adult Attachment: Similar to childhood attachment, adult attachment is the relational bond that human beings have with one another, however, the caregiver no longer plays a direct role. Adult attachment styles have been grouped into four categories; *secure, dismissive, preoccupied,* and *fearful* (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Leadership: leadership can be defined as a relationship where one person has the ability to influence another person to perform an action, task, or achieve a goal.

Leadership Styles: Various styles, or characteristics that define certain styles, of how one leads others to achieve goals and ambitions. This paper focuses on the five key leadership styles;

namely, *autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional,* and *transformational* (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; MindTools, n.d.).

Assumptions

For this paper several assumptions have been made. It is assumed that the majority of leaders will exhibit traits that allow them to be categorized as being dominant in one or more of the five leadership styles; autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational. Furthermore, an assumption has also been made that due to some of the overlapping qualities in each of the leadership styles; some of the results and research studied may indicate a weaker correlation than actually present. There is just no scientific way to categorically place billions of people into five groups without have some overlap and also some alienation of certain traits and characteristics; in light of this, it is assumed that the majority of traits and people are represented in the results that are represented in this document. Some further assumptions and speculations, with suggestions for future study, will be made in order to allow for the scant research that exists on the correlation between one's personal attachment style and the leaders they are or can become.

Various studies (Boatwright et al, 2010; VanSloten & Henderson, 2011) focus on two leadership behaviours as identified by the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). These two behaviour tendencies are: task-centred and relation-centred. Task-centred leaders focus heavily on results and completion of certain tasks and therefore tend to focus less on the relationship that is being forged with their followers. Relational leaders, on the other hand, are more likely to focus on the relationship that is being built and maintained and then use it to remain engaged with their followers. There are no studies that directly link the LDBQ behaviours to the five leadership styles as presented in this paper; autocratic, democratic, laissez-

faire, transactional, and transformational. Hence an assumption has been made in regards to the relation between the LDBQ behaviours and leadership styles. It is important to note that this is not a superficial or shallow assumption, but it has been carefully researched and various studies indicate that there is implicit evidence that support this assumption (Johnson, 2007; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2009; Boatwright et al, 2010). For the purpose of this document, democratic, laissez-faire, and transformational leaders are assumed to be considered relational in their behaviours. On the other hand, autocratic and transactional leaders are considered to be task-centered in their behaviours. There is much opportunity for research in relation to this assumption.

Significance

For the past century, both leadership and personality theory have been closely watched and researched (Lewin, Leppit & White, 1939; Towler, 2005; Maxwell 2007, 2011), and yet it seems as if very little progress has been made on the development of great leaders. By accepting personality trait theory as being important (Rath, 2007; Personality Types, 2016) in the understanding of ourselves and how we perceive the world, how we make decisions, and how we work we can move beyond accepting it strictly as predictor of great leaders. By accepting this however, we have the chance that we could leave a vacuum in terms of what we truly believe defines a great leader. It is fortunate that research has shown that leadership instead is about influence (Greenleaf, 1970; Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Sinek 2013) and how capable people are in influencing others predicts how good of a leader they can be. We also know that influence is about trust; both being trusting and trustworthy (Maccoby, 2004; Lencioni, 2014; Sinek, 2014). Attachment theory has proven to also have many aspects of trust inherent in its model (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Therefore by finding correlations between an individual's

attachment style and their leadership style we may be able to predict that certain attachment styles will lead to certain leadership styles. Once this link has been established we can rely on basic therapeutic, or possibly non-therapeutic, interventions that improve an individual's attachment, which in turn can affect the type of leaders they will become.

This proposition has enormous implications on many areas of life. First and foremost the entire leadership field would benefit; rather than looking for great traits and qualities in leaders, we would need to ensure that we work on building trust and attachment in order to develop great leaders. No longer would we need to rely on an aging paradigm that states some people simply will never have the potential to be effective leaders. Furthermore, by establishing that trust and attachment are integral to becoming an effective leader, other areas such as marriage therapy, family therapy, etc. would also benefit; any familial system that requires collaboration and integrating between its members also requires influence and trust. Therefore, if we have learned better ways to affect these relationships then we have made significant advances in respect to the quality of life on our planet.

Researcher Position

As a researcher I am not only extremely interested in how attachment theory and attachment styles are correlated to, or even predict, leadership styles, but I also have a vested interest in this research for various other reasons. First and foremost, I am a strong believer in aspects of attachment theory; in particular the components that indicate there is a correlation between the level of attachment one has with their primary caregiver and how this correlates to the level of trust that is displayed in future relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, 2007). This has always piqued my interest, especially because I come from a large family, and also have a large family, which both have anecdotally indicated to

me that attachment is very personal and relational and can vary greatly from one relationship to the next, even within one family. Over the years I have also noticed how this attachment affects the many relationships that each of my family members has had in later life and this has only assisted in deepening my desire for more empirical evidence to back up those observations. Secondly, I currently hold several leadership positions both in business, school, and my personal community and the quest to create deep and long lasting relationships that transcend just transactional interactions has always intrigued me. Hence, attachment, trust, and relationships are something that hold special value for me. Furthermore, I am continually endeavoring to have a larger impact on others and the communities/relationships which I am part of. Therefore, by understanding the intricacies of what makes great leaders great and how we can influence this development at a very young age seems to me to be a very rich and rewarding endeavor.

As mentioned, I come from a large family and also have a large family myself and in line with this, I believe that I was, and still am, fairly securely attached to my parents; in particular, my mother. I also believe that this has allowed me to be fairly trusting in others, however, I also feel that trust in myself was something that was lacking; especially in the first 20 years of my life. Regardless of this, I was able to gain a persevering and increased level of trust in myself through much work, self-reflection, and practice. This process has made me a firm believer that levels of trust and how trusting we are as leaders can be influenced; not only through therapy, but also by experiencing and believing that attachment is important and working from this premise to achieve a greater level of trust in self. Research has also shown that attachment can also fluctuate over time (Keller & Cacioppe, 2001; Zhang & Labouvie-Vief, 2004; Wake, 2010). My personal journey has most definitely made an impact on the level of optimism I have for the idea that if attachment styles can be influenced and if the leaders we become is correlated to attachment

styles then there is hope for leadership training programs that will use attachment as a basis for continued development of better leadership skills and approaches.

Therefore, being personally vested in the journey that this research begins to uncover and having much hope for future research and findings that validate this research, I am keenly aware that all this research must be deeply rooted in empirical data that proves beyond a doubt that we are able to impact future leaders by basing our training programs on attachment theories.

Chapter 2 – Attachment Theory

Historical Context

Attachment theory emerged from various psychology roots which, blended together, are based on the idea that the attachment behaviour in humans is a behavioural system which has its roots in evolutionary terms and, as such, is fundamental to the survival of the human race (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Bretherton, 1992). Attachment is as critical to human success as reproduction (Kurth, 2013). Bowlby (1982) describes attachment behaviour as "any form of behaviour that results in a person attaining or maintaining proximity to some other clearly identified individual who is conceived as better able to cope with the world" (p. 668). As will be shown, attachment theory, just like many emerging concepts and theories, has evolved through various iterations, modifications, and additions over the past 60 years.

The origins of attachment theory can be traced back to the late 1920s at which time John Bowlby, an aspiring graduate, was just beginning to chart his course as a psychiatrist (Bretherton, 1992). Although psychology was only just emerging as a field unto itself, Bowlby did take some courses in what is now called developmental psychology. While trying to decide where he should put down his career roots, Bowlby did some volunteer work at a school for maladjusted children. Two of these children in particular made an indelible impression on him (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). This experienced proved to highlight for Bowlby that the relationship these boys had with their mother was paramount to how they would develop as adolescents and adults; in particular, he believed that their attachment to their mother predicted how they were able to cope with the stresses of life in general. Subsequently, his experience with these two boys persuaded him to become a child psychiatrist.

During his training as a psychiatrist, Bowlby was also accepted to study at the British Psychoanalytic Institute (Bretherton, 1992). During this time he was heavily influenced by the Kleinian group, who, although Freudian, differed from Anna Freud in several areas but most importantly in Klein's staunch adherence to the concept that all issues arise from a child's fantasy world (Vorus, 2003). Although Bowlby was grateful for this training, he had some serious concerns with the Kleinian fanatical focus on this fantasy world. Bowlby felt too much emphasis was placed on this fantasy world and in its place he was more apt to believe that the external world was impacting children more than their fantasy world was. This disagreement eventually ran so strong that Melanie Klein eventually "forbade Bowlby to talk to the mother of a 3-year-old whom he analyzed under her supervision" (Bretherton, 1992, p. 761). Without any access to the individuals he wanted to study, Bowlby was left in a situation where he could not continue his research. This dispute however did not cause Bowlby to completely break from his psychoanalytic roots. Even years after breaking away from the Klein group, Bowlby (1958) still considered himself to be a psychoanalyst and stated that he believed all psychoanalysts generally agree that by 12 months of age children have very strong ties to their caregivers. However, "the differences [between individual theories] lie in how this has come about" (p. 350). With this as a backdrop, Bowlby went on to do various research projects on his own, one of which was his first systematic research on 44 juvenile thieves, which was published in 1944 (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). During this research he was able to quite convincingly connect "their [maladaptive] symptoms to histories of maternal deprivation and separation" (Bretherton, 1992, p. 761).

    It would prudent at this time to make mention of Mary Ainsworth, who is considered to be the co-founder, with Bowlby, of attachment theory. Ainsworth, six years younger than Bowlby, finished up her graduate studies at the University of Toronto just before the outbreak of

World War II. Although also influenced by Freud's work and theory of psychoanalysis,

Ainsworth took a different element to her work that also heavily influenced attachment theory;

her dissertation was based on Blatz's theory of security (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). According

to Blatz's theory the definition of security, is based on its root word "secure", which in Latin

literally means "without care/anxiety" (Oxford Dictionary, n.d.). Children naturally have a

curiosity to explore the world but will only do so when they are secure (Bowlby, 1982;

Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Eventually they will venture out farther and farther from their

primary caregiver and into the realm of insecurity, but always with firm knowledge that their

caregiver is only a few steps away. As time and experience goes on, the child learns to find some

of this security within themselves, which then allows them to become secure, autonomous

humans. Furthermore, security also has a lot to do with trust. A child's level of security is based

on his/her trust that the world is not too dangerous of a place. However, upon further reflection

after her graduation, Ainsworth began to see that Blatz's security theory did not deal with

defense mechanisms properly. Ainsworth also could not agree with Blatz's rejection of Freud's

idea of the role of unconscious processes (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991).

World War II played a crucial role in how Bowlby and Ainsworth became co-founders of

attachment theory. With both of their departments nearly abandoned due to the war effort,

Ainsworth and Bowlby became very busy using their skills as psychologists and researchers in

and during the war effort (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Bretherton, 1992). After the war, Bowlby

took on the position as the head of the Children's Department at the Tavistock Clinic. It is fitting

that he immediately renamed it to the Department for Children *and Parents*. Coincidently, back

in Canada, Ainsworth had married and subsequently moved to London to be with her husband

who was completing his doctoral studies. It was in 1950 that Ainsworth responded to an ad as a

research assistant for Bowlby and by securing that job a relationship that would span more than 40 years began. However, during this time it was not only Bowlby and Ainsworth who were focussing on the mother/child relationship. It was widely believed that the relationship with a mother and a child emerged because she fed the child and the need for food created a sense of satisfaction for the child when the mother was able to provide food (Bowlby, 1982). At this time, it is worth mentioning that Bowlby himself was raised by a nannie, and typically only saw his birth mother for one hour per day during teatime. It is understandable that he was sceptical of any theories that postulated that a mother-child bond was simply created through the act of feeding. In fact, he vividly describes how his nanny left him when he was four and this was like the loss of a mother to him ("John Bowlby", 2015). As a result, the causal effect of feeding on attachment did not make complete sense to Bowlby and it was during this time that he became aware of the work of Lorenz (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). Lorenz was studying infant geese and their initial relationships with their parent figures. His studies and findings of "imprinting" showed that goslings could become attached to humans and even inanimate objects that did not feed them. This was further confirmed by studies done by Harlow (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008), which showed that baby monkeys preferred a cloth covered "mother" that provided contact comfort over the wire covered mother that provided food. This led Bowlby to become extremely sceptical that it was strictly the feeding and hunger cycles that were cause for the attachment that was believed to be critical to a child's rearing and development of the relational bond that seemed to be driving the attachment styles.

Childhood Attachment Theory Model

With both Ainsworth and Bowlby determinedly looking for the causes and links inherent in a child's attachment, various studies were undertaken. One of the more important studies was

when Ainsworth left for Uganda from 1953-1955, due to her husband's placement, where she

conducted her research with many infant-mother dyads. The next critical study was undertaken

in Baltimore; another move due to her husband's work. During all of these changes and moves,

Bowlby and Ainsworth made strong efforts to ensure they worked closely together. In fact, after

1960 all drafts for their individual major publications were exchanged and critiqued by the other

(Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). It was during this time that Ainsworth, based on her research and

supported by Bowlby's theoretical postulations, came up with the first categorization of

attachment styles. Although at first quite "rather crudely" (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991, p. 337)

put together, as Ainsworth described in her own words, her styles eventually merged into three

main classifications. The first category is *securely attached*, which sees a child crying during

separation and then calling for a familiar person, but as soon as this person appears with a joyful

welcome to the child, the child's stress quickly subsides and the child continues to play. The

second category is *insecure-avoidant*, which sees the child showing little if any outward reaction

to a separation event. However, a physiological reaction definitely occurs (i.e. cortisol levels

increase). When the familiar person returns, the child will turn away from this person and

continue playing but seems to do so without feeling. The third attachment style is defined as

insecure-anxious/ambivalent; this style sees the child as already being anxious or angry prior to

the separation. The stress is even markedly higher during separation and when the familiar

person returns the child remains stressed for a long time. Sometimes the stress is displayed as

aggression by the child rather than seeking proximity. Many years later, in the 1980s, Mary Main

added a fourth category called *disorganized/disoriented*. This style is defined by contradictory

behaviour patterns towards the familiar person. Studies across various cultures and countries,

prior to 1980, have shown that on average 65% of participants are securely attached, 21% are

insecure-avoidant and 14% are insecure-ambivalent (Kurth, 2013).

Much research has indicated that the attachment theory model has significant merit and

numerous studies have attested to the fact that attachment is not something that can simply be

ignored (Bowlby, 1982; Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). As mentioned earlier, Bowlby, Ainsworth,

and their followers have classified the attachment model as a behavioural system which can learn

from the memory of prior events and also learn to react to other cues that the environment, or the

primary caregiver, will display from time to time (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). This learning and

memory-based context is very promising in regards to future work with mal-attached children.

Bowlby was convinced, and subsequent studies have shown, that attachment to a caregiver

occurs regardless of whether or not the child's needs are being met. Attachment is not simply the

effects of basic needs and wants. It is a fundamental relational system that requires constant

interaction and children will become attached, securely or not, regardless of the situation or

whether the child's needs are being met. In fact, the researchers claim that "there is no need to

view attachment as the by-product of any more fundamental processes or drive" (Cassidy &

Shaver, 2008, p. 5). So then if attachment is truly a behavioural system at work within a child's

body and if it can be influenced at a very young age to negatively affect a child's ability to

productively function in the world, then surely, although possibly with much work, we can also

positively influence it later in life to once again regain some of its lost elements as we can with

other behavioural systems in our body. This theory of a malleable attachment is further

strengthened by Mikulincer & Shaver (2007), who found that attachment styles can be temporal

and that a familiar figure can influence his/her attached followers' preferences over time. I hope

to return to this fluidity of attachment after dealing with the implications of adult attachment

theory.

Adult Attachment Theory Model

Regardless of the future promise in relation to how we can influence adult, or even

adolescent, attachment styles many past and current studies show that childhood attachment is

very predictive of adult attachment styles (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). According to Bowlby (1982)

this makes complete sense; attachment is a behavioural system and therefore it must lay down

some foundational neural connections that are developed in early childhood in order for a person

to remain somewhat stable throughout their life; it would only be logical that these patterns are

maintained throughout adulthood. Nevertheless, there are some differences between childhood

and adult attachment. Whereas childhood attachment is related to having a primary caregiver (or

mother) figure, which the child must be in close proximity too, adult attachment takes more the

form of an attachment to a peer (or sexual partner) and rather than proximity, Sroufe & Waters

(1977) have identified what they call "felt-security" which is more of an emotional sense rather

than physical sense of security (p. 3). Just like when a child moves from concrete to abstract

ideas as they mature into an adult, the same is for attachment; rather than concrete proximity

they are able to move to a more abstract notion of proximity.

Although Hazen & Shaver (1987, 1997) identified adult attachment orientations as being

equal to childhood attachment styles; namely, secure, insecure-avoidant, and insecure-

ambivalent, Bartholomew & Horowitz (1991) identified a four-category model theory that is not

only more in line with the previous mentioned childhood four-category model system as

identified by Main (Kurth, 2013), but it also allows for a more comprehensive explanation of the

internal workings of the adult attachment model. The two foundational parts of this four-category

model are the internal model of self (either positive or negative) and the internal model of others (again, either positive or negative). The proposed model moves from most secure to least secure. The first category is *secure* where the person has both a positive internal model of self and a positive model of others. In this category it can be assumed that the person is both confident in their own abilities and autonomy but also able to have complete trust and confidence that others will be available and come through for them should the need arise. The second style is *dismissive*, which is characterized by a positive model of self, but negative model of others. These people are most likely to be highly independent and have little need, or desire, to depend on others. They are most likely to supress any feelings of vulnerability and will use distance from others as a coping strategy during stressful times. The third category is *preoccupied*. This category is characterized by an individual who has a negative model of self and a positive model of others, making this person extremely dependent. When closeness and support are lacking these people will display immense amounts of anxiety; as a result these individuals will usually have poor coping mechanisms and will also be easily overwhelmed and preoccupied by what others are thinking. The fourth and final style is *fearful*. This style describes people who have both a negative model of self and a negative model of others. These people typically see themselves as worthless and unlovable as well as they will tend to avoid relationships in order to protect their ego; as a result intimate relationships tend to be rare (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Fluidity of Attachment

I would now like to go back to the earlier brief discussion about the fluidity of our internal attachment system. Fluidity of, or change in, attachment style was discovered in a 6-year longitudinal study by Zhang & Labouvie-Vief (2004). The researchers found that the level of

security for a person was negatively correlated with their defensive coping and depressive symptoms. There was also a positive correlation between the security of an individual and a better sense of well-being and integrated coping. Throughout the study when a participant reported being better at coping and had a better sense of well-being, they also scored as being more secure. Conversely, when a participant was not doing very well and felt a reduced ability to cope, they also scored lower on the secure attachment score. Furthermore, the researchers also found fluidity in the realm of age affect. Throughout the course of their study, individuals become more secure and dismissing and less preoccupied than the younger people.

An extremely promising and vital finding by other studies have shown that the level of fluidity and change in a person's attachment style could be indicated by the style of attachment the person displays to begin with (Keller & Cacioppe, 2001). This leaves us with the potential to be able to predict how much fluidity any particular individual may be prone to prior to entering any therapy or education that attempts to affect attachment styles. Various other studies have also shown that individuals who seek support have an increased belief that others may be able to help them (Riggs, Jacobvitz, & Hazen, 2002). Along this line, people with secure and pre-occupied styles (defined as having positive internal model of others) are more likely to seek for help than those with dismissive and fearful styles (defined as having negative internal model of others). This again displays much promise for the future of the ability to affect attachment styles with therapy. If people with a dominate preoccupied style can learn to boost their internal model of self as they age, or possibly with therapy, then there is also potential that those with negative models of others can learn to trust and view others which will only serve to move them up the continuum to more secure individuals. This is also confirmed by various studies as detailed by Golden (2009), which show that Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and other cognitive and/or

behavioural therapies have proven to be successful in treating a variety of attachment issues/disorders. Further and more recent evidence also displays the effectiveness of many types of brief therapy that exist today. Most brief therapies include some form of psycho-educational and neuroscience components both of which have been deemed to be effective in working with attachment issues (Wake, 2010).

Future of Attachment Theory

When attachment theory first emerged, the focus quickly moved from what was then a very single-person focussed psychoanalytic model to a dyadic child-mother relationship. However, in the last 15-20 years, attachment theory has been moving more towards a family systems approach. The entire family plays a role in the attachment model of each individual within the system (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). Attachment theory is also making an impact on other areas of psychology and therapy. In particular, developmental psychology is making use of and integrating the findings that cross-cultural, life-span, and ecological longitudinal studies are providing (Bretherton, 1992). Recent developments in neuroscience undoubtedly will also play a critical role in the evolution of attachment theory (Wake, 2010). Although much understanding and knowledge will be gained by understanding how attachment develops throughout our lives and what truly constitutes secure attachment, I believe that due to the eclectic nature of attachment theory (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991) a greater impact will be had once more of the research becomes focussed on the interventions and promise that new, or strengthened, therapies and treatments can offer for current and future generations.

Chapter 3 – Leadership Styles

Historical Context

One only has to peruse popular magazines, news sites, and history books to come to the conclusion that we, as humans, have always been enamoured by our leaders. History books are full of both heroic and dastardly accounts of leaders. From this plethora of historical content many qualities and characteristics of leaders have been purveyed. As a result there has never been a single, all-encompassing definition that describes the ideal leader. Not only cross culturally, but also within cultures there are multiple paradigms of what makes a leader. However, one thing we can be sure is that there are numerous inborn and acquired talents and skills that make up a leader (Rath, 2007; Personality Types, 2016). I am frequently reminded of a quip by the leadership guru John Maxwell, when asked if leaders are born, his response was, "I certainly hope so, I have never met an unborn leader and quite frankly, I have no desire to meet one" (Maxwell, 2007, p. 25). The premise of this comment is that there is no single, or even several, natural inborn traits that makes one person a leader and not another. Inversely everyone who is alive (has been born) has the capacity and ability to be a leader.

Various leadership theories have been postulated in the last few millenniums. One such theory, the *great man theory* (Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014; Chand, 2015)*,* seems to have suited the human race just fine for many centuries. This theory describes the leader as a great man (or woman) who is just at the right place at the right time and always had the right talents to lead in the presenting situation. Furthermore, many times leaders were considered to be gifts from God or from the heavens and as such they were considered to be of divine nature. However, more research in the last century has proven this to be incorrect. Out of this came *trait theory* (Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014; Chand, 2015), which describes the leader as someone who has all

the right qualities and traits to lead in whatever situation he/she is placed in. Subsequently, for

many years much research was done on personality traits and various characteristics; yet this also

has not improved the vision of what defines a great leader (Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014).

However, the research on personality theory is not wasted; rather it has prompted us to identify

how each personality type can effectively utilize their own inborn and acquired traits to become

leaders in their own right. Various other overarching theories, such as *situational, behavioural*,

and *participative theories* have since been identified as well, but for each of them leadership

tends to be defined by what the leader delivers rather than by a set of leadership qualities or

characteristics that could both define and restrict the leadership style (Sethuraman & Suresh,

2014). We have simply not been able to define and hang onto a great leadership theory until

recently. Modern leadership gurus are arguing that simply put, leadership is all about influence

(Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014). When one individual is able to influence

another they are leading; it's that simple. In essence every human on earth can and typically is a

leader in some form and in some context. Therefore in order to become a better leader, we need

to become a better influencer.

The Leadership-as-Influence Model

Just as trait theory was gaining ground, Kurt Lewin introduced his three-style leadership

model in 1939 (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939). Lewin can be considered the founder of the

modern leadership-as-influence movement. His model consisted of three styles; namely,

autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire (MindTools, n.d.). Although Lewin's initial study

(Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939) was created to identify forms of aggression in children who were

being led by three different types of leaders, the rest of the world took notice and since then a

stream of similar models, theories, and books have been published. As one can notice, Lewin's

styles do not focus on one particular personality trait, or on one particular talent, which an individual must possess in order to be successful. In contrast to earlier theories his style focuses on what method the leader in question uses to influence others. The acquired and innate traits of each individual then allow each leader to utilize these in their area of strengths. Leading is now being seen as more about managing talents to influence others than it is about possessing a particular leadership gene (Prewitt, Weil, & McClure, 2011). Since the introduction of the three styles, Popper, Mayleless, & Castelnovo (2000) have expanded the modern leadership model to include five styles; the two added styles are transactional and transformational leadership.

In order to understand the leadership model used throughout this paper each of the five styles are summarized as follows (MindTools, n.d.; Talithi, 2015):

The autocratic leader. This type of leader, also known as the authoritarian leader, tends to make his/her decisions with little or no input from his/her followers. Followers are more than likely referred to as subordinates and, as such, influence is delivered with a heavy hand. Typically in today's fast-paced and loosely coupled environment, influence must unfortunately be administered with various reward/punishment based systems in order to maintain high levels of productivity. This style has its place, especially when decisions need to be made quickly, but it can also be demoralizing, creating high staff turnover and lack of trust. Furthermore, usually a leader will eventually run out of continually escalating rewards and/or punishments which could result in diminished influence. However, the military and other like-minded institutions seem to fair well with this particular style.

The democratic leader. This leader is very involved in decision making, but he/she also includes the various stakeholders in a deeply embedded consultation and decision making process. Followers are typically heavily involved in all levels of decision making and therefore

the influence exerted by the leader happens as a result of the leader guiding the democratic

process rather than guiding/dictating the decision itself. This type of leader encourages creativity

and buy-in, which in turn usually leads to positive job satisfaction and higher rates of

productivity. However, this type of leader also runs the risk of having too many options and

paralyzing the decision process, or furthermore, they also run the risk of alienating one or more

individuals if they have not been consulted properly or fairly.

      The laissez-fair leader. Lewin's third and final style is a leader who involves him/herself

very little in the actual decision making. The resources and advice are offered and for the rest the

followers would typically make all the decisions; hopefully guided by a pre-defined framework

to ensure the best interests of the group are still being met. Typically this style will work well

with a group of experts who are each an expert in their own right and are expected to perform to

a certain level of conduct while executing their profession. This style can work very well under

the right circumstance, but it can also be very easily abused by those who lack the skills and

motivation to work efficiently.

      The transactional leader. The transactional leader could possibly also be considered as

simply being a milder version of the autocratic style in that transactional leaders expect their

followers to obey them, but at the same time they typically allow for more freedom in making

decisions; hence it has been defined as a separate style. There are some other subtle differences

as well in that transactional leadership also often allows for more promotional opportunities for

making great decisions but again it can tend to rely too heavily on a reward/punishment based

influence system. Furthermore, this style has also been associated with that is known as

bureaucratic leadership, which is typically not as well suited for innovative teams. Output is

typically measured by transactions and tasks accomplished rather than goals reached. As such, compensation is also related to similar metrics.

The transformational leader. Transformational leaders motivate and influence people with a shared vision and they communicate extremely well. Typically they have what is also known as Emotional Intelligence (EQ), which again, unlike IQ, can be learned (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). These leaders simply expect that everyone will perform and they hold themselves and everyone accountable accordingly (Popper, Mayleless, & Castelnovo, 2000). This final style has also been sometimes associated with what is known as the charismatic leadership style (Towler, 2005); however, the major difference between the charismatic and the transformational leader is their intent. The charismatic leader is usually focussed on their own gain, whereas the transformational leader is focussed on each team member's and the whole team's gain.

Broadening the Leadership Style Model

Based on the preceding information, one could consider the topic of leadership styles as being sufficiently covered. However, in recent years several more very integral and important leadership theories have emerged and subsequently embraced by various leadership disciplines. The following theories in no way replace any of the previous work which Lewin (1939), Popper et al (2000), or any others that have contributed to the above leadership-as-influence model. In fact, these newly developed theories only serve to strengthen and increase the robustness of the previous work. Specifically, three concepts require elaboration to fully appreciate what they add to the leadership field; they are *the servant leader* (Greenleaf, 1970), *contextual leadership* identified by the Five Levels of Leadership (Maxwell, 2011), and a concept called *vulnerability-based trust* (Lencioni, 2014).

The servant leader. The servant leadership style is a theory that was originally developed by Greenleaf (1970). Servant leadership is defined as, "The servant-leader is servant first… It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions" (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 2). Although it can be argued that servant leadership is thousands of years old and that it can be traced back to the biblical teachings of Jesus, the idea was still considered a breakthrough in 1970. Even today, servant leadership tends to remain a rare, yet sought after leadership quality (Chinomona, Mashiloane, & Pooe, 2013; Klaassen, 2015a). As one can ascertain from the name of this theory, a true servant leader always puts the needs of the team and greater society ahead of their own needs. Simon Sinek would describe it very succinctly in when he says that great leaders eat last; succinctly put these leaders will sacrifice themselves so others may gain (Sinek, 2015). Unfortunately, it is more common to encounter leaders who sacrifice others so they themselves may gain; as was clearly displayed by the leaders of the major financial institutions during the 2008 financial crisis. Although all of the five previously identified styles can be executed by a servant leader, some fit better with the servant leader approach than others do. A true servant leader can be compared to a stagecoach driver who only holds the reins (representing the guidelines) and allows the horses to run as they need to. The driver, or leader, is still in charge, but rather than being ahead and getting in front of the people he/she is allowing their team to lead and he/she is then a servant to the people who they are leading (Klaassen, 2015a). Being a servant leader is not the same as being lackadaisical or flippant about leading; in fact, it is a very determined and specific kind of leadership that is meant to empower followers. A servant leader is completely in tune with the individual needs of

each person that he/she leads. However, this does not mean the leader becomes a slave to their

people, but rather, they become a supplier of resources, advice, and encouragement to allow the

entire team to flourish. By remaining a consistent and humble servant, influence can be exerted

whenever required.

Maxwell's five levels of leadership. With his leadership model, leadership guru, John

Maxwell takes a completely different approach. Again, he does not negate any of the

aforementioned work, nor does he detract from it in any way. According to Maxwell, leadership

is all about influence; nothing more, nothing less (Maxwell, 2011). Prewitt, Weil, & McClure

(2011) also argue that "leadership is the ability to influence others" (p. 13). Influence is defined

as, "the capacity to have an effect on the character, development, or behaviour of someone or

something, or the effect itself" (Oxford Dictionary, 2001). Based on this definition it is not

difficult to make the connection that Maxwell has also made. In order to lead effectively, a leader

must have the ability to influence his/her followers, or, at a minimum, have an effect on people

and their behaviours. Just as in servant leadership and with reference to the stagecoach analogy

again, if a leader does not have the ability to have an effect on his/her followers, then he/she is

simply a passenger on the stagecoach and not the driver (Klaassen, 2015a). The five levels, as

defined below, are contexts, or situational constructs, that define how much influence a leader

really has, regardless of the which style they may employ.

Each one of Maxwell's (2011) five levels starts with the letter "P" (Klaassen, 2015b).

The first is position, which refers to the context where the leader is only the leader due to their

rank or position as leader; it's all about the title. In this context the leaders are the directing force

and they are only influencing their followers because they have the positional rights and

authority to do so. If a leader were to stay at this level for an extended period of time then there

is an inherent risk they will influence strictly with reward and punishment systems since this is about the only impact they have on their followers' activities. In this level, followers "follow because they have to"; this level is all about hierarchy and power structure. Influence is only exerted at this level because of the hierarchical structure dictated within the definition of the word itself. Neither party (leader or follower) may have even bought into the idea of leadership; they are simply following the structure.

Once and if there has been forward movement in the relationship and it is now based on more than just position, the leader has moved to the second level; aptly called permission. Permission is purely about the relationship between the leader and follower. In this level, followers actually want to be led and directed by the leader because they believe in the leader. The followers have trust and faith that the leader is in a leadership position to assist and influence their growth and as a result it is not just the positional right to be a leader any longer; there is an implicit permission, or request, to be served by the leader. At this time it is prudent to mention that these levels are not necessarily sequential. It is entirely possible that a relationship starts at this level, or at even more developed levels. It is perfectly reasonable that some relationships may be start at this level because of the level or rapport that is built up in the very first meeting.

The third level is production, which is all about results. In this level the relationship is not only built on the positional right of the leader to lead, nor on just the permission of the follower to be led, but it is rooted in what type of results the leader has achieved and displayed for the organization or field of expertise. In this level the leader is exemplified by his/her accomplishments and this then only proves to build the trust and rapport for the leader/follower relationship. In an employment (or work-based relationship) it is not uncommon for leaders to

begin at this level; in fact, they are often promoted or hired due to previous rapport and/or

accomplishments. The follower is of course employed by the leader (or the leaders' boss) and

therefore the leader certainly has the position to serve, but the follower has also requested the

leader to lead them by giving them permission to employ them and finally the leader has already

adequately demonstrated to the entire organization that they have the capacity to lead. A fair

amount of momentum and productive work can happen when a relationship has reached this

level; little or no time is spent on building trust or evaluation of expertise.

The fourth level is extremely important in achieving maximum production in an

organization. This level is called people development and is all about what the leader has done

(personally) for the follower. This is where it gets personal. People typically have no problem

being led, watched, and directed by a leader that has displayed that they have a vested interest in

the follower's future well-being and growth. It is on this level when the relationship is truly safe

enough to engage in all the feedback, critique, and affirmation necessary for a healthy,

productive, and efficient relationship. The age old, somewhat farcical, "What have you done for

me?" could be applied positively to this level. Although it could be argued that the relationship

stops here on a leader/follower level, Maxwell does introduce one final level.

This fifth level is pinnacle, or personhood, which is all about respect. At this level people

simply have a relationship with this type of leader because of who they are, what they represent,

and their values. Once a relationship has reached this level much would have to happen to shake

the foundation of the relationship. If the relationship was an analogy of building a tower, this is

where the stay cables would be anchored into the ground and this is where the leader has begun

to achieve national or even international acclaim and people are willing to follow based on this

alone (Maxwell, 2011).

One critical component of Maxwell's (2011) theory is that any given relationship is not fixed on one level and neither is one particular person always fixed on one level. It is entirely possible for one leader to be a permission (level 2) leader with a certain department while simultaneously be a production (level 3) leader with another department in the same company. Furthermore, a leader may be a position (level 1) leader with a certain new individual on one team; all the while he/she has reached a person development (level 4) level with the rest of the team. Herein lies the strength of this particular model. No one leader is bound to be stuck in one level and there is no set of defining characteristics that restrict a leader from become whatever type of leader, as defined by the five leadership styles, they wish. In line with this, it may be necessary for a leader to be very autocratic with one task oriented department and in doing so the leader is able to achieve a person development (level 4) level. However, if this same leader were to be autocratic to another department they may only ever achieve a position (level 1) level with that department. For the second team, in order to achieve a higher, more influencing level, the leader may need to adopt a more transformational leadership style in order to achieve a higher level. This variance in levels could also be related to the relationship chemistry of each team or by the type of work each team performs. It must also be noted that any leader can of course move up through the levels as their relationships with their followers mature, but it is also entirely possible that a leader may lose some momentum and drop down the scale if they have acted in a way that erodes the followers' trust in their ability to lead.

Vulnerability-based trust.

Having reviewed the five leadership styles and then complementing that with the concept of servant leadership and reviewing the contextual five levels of leadership, I can only think of one component that would completely round out the leadership-as-influence model. This would

have to be trust. Leadership is influence and certainly it can be postulated that the most effective

way for a leader to influence someone is to ensure they have trust in them first; after trust has

been achieved the amount of influence that can be exerted is virtually limitless. The entire notion

of servant leadership and the five levels as defined by the contextual leadership model are built

on the premise that trust is the most important ingredient in being and becoming a great leader

(Greenleaf, 1970; Maxwell, 2007, 2011). However, when I refer to trust I am not just referring to

the standard type of trust we typically think of, which is defined as, "faith or confidence in the

loyalty, veracity, reliability, strength, etc., of a person or thing" or "a confident expectation"

(Oxford Dictionary, 2001). But rather, I refer to a type of trust that is also called "vulnerability-

based trust" (Lencioni, 2014, p. 27-28). Vulnerability-based trust is something much more

visceral and primitive. It is akin to defining love as giving someone enough power over you to

give them the ability to hurt you, but the part that makes love what it is, is knowing that they

won't hurt you. This is what vulnerability-based trust is. It is when a leader is vulnerable enough

to give his/her followers enough empowerment, authority, and credit that they can seriously

affect the well-being of the leader and/or organization. However, the trust part of the hyphenated

word is the belief that the follower will not misuse this power. The second component of this is

that the leader is vulnerable enough to admit that they are human; they make mistakes, and are

just as afraid, worried, and concerned as every other employee. Why is this so important to

effective leadership? As mentioned earlier, leadership is all about influencing an individual. By

nature most people are not prone to be influenced by everyone they meet; the reason for this is

that they have not yet developed any relationship or trust with that person. However, once a

person is able to trust their leader, he/she is now in a much better position to be influenced by

them. The more basic, primitive, and vulnerable the trust is the more influence that can be

exerted. Furthermore, in line with Maxwell's (2011) five levels, I believe that he refers to a level

of relationship and trust that must build up between each level prior to progressing to the next

one. Once a certain amount of trust has built up, the leader can quickly and easily move to the

next level. As shown before, the higher the level of leadership the more easily a leader is able

lead, or influence, his/her followers; which is directly correlated to the level of trust that is

displayed by both the leader and the follower (Maxwell, 2011).

Chapter 4 – Influence of Attachment Theory on Leadership Styles

Effects of Attachment on Leadership Styles

At this point I come to the crux of the question that the previous two chapters have provided background on. Prior to launching into the problem statement of whether or not it can be proven that there is a correlation between a person's attachment style and their leadership style, I would like to share a brief little story that I heard many years ago. This story does not appear to be credited to anyone; it seems to have become part of the myths of various ancient villages. The gist of the story is as follows:

> A group of tourists are visiting a picturesque village and see many ruins that indicate the village is not only old, but also was once a prominent village. Walking on they see an old man sitting by a fence. Being curious as to the origins of this village and its prominence one of the visitors asks, "Sir, were any great men born in this village?" Without looking up the old man replies, "Great men born in this village? No ma'am, in this village only babies are born."
>
> (Ravenhill, 1995, Jackson, 2016)

This little anecdote speaks volumes in regards to the topic of leader development. Just as Maxwell (2007) once quipped that of course leaders are born because everyone is born and everybody can be a leader, this story also portrays that the greatest leaders were all once just normal average babies; no different than any other baby born in the village. To take this one step further and link the future leadership development of this child to the theory of attachment we could also postulate that each of those babies that became great leaders were once cared for by a primary caregiver or by parents/guardians. This caregiver then was part of the equation for the child's first relationship with attachment and was the source of his/her attachment as he/she grew

up. Finally, only after many years of being dominantly attached in one of the four attachment styles, these young children then became famous leaders. Now the question remains; does one's attachment style predict or indicate what type of leader this person will become? The remainder of this chapter will focus on the research that first attempts to find correlations between attachment styles and leader preferences and perceptions, and then following this, I will discuss the scant research that does exist that begin to answer the problem at hand. However, due to the limited amount of research that has been conducted on this topic, I will propose some ideas and considerations for what the next steps could be in order to uncover the true link between attachment and leadership styles.

Leadership Style Preferences

During the initial stages of trying to find studies that attempted to discover the correlations between attachment and leadership styles most of the studies that were relevant to the topic at hand seemed to be focussed on follower's preferences for leaders based on the follower's attachment styles (Johnson, 2007; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2009; Boatwright et al, 2010). Much of this work uses the term "relational leadership" rather than leadership styles as defined in this paper (Boatwright et al, 2010, p. 7). Relational leadership is identified by using the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which categorizes leaders as being either task-centred or relationally focussed (VanSloten & Henderson, 2011). Task-centred leaders are concerned about getting tasks done and they tend to focus less on the relationship that is being forged or created between the leader and follower(s). Relational behaviours on the other hand are all about creating relationships and leaders who fall in this category are very intentional about engaging with their followers and, as a result, the style is typically less structured and/or autocratic (Boatwright et al, 2010). Therefore, as mentioned

earlier, when I refer to relational leaders I am specifically referring to three of the leadership styles; democratic, laissez-faire, and transformational since they are considered to be leaders who exhibit relational behaviours. When I refer to task-centred leaders, I specifically refer to the remaining two types of leadership styles; autocratic and transactional leaders.

Workers with preoccupied attachment styles, dictated by positive model of others, had a much stronger preference for relational leaders than workers with either dismissive or fearful attachment; dictated by negative model of others (Boatwright et al, 2010). This study clearly showed that when a person has an attachment style that is indicated by consistently having a positive model of others, they typically prefer relational leaders. In contrast with the workers who consistently have a negative internal model of others and prefer task-centred leaders.

This line of research is further concentrated by Shalit, Popper, & Zakay (2009) who found that securely attached people prefer socialized charismatic leaders. Securely attached people, again, are indicated by a positive model of others. As mentioned earlier, the term transformational leader is sometimes interchangeably used, as in this case, with charismatic leader. A socially charismatic leader is a relational leader who aligns "their vision with the followers' needs and aspirations" (p. 461). Therefore, the evidence in this study also clearly indicates that relational leaders are preferred by those with positive models of others. Inversely, the study also found that avoidant attached followers prefer personalized charismatic leaders. Avoidant attachment is the childhood attachment style that is indicated by a negative model of others. Personalized charismatic leaders are task-centered people who "promote their own personal vision and maintain one-way communication" (p. 461). This evidence not only confirms the earlier study (Boatwright et al, 2010), but it also shows that followers who have a negative model of others tend to prefer leaders who are task-centered. Based on this, it could be postulated

that neither the leader nor the follower are interested in a relationship; they simply want to

complete tasks and achieve goals without the extra strain of having to build and maintain

relational behaviours. If this could be solidified with more research then there is no doubt that

this will have a far-reaching impact on the development of a cohesive, all-encompassing

leadership development program. This program will then not only focus on the leader and his/her

qualities, needs, and wants, but the qualities, needs, wants, and attachment of the followers will

also play a role in how we train leaders.

Mayseless & Popper (2007), based on various studies, also argue that in times of crisis

individuals will tend to see leaders (usually charismatic or transformational leaders) as parental

figures and therefore create an attachment bond with them as if the leader were their parent. The

relevant issue in regards to this finding is that it is again the leadership styles which have

relational behaviours that drive the preference for the followers to want to create a connection as

well. Johnson (2007) also studied followers and their preference for leadership styles and

although in her research she found very little evidence of any significant correlations, previous

and more recent research, as indicated above, shows there are positive correlations between

secure/preoccupied attachment styles and relational leadership styles. She also found negative

correlations between dismissive/fearful attachment styles and relational leadership behaviours.

Although these findings are very helpful in understanding some of the dynamics between leaders

and followers, and there could be lasting effective benefits from understanding this, there are still

many questions that remain on how attachment styles could potentially predict leadership styles.

Leadership Style Perceptions

With a clearer understanding of follower's preferences for leaders, it is important to note

that studies have also been conducted to identify the correlations between attachment styles and

how they relate to the perception of leaders (Berson, Dan, Yammarino, 2006; Underwood, 2015). Securely attached individuals have a tendency to perceive themselves as being more effective team members than those who are insecurely attached. Furthermore, fellow team members also tended to perceive securely attached members as being future team leaders more often than those who were insecurely attached team members. Securely attached team members have a positive model of self and others. On the other hand, insecurely attached team members have either a negative model of self or others; or both. This study then also affirms that people with attachment styles that are indicated by negative internal models, which are further indicated by decreased levels of ability to trust (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), are less likely to be perceived as future leaders; both by themselves and their colleagues.

Furthermore, a subordinate's, or a follower's, perception of a leader is highly indicated by the level of trust that is both given and received by the leader (Underwood, 2015). Therefore, it is not preposterous to suggest that since trust is very indicative of our attachment styles and trust is also very indicative of our perception of leaders, coupled with the findings that attachment styles do effect our perceptions of leaders, there must be a link between our attachment style and type of leaders we become.

Leadership Style Presentation

As I mentioned earlier already, there are only a handful of studies that have explored the problem of whether or not there is a correlation between the attachment styles we have developed and the leadership styles we tend to display. Although this research is limited, there is still enough evidence and enough data to both indicate a general consensus on strong correlations, and more importantly, allow researchers to chart a course down a path that has already been started. It shows much promise for the future of leader training and development.

The earliest research that attempted to study the correlation between attachment and leadership styles was conducted by Popper, Mayesless, & Castenovo (2000), who in three studies studied transactional (task-centred behaviour) and transformational (relational behaviour) leadership styles and their correlated attachment styles. In the first study the team leaders were asked to assess their follower's attachment and leadership styles, in the second study the leaders self-reported their attachment and leadership styles, and finally in the third study the followers assessed their leader's attachment and leadership styles. In all three studies the researchers found enough evidence to indicate significant positive correlations between secure attachment styles and transformational leadership. In terms of negative correlations between insecure attachment and transformational leadership styles the researchers were only able to identify them on some occasions, but nothing conclusive to indicate there were any significant correlations present on this level.

Another study found that people who tend to be avoidant (childhood attachment indicated by a negative model of others) in their attachment style also demonstrate less relational leadership behaviours than those who are secure or anxious (childhood attachment types which are both indicated by a positive model of others (VanSloten & Henderson, 2011). Just like the studies regarding follower's preferences for relational leaders when the follower's attachment style indicated a positive model of others, a person's own leadership style also tends to be relational when they have attachment that is represented by positive models of others. Inversely, Popper (2002) had previously found that avoidant attached people were much less likely to advocate relational leadership qualities than secure or anxious attached people. Even from just the few studies mentioned, there seems to be a general consensus that leaders with relational behaviours, also identified as transformational leadership, tend to be correlated with secure and

anxious attachment styles. I therefore propose that our internal model of others is able to predict

to some degree the style of leader we become, but clearly more research must be done on this

issue to ensure there are no other extenuating factors that are causing this correlation in the

current studies.

Popper & Amit (2009) found that secure attachment style was positively correlated with

the potential to lead. The researchers identified seven hypotheses, one of which was a correlation

between attachment and the potential to lead, the remainder of the study was focussed on how

the potential to lead was correlated to the big five personality traits; openness, conscientiousness,

extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. They did not specifically study any individual

leadership styles in relation to secure attachment. Another very interesting finding was that a

mother's attachment style with a child can have a different impact on the child's future

leadership style than a father's attachment style (Towler, 2005). The researcher found that secure

parental attachment was positively correlated with a child's future charismatic (also referred to

as transformational) leadership styles. Furthermore, she also found that a father's negative

parental control behaviours were negatively correlated with charismatic (transformational)

leadership. However, a mother's parental style did not show this negative correlation. It is

intriguing that although a child can have a secure attachment with both parents and this then is

positively correlated with future charismatic leadership style, the inverse is not true; only the

father's insecure attachment with the child indicates a negative correlation with a charismatic

leadership style. More research is definitely required in this area as well.

Contrary to the studies, as outlined above, that have all found positive correlations

between secure attachment and transformational leadership styles White (2013) found that there

were no significant correlations between secure and insecure attachment styles and leadership

styles. Although at first it was somewhat startling to read this outcome, since other studies have found such strong correlation, upon further distilling of this study it became clear that the researcher was studying quite different leadership styles. The three styles that were identified were: servant leader (Greenleaf, 1970), authentic (deeply aware of how they think), and transformational. Other than transformational leadership, I believe it would have been more realistic to identify the other two leadership styles (servant and authentic) simply as behaviours that could be part of any leadership style. Hence, I believe these finding were so different from previous findings because of the definition of leadership styles.

However, other studies have also found correlations between secure attachment and transformational leadership styles (VanSloten, 2011; VanSloten & Henderson, 2011). In particular, VanSloten (2011) found that secure and avoidant attachment styles "yield directly opposing patterns of leadership styles" (p. 2). Secure and avoidant attachment styles are both characterized by a positive internal model of self, however, avoidant differs in that it is represented by a negative model of others. So here again, it seems to be evident that the internal working model of others impacts the prediction of leadership styles the most. Her research on anxious attachment and its correlation did not find any significant correlations with any leadership style. Again, anxious attachment is represented by a negative model of self, and just as Popper (2002) found, it seems to be more difficult to find correlations between leadership styles and attachment styles that indicate negative models of self; anxious/ambivalent in childhood attachment and preoccupied and fearful in adult attachment.

More recent research is also showing much promise in finding the link between attachment and leadership styles. In her research, Underwood (2015) found that secure attachment styles correlated with transformational (charismatic) leadership styles but not with

laissez-faire. This is very interesting of course, since other studies have found correlations

between the secure attachment and relational leaderships. Laissez-faire is considered to be a

relational leadership; albeit less relational than transformational. Clearly these results show that

it is more than just the relational component that is predicting the correlation. Secondly, she also

found that transformational leadership was negatively correlated with dismissive attachment

style and fearful attachment was negatively correlated with charismatic. Furthermore, laissez-

faire was positively correlated with dismissive attachment (Underwood, 2015). Dismissive and

fearful adult attachment styles are again represented by negative models of others and this study

only again confirms that leaders who have negative internal models of others tend to not become

transformational leaders. It must be noted that it was somewhat confusing to differentiate

between the leadership styles that this researcher chose to use. At one point transformational and

charismatic leadership styles were indicated as being synonymous (as they are in this paper), yet

in the results she identified them as separate styles; both however, are very relational in their

behaviour. In this second part of her study she did find that laissez-fair leaders were positively

correlated with dismissive attachment style (Underwood, 2015). Dismissive attachment, as

mentioned earlier, has a positive model of self and a negative model of others; this finding was

not surprising in light of all the research outlined thus far.

Developing Leaders from an Attachment Orientation

Even though there remains an incredibly wide open field of research that could, and

should, be conducted in order to establish a strong and consistent link between all attachment and

leadership styles, this has not stopped some to postulate that we must develop leaders from an

attachment orientation (Drake, 2009). He argues that based on Narrative Therapy and

Attachment Theory and the scant research that has thus far found correlations between

attachment and leadership styles we must create programs that endeavour to develop leaders using attachment-oriented techniques. There is enough evidence, both anecdotally and empirically, for him to utilize the five therapeutic tasks as identified by Bowlby (1988). Drake (2009) adapted these tasks to come up with five strategies when coaching leaders. The five strategies are as follows: (1) provide each coaching session as a safe haven, (2) see how the leaders relate to others, (3) use the client's attachment related behaviours to build more secure and relational patterns, (4) discuss how the leader's working models are rooted in childhood attachment experiences, and finally, (5) position yourself as a "good enough" coach (p. 56-57).

The Future of Attachment and Leadership Styles

Although several studies have indicated that there are strong correlations between secure attachment and transformational leadership and that there are negative correlations between attachment styles that are indicated by a negative model of others (dismissive and fearful) and transformational/charismatic leadership styles, yet there is not nearly enough research available to conclusively state that leadership styles can be predicted by attachment styles. There are a number of reasons for this. Firstly, simply not enough research has been done in this huge field of study. Secondly, researchers continually define and rely on different leadership theories and models to represent the most common leadership styles. One researcher defines leadership as being comprised of three styles; servant, authentic, and transformational (White, 2013). Other studies use the terms relational and task-centered to differentiate between leadership styles (VanSloten & Henderson, 2011; VanSloten, 2011). Yet other researchers only focus on transformational and transactional leadership styles (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo 2000). Popper (2002) also uses the terms *socialized charismatic leader* and *personalized charismatic leader* to identify two types of leaders. Clearly, a consensus on the definition of leadership styles

would make it much easier to study the correlation between attachment and leadership styles.

Thirdly, although attachment theory has been well-documented and thoroughly studied, some

research (Popper, 2002; VanSloten & Henderson, 2011; White, 2013) focusses on childhood

attachment styles and others (Popper & Amit, 2009; Boatwright et al, 2010; Underwood, 2015)

focussed their research on adult attachment styles. This makes it more difficult to pinpoint

exactly which styles are correlating with each of the leadership styles.

   As outlined, although there are various factors that make the research somewhat less

relevant than it could be, there is still enough evidence to indicate that more research would be

beneficial in order identify relationships with some of the other leadership styles that have not

yet been studied, or only been the focus of one or two studies; in particular, autocratic,

democratic, and laissez-fair leadership styles.

Chapter 5 – Discussion & Conclusion

Purpose Overview

The purpose of this paper is to bring about an opportunity to explore a more meaningful way to develop future leaders. There has been an abundant amount of different types of leadership styles that have been identified in the past 75 years. (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939; MindTools, n.d.). By creating an awareness of these leadership styles and identifying any possible correlation between leaders who exhibit such styles and their corresponding attachment styles, this paper endeavours to tap into what could possibly become the best leadership training and development program that has ever existed. The premise of this notion is that leadership is undoubtedly about influence (Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Sethuraman & Suresh, 2014; Sinek, 2014). Therefore, if leadership is about influence then it can also be stated that leaders who are highly trusted are more likely to be effectively exert influence on their followers (Greenleaf, 1970; Maxwell, 2007, 2011; Lencioni, 2014). Trust would then evidently beget greater powers of influence.

Inherent in attachment theory are implicit models of trust (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Adult attachment styles are categorized into four styles; secure, dismissive, preoccupied, and fearful. Secure attachment is characterized by a both a positive internal model of self and others. Dismissive attachment is represented by a positive model of self and a negative model of others. Preoccupied attachment is characterized by a negative model of self and a positive model of others. Finally, fearful attachment displays both a negative model of self and others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). These internal models are also essentially about trust; how well does one trust oneself and how well does one trust others (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Since both attachment and leadership

styles are all based on the same fundamental principles of influence and trust, it is not a far-reaching suggestion that surely there must be some correlation between attachment theory and leadership.

Although it is evident that there are still too many variant definitions of leadership styles (MindTools, n.d.); it is my belief that until we truly understand what predicts leadership styles, this field will only get more cluttered. Therefore, this paper attempts to somewhat clarify the much cluttered field of leadership styles and definitions and then subsequently explores how these styles correlate to attachment styles.

Summary and Context of Findings

As mentioned earlier, due to the ambiguity of the available leadership styles and the existing research's tendency to interchangeably use childhood and adult attachment styles, there simply is not enough research to conclusively state that there are correlations between the five leadership styles used in this document (autocratic, democratic, laissez-fair, transactional, and transformational) and the four adult attachment styles (secure, dismissive, preoccupied, and fearful). However, several of these styles have been studied and particularly the transformational leadership style has been researched the most (VanSloten, 2011; VanSloten & Henderson, 2011; Underwood, 2015). In each of these studies a positive correlation was found between secure attachment and transformational leadership styles. Furthermore, these studies also found that insecure attachment styles, which are characterized by negative internal models of others, tend to be negatively correlated to transformational leadership styles.

Due to the scant amount of research that has been conducted in recent years, as just referenced above, I also explored the preferences that follower's exhibited for leaders based on the follower's attachment styles. In all of the studies, researchers found positive correlations

between the attachment styles that had positive internal models of others and a preference for

relational leaders; typically represented by transformational, democratic, and laissez-faire

leadership styles (Johnson, 2007; Mayseless & Popper, 2007; Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2009;

Boatwright et al, 2010). The one finding that tends to remain consistent through all the studies

referenced is that there is a significant positive correlation between our internal model of others

and transformational leadership.

These findings reveal promising trends. Based on this, not only have some researchers

(Drake, 2009) already created models of leadership development that rely on attachment

orientation techniques, but thus far there have been no, or very little, indication that current and

future research is coming up empty when searching for correlations. Hopefully this will

encourage many more studies and research opportunities that will continue to explore this novel

and exciting field of study.

Implications for Further Study

Based on the scant research that was available while researching this paper, there are

ample implications for further study. First and foremost, more conclusive research that sets out a

concrete set of leadership styles, which have potential to be embraced by most researchers would

be highly beneficial. Currently, there are more than 25 defined and accepted leadership styles

with many that share traits and behaviours (MindTools, n.d.). One can ascertain that by having

this many styles the amount of research that it would take to identify correlations with

attachment is simply astronomical. Therefore, by condensing these styles into a smaller set of

meaningful definitions would be very helpful.

As indicated earlier, much research has been done on follower's preferences for leaders

and how this relates to follower's attachment styles, but very little research has been done on

follower's perceptions of leaders. It could be argued that how we perceive others is very important; if leadership is about influence and trust, then our perception of our followers, or of our leaders will also be very heavily impacted by how much trust and influence one has with and over us.

Most of the current research has focussed on one or two leadership styles and one or two attachment styles. More comprehensive research that studies all five leadership styles, as defined by this paper, and all four attachment styles is also an area that would benefit from more research.

The adult attachment styles are completely based on two internal models; a model of how we see our self and a model of how we view others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The four attachment styles then create a quadrant of possible variations. Most of the research to date has indicated that our model of others shows significant correlations with leadership styles; both positively and negatively. However, very little research has explored how the internal model of self is correlated to the various leadership styles. Possibly it is less of an indicator of future leadership style, but regardless, more research would help us understand this better.

One final and very intriguing study found that the attachment with one parent did not always correlate to a particular leadership style the same way as the attachment with another parent (Towler, 2005). No further research was found regarding this and therefore this is definitely an area for future study in order to uncover more of this.

Limitations

Several of the studies referenced in this paper used the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Boatwright et al, 2010; VanSloten & Henderson, 2011). The LDBQ categorized leaders as having one of two behaviour tendencies; task-centred or relation-centred.

Due to the lack of research that correlates these behaviours to the five leadership styles that are

used in this paper, assumptions had to be made as to which style tended to indicate either

behaviour as identified by the LDBQ.

Since research regarding attachment theory and leadership styles is so novel, there are

very few studies that are currently available to reference. This is a limiting factor in how these

findings can be applied to the practical field of developing leaders.

As one can readily ascertain this paper did not endeavour any type of study to uncover

new correlations, but rather relied on various other studies to indicate the evidence of

correlations between attachment and leadership styles. Most of these studies were either done in

military/government settings (Mayseless & Popper, 2007; White, 2013), or educational settings

(Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2009). These institutional settings have the potential to be somewhat

limiting with the transferableness of these findings to private and industry organizations.

Experience

Doing the research for this thesis was not only enlightening but it was also a thoroughly

enjoyable and incredible experience. Upon embarking on the search for a topic for this paper, I

had a strong feeling that I wanted to research and write about leadership. Leadership has always

been close to my heart and my passion is to continue to research, study, and write about this

topic for as long as I can. Once I had made the decision to write about leadership, I started to do

some exploratory research and it became clear to me that since 1939 new leadership styles were

still continually being developed regardless of how many already existed. Many researchers, or

leadership gurus, seem to come up with their own model of how leaders behave and hence

numerous leadership styles have crept into existence over the decades. This piqued my interest

and I began to question why this was happening. I then surmised that maybe we, as humans, are

not sure what truly drives the development of a leader and by always just looking at the symptoms or behaviours that leaders exhibit, we are continually searching for that defining, yet seemingly elusive, perfect category of leadership style when in fact we should be looking at how leaders develop through their lifespan; starting from birth. Soon I discovered that there was actually very little evidence of how leaders develop into the leaders they are.

After separately doing other research on attachment for one of my degree classes, it suddenly dawned on me that attachment theory (Bartholemew & Horowitz, 1991) has a similar foundational element as the leadership-as-influence model (Maxwell, 2007, 2011); namely the development of trust. From this I deduced that there was an extremely good chance that there could be correlations between attachment and leadership styles. Although not much research exists regarding this correlation, by reviewing both attachment styles and leadership styles in detail the promise for what future research could find is truly exciting. Furthermore, the few studies that have been conducted, with the exception of one, all found strong correlations that support my initial hypothesis. Hopefully, other researchers will continue to research this fascinating area of study.

Conclusion

As I have mentioned earlier there is no shortage of leadership style models and also no shortage of books, programs, or magazines that one can purchase to develop their own, or other's leadership styles and behaviours. Ironically, regardless of how many leadership styles have been discovered, new ones are still continually being developed. However, it is noteworthy to mention that many of the styles are fairly similar in definition and only have minor variations that don't necessarily require an entire different leadership style category. Therefore, for the purpose of this document, I used five leadership styles that seemed to comprise all the behaviours that were

found in the majority of the leadership styles I researched. Fortunately, the majority of the

researchers looking into the correlation between attachment styles and leadership styles also used

similar leadership styles as the basis for their studies. To find the strong correlations that they

found is an indication to me that not only is there strong evidence that using an attachment

orientation when developing leaders will be beneficial, but without a doubt, an entire new arena

of research has suddenly opened.

  Attachment theory is heavily influenced by the trust that one develops within their

relationships. Children build trust with their caregiver and vice versa. Furthermore, adults also

build trust with all those who are in their relationship circles. Using the idea that regardless of the

style of leadership one exhibits, one must be able to influence his/her followers in order to lead

them well. It is also important to note that for relational leadership styles the amount of influence

that one can exert on their followers is directly correlated to how much trust has been developed

in the relationship. Therefore, if both attachment and effective leadership are built on trust and if

attachment is developed in a child at a very young age, then surely we are missing a golden

opportunity for leadership development if we do not tap into the ideas that attachment theory can

offer for training the next generation of leaders.

References

Ainsworth, M. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*(4), 333-341. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.333

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

Berson, Y., Dan, O., & Yammarino, F. J. (2006). Attachment style and individual differences in leadership perceptions and emergence. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(2), 165-82.

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

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. American Journal Of *Orthopsychiatry, 52*(4), 664-678. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01456.x

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base. Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory.* London: Routledge

Boyd, J. D. (2015). Attachment and leadership: A qualitative exploration of how adult attachment style is expressed in leadership behavior (Order No.3684949). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1660970123). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1660970123?accountid=1230

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence 2.0.* San Diego, CA: TalentSmart

Bretherton, I. (1992). The Origins of Attachment Theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental Psychology 1992*(28), 759-775.

Cassidy, J., & Shaver. P. R. (2008). Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical

Applications (2nd Edition). New York, NY, USA: Guilford Press.

Chand, S. (2015). Great Man Theory and Trait Theory of Leadership. Retrieved from

http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/leadership/great-man-theory-and-trait-theory-of-

leadership/28004/

Chinomona, R., Mashiloane, M., & Pooe, D. (2013). The Influence of Servant Leadership on

Employee Trust in a Leader and Commitment to the Organization. *Mediterranean Journal*

of Social Sciences, *4*(14), 405-414.

Drake, D., B. (2009). Using attachment theory in coaching leaders: The search for coherent

narrative. *International Coaching Psychology Review 4*(1), 49-58.

Golden, J., A. (2009). Introduction to a Special Issue on the Assessment of Children with

Reactive Attachment Disorder and the Treatment of Children with Attachment

Difficulties or a History of Maltreatment and/or Foster Care. *Behavioral Development*

Bulletin 15(1), 1-3.

Greenleaf, R., K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Westfield, IN: Greenleaf Center for Servant

Leadership.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *52*, 511-524.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on

close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, *5*(1), 1-22.

Influence (2001). In *Oxford Dictionary* (9th ed.). Oxford University Press

Jackson, K. (2016). Michael Dom's poetic gifts to the people of PNG. Retrieved from

     http://asopa.typepad.com/asopa_people/2016/02/michael-doms-poetic-gifts-to-the-people-

     of-png.html.

John Bowlby. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.goodtherapy.org/famous-psychologists/john-

     bowlby.html.

Johnson, B.., E. (2007). Taking the Child to Work: The Relationship of Adult Attachment Styles

     and Implicit Leadership Theories in Organizational Settings. (Order No. 3281262).

     Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304714860).

     Retrieved from http://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/

     304714860?accountid=1230

Klaassen, W., J. (2015a). *My Philosophy of Supervision: Servant Leadership.* Unpublished

     manuscript. Department of Counselling, City University of Seattle, Vancouver, Canada.

Klaassen, W., J. (2015b). *The Development of Leadership Styles: The Influence of Attachment*

     Styles. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Counselling, City University of Seattle,

     Vancouver, Canada.

Kurth, W. (2013). Attachment theory and psychohistory: Overview. *The Journal of*

     Psychohistory, 41(1), 14-38.

Lencioni, P. (2014). *The Advantage: Why Organizational Health Trumps Everything Else in*

     Business. New Jersey: Wiley.

Lewin, K., Lippit, R. and White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally

     created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology 10*, 271-301

Maccoby, M. (2004). Narcissistic Leaders: The Incredible Pros, the Inevitable Cons. *Harvard Business Review 2004*(1). Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2004/01/narcissistic-leaders-the-incredible-pros-the-inevitable-cons.

Maxwell, J. (2007). *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership.* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Maxwell, J. (2011). *5 Levels of Leadership: Proven Steps to Maximize Your Potential.* New York, NY: Center Street.

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

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

MindTools (n.d.). Leadership Styles. Retrieved from http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_84.htm

Personality Types, (2016). Retrieved February 16, 2016 from The Meyers & Briggs Foundation: http://www.myersbriggs.org/my-mbti-personality-type/mbti-basics/

Popper. M. (2002). Narcissim and attachment patterns of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships 19*, 797-809.

Popper, M., & Amit, K. (2009). Influence of attachment style on major psychological capacities to lead. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 170*(3), 244-67.

Popper, M. O., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational Leadership and Attachment. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(2), 267-289.

Prewitt, J., Weil, R., & McClure, A. (2011). Developing Leadership in Global and Multi-cultural Organizations. *International Journal of Business and Social Science 2*(13), 13-20.

Rath, T. (2007). *Strengths Finder 2.0*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.

Ravenhill, L. (1995). The Last Days Newsletter. Retrieved from

http://www.ravenhill.org/prayer.htm.

Riaz, A., & Haider, M. H. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job

satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business & Economic Horizons, 1*(1), 29-38.

Riggs, S. A., Jacobovitz, D., & Hazen, N. (2002). Adult attachment and history of psychotherapy

in a normative sample. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 39*(4), 344-

353. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.39.4.344

Secure. (n.d.) In *Oxford Dictionaries*. Retrieved from

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/secure

Sethuraman, K., & Suresh, J. (2014). Effective leadership styles. *International Business

Research, 7*(9), 165-172.

Shalit, A., Popper, M., & Zakay, D. (2010). Followers' attachment styles and their preference for

social or for personal charismatic leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development

Journal, 31*(5), 458-472. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731011056461

Sinek, S. (Producer). (2013, November 26). *Leaders Eat Last*. Video retrieved from

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ReRcHdeUG9Y

Sinek, S. (2014). *Leaders Eat Last: Why Some Teams Pull Together and Others Don't*. New

York, NY: Portfolio.

Sroufe, L., A. & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an Organizational Construct. *Child

Development 1977*(48), 1184-1199.

Talathi, R. (2015) Leadership Styles: List of Top 4 Leadership Styles. Retrieved from

    http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/leadership/leadership-styles/leadership-styles-list-of-

    top-4-leadership-styles/69849/

Towler, A. (2005). Charismatic Leadership Development: Role of Parental Attachment Style and

    Parental Psychological Control. *Journal Of Leadership & Organizational Studies (Baker*

    College), *11*(4), 15-25.

Trust. (2001). In *Oxford Dictionary* (9th ed.). Oxford University Press

Underwood, R. M. (2015). Attachment style, leadership behavior, and perceptions of leadership

    effectiveness in academic management (Order No. 3673946). Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com/docview/1652473026?accountid=1230

VanSloten, J. (2011). Attachment and Orientation and Leadership Style: From Child's Play to

    Partnerships with the Person Upstairs. Retrieved from

    http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/85232/jvann.pdf?sequence=1

VanSloten, J., & Henderson, M. (2011). Attachment and Orientation and Leadership Style: The

    Effect of Avoidant Attachment Priming on Relational Leadership. Retrieved from

    http://www.yale.edu/yrurp/issues/VanSloten%20&%20Henderson%20(2011).pdf

Vorus, N. (2003). Disquieting phantasy: Klein-Freud controversies. *Psychoanalytic Review,*

    90(1), 63-99.

Wake, L. (2010). Role of Brief Therapy in Attachment: Disorders. London, GBR: Karnac Books.

White, A. L. (2013). A quantitative investigation of the relationship between adult attachment

    and the leadership styles of Florida's public service leaders (Order No. 3598486). Available

    from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1459239478). Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com/docview/1459239478?accountid=1230

Zhang, F. & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2004). Stability and fluctuation in adult attachment style over a

6-year period. *Attachment & Human Development 6*(4), 419-437.