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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Attachment theory attempts to address and explain an extensive array of research questions concerning the functions, emotional dynamics, evolutionary origins, and developmental pathways of our affectionate bonds (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Evolving from the original work of John Bowlby (1982) is the idea that an infant will form one of three attachment styles with his or her primary caregiver: secure, anxious ambivalent, and avoidant. These attachment styles result from the manner in which the caregiver responds to the infant. Attachment styles that we develop as infants serve as a foundation for our relationships in adulthood (Fraley, 2002). As we develop throughout our lifetime, our attachment styles remain with us and affect our future relationships and experiences (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006; Fraley, 2002). While some of us will maintain the same attachment style from infancy, attachment styles can also change as we encounter new relationships and ways of interacting (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006). Our attachment style has a strong influence on the personality and behavioral characteristics that we develop, and thus whether we become leaders (Fraley, 2002). Therefore, developing a secure attachment lays the foundation for developing as a successful transformational leader (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000).
Developing Attachment

We develop an attachment with our primary caregiver as a result of how our caregivers respond to and care for us (Fraley, 2002). A secure attachment is formed when our caregivers are trustworthy and responsive when we need them (Fraley, 2002). This experience allows us to develop the belief that the world is a safe and caring place and that we can expect to count on others (Fraley, 2002). An insecure attachment style, on the other hand, develops when an infant perceives that there is not a responsive figure available, possibly resulting in the infant making an explicit or implicit decision to alter his or her own attachment style as a way to compensate for the lack of responsive care (Dinero, Conger, Shaver, Widaman, & Larsen-Rife, 2008). Thus, many attachment theorists share a common belief that the caregiver determines the infant’s attachment style, such that an infant will alter and shape the dimensions of his attachment system depending on which type of care-giving the infant receives (Dinero et al., 2008).

On the other hand, some researchers have identified the personality of an infant as the main determinant of attachment style (van den Boom, 1994). For example, infants with difficult temperaments may display behaviors such as frequent crying, irritability, and negative affect (Susman-Stillman, Kalkoske, Egeland, & Waldman, 1996; van den Boom, 1994). These behaviors may affect the quality of the infant-caregiver interaction, causing less maternal involvement with the infant and leading to the development of an insecure attachment style (Susman-Stillman et al., 1996; van den Boom, 1994).
Even though some researchers believe that infants who display a difficult temperament are more likely to develop an insecure attachment style, I believe that the relationship between the caregiver and the infant is reciprocal, such that both the temperament of the infant as well as the responsiveness of the caregiver equally influence the developing attachment style. Empirical evidence supports this assertion. For example, when an insecurely attached infant’s primary caregiver is taught to respond with care, concern, and consistency, the infant is able to develop a more secure attachment style (Belsky, Fish, & Isabella, 1991; van den Boom, 1994). Furthermore, after caregiver training, previously insecurely-attached children begin to participate in explicit environmental exploration, similar to securely-attached infants (van den Boom, 1994).

**Secure Attachment**

Attachment theory proposes that children should develop a secure attachment style when attachment relationships involve caregivers who are responsive, sensitive, loving, caring and available (Dinero et al., 2008). In a secure attachment, the infant develops an internal working model characterized by trust in the caregiver and confidence that the caregiver will be available if the infant develops a need or becomes fearful (Cassidy, 1994). This experience creates feelings of security within the infant that are not experienced by infants that have the insecure attachment styles (Simmons, Gooty, Nelson, & Little, 2009). Studies have shown that 67% of American infants have a secure attachment with their primary caregiver (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).
With a secure attachment in place, the infant may feel more confident in exploring the outside world, knowing he or she will gain help from others when the need arises (Cassidy, 1994; van den Boom, 1994). Erik Erickson (1963) theorizes that if we pass successfully through this period of life, we will learn to trust that life is basically safe and have confidence in the future. If we fail to experience trust and are constantly frustrated because our needs are not met, we may end up with a deep-seated feeling of worthlessness and a mistrust of the world in general (Erickson, 1963). This could lead to the development of one of the anxious types of attachment models in the infant (Erickson, 1963), as described below.

**Anxious Ambivalent Attachment**

The internal working model of the ambivalent infant is characterized by uncertainty regarding whether his or her caregiver will be available or responsive when he or she has a need (Cassidy, 1994; Cohen & Belsky, 2008). Resulting from this uncertainty, Cassidy (1994) explains that the ambivalent infant is usually sensitive to separation anxiety and shows clinginess while manifesting unresolved anger towards the caregiver; the relationship is characterized by conflict, resulting from unreliable responding patterns from the caregiver. Cassidy found anxious ambivalent infants to be angry and anxious, displaying continuous preoccupation with their caregiver. This preoccupation with their caregiver prohibits anxious ambivalent infants from focusing on exploration of the outside environment and other learning opportunities (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), which results in a lack of competency in cognitive and social skills in
comparison to securely attached infants (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Research shows that 11% of American infants have an ambivalent attachment to their primary caregiver (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

**Avoidant Attachment**

The third internal working model belongs to the avoidantly attached infants who lack confidence and expect to be rejected by their caregivers when in need (Cassidy, 1994). These individuals may attempt to become emotionally self-supportive and as they get older they may display hostility and anti-social behaviors (Cassidy, 1994). This pattern develops as a result of the constant rejection from the parent or caregiver (Cassidy, 1994). Research has shown that 22% of American infants demonstrate an avoidant attachment pattern with their primary caregiver (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

**Disorganized Attachment**

Hazan and Shaver (1994) have identified another pattern of attachment as disorganized. Disorganized attachment is characterized by infant behaviors such as a sequential or simultaneous display of contradictory behaviors, freezing, fear on approaching the caregiver, disorientation, and attempting to follow the stranger rather than the caregiver in the strange situation (Crawford & Benoit, 2009). Unlike each of the three organized strategies, where the infant has developed an adaptive, organized response to having attachment needs met, infants with disorganized attachment lack an organized strategy (Crawford & Benoit, 2009), and instead manage anxiety with a blend of ambivalent and avoidant behaviors (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). This model of
attachment may arise in an infant when his or her caregiver is depressed, disturbed, or abusive in some form, or when caregivers have unresolved mourning and trauma in their own life (Crittenden, 1988).

Disorganization arises when the infant finds him or herself reliant upon a caregiver who is also a source of fear (Crawford & Benoit, 2009). In a frightening or distressing situation, the infant does not have the ability to resolve contradictory impulses (proximity to the caregiver or flight from the distress), and is faced with a paradoxical situation of fright without solution (Crawford & Benoit, 2009). This may become a chronic pattern of interaction between the infant and his or her caregiver, resulting in the infant developing a disorganized attachment style (van Ijzendoorn, Schuengel, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 1999). Disorganized children usually display dissociative behavior later in life as adults (van Ijzendoorn et al., 1999). A meta-analysis showed that about 15% of infants in low-risk United States samples were classified as disorganized (van Ijzendoorn et al., 1999).

**Adult Attachment**

Throughout development, changes occur in the content and structure of our attachment relationships, shifting from asymmetric complimentary attachments (such as the infant-caregiver relationship) to more symmetric or reciprocal attachments like those found in adult relationships (Henderson, Bartholomew, Trinke, & Kwong, 2005). Experiences in early life are retained over time and continue to influence our attachment behavior throughout our life course (Fraley, 2002). However, research has also shown
evidence that continuity between childhood and adult experiences decreases as we transition further into adulthood (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). As we grow and participate in new relationships, we gain the opportunity to revise mental models of our self and others (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Thus, although our family interactions have an initial direct influence on our attachment model, this influence may lessen over time and our adult relationships will begin to have a greater influence as we gain experience with other people (Dinero et al., 2008).

Newly formed relationships that create successful interactions (with the partners becoming more interdependent over time) may shape a person’s initially insecure style of attachment into a more secure style (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). These changes in security are likely to take place well into the relationship since they require the establishment of trust between the partners (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006). On the other hand, a securely attached person who gets involved with an insecurely attached person may begin to display behaviors similar to someone who is insecurely attached (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Richards & Schat, 2010).

The styles of attachment seen in infancy continue to exist throughout adulthood, revealing the following characteristics of each attachment style: Adults with a secure attachment model are defined as having comfort with emotional closeness and a desire for interdependence with others (Mikulincer, 1998). Secure adults have confidence in love from others and this is associated with happy, intimate, and friendly love relationships (Mikulincer, 1998). A secure attachment is the most commonly observed
pattern seen in American adults, accounting for approximately 60% of attachment patterns (Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, & Steinberg, 1983).

Adults with an anxious ambivalent attachment are characterized by a strong desire for intimacy coupled with insecurity about what type of response to expect from the other person (Mikulincer, 1998). This attachment style in adults is associated with love addiction, passionate love and the fear of being unloved (Mikulincer, 1998). The anxious ambivalent attachment is the least common style in adulthood and characterizes about 15% of American adults (Campos et al., 1983).

Adults with an avoidant attachment model have insecurity in others’ intentions and have a preference for distance in their relationships (Mikulincer, 1998). These people will display a fear of intimacy and have difficulties depending on others in their adult relationships (Cohen & Belsky, 2008; Mikulincer, 1998), which will be revealed as emotional detachment (Mikulincer, 1998). This avoidant style of attachment is seen in 25% of American adults (Campos et al., 1983).

**Attachment in Personal Relationships**

If working models of the self and relationships are related to attachment style, then people with different attachment orientations are likely to have different beliefs about the availability and trustworthiness of others, as well as their own relationship worth (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). These beliefs may create a vicious cycle in which people with insecure attachment styles may transfer their negative beliefs about themselves onto their current relationship, causing unwarranted difficulties in that relationship (Hazen &
Shaver, 1987). This may result in a continuous pattern of unintentionally self-sabotaging relationships with others, creating difficulties for the self and for peers.

Many variations can be seen within different relationships, depending on the degree of security or insecurity that is experienced in the relationship (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). For example, when a securely-attached person is trying to build a relationship with an avoidantly-attached or ambivalently-attached person, the securely attached individual might feel compelled to use avoidant behaviors in reaction to the insecurely-attached partner, who may be acting inconsistently or emotionally unavailable (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Alternatively, an avoidantly-attached person may cause a usually securely-attached partner to feel and act ambivalently within the relationship exchange as a result of constantly feeling pushed away and not needed (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Interactions as these can reveal themselves in a variety of environments, not just in the romantic relationship, creating difficulties in relationships with others (Richards & Schat, 2010).

Securely attached people are shown to place trust in others, which enhances their relationships and interactions (Simmons et al., 2009). They display behaviors such as increased flexibility, the ability to connect well with others, and the ability to form successful reciprocal relationships (Simmons et al., 2009). Feeling secure and trusting in the relationship may lessen the threat of negativity from ambivalent or avoidant behaviors. Being more flexible, the securely-attached person may be able to allow minor
irritants to dissolve rather than focusing too much attention on the incidents (Simmons et al., 2009).

**Work Environment**

Secure attachment is likely to increase motivational processes in all spheres of functioning as individuals feel free to fully engage in daily life with the confidence that support and acceptance is always readily available (Elliot & Reis, 2003). Secure individuals should be able to experience more successful relationships in the work domain because they can fully engage with peers and supervisors while working on projects. Simmons et al. (2009) showed that employees who are trusting of their supervisor are evaluated by their supervisor as having enhanced work performance. This could lead to more promotions, employee financial gain, and company profits.

In contrast, both insecure forms of attachment are likely to evoke avoidance-prone motivational processes across domains, causing people to evade the negative possibilities of rejection or abandonment (Elliot & Reis, 2003). Interacting with peers in a detached and unavailable manner while trying to accomplish tasks for a project can cause more interpersonal stressors, work related conflicts, and poor choices that lead to unprofessional outcomes in the workplace (Richards & Schat, 2010).

**Transformational Leadership**

Since outside influences can affect positive changes in attachment style, people could benefit from knowing which type of encounters can generate positive outcomes. Transformational leaders are leaders who empower their followers and influence their
followers to achieve goals by motivating followers to increase their performance and exert more effort and commitment (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Transformational leaders bring a vision and an inspiring sense of trust into their relationships with followers (Bass, 1985).

Popper et al. (2000) described each characteristic of the transformational leader as an idealized leader who will consider the needs of others before his or her own: He or she will avoid the use of power for his or her own personal gain, and will demonstrate and model high moral standards for his or her followers. He or she will also focus on setting challenging goals for his or her followers while remaining available to them for support if needed. The transformational leader provides inspirational motivation by creating an experience of meaningfulness in projects and activities; he or she creates a challenging environment and simultaneously demonstrates enthusiasm and optimism toward his or her follower’s abilities to accomplish tasks. The leader is able to accomplish this by communicating shared goals and high expectations with his or her followers.

The four personality characteristics of transformational leaders have been identified as 1) individual consideration, 2) intellectual stimulation, and charisma (Bass, 1985). Charisma is described as 3) idealized influence and 4) inspirational motivation (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Individualized consideration is achieved by the leader as he or she focuses on individual followers while coaching and mentoring them and guiding them to their full potential. Intellectual stimulation refers to the leader’s efforts to stimulate innovativeness and creativity in his or her followers (Popper et al., 2000).
Popper et al. describe how the transformational leader will encourage followers to question assumptions and approach problems in new ways. As the transformational leader is working with his or her followers in this manner, the followers are likely to increase their loyalty and self-efficacy. This can result in a stronger bond between the leader and his or her followers, which can lead to more satisfying reciprocal working relationships, loyalty, and success in the company or group in which they are participating.

Transformational leaders have been compared to transactional leaders in past research (Bass, Jung, Avolio, & Berson, 2003). Transactional leaders are described as leaders that identify the expectations of their followers and respond by rewarding followers when they have met their performance requirements (Popper et al., 2000). Transactional leaders also closely monitor deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors in the followers’ assignments and then take corrective action as it becomes necessary (Avolio & Bass, 1998). Howell and Avolio (1993) have shown that transformational leaders are more effective than transactional leaders when comparing financial managers over a one-year period. Furthermore, Austrian bank managers who were transformational leaders had a strong positive effect on the long-term performance of their subordinates (Geyer & Steyrer, 1998). Finally, two meta-analyses revealed that the contingent rewarding and punishing used by transactional leaders was effective in motivating others to achieve a higher performance. However, the contingency rewarding
and punishing was less effective than strategies used by transformational leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1998).

**Secure Attachment and the Transformational Leader**

Attachment style continues to influence behavior as people develop throughout life (Fraley, 2002). Career choices, partners, friends, and child rearing are all influenced by attachment style (Hazan & Shaver, 1990, 1994). Therefore, attachment style will likely influence the leadership characteristics that people develop. For example, secure attachment has been positively correlated with the transformational leadership characteristics of military personnel in Israel (Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000). Furthermore, Elliot and Reis (2003) found that a secure attachment style was linked to characteristics similar to traits possessed by transformational leaders in a sample of students in an American academic setting: securely attached students possessed a high desire for achievement, a low fear of failure, and motivation for high competence (all characteristics of transformational leaders). Elliot and Reis examined the relationship between attachment and achievement motives and goals and found that a secure attachment enables individuals to view achievement contexts in terms of potential gains and to focus on pursuits.

This research by Elliot and Reis (2003) demonstrates a meaningful association between relationship and competence domains, which are two of the most central domains of daily life and are normally studied in isolation from each other. Further bridging relationship and competence domains, Luthans (2001) has recently begun to
look to positive psychology as a means of answering questions related to building strengths in human resources. Based on Seligman’s positive psychology work (Seligman, 1998), Luthans and his colleagues built a theoretical understanding of how individuals and organizations thrive and prosper, called positive organizational behavior (POB).

POB theory encompasses several of the same characteristics as transformational leadership (Andressen, Konradt, & Neck, 2012; Luthans, 2001; Popper et al., 2000). For example, Luthans (2001) describes one of the characteristics in POB theory as positive-efficacy, which is an individual’s motivation, abilities, and belief that he or she can successfully accomplish a specific task (self-efficacy). The development of positive-efficacy is created through performance attainments, positive experiences, modeling, persuasion, and psychological arousal. Transformational leaders are able to heighten an individual’s motivation through encouragement, empowerment, continuous mentoring and performance enhancement (Andressen et al., 2012; Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Gundersen, Hellesøy, & Raeder, 2012; Popper et al., 2000). Thus, the characteristics that are nurtured and influenced by transformational leaders are similar to positive-efficacy as described in POB (Luthans, 2001). These avenues of research provide examples of the successful bridge between relationship and competence domains.

Life Satisfaction

Transformational leaders have the ability to bring a heightened life satisfaction to their followers (Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & McKee, 2007). Arnold and his
colleagues describe life satisfaction as the cognitive component of a person’s well-being. Transformational leaders are believed to enhance the life satisfaction of their followers because of their ability to empower their followers to find greater meaning in their work (Arnold et al., 2007; McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, Islam, 2010). Arnold and colleagues thought that humanistic work values (i.e., the normative beliefs individuals hold about whether work should be meaningful) influence the likelihood of finding meaning in work and whether workers feel an increase in psychological well-being. Other benefits of being led by a transformational leader include greater connectedness to the organization, leading to a strong commitment from the employee (McMurray et al., 2010).

People who are securely attached also enjoy a high level of life satisfaction, positive affect, and hope regarding their futures (Bass, 1985; Bronk, Hill, Lapsley, Talib, & Finch, 2009; Diener, Napa-Scollon, Oishi, Dzokoto, & Suh, 2000; Simmons et al., 2009). Evidence shows that secure attachment is an antecedent for building trusting relationships with colleagues, which enhances job performance (Simmons et al., 2009). Secure attachment also seems to be an important antecedent to developing transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Simmons et al., 2009). While transformational leaders inspire life satisfaction in their followers, they also have the opportunity to experience meaningfulness in their work. This is likely to lead them to experience greater life satisfaction as well (Arnold et al., 2007; McMurray et al., 2010). Taken together, securely attached people who also possess the traits of a transformational leader
are likely to enjoy high life satisfaction as a result of the many positive characteristics they encompass and the opportunities and life experiences in which they are able to participate (McMurray et al., 2010; Munir, Nielsen, Carneiro, 2010).

**Present Study**

In the present study, I focused on attachment style as it relates to transformational leadership and life satisfaction. Transformational leaders possess the characteristics and behaviors needed to form strong bonds, they consider the needs of others before their own, and they encourage their followers to achieve their goals (Popper et al., 2000). Thus, I predicted that transformational leaders possess a secure attachment style. Furthermore, I predicted that transformational leaders and people with a secure attachment style feel a strong sense of life satisfaction. Based on these beliefs, I had the following specific hypotheses:

H1: Attachment style will be related to leadership style. Specifically, secure attachment would be positively related to transformational leadership, such that people who scored higher on secure attachment will score higher on characteristics of transformational leadership, including idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Anxious Ambivalent and Avoidant attachment styles will be negatively correlated with transformational leadership, such that people who scored higher on anxious ambivalent and avoidant attachment will score lower on transformational leadership.
H2: Attachment style will be related to life satisfaction such that secure attachment will be positively correlated with life satisfaction, while anxious ambivalent and avoidant attachment will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

H3: Leadership style will be related to life satisfaction. Transformational leadership will be positively related to life satisfaction, such that those who scored higher on idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation will also score higher on life satisfaction. Transactional leadership will have no relation to life satisfaction, such that scores on contingent reward and management by exception will show no significant relationship to life satisfaction scores.

H4: I predicted mediation between attachment style and leadership style such that people who scored higher on secure attachment would also score higher on transformational leadership, which would be associated with higher life satisfaction.
Chapter 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 160 students at Sacramento State University whose ages ranged from 16 years to 43 years of age ($M = 21.58$, $SD = 3.38$). A student sample was used for this study as a result of the lack of available participants in the immediate business community. Since time was an issue to gather the data from participants, I decided to use the department’s human subject pool of undergraduate Psychology students. Of the 160 participants, 75% were female and 25% were male, 28.1% of the students lived in a household with an annual income less than $10,000, 14.4% of the participants lived in a household with an annual income between $10,001 and $20,000, 26.3% of the participants lived in a household with an annual income between $20,001 and $50,000, 13.8% of participants lived in households with an annual income of $50,001 to $75,000, and the other 17.5% of participants lived in households with an annual income over $75,000. Concerning racial and ethnic background, 36.9% of the participants described themselves as White or of European descendant, 23.8% were Asian, 19.4% were Mexican, 8.8% were Multi-Cultural, 6.9% were African American, 2.5% were Middle Eastern, 0.6% were Native American, and 8.8% were other. This group of participants is comparable to the ethnic diversity found in the United States according to the United States census of 2010 (Humes, Jones, & Ramtrez, 2011).
**Procedures**

Data were collected via self-report questionnaires. Upon arrival to their scheduled session, students were given an informed consent page to read and sign. Next, the participants were given instructions for completing the confidential surveys. Each packet contained the three questionnaires (described below) in random order. Questionnaires were placed into each envelope in random order according to research randomizer at http://randomizer.org/form.htm. Once all envelopes were returned, the participants were debriefed and dismissed.

**Measures**

*Attachment Styles*

Attachment styles were measured using the Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) (see Appendix A). According to Bartholomew (2005), the RSQ is drawn from Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) attachment measure, Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) Relationship Questionnaire, and Collins and Read’s (1990) Adult Attachment Scale. The RSQ is a 30-item self-report questionnaire designed as a continuous measure of adult attachment styles. Using a 5-point scale, participants rated the extent to which each statement best describes their characteristic style in close relationships (1: “not at all like me” to 5: “very much like me”). The RSQ contains five items to measure secure, five items to measure anxious ambivalent, and four items to measure avoidant attachment styles (see Appendix A for scoring information) (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Kurdek, 2002). Scores for each pattern are derived by taking the
mean of the items representing each attachment pattern. The remaining 16 items are filler items and are not scored. Bartholomew (1994) demonstrated moderate to high test-retest reliability and stability over an eight-month period, ranging from .81 to .84 on self-rated questionnaires. In a study of the RSQ conducted in France on an adult sample, the RSQ showed a Cronbach alpha ranging from .60 to .66 and intraclass coefficients ranging from .78 to .85 (Guedeney, Fermanian, & Bifulco, 2010). In the current study, the Cronbach alphas ranged from .70 to .76, similar to previous studies.

**Leadership Styles**

Measurement of transformational and transactional leadership was accomplished with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004) (see Appendix B). The MLQ is a 45-item self-report questionnaire measuring Transformational leadership (idealized influence attributes, idealized influence behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration, a total of 20 items) and Transactional leadership (contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception, a total of 15 items) characteristics. Each item was answered on a 5-point scale (0 = “not at all” to 4 = “frequently, if not always”). Scoring was accomplished by calculating an average for each variable. Ten items are filler items and are not scored. According to Avolio and Bass (2004) external validity has been found in studies performed in Canada (Howell & Avolio, 1993), and in Spain (Morales & Molero, 1995), among others. Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94 (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Muenjohn
and Armstrong (2008) assessed the reliability for the MLQ and found that Cronbach alpha values were greater than .70. Cronbach alpha ranged from .65 for transactional leadership to .90 for transformational leadership in the present study.

During the study of military in Israel Defense Forces, Popper et al. (2000) reported that one of the commanders repeated the evaluations on his own men in his platoon one month after the first evaluation to examine their test-retest stability. The commander also evaluated men from two other platoons to test interjudge reliability. The significant correlations between the evaluations at the two times of measurement indicated good stability ($r = .69 - .80$).

*Life Satisfaction*

Life satisfaction was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) (see Appendix C). The SWLS is a 5-item self-report measurement designed to ask participants for an overall judgment of their life. Each item is scored using a 7-point scale (1: “low satisfaction” to 7: “high satisfaction”). The SWLS scale has been shown to have a good level of construct validity when compared with the Life Satisfaction Index (Adams, 1969; Diener et al., 1985). The two-month test-retest correlation coefficient for the SWLS was .82 and coefficient alpha was .87 (Diener et al., 1985). The inter-item correlation matrix was factor analyzed using principal axis factor analysis, and a single factor emerged, accounting for 66% of the variance (Diener et al., 1985). When researchers interviewed 53 participants to compare the results between the Life Satisfaction Index (LSI; Adams, 1969) and the SWLS they found that
scores for the LSI and the SWLS were moderately correlated, $r = .46$, demonstrating construct validity. Scores on the LSI were also highly correlated with previous life satisfaction interviews, $r = .86$ (Diener et al., 1985). The item-total correlations for the five SWLS items ranged from .61 to .81, again showing good internal consistency for the scale (Diener et al., 1985). The Cronbach alpha reliability in the present study was .89.

**Demographic Information**

In addition to attachment, leadership, and life satisfaction, I collected information regarding the participants’ age, gender, socioeconomic status and ethnicity (see Appendix D).

**Bonus Question**

In an attempt to gain greater focus from the participants, I added one question at the end of the surveys. The participants were notified during the instruction phase that if they paid attention throughout the questionnaires they would be able to answer the question correctly. They were informed that they would receive a small candy bar upon the end of the survey if they answered this bonus question correctly. The question was actually unrelated: “Name one person during the course of your life that has had a significant impact on you” and “Do you consider this impact to be negative or positive?” Each participant who answered the question received a candy bar. The purpose of this activity was to attempt to gain deeper attention from participants by using a reward to motivate them. Every participant answered the bonus question and received a candy bar.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

Exploratory analyses were conducted on all variables to ensure normality of the distribution and reliability of measures. All measures were normally distributed and reliable. After that, zero-order correlations between all variables were calculated and examined (see Table 1). Only 4 of the 45 correlations were strong enough to indicate a relationship that accounted for at least 10% of the variance. They were the relationships between secure and avoidant attachment, anxious and avoidant attachment, transformational and transactional leadership, and transformational leadership and life satisfaction.

Table 1

Correlations Between Study Variables (N = 160)

| Variable      | M   | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 01 Age        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 02 Gender     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 03 Income     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 04 Ethnicity  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 05 Secure     | 3.39| .75  |     | .06 | .02 | -.12| -.02| -.19*|-.05 |-.10 |-.05 |-.10 |
| 06 Anxious    | 2.39| .89  |     |     |     | -.14| .10 | .04 |-.07 |-.02 |.01  | .13 |
| 07 Avoidant   | 2.76| .88  |     |     |     | -.03| .15 |-.04 |-.22**| .18*|-.03 |.19* |
| 08 Transform  | 2.86| .56  |     |     |     |     |     |     |-.21**|-.49**|-.25**| .09 |
| 09 Transaction| 2.47| .60  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |-.13 | .06  |-.30**|
| 10 Life       | 4.81| 1.40 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

Note. * Significant at \( p < .05 \), two-tailed. ** Significant at \( p < .01 \), two-tailed.
Next, the relationships of attachment with leadership and the relationships of attachment and leadership with life satisfaction were examined in Hierarchical Multiple Regression (HMR) analyses using listwise deletion. Results are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

**Transformational Leadership**

Attachment styles explained 11.8% (10.1% adjusted) of the variance in transformational leadership, \( F(3, 156) = 6.98, p < .001 \). Secure attachment and anxious attachment were both associated with transformational leadership, such that higher secure attachment was related to higher transformational leadership (\( \beta = .38, p < .001 \)), and lower anxious attachment was associated with higher transformational leadership (\( \beta = -.29, p = .002 \)). The squared semipartial correlations revealed that secure attachment explained 9% of the variance in transformational leadership, while anxious ambivalent attachment explained 6% of the variance in transformational leadership. Avoidant attachment did not share a statistically significant relationship with transformational leadership, contrary to hypotheses (\( \beta = .16, p = .13 \)). Contrary to usual expectations, the semipartial correlations were larger than the zero-order correlations. In addition, anxious attachment did not share a significant zero-order correlation with transformational leadership but did explain a significant amount of variance in transformational leadership when examining the semipartial correlations. Furthermore, the squared semipartial correlations revealed that secure attachment (9%) and anxious attachment (6%) explained 15% of the variance in transformational leadership, which is more than the total variance in transformational leadership (11.8%) explained by all predictors.
Table 2

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>−.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>−.29**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F(3, 156) = 6.98^{**} \]

Note. ** p < .01. sr² = the squared semi-partial correlation.

Life Satisfaction

Attachment styles and leadership styles were evaluated for their relationship to life satisfaction next, as shown in Table 3. Variables explained 26.4% (24.0% adjusted) of the total variance in life satisfaction in this regression analysis, \[ F(5, 154) = 11.02, \ p < .001 \]. Attachment styles were entered on the first step and explained 16.7% (15.1% adjusted) of the variance in life satisfaction, \[ F(3, 156) = 10.41, \ p < .001 \]. Secure and anxious attachment were associated with life satisfaction on this step, such that higher secure attachment (\( \beta = .25, p = .01 \)) and lower anxious attachment (\( \beta = -.32, p < .001 \)) were related to higher life satisfaction. The squared semipartial correlations revealed that secure attachment explained 4% of the variance in life satisfaction on this step, while anxious ambivalent attachment explained 7% of the variance in life satisfaction. Avoidant attachment did not have a significant relationship to life satisfaction (\( \beta = -.06, p = .54 \)).

Leadership variables were entered on the second step and explained an additional 9.7% (8.9% adjusted) of the variance in life satisfaction, \[ F(2, 154) = 10.12, \ p < .001 \]. In step two, anxious attachment was the only attachment style that was significantly associated with life satisfaction (\( \beta = -.23, p = .01 \)). Of the leadership styles, only
transformational leadership was associated with life satisfaction on this step, such that higher transformational leadership was related to higher life satisfaction ($\beta = .37, p < .001$). The squared semipartial correlations revealed that anxious ambivalent attachment explained 3% of the variance in life satisfaction on this step, while transformational leadership explained 9% of the variance in life satisfaction. The sum of the squared semipartial correlations for the significant predictors in step one (11%) and step two (12%) differed by only 1% from substituting transformational leadership for secure attachment.

Even though secure attachment shared a significant relationship to life satisfaction in step one, it failed to show significance in step two, leading me to believe that transformational leadership could be a mediator between secure attachment and life satisfaction. Before conducting the test for mediation, I confirmed these four required conditions: (1) secure attachment significantly predicted transformational leadership in the first regression analysis; (2) secure attachment significantly predicted life satisfaction in the absence of transformational leadership in the second regression analysis; (3) transformational leadership significantly predicted life satisfaction in the second regression analysis; and (4) the relationship of secure attachment to life satisfaction diminished once transformational leadership was added into the regression analysis. I tested for mediation with the Sobel test, which tests whether the mediator variable (transformational leadership) significantly carries the influence of the independent variable (secure attachment) to the dependent variable (life satisfaction); in other words,
the Sobel test determines whether the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable through the mediator variable is significant (Baron & Kenny, 1986, Denis, 2010). The results of the Sobel test revealed that the indirect effect of secure attachment on life satisfaction via transformational leadership was significantly different from zero, Sobel \( t(158) = 2.89, p = .004 \). In other words, transformational leadership was a significant mediator of the relationship between secure attachment and life satisfaction. The Sobel test does not provide an estimate of the variance explained by the indirect relationship, but the variance in life satisfaction explained by secure attachment dropped from 4% in Step 1 to 1% in Step 2 with the addition of transformational leadership, suggesting that the indirect effect of secure attachment via transformational leadership explains approximately 3% of the variance in life satisfaction.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>sr²</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ΔR² = .17, \quad ΔR² = .10, \)

\( \text{Total } R² = .17, \quad \text{Total } R² = .26, \)

\( ΔF(3, 156) = 10.41**, \quad ΔF(2, 154) = 10.12** \)

Note. ** \( p < .01 \). sr² = the squared semi-partial correlation.
Attachment Style and Transformational Leadership

As expected, secure attachment style was positively related to self-ratings of transformational leadership in the current study. This finding is consistent with earlier research that has found positive relationships between secure attachment and transformational leadership (Popper et al., 2000). Secure attachment is part of a foundation that seems to be required for the development of a transformational leader (Bass, 1985; Simmons et al., 2009). The characteristics found in securely attached persons, such as trustworthiness and the ability to trust others, openness to exploration, confidence in the self and others, and a desire for interdependence with others, likely enables securely attached individuals to develop characteristics that lead them to become transformational leaders (Elliot & Reis, 2003; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000).

Securely attached people are flexible and able to place trust in others, which enhances their relationships and interactions (Simmons et al., 2009). Securely attached individuals are able to use these abilities to form strong reciprocal relationships and deep emotional connections, gaining cooperation from other people (Simmons et al., 2009). Evidence found in the present study in relation to attachment styles and transformational leadership is in agreement with previous studies relating to these variables (Cohen & Belsky, 2008; Elliot & Reis, 2003; Richards & Schat, 2010; Simmons et al., 2009).
Further consistent with predictions, anxious ambivalent attachment was negatively related to transformational leadership in the present investigation. Without the foundation created by a secure attachment, there may be too many negative behaviors to overcome, such as difficulties in trusting others, lack of successful communication, and resistance in building relationships. These are likely to block the ability of being able to motivate, inspire, and encourage other people. For example, those who have an insecure attachment are likely to create a cycle where they may transfer their own negative beliefs about themselves unto other people, causing unwarranted relationship difficulties (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Contrary to prediction, avoidant attachment did not have a significant relationship to transformational leadership in the present study. Avoidantly attached individuals have been shown to avoid relationship closeness and to distrust others (Cohen & Belsky, 2008; Mikulincer, 1998). Theoretically, this relationships style should not work well in the transformational leadership context, where the leader must direct and motivate groups of other people (Bass & Avolio, 2004; Popper et al., 2000). Thus, I had expected to find a negative relationship between these two variables, indicating that lower avoidant attachment is related to higher transformational leadership. However, the results of the present study did not reveal any relationship between avoidant attachment and transformational leadership. The results that I found may indicate that people who have avoidant attachment are protecting themselves from the negative feelings associated with any day to day occurrences that are happening around them (Cohen & Belsky, 2008;
As a result of their avoidant attachment style, they may be able to use detachment as a tool to protect them from psychologically experiencing negativity from disappointments and disagreements that regularly occur in life. This may enable them to experience daily life with a subtle contentment that may seem unwarranted, but could be explained by this sort of veil of protection they have constructed around themselves.

The present results provide information that can be useful for companies that are building their departments and deciding upon leaders who will influence their employees. It would be difficult to give a measurement such as the RSQ to newly hired management, but if the human resource staff along with upper management could find a way to work it into employee training workshops, then they may be able to reveal some important characteristics about the manager and provide assistance as needed. If companies staff their offices with leaders who are securely attached, then companies will benefit from the foundation of the business. Alternatively, if companies staff leadership positions with those people who are anxiously attached, then they may be creating a work environment that is untrusting and uncooperative from the foundation. This type of environment will slow down and undermine the success of businesses (Elliot & Reis, 2003; Richards & Schat, 2010).

**Attachment Style and Life Satisfaction**

Supporting my second hypothesis, secure attachment was positively related to life satisfaction, while anxious ambivalent attachment was negatively related to life satisfaction. These results are in agreement with previous research that has been
completed on attachment theory and satisfaction in life (Bronk et al., 2009; Diener, Harter, & Arora, 2010; Fraley, 2002; Simmons et al., 2009).

When examining the semipartial correlations, I found that anxious attachment explained more variance in life satisfaction than secure attachment. I believe this occurred because people with an anxious attachment live with such negative daily life experiences, due to their mistrust of others and lack of supportive relationships, that they experience a strong lack of life satisfaction. As a result of their behavior in relationships, anxiously attached people go through life without getting their own needs met, which creates a continuous love-hate dynamic between the anxiously attached person and his or her relationship partners. The results from the present study show that this type of attachment stands out as a negative influence, whereas the other two styles of attachment are more limited regarding their influence on a person’s felt life satisfaction.

**Transformational Leadership and Life Satisfaction**

In support of my third hypothesis, my study showed that transformational leaders are high in life satisfaction. The present results are consistent with other research studies that have indicated that transformational leaders are likely to experience heightened life satisfaction due to their positive influence on others (Arnold et al., 2007; Bass, 1985; McMurray et al., 2010; Munir, Nielsen, Gomes-Carneiro, 2010; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000). According to the squared semipartial correlations, transformational leadership was the strongest predictor of life satisfaction in this study, explaining almost one-tenth of the variance in life satisfaction.
The many positive characteristics that a transformational leader possesses, such as a charismatic personality and the ability to successfully interact with others by creating trust, motivation, positive influence and commitment, are likely responsible for creating a life of felt happiness and satisfaction (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Shamir et al., 1993). Transformational leaders have an abundance of positive characteristics that cause them to experience a high level of life satisfaction due to the results of their own behaviors, which may overshadow their attachment style.

**Secure Attachment Style, Transformational Leadership, and Life Satisfaction**

My results revealed transformational leadership as a mediator for the relationship between secure attachment and life satisfaction, as predicted. Securely attached people have the foundation of trust, and a desire for connection with others, yet with the experience of interacting with others in a role of transformational leadership, these people are likely able to increase their felt life satisfaction due to an increase in positive occurrences and outcomes on a day to day basis. The positive experiences that they participate in will likely increase their continued felt life satisfaction (Cohen & Belsky, 2008; Elliot & Reis, 2003; Richards & Schat, 2010; Simmons et al., 2009).

**Future Research Directions**

A question I have pondered since finding these results is regarding anxious ambivalent attachment and its effect on transformational leadership and life satisfaction. It seems that having the anxious ambivalent attachment style creates a strong negative underlying influence on the person’s life. What is it about the characteristics of this
attachment pattern that have such a strong detrimental effect on the person’s life?
Perhaps anxiously attached individuals lack the trust of the securely attached person. Therefore, the anxiously attached are unable to connect in a positive manner with other people. It seems as though they will live their life with an invisible wall between them and others that can only be broken down by learning how to trust. I find this fascinating, because according to the research that I reviewed during this study, 15% of American adults and 11% of American infants have this anxious ambivalent attachment style (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Campos et al., 1983). Therefore, with more in-depth research on anxious ambivalent attachment style, many people could be helped to learn ways to increase their life satisfaction.

Another topic for future exploration would be to examine the cultural/societal values of individualism and collectivism. The United States is typically considered individualistic, but with the influx of many new cultures there may be more representation of collectivistic values. Therefore, it would be interesting to see how attachment styles and leadership tendencies are affected by the societal influences of individualistic versus collectivistic values.

Limitations

One limitation to my study involved the students that participated. Since I gathered my data from students at a university in Sacramento, California, my participants were predominately young college students beginning their education and careers. This limits the generalizability of my results to people who have not experienced a significant
amount of adult life. Importantly, these young college students may not have yet experienced opportunities to develop transformational leadership characteristics, leading to shortcomings in the results that were revealed in my study. If the participants were more experienced in their careers, I would expect to have more realistic results regarding leadership revealed. Since many of the young adults that I measured have not experienced time in their careers, they had to complete the MLQ scale using projection of how they believed they would feel in the hypothetical situation, rather than completing the scale based on actual experience.

Furthermore, the predominant attachment style of the participants may change as they go through young adulthood and move out of their family homes into a more independent life with different opportunities to develop their attachment styles. I feel that once they are in the presence of people other than their families, they may develop parts of their personalities and form new relationships that will have an effect on their attachment style over a long period of time.

In addition to problems associated with the sample, the present study was also limited in design. This study was conducted in a short time period with questionnaires given to participants on only one occasion. Causal inferences cannot be drawn from cross-sectional work. Therefore, study variables should be examined again using a longitudinal design. It would be best to sample participants when they are eighteen years of age, and then again three more times every three or four years. This would provide thorough information on the development of transformational leadership skills and
attachment styles over time. This would also allow for the opportunity to validate the preliminary mediation result of transformational leadership as a causal pathway from secure attachment to life satisfaction.

My study was also limited by the fact that the students were being given research credit for the time that they spent participating in my study. I believe that this created a situation where many of them came in and quickly answered the questionnaires with the goal of receiving credit, yet did not fully focus on the information in the research study. Therefore, it is difficult to believe that my results are completely accurate.

**Conclusion**

Attachment style has a great impact on adult development. Since we can make alterations to our attachment style as we grow older, it seems beneficial for us to know how to do so. My study has revealed how important it is to consider the people with whom we are surrounding ourselves. Those people that we befriend and spend the majority of our time with influence our attachment style. Having a secure attachment influences our felt experiences in relationships with all other people. This has an impact on whether we enjoy satisfying marriage, friendships, family relations and career. Our attachment style has a strong influence on our success and contentment at our place of employment and ultimately will affect our income.

In the business world it would be desirable for Human Resources managers to understand the effects of a person’s attachment style and how this could equate to productivity within an office environment. Having a secure attachment influences
whether one has a portion of the foundation needed to develop as a transformational leader. A securely attached person will likely be more efficient due to his or her ability to successfully work well with others and will show more confidence in the workplace. It is important to understand how people who are anxiously attached or avoidantly attached can create havoc in an office environment due to their relationship insecurity. If we could develop training modules within our workplace that included ways to integrate education that would encourage some of those who experience these insecurity issues to gain help for a better understanding of their own inner attachment issues, we could create work environments that run more successfully. Upon understanding how these underlying attachment styles affect all of us, we may be able to use this information to create more positive interactions within our lives and those of others, resulting in an increased life satisfaction for everyone.
APPENDIX A

Relationship Scales Questionnaire

Items 13 and 23 are reverse coded. Items not labeled as secure, anxious ambivalent or avoidant are not part of the scoring for the RSQ.

1. I find it difficult to depend on other people: (avoidant)
2. It is very important to me to feel independent:
3. I find it easy to get emotionally close to others:
4. I want to merge completely with another person: (anxious ambivalent)
5. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others:
6. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships:
7. I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them:
8. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others:
9. I worry about being alone:
10. I am comfortable depending on other people: (secure)
11. I often worry that romantic partners don’t really love me: (anxious ambivalent)
12. I find it difficult to trust others completely: (avoidant)
13. I worry about others getting too close to me: (secure; reverse coded)
14. I want emotionally close relationships:
15. I am comfortable having other people depend on me: (secure)
16. I worry that others don’t value me as much as I value them:
17. People are never there when you need them:
18. My desire to merge completely sometimes scares people away: (anxious ambivalent)

19. It is very important to me to feel self-sufficient:

20. I am nervous when anyone gets too close to me:

21. I often worry that romantic partners won’t want to stay with me: (anxious ambivalent)

22. I prefer not to have other people depend on me:

23. I worry about being abandoned: (secure; reverse coded)

24. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others: (avoidant)

25. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like: (anxious ambivalent)

26. I prefer not to depend on others:

27. I know that others will be there when I need them:

28. I worry about having others not accept me:

29. Romantic partners often want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being:

   (avoidant)

30. I find it relatively easy to get close to others: (secure)
APPENDIX B

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The items that are not labeled are not used for the leadership style scales.

Transformational codes are as follows:

II-A Idealized Influence Attributes
II-B Idealized Influence Behaviors
IM Inspirational Motivation
IC Individual Consideration
IS Intellectual Stimulation

Transactional Codes are as follows:

CR Contingent Reward
AM Active Management by Exception
PM Passive Management by Exception

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts: Transactional-CR
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate: Transformational-IS
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious: Transactional-PM
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards: Transactional-AM
5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise: Transactional-PM
6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs: Transformational-II-B
7. I am absent when needed: Transactional-PM
8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems: Transformational-IS
9. I talk optimistically about the future: Transformational-IM
10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me: Transformational-II-A
11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets: Transformational-CR
12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action: Transactional-PM
13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished: Transformational-IM
14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose: Transformational-II-B
15. I spend time teaching and coaching: Transformational-IC
16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goal are achieved: Transactional-CR
17. I show that I am a firm believer in “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”: Transactional-PM
18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group: Transformational-II-A
19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group: Transformational-IC
20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action: Transactional-PM
21. I act in ways that build others’ respect for me: Transformational-II-A
22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures: Transactional-AM
23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions: Transformational-II-B
24. I keep track of all mistakes: Transactional-AM
25. I display a sense of power and confidence: Transformational-II-A
26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future: Transformational-IM
27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards
28. I avoid making decisions: Transactional-PM
29. I consider and individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others: Transformational-IC
30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles: Transformational-IS
31. I help others to develop their strengths: Transformational-IC
32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments: Transformational-IS
33. I delay responding to urgent questions: Transactional-PM
34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission:
   Transformational-II-B
35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations: Transactional-CR
36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved: Transformational-IM
37. I am effective in meeting others’ job-related needs
38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying
39. I get others to do more than they expected to do
40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority
41. I work with others in a satisfactory way
42. I heighten others’ desire to succeed

43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements

44. I increase others’ willingness to try harder

45. I lead a group that is effective
APPENDIX C

The Satisfaction with Life Scale

1. In most ways my life is close to ideal
2. The conditions of my life are excellent
3. I am satisfied with my life
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing
APPENDIX D

Demographic Information

1. What is the year of your birth? ____________

2. What is your gender? Male  Female

3. What is your annual current household income? If you live with your parents please estimate the household income.
   1. Less than $10,000.00
   2. $10,000.00 to $20,000.00
   3. $20,001.00 to $50,000.00
   4. $50,001.00 to $75,000.00
   5. $75,001.00 or more

4. What ethnicity do you consider yourself to be?
   1. White and/or European American
   2. Black and/or African American
   3. Mexican/Latino and/or Mexican/Latino American
   4. Native American or Aleutian Islander/Eskimo
   5. Asian/Pacific Islander and/or Asian American
   6. Middle Eastern and/or Middle Eastern American
   7. Other (please specify) ________________________
   8. Multi-ethnic (please specify) ____________________
BONUS QUESTION:

Name one person during the course of your life that has had a significant impact on you _______________________________________________________________

Do you consider this impact to be negative or positive (please circle one)
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