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This study investigates a relatively new area of research, namely, the relationship between attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980, 1988) and leadership theory. Attachment theory posits that human beings unconsciously establish mental models of how relationships work. Depending on the kind and quality of early relational experiences, humans can associate feelings of security, anxiety, or avoidance with relationships. According to attachment theory, these associations are transferable and inform future relationships. Much of leadership theory suggests that relationships are a key component of effective leadership and may very well be the most important factor (Gardner et al., 2005). Recent quantitative studies align attachment behaviors with transformational and transactional leadership behaviors (Berson, 2006; Boatwright et. al., 2010; Bresnahan, 2008). This study uses population surveying to investigate the clergy of a small, bi-national, Protestant denomination with a total of 995 full-time, parish-based pastors. This study explores potential relationships between attachment behaviors using the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Feeney, et al., 1994), and leadership characteristics using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004), while controlling for demographic variables. The study confirmed the relationship between
attachment security and transformational leadership. The clergy in this study (n=348) scored highest in transformational leadership yet lower than the average benchmarks established by Avolio & Bass (2004). Participants’ work satisfaction levels were consistent with the normative mean establish by Avolio & Bass, but both extra effort and effectiveness means were lower than the norm for other leaders. Surprisingly, this study also revealed that clergy professional longevity reduces with transformational leadership and increases with a more passive style of leadership.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Separations between clergy leaders and their congregations are increasing at an alarming rate as pastors and congregations try to navigate precarious leader-follower relationships. Collecting reliable data on these separations is not easy. Churches, pastors, and denominations do not always disclose why these separations have taken place and sometimes, the distinction between a forced resignation and leaving for other reasons is not very clear (Schultz, 2013). Increasingly, pastors and denominational adjudicatory bodies are growing more cautious about naming the particulars surrounding clergy separations with their congregations; sometimes for the sake of the congregation and other times for the sake of the pastor. Official denominational records increasingly do not reveal some of the hidden casualties that congregations and intermediate judicial bodies wish to avoid (Schuurman, 2014).

Nearly a decade ago - when clergy-congregational failure rates and reasons seemed more simple – some research claimed that approximately 1,700 pastors per month in the U.S. would either leave or were asked to leave their congregations and never return to full-time ministry (Kreijer, 2007). A more recent study from a slightly different approach found that 28% of Christian ministers surveyed acknowledged they had experienced a forced termination; some three or more times. Other surveys put that figure between 19-41% percent depending upon the denomination (Tanner, 2011, p. 24). The denomination selected for this study reported a 580% increase in terminations from the 1990’s to the 2000’s; from 25 cases between 1990-1999 to 146 cases between 2000-2009. During the same time period, the same denomination reported nearly a tripling in the number of clergy resignations from 11 to 30 cases (Schuurman, 2014).
The crisis for clergy leaders and their congregations is certainly multifaceted. The larger factors include denominational issues, sweeping cultural shifts, varied expectations about leadership, congregational dysfunction and bullies, and the failing character and competence of pastors (Schuurman, 2014). The most common reason pastors cite for leaving their congregation is conflict with parishioners, staff or denominational officials. More clergy leave for interpersonal reasons of loneliness and isolation than because of a loss of faith or for financial reasons (Hoge & Wenger, 2005). Based on their five denomination study, Hoge and Wenger (2005) found that 30-40% of “ex-pastors” left involuntarily, 15-25% left voluntarily, and 40-50% left voluntarily having felt pushed or pulled out as a result of job-related pressures inside them or inside the congregation (p. 45).

The three most common reasons that congregations cite for their ecclesiastical divorce are: clergy narcissism, poor leadership skills, or an inability to connect well with the congregation (Van Meris & VanHoek, 2006). Each of these conditions reflects a failed dynamic in the leader-follower relationship between clergy and their congregations. The capacity for emotional availability, connectivity, and interpersonal relationship are significant for clergy effectiveness and each are present or absent long before one arrives at seminary. Like other human beings, clergy develop ideas of how relationships work long before any formal education begins. The process of learning how relationships work is not just a clergy phenomenon but a human one. Human beings - like other mammals – develop relational prototypes very early on that then become working models for future relationships; adult relational patterns are formed and informed by early antecedents.
Background

Initial research by Bowlby (1969, 1973) described attachment as the relationally-developmental dynamic that is at work when infants are seeking proximity, protection, and bonding with their caregiver. Attachment can further be understood as “an emotional connection to someone, evidenced by proximity seeking, and feelings of security in the persons’ presence and protest upon separation” (Archer & Stroebe, 2013, p. 29). During and after World War II, Bowlby observed the impact of wartime evacuations, hospitalizations and orphanages that resulted in the separation of young children from their parents and caregivers. Even brief separations from parents in overnight hospitalizations intensified children’s suffering. Contrary to the prevailing notion of his day that a child’s disturbed behavior was a result of infantile sexual fantasies, Bowlby made the radical claim that a child’s disturbances were a response to life experiences of separation, neglect, and exposure to threatening experiences. Bowlby devoted the rest of his professional career to the study of what has come to be known as attachment theory (Van Der Kolk, 2014). Per Bowlby, one’s mode of attachment influences one’s capacity for relationship for a lifetime. In light of the interpersonal dimension of human interaction, early developed attachment models have been demonstrated to become the antecedents for future relationships.

Ainsworth (1978) developed and expanded Bowlby’s theories and identified three styles of infant attachment that include: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant. These styles of both relating and responding become working models for understanding infants (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1969, 1973), children and adolescents (Doverspike, Hollis, Justice, & Polomsky 1997; Brenan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Carver, 1997; Crowell & Treboux, 1995), as well as for adults - particularly with authority figures (Doverspike et al., 1997), and in the
workplace (Harms, 2011). But research has also demonstrated that attachment dynamics are operative in relationships that are closer in proximity. Hazan and Shaver (1987) demonstrated that attachment theory is operative in adult romantic relationships, and Popper (2000) found that attachment is a significant variable in leadership practices. More recent studies have found that the categories developed in attachment theory have been helpful in describing the capacity for success in leader-follower relationships, particularly with the descriptions of follower’s needs in terms of anxious (Davidovitz, 2007; Drake, 2009; Ghazal, 2011), indifferent and avoidant attachment styles (Goleman, 2013; Popper, 2002), and secure ones (Kohlreiser, 2012; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Prior to exploring the relationship between attachment and leadership, it is important to have a working understanding of the dynamic of leadership. The first modern attempt to formulate a theory of leadership was the Scottish philosopher Thomas Carlyle in 1841 (Popper, 2004). Leaders were “great men” who were above all spiritual leaders who shaped history, moved and molded masses, and held individual genius. This view was very different from Marx and Engels (1968) who regarded circumstances as the defining factor of leadership, not a “great man.” In more recent years, influence and inspiration have replaced the trait approach of the “great man” and the situational approach of circumstances (Popper, 2004, pp. 108-109).

Kouzes and Posner (2010, 2012) observed that there are hundreds of definitions of leadership from which to choose and that leadership is everyone’s business. Some of these definitions focus on the leader’s traits of creativity, integrity, credibility, authenticity, or clarity – to name a few - while others focus on followers’ needs and capacities. Burns (1978) saw leadership as a leader-follower dynamic. Popper (2001) looked at leaders, followers, and the role of charisma in those relationships. Negatively, self-serving leaders can use their charisma in
such a way where they function as a spark, their followers the fuel, and the conditions the oxygen. In such situations, leadership is happening in the sense that there is a change process underway, but such “hypnotic” circumstances are ones where leaders have their own needs met and followers lose their sense of self in the process. More positively, Northouse (2013) described leadership as a process while Kotter (1995) is even more specific by suggesting that leadership is about facilitating a process of change in the proper developmental sequence.

Each of these fit within a lens developed by Popper (2004) who observed that leadership is a relationship, but it is an emotional relationship at one of three levels: regressive, symbolic, or developmental (p. 112). Each of these grow out of the needs of the followers and the ability of the leader to meet that need. Regressive relations are characterized by dependency, symbolic relations by aspiration, and developmental relations is characterized by frequent, adaptive changes to the status quo (pp. 112-116). For the purposes of this paper, I will define leadership in a way similar to Burns (1978), who understands leadership not as skills or technique but a process where mutual needs are met and where “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20). Burns understood Maslow (1954) and his understanding of human needs. Leadership then, involves emotional influence that causes people ‘to be more’ than they were before their relations with the leader, meaning, more moral, more social, and beyond the norms and expectations of the environment or immediate context (Popper, 2004). Leadership involves relationship (Avolio, 2013); human capacity for relationships, relatability, and leadership begins long before the leader-follower relationship.

**Problem Statement**

Attachment theory was pioneered by Bowlby in 1969 and developed through multiple researchers over the past 45 years. In its most recent form, attachment can be applied as a
predictor of transformational leadership capacities of leaders and followers. Although Bowlby claimed that attachment theory is operative from the cradle to the grave, it has taken 40 years for researchers to apply attachment theory in an ever-expanding field of study. What began with Bowlby (1969) as an emotional-relational system, was further developed by Ainsworth (1978), then applied to romantic relationships and adulthood by Hazan and Shaver (1987) and Brenan and Clark (1994), and then to other aspects of human behavior such as leadership.

The first known study to explore the relationship of attachment theory to leadership was by Doverspike et al. (1997). Popper, Mayseless and Caselnovo (2000) would then apply it to transformational leadership by describing such leaders as “secure,” vocabulary derivative of attachment theory. Popper and Mayseless (2003) examined transformational leadership again, but this time did so utilizing a parenting model. Popper (2004) looked at leadership theory, attachment theory and relationships and found a correlation. Popper and Amit (2009) found that secure attachment can predict strong leadership traits. Boatright et al. (2010) explored the role of adult attachment on worker preferences in relationship to their leader’s relational behaviors. Harms (2011) presented a theoretical overview of links between leadership theory and attachment theory. Hansbrough (2012) examined the relationship between transformational leadership and follower attachment style, and Molero et al. (2013) examined the interaction between attachment, perceived leadership style, and work satisfaction among employees. Hudson (2013) found links between a leader’s attachment style and the anticipated leadership behaviors. More recently, Hinojosa et al. (2014) and Kafetsios (2014) each released studies that examined leader-follower attachment and its implications for work relationships.

The various versions of attachment theory that have been developed are neither identical nor mutually exclusive. Each theory provides a different lens through which to view attachment
theory and some of its implications. While each theory can shed light on certain aspects of relationships, applying attachment theory differently to leadership behaviors and perceptions – particularly in failed clergy leadership relationships – permits attachment to be a potential predictor of leadership and follower outcomes.

Overall, quantitative studies align attachment behaviors with leadership behaviors that are measured in transformational and transactional terms (Bartholomew, 1990; Berson, 2006; Boatwright et al., 2010; Bresnahan, 2008; Chacon, 2009; Davidovitz, 2007; De Sanctis & Karantzas, 2009; Goleman, 2013; Kafetsios, 2004; Hansbrough, 2012; Hinojosa et al., 2014; Popper et al., 2000, 2002; Van Sloten, 2011; Van Sloten & Henderson, 2013). Attachment and leadership are also linked in three known qualitative studies (Boyd, 2015; Olbrych, 2010; Wyse, 2014).

In light of the number of separations between clergy and congregations, a study measuring the relationship between attachment and clergy leadership style is warranted. Van Meris and Van Hoek (2006) observed that the clergy-side of failed clergy-congregational relationships generally have their origins in one of three areas: narcissism, disorganization, or an inability to connect. Each of these deficiencies could be rooted in one’s attachment style. Those who have learned avoidance prize independence and devalue relationships; their leadership bends toward minimizing attachment behaviors. In attachment theory, such persons practice avoidant attachment; in leadership terms, they become more like transactional leaders. In sum, those who cannot bond well with others may find their leadership capacity limited and bound by their inability to relate.

While multiple studies have been done on attachment and leadership, there is precious little research in the domain of attachment theory and the clergy-congregational relationship –
particularly in regard to failed clergy-congregational relationships. Indeed, only one study could be found whereby a fairly recent case study (Olbrych, 2010) examined one clergyperson and one congregation’s capacity to bond in light of the church’s tempestuous history, but no known study examines the relationship between clergy leader attachment and its impact on transformational leadership.

My study presumes that to be a transformational clergy leader, one must work out of attachment security and must have an acute and empathetic interest in the well-being of others. The evolved expressions of which strongly resemble emotional intelligence as understood by Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2013). They identify these traits as self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, self-confidence, self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, optimism, empathy, organizational awareness, service, inspiration, influence, development of others, change catalyst, conflict management, and collaboration (pp. 253-256).

In psychological terms, a healthy and positive sense of self, a clear view of leadership and a positive regard for others expresses itself in these qualities. This is the link between transformational leadership theory and practices with the secure attachment style of attachment theory. In attachment and leadership terms, pastors are symbolic leaders but also represent parental figures.

**Significance**

My research outcomes of a study on clergy attachment style gives valuable data for clergy, churches, seminaries, and denominations and could help increase clergy effectiveness and potentially, increase their leadership longevity in their congregations. Minimally, a clearer understanding of the relationship between attachment and clergy leadership style will help us better understand the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership practices.
Bowlby’s (1969, 1973, 1980, 1988) work with attachment, safe haven, and secure base is a natural bridge to a relationship-based leadership theory. “Beyond close personal relationships, attachment theory has been successfully applied to one of the most central social domains: leadership processes and leader-follower relationships” (Mayseless, 2010, p. 271). Burns’ (1978) seminal work with transformational leadership is congruent with Kouzes and Pozner (2012) who asserted the importance of leadership as relationship. A leader-follower relationship that is characterized by fear and distrust does not bear fruit; “a relationship characterized by mutual respect and confidence will leave a legacy of significance” (p. 30). A pastor’s capacity for relationship will have a profound impact on his or her leadership effectiveness.

While attachment styles tend to operate unconsciously outside of our awareness (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Bretherton, 1985; Crowell et al., 1999), they tend to guide behaviors, inform our expectations, and guide the relational strategies and behavior we deploy in later relationships (Crowell & Treboux, 1995, p. 296). Bowlby (1969, 1982) suggested that attachment behaviors and styles continue from cradle to grave, yet also suggested that change in adult life is possible. In order for change in attachment style to take place, new emotional relationships would need to form in ways that would change one’s way of thinking about the attachment prototypes. This “combination of events would allow the individual to reflect on and reinterpret the meaning of past and present experiences” (Crowell & Treboux, 1995, p. 296).

A significant life event however, such as the development of a new significant relationship, can develop into a construction of a new working model (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006). In light of this, individuals may be vulnerable to negative experiences, but may also derive benefits from positive ones (Bowlby, 1988). For those with attachment insecurity, a new, supportive and sensitive relationship such as a friend, significant other, or
therapist can bring about changes to a more secure style (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1988; Lieberman, Weston, & Pawl, 1991; Van Ijzendoorn, Juffer, & Duyvesteyn, 1995). While changes in attachment style from secure to insecure are more common as a result of crisis events, in the right circumstances, it is conceivable for pastors with insecure attachment to change to a more secure style.

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership behaviors, and any connections to longevity within their congregation.

1. For clergy affiliated with a small, bi-national denomination, what are the:
   a) attachment styles,
   b) leadership styles and,
   c) average longevity and involuntary separation rates within their congregations?

2. What is the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership style?

3. To what extent can a clergyperson’s attachment and leadership style be used to predict average longevity and involuntary separations within their congregations?

**Conceptual Framework**

Ainsworth (1978) furthered Bowlby’s initial research by observing infants’ responses to the temporary separation from their mothers. She observed that all children protest upon realizing the disappearance of their mother. Upon her return, securely attached infants show immediate relief and upon reconnecting with their mother, settle down and resume their play. Reunion with mother is enough to relieve distress and restore play, socialization and exploration. Children who have insecure attachment respond to reunion with their mother in one of two significant ways; either they were inconsolable and even visibly angry with their mothers or they
were withdrawn. Ainsworth described these attachment responses as avoidant and anxious-ambivalent. In practical terms, Crittenden (1992, 1994) differentiated avoidance and anxious-ambivalence responses in the following way: one involves dealing without feeling; the other involves feeling without dealing.

Ainsworth (1978) identified three styles of attachment that include: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant. These styles of relating/responding become working models for infants, children, adolescents, and adults - in romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and in leadership practices (Popper, 2000). Those who have learned avoidance prize independence, devalue relationships, and their leadership bends toward minimizing attachment behaviors. In attachment theory, such persons practice avoidant or ambivalent attachment; in leadership terms, they become transactional leaders. These terms flow right out of Ainsworth’s development of Bowlby’s theory as a way to describe those who have difficulty bonding as a result of attachments that disappoint. Such persons are characteristically task-oriented and either are cautious or even suspicious of others. It would follow that such pastors would have difficulty attaching and bonding with their congregations and may be less effective (and certainly less affective).

Bowlby (1988) also observed that anxious and secure persons are relational in their orientation. One is relational because they are secure in their proximity to another, the other is anxiously relational because of their own relational needs. Recent studies have demonstrated overlap between some of the behaviors of transformational and transactional leadership with attachment style (Mayseless, 2010; Popper & Mayseless, 2003, 2007). Presumably, transformational leaders are more people-centered and have relational bonds that are secure; that is, neither held too tight nor too loose. In the case of parish settings, it would follow that secure,
transformational leaders should be more effective, reliable, trustworthy, available, and potentially, have greater longevity in their parish settings than those with insecure attachment and transactional leadership.

One primary assumption of this study is that there is a link between clergy attachment style and the leadership they offer their congregations. This suggests that there is a correlation between a leader’s attachment style and the kind of leadership they are capable of providing their followers. Per Popper and Mayeless (2002), the origins, ability, and motivation to be a transformational leader lie in childhood experiences. Further, the development of this capacity and the motivation to use it can be understood by attachment theory. A transformational leader’s “internal world” is formed early and is one that is “characterized by a motivation to lead, self-efficacy, motivation and capacity to relate to others in a prosocial way, and openness to new experiences and viewpoints” (p. 277). See Figure 1.1 for a visual of these ideas.
“The leadership relationship is another important relationship in which attachment models are activated” (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006, p. 178).

Notes:

*The instrument used for this study (ASQ) uses “confidence” to measure what is known in Attachment Theory as “security”.

**Securely attached adults** value relationships more highly than insecurely attached adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). **Anxiously attached adults** tend to have excessive worry and preoccupation about relationships (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994). **Avoidant attached adults** treat relationships as secondary, rely on themselves, and are uncomfortable being close to people (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994). A **transformational leader** is associated with positive outcomes in followers (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). A **transactional leader** identifies expectations for followers and will respond in order to link effort and reward (Zalenznik, 1992).

*Figure 1.1* Attachment and Leadership.
One of the key markers of transformational leadership is care and concern for others (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kohlberg, 1963). When a child’s needs are met with caregiver responsiveness, that child eventually learns that others have needs that can be addressed. Attachment research suggests that internal working models shape self-image and images of others in ways that will inform thoughts, feelings, and behavior in relationships (Popper & Mayseless, 2002).

Transformational leaders possess and practice developed empathy; something they likely learned from antecedent relationships. Popper and Mayseless (2001) likened transformational leadership to good parenting; both parents and leaders serve the “smaller” ones as those who are “older and wiser.” Good leaders and good parents are sensitive and responsive to needs (Bass, 1985; De-Wolff & Van Ijzendoorn, 1997; Howell, 1988; Roush & Atwater, 1992), affirm the autonomy of the underling (Bass, 1985; George & Solomon, 1989; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), are non-judgmentally supportive (Bass, 1985; Baumrind, 1978; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Sroufe, 1983), provide opportunities and learning experiences (Bass, 1985; Baumrind, 1978; Howell, 1988; Matas, Arendt, & Sroufe, 1978), and serve as nurturing role models (Conger & Kanugo, 1987; Clover, 1990; Howell, 1988; Main, 1983).

Overall, research has found that there is a positive association between the secure attachment style and the transformational leadership style (Kunce & Shaver, 1994). Therefore, correlating attachment and leadership styles of clergy suggests that a pastor’s early relational curriculum may inform future leadership relationships. It follows that unattached, task-oriented clergy leaders may be more likely to possess a more transactional style of leadership, while both anxious and more securely attached leaders are more likely going to embody a more transformational leadership orientation. In part, this means that in situations where
transformational leadership in clergy is the ideal, one should expect to find a leader who is self-assured and have an empathetic interest in others. This connection however, is a theoretical one. This study explores whether that theoretical assumption is demonstrable through research.

**Methods Overview**

This quantitative study is of a non-experimental design and involved surveying a convenience sample of approximately 995 Protestant clergy within a small, bi-national denomination. The confidential, electronic survey asked for simple demographic information from the respondents, including: gender, ethnic identification, years in ordained ministry, years in previous congregations, years in their current congregation, congregation size, and whether they have ever had an involuntary separation from a congregation. In addition, the survey combined two established instruments: the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994) to measure adult attachment style, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) to measure transformational and transactional leadership. Interval responses on a Likert Scale were recorded and analysis performed via inferential and descriptive statistics to explore what if any correlation exists between attachment and leadership style.

**Summary**

When we come into the world, we announce our arrival by crying out; when we do, someone responds. That person holds us in our distress, remains close and available, and feeds, comforts, and tends to us in ways that keep us safe and warm. As we grow up, we learn to take care of ourselves - but only because we have experienced having been cared for. Children who have had parents who are reliable sources of comfort and availability have developed Secure Attachment and have a lifetime advantage against the worst that life has to offer (Van Der Kolk,
How we learn to “do” relationships from early on becomes a “set of rules” (McConnell & Moss, 2011, p. 61) that will have a significant bearing on how we will do future relationships. Our first relationships become prototypes and antecedents for future ones. These form and inform the relational curriculum that will be our ever-working model for how relationships work for us.

When a person has a relationship that is a safe haven and a secure base from which to live their life, that person not only has strong self-reliance but is also able to empathize with others. Secure attachment enables children and adults to possess and practice empathy in ways that empower them to be available and helpful to others who are in need or distress. When attachment bonds are secure, young children learn that other people have feelings and responses that are similar to their own. This process of relational learning can sensitize individuals so that they grow in both self-awareness and empathy. Both their needs and the needs of others can be met through relational connections.

Attachment is not something that is optional, though sometimes, attempts with attachment are one-sided. While Bowlby (1980) found that the majority of the world’s children have some form of secure attachment, this is not the case for all. Children whose caregivers are not responsive or, whose responsiveness is not reliable, develop Insecure Attachment. Because attachment is a basic human need, children will adopt coping mechanisms – which to the child feel and function as survival mechanisms - when these needs are not being met. Securely attached children grow into adults who have a reservoir of resources in the face of caregiver separation. Though the experience is stressful and distress-filled, previous parental reliability has taught them that they will be okay because a parent – or in the case of an adult, a parent figure - will respond.
Insecurely attached individuals do not have that reservoir of resources and the distress experience instills a sense of distrust of self and/or others. The early feelings and experiences of both the secure and insecurely attached form and inform a capacity to trust self and others in the future; in adolescence, romantic relationships, adulthood, and in leader-follower relationships. However, parents who are attentive, sensitive, and warmly responsive to their children’s needs and who model a pro-social orientation raise children who are empathic, care about the welfare of others, and have the capacity to help others (Cassidy, 1999; Eberly & Montmayor, 1998; Grusec & Dix, 1986; Thompson, 2000).

The experience of attachment security, attachment anxiety, and attachment avoidance informs one’s leadership style. “The leadership relationship is yet another important relationship within which attachment models are activated” (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006, p. 178). Attachment theory provides a theoretical framework in which to investigate leader-follower dynamics (Popper & Mayseless, 2003); followers want to be close to leaders who provide advice and resources for personal development and advancement (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

In light of the correlation between attachment style and leadership style, a study on parish pastor (clergy) attachment and leadership style is warranted. A growing body of research is demonstrating that one’s mode and capacity for relationship will significantly inform the kind of leadership they offer. In regard to clergy, relationship capacity and leadership style is essential awareness for success and potentially, longevity.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Attachment theory and leadership theory share the common terrain of human relationships. If leaders are like parents who provide a teaching, guiding, caring, and directing role for those who are either dependent or less strong than their followers (Popper & Mayseless, 2003), it is fitting to think about the relationship between attachment theory and clergy leadership. Like good parents, leaders function as those who are “stronger and wiser” (p. 42), and effective ones provide a secure base and a safe haven from which followers can explore, create, and derive security, availability, nurture, and reassurance – particularly in times of need. Relationships are a key component of much leadership theory and may very well be the most important factor (Gardner et al., 2005). What follows is a review of the literature of attachment theory, attachment theory and the relationship process, and attachment and leadership. The intent of this review is to show the links between attachment and leadership theory and provide the grounds for a study on the relationship between attachment and leadership of clergy.

Origins and Implications of Attachment Theory

While attachment theory found its roots in the observations of the infant-caregiver bond, Bowlby (1979) acknowledged it as a relational dynamic that is operative from cradle to grave (p. 129). In the 45 years of research following Bowlby’s initial work in 1969, the aperture of the application of attachment principles has been widening to include adolescents, adult relationships, romantic relationships, working relationships, and the leader-follower dynamic. Attachment orientation impacts both leadership effectiveness and followers’ capacity to trust another.
A growing body of research is consistently showing a relationship between a leader’s attachment orientation and his or her leadership style. Early on, internal working models of attachment figures inform the basis on how one relates to others interpersonally. Secure relationships form a positive view of self and others while insecure attachment forms a doubtful, negative, and even suspicious view of self and others. For the last several decades, leadership theory has been grounded in two kinds of leadership: transactional and transformational. Both Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) demonstrated that leaders are often either task or person-focused. Transactional leaders lead by providing contingent rewards to others while transformational leaders hold their own and followers’ needs in high regard. In light of this, a leader’s mental models of self and other, formed at an early age, will strongly influence the leadership style she embodies and will inform her capacity to have interpersonal relationships.

Bowlby’s (1969) attachment theory grew out of his observations of 12-18 month old infants who were separated from their primary caregiver (ordinarily their mother). Bowlby observed that infants respond in similar ways to that of primates who cycle through a predictable series of emotional responses including, protest, despair, and detachment (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The protest phase is marked by crying, seeking, searching and resistance to others’ attempts at consolation. The subsequent phase of despair is marked by melancholy and apparent powerlessness. The final phase of detachment appears to be unique to human beings. In this phase, infants appear to be both defensive and then avoidant of the mother even if she returns. This cycle of attachment, separation, and loss is a grief process that generates feelings that – addressed or left unaddressed – will shape future perceptions of the reliability of self and others.
Bowlby (1969) postulated that human beings are instinctively born with a desire to be proximity-seeking in relationship to their caregivers. This desire on the part of infants is a survival strategy due in large part because of the infants’ dependency on another for food and protection. In most cases, these “others” are larger, beneficent, and skilled at both providing both physical and emotional nurturing. In light of this special role in the life of the infant, they become the attachment figure to which a child bonds. In her absence, the child develops an identity with corresponding behaviors. Crying, calling, searching, and clinging behaviors are the observable and measurable attention-seeking attachment activities that are associated with the infant’s interest in being known and cared for. These strategies are particularly helpful in times of need and distress, and, tend to work for the infant in his relationship with the attachment figure.

When the acting-out behaviors bring about a successful response from the caregiver, the infant develops a sense of security. That sense of security – or the absence of it – becomes part of the attachment behavioral system that motivates and governs a child’s sense of self and others. The goal of this behavioral control system is to perpetuate a feeling of safety and security as a result of the quality of the responsive relationship with the attachment figure. The attachment figure promotes attachment behavior by being available, accessible, responsive, and a source of comfort in times stress or threat (Crowell & Treboux, 1995).

The active engagement on the part of the attachment figure is essential for the child’s security and emotional well-being. As emotional safety and security develops, marked by security, love, and confidence, the child is then emotionally equipped to explore and to engage others. The child is able to do so confidently in light of the track record of the attachment figure.
The child knows from her experience that the attachment figure will be available and accessible in times of need.

Sometimes however, the attachment figure remains inaccessible or unresponsive despite the child’s pleas for closer proximity. Bowlby (1969) observed that a child will exhibit a multitude of crying and searching strategies for a lost caregiver. The caregiver is the child’s primary frame of reference as he navigates his world. Separation from that frame is not only unsettling, but arouses survival instincts in young children. Young children will vocalize, cling, and visually scan the surroundings in search of the attachment figure in the hope gaining closer proximity. These behaviors will continue until closer proximity is achieved or the child is spent from exhausted attempts for reunion with the attachment figure. Failure to regain proximity with the attachment figure is believed to shape the child’s sense of self and self-worth as well as the reliability and trustworthiness of their caregiver. The absence and unresponsiveness of an attachment figure is not just departure, but for the child, it is abandonment and desertion. Such a child has had their grief disenfranchised. That grief is unresolved and therefore unfinished. This absence of resolution may be emotionally wounding in ways that may lead to relationally scarring. Over time, the child may grow skeptical about the trustworthiness of their feelings as well as the reliability of relationships as a means for dealing with those feelings. The attachment figure is the child’s first interpersonal relationship and the dynamics of that relationship matter, and matter much.

Bowlby’s (1969) attachment theory is really an attachment behavioral system that can be summarized in three propositions. The first is that when an individual is confident in the availability of an attachment figure, that person is going to be less prone to acute or chronic fear than the person who does not have that security. Second, there is a critical juncture at which
trust, confidence, and security is developed during the formative years. The absence of that
security in infancy, childhood, and adolescence as well as all of the expectations that went with
it, tend to persist unchanged throughout the rest of life. The third is experiential. The
expectations that individuals had in regard to the responsiveness – or lack thereof - of their
attachment figures is an accurate reflection of the experience those individuals actually had
(Bowlby, 1973, p. 202). Around the age of three these seem to become part of a child’s personality.
The result is that it affects their self-understanding as well as their understanding of the world and the
future interactions they will have with others (Schore, 2000).

The individual’s need for sustenance and survival perpetuate strategies that produce a
sense of safety. As long as an individual is “preoccupied” with the perpetual need to promote
safety and survival strategies, the more reticent she is to socialize, explore, and engage in other
activities and adventures. When an individual’s attachment with the caregiver is secure, she is
developing the idea that a secure attachment leads to a secure base from which to work from. A
“secure base” is originally a military term used to designate a safe and secure staging area from
which missions can initiate. The idea is that human beings function best and most freely when
they have security, stability and secure attachments as their “safe haven”. Such persons are
secure in the sense that they are free from needing to be preoccupied with physical or emotional
survival needs. In the last 10 years, the vocabulary of secure base and secure base leadership is a
burgeoning field whose roots dig deeply into the work of Bowlby and Ainsworth (1969).

In many ways, the dynamic relationship that exists between caregiver and child become
an early form of a relational curriculum for the child. Bowlby (1980) repeatedly refers to this
relational curriculum as both “models” and “scripts” out of which infants and children learn to
make their way interpersonally in the world. Because these internal models seem to be portable
in the sense that they are not left in childhood and infancy and continue to be operative throughout one’s lifetime, Bowlby (1973) referred to them as “working models” (p. 203). Thus the security – or lack thereof – offered by the attachment figure is both instructive and formative in development. The research done by Bowlby (1969) and countless others since demonstrate that a person’s early attachment style has lifelong implications on how that person sees themselves and others. This is an important interpersonal dynamic that is profoundly important not only in familial and work relations, but in how leaders see themselves and those they seek to lead.

**Childhood and Adolescence**

Ainsworth (1978) extended and expanded Bowlby’s research on attachment and in some ways codified it. The primary attachment styles used in research to this day are based on research by Ainsworth (Harms, 2011). Systemically, Ainsworth and her students began to study infant-parent separations in order to gain a formal understanding of the dynamics of attachment relationships. Using a technique called the “Strange Situation,” Ainsworth would separate infants from their mothers for a short period of time and then observe their reactions. Most of these infants would have predictable reactions in response to their maternal deprivation. The attachment behavioral system is a child’s survival mechanism and is an instinctive relational response to the loss of one’s mother. Upon their mother’s return, those who were consoled were regarded as “secure” in their attachment orientation. Others however, were not consoled and continued with their attachment behaviors even after their mother’s return and clearly demonstrated a desire for closer proximity. These individuals were regarded as insecurely attached and “anxious/ambivalent.” The last grouping of infants showed little distress when separated and showed active avoidance of contact with parents upon their return. They too, were
regarded as insecurely attached by their behaviors that were deemed “avoidant” (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall 1978). The attachment terminology of secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant continues to be the language used by researchers to describe an individual’s style of attachment throughout the lifespan. Later, other researchers have proposed additional categories for insecure attachments including, “fearful” (Crittenden, 1985), “disorganized attachment” (Main & Solomon, 1990), and “fearful-avoidant and dismissive-avoidant” (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Ainsworth (1978) discovered that the mother’s responsiveness to the child’s attention-seeking signals in the first year of life are profoundly important. Mothers whose responses were irregular or delayed or those who interrupted a child’s desired level of play were often met with an individual who would cry more, explore less, and become angry or anxious or both. Mothers who minimized either the child’s attention-seeking behavior or her own responsiveness to that behavior were met with a child who began to avoid her.

The secure style of relating is characterized by responsive parents who engage, are sensitive to their children’s feelings and needs, and are available for them. In turn, the secure children are characterized by more trust, sociability, a higher view of self, and a willingness to confidently explore. The support and availability of the attachment figure allows the infant and child to live beyond survival strategies. Infants who are characterized by anxious/ambivalent behaviors often have caretakers who are preoccupied with their own needs or are inconsistent in responding to the needs of their child. Avoidant children generally had parents who were emotionally cold or distant and certainly not responsive in relationship to their child’s expressed distress. “The insecure attachment patterns of anxious/ambivalent and avoidant develop when attachment behavior is met with rejection, inconsistency, or even threat from the attachment
figure” (Crowell & Treboux, 1995, p. 296). Infants begin to parallel the model that they have learned from the attitudes, responses, and behavior of their attachment figure. Bowlby and Ainsworth (1969) regarded this as adaptive behavior, meaning, that relational working model is formed but is also forming. For this reason, Crowell and Treboux, (1995) refer to the working models as “prototypes.”

Ainsworth et al. (1978) referred to infants having expectations in regard to their mother’s responsiveness, proximity, and availability. An infant’s unmet expectations of the attachment figure’s style or manner of response create an experience of uncertainty – in the case of inconsistency of the attachment figure’s response – or avoidance in the case of a parent who is unresponsive for the child. These responses - and lack of responsiveness - contribute to the formation of an insecure bond which in turn, shapes personality development. In avoidant attachment, the distressed infant will minimize the expression of distress in an effort to avoid the disapproval and rejection of the attachment figure (Bartholomew, 1990; Main, 1981; Main & Goldwyn, 1984). This response is important as it is characterized by the minimization of self (personal needs) fear, and the experience of distress. This strategy of distancing is congruent with what the infant is doing in relationship to its proximity to its attachment figure; on the one hand, he is denying his mother physical access, on the other, he is distancing himself from his own emotional experience. Egeland and Farber (1984) confirmed these findings among mothers who were averse to physical contact. In anxious/ambivalent attachment, the infant has increased attachment behavior in light of the unpredictability of the attachment figure (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). This is consistent with Bowlby’s (1969) attachment behavioral system that tends to activate and then mobilize in times of fear, stress, and need.
Ainsworth’s (1978) work with infants and children is significant for at least four reasons. First, she provided some of the first empirical research that demonstrated how Bowlby’s behavioral attachment system is operative in settings that were both threatening and safe. Second, she provided the first empirical taxonomy for how individuals might develop differing attachment styles depending on primary caregiver’s responses through the “Strange Situation” experiment. According to her research, there are three primary attachment orientations for children, including: secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant. Third, she demonstrated that individual differences can be correlated with the interpersonal relationship between the attachment figure and the child during the first year of life. Secure children have parents who are responsive to their needs. Children who are insecure – whether anxious/ambivalent or avoidant – often have parents who are either insensitive to their child’s needs or are inconsistent in the quality of their responsiveness. Ainsworth et al. discovered that there is a demonstrable link between parental sensitivity, responsiveness, and engagement and a child’s attachment style (Fraley, 2010). Fourth, Ainsworth et al. (1978) introduced the idea of the attachment figure as a secure base. When an individual has attachment security and is not overly focused on fear suppression and survival needs, that individual tends to be more social, thrive, and explore with confidence. During development from infancy to adulthood, these models continue to inform reactions, responses, relationship, and personality. In later studies, Ainsworth (1991) highlighted the attachment system in adult life and demonstrated that the same system that seeks comfort and security is operative in adult relationships. This will become extremely significant as we consider the interpersonal dimension of leadership styles in light of attachment.
Mental Model Continuance Past Early Childhood

Attachment theory is based on the assumption that working models are carried forward across time and context (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006). Levy, Blatt, and Shaver (1998) observed that multiple studies reveal that “the available evidence indicates that the attachment classifications are fairly stable over extended periods of time” (p. 408). This is consistent with Hazan and Shaver (1987) and Crowell and Treboux (1995), each of whom found continuity in both adult and child relational styles from infancy through childhood along with a growing body of studies (Cassidy, 1999; Dontas, Maratos, Fautotis, & Karangelis, 1985; Erikson, Sroufe, & Engeland, 1985; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Sroufe, 1983; Waters, Wippman, & Sroufe, 1979). These studies demonstrated that while infancy and childhood patterns are not necessarily fixed in that they are unchangeable or inadaptable, they remain continuous constructs that remain operative. As such, they have a kind of permanence and portability, but they are not immutably fixed. These conclusions are often and largely drawn from the observation that adult patterns are usually consistent with ones from infancy and early childhood. Adolescents have close relationships as a way of achieving close proximity through physical closeness (Fischer, 1994).

Mental representations that are rooted in early childhood continue to shape the way relationships are conducted later in life. These patterns have been the working platform from which humans enact interpersonal relations. These mental representations tend to guide interpersonal behavior in new circumstances (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006). These models tend to reemerge in large part because the working models are the relational resources that are immediately accessible. Attachment behaviors are a form of transference where humans use pre-existing mental representations of significant others and then use those models, feelings, and
experiences to influence new social interactions (Anderson & Cole, 1990). “The assumption that existing representations are carried forward from one relationship to the next is fundamental to attachment theory” (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2006, p. 552).

Yet, in the case of those who are insecure in their attachments, Hazan and Shaver (1987) remained hopeful: “The average person participates in several important friendships and love relationships, each of which provides an opportunity to revise mental models of self and others” (p. 522). Theoretically, these “opportunities” may decrease the degree of continuity between childhood and adulthood. This is consistent with Bowlby (1973) who observed that it is possible to remold models by new relationship experience that counter previous working models.

From early on children have learned from their own experience how close relationships operate and they have learned it unconsciously as they know no other way. Even into adulthood, working models are thought to be change reluctant if not change resistant. While internal models play an important role in shaping our behavior and our affective responses, the models largely operate outside of any conscious awareness (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). As such they are more often built upon and growing rather than edited or replaced. It is unclear how much revision of an individual’s mental models takes place between infancy and adulthood though they are repeatedly described by researchers as predictable, stable, working, and consistent (Collins & Read, 1994). An individual’s own attachment model makes presumptions; it knows relationship no other way than how and what it has come to know. In light of that, the relational feedback loop is a closed one until it opened to those outside of primary caregivers. “Even when the models of self and other have become distinct, they represent obverse sides of the same relationship and cannot be understood without reference to the other” (Bretherton, 1985, p. 12).
Attachment Continuity

Continuity – and discontinuity – in one’s mental models for attachment relationships is important when we consider adult attachment and relational styles. The matter of continuity provokes the question, “can someone lose their secure attachment style?” or “If someone has an anxious or avoidant attachment style, can they change and become secure?” “Although some changes are expected, attachment theory posits a tendency of internal working models to resist change” (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000, p. 272). Bowlby (1979) maintained that human beings have innate survival needs that are connected to a caregiver. Further, Bowlby (1973) believed that internal working models include a version of one’s self and another in the dynamic of a relationship.

This relationship exists irrespective of the kinds of bonds or emotional warmth that exists between the two persons. This attachment is a life-long need and the attachment pattern tends to be stable over a lifetime (Bretheron, 1985; Crowell, Fraley, & Shaver, 1999; Main & Cassidy, 1988; Waters, 1978; Waters, Crowell, Treboux, Merrick, & Albersheim, 1995) and tend to operate unconsciously outside of our awareness (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Bretherton, 1985; Crowell et al., 1999).

As such they tend to guide behaviors, inform our expectations, and guide the relational strategies and behavior we deploy in later relationships (Crowell & Treboux, 1995, p. 296). Bowlby (1969, 1982) suggested that change in adult life is possible, but that new emotional relationships would need to form in ways that would change one’s way of thinking about the attachment prototypes. This “combination of events would allow the individual to reflect on and reinterpret the meaning of past and present experiences” (Crowell & Treboux, 1995, p. 296).
A significant life event however, such as the development of a new significant relationship, can develop into a construction of a new working model (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006). Previous research suggests that insecure people can become more secure when paired with a secure partner (Kirkpatrick & Hazan, 1994). In light of this, individuals may be vulnerable to negative experiences, but may also derive benefits from positive ones (Bowlby, 1988). Several studies suggest the possibility of attachment discontinuity: insecure models of self and others may be revised or replaced when changes occur in parental caregiving (Egeland & Farber, 1984), with a corrective experience in a supportive and sensitive relationship such as a friend, significant other, or therapist (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1988; Lieberman, Weston, & Pawl, 1991; Van IJzendoorn, Juffer, & Duyvesteyn, 1995). In many of these studies, subsequent reflection upon relational prototypes is an essential part of the revision of previous attachment figures. The element of reflection is key as change becomes more difficult with repetition as the mental constructs continue to guide interpretation of experiences (Bowlby, 1988).

Several recent studies have identified some of the circumstances that have contributed to a movement from attachment security to insecurity or disorganization. Stressful life events, family risk and depression each have been found to take away attachment security (Allen, McElhaney, Kuperminc, & Jodi, 2004; Bar-Haim, Sutton-Fox, & Marvin, 2000; Moss, Cyr, Burea, Tarabulsky, & Dubios-Comtois, 2005). There are far fewer studies pointing to factors that can contribute to attachment security or move someone from insecurity to secure attachment (McConnell & Moss, 2011). Factors such as relationship satisfaction, emotional openness, and fewer negative life-events can lead to greater attachment security (Egeland & Farber, 1984; Vondra et al., 1999).
Adult Attachment

Bowlby described attachment behavior as a motivational control system whose goal is promoting safety and felt security in relationships (Bowlby, 1969, 1982). Despite Bowlby’s (1979) assertion that the attachment behavioral system is at work from the cradle to the grave, researchers did not begin to formally study the attachment process in adults until the mid 1980’s. Hazan and Shaver (1987) saw a direct correlation between infant and childhood attachment patterns and adult behaviors.

Once developed, internal attachment working models tend to be pervasive through adulthood (Hansbrough, 2012). As such, they have been linked to romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), as well as orientation for work relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Batholomew (1990) observed that adult insecure attachments have two dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. This data confirmed a correlation between Ainsworth’s (1979) discoveries in infants and adult behavior. One dimension is characterized by fear and the other dimension is dismissiveness. In the case of the fearful style, those with avoidant attachment who are fearful find themselves avoiding intimacy because they view themselves of undeserving of the love and support of others. Those who are dismissive tend to have a strong view of themselves and then deny their need for social contact. Individuals with secure attachments, whether they be parents, partners, lovers, helpers, or leaders, are able to be focused fully and accurately on others’ needs without being distracted by or bound to their own insecurities (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Their positive view of self and others enable them to be more engaged and responsive to the needs of others. Put another way, securely attached persons have had their own needs addressed in ways that allow them to be more fully present for others.
Hazan and Shaver (1987) also saw multiple, key parallels in the felt and addressed needs of romantic partners with those of the infant-caregiver as developed by Ainsworth (1979). Like infant-caregiver pairings, adult romantic partners feel safe when their partner is in close proximity and responsive. Both pairings engage in close, bodily contact, are responsive to one another’s facial expressions, and both tend to feel more insecure when the other is inaccessible. Curiously, pairings of infant-caregivers and adult lovers engage in baby talk. On the basis of these phenomena, Hazan and Shaver concluded that romantic love is part of the attachment behavioral system (Fraley, 2010).

There are however, key differences between attachment behaviors between adults and the attachment behaviors that take place between parents and children. In adults, there are shared needs between two equals. In adult relationships, partners are not assigned particular roles like they are in parent-child relationships (Ainsworth, 1985; Weiss, 1974). In addition, adult relationships serve multiple functions including sexual bonds, companionship, and shared purposes (Crowell & Treboux, 1995). Adult relationships however, have shared values, beliefs, and nearly always involve sexual intimacy (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Adult attachment is not based on survival and sustenance needs like for infants, it is however, based on security needs. The felt need for security and protection from someone stronger and wiser does not disappear into adulthood, though the ability of individuals to fulfill that need greatly diminishes. Instead, both the objects and the perceptions of that attachment attention shift toward a diverse set of figures: parents, friends, and lovers (Ainsworth, 1991).

Parents may become wiser, but not stronger. The idealization connected with lovers and friends diminishes into a charitable realism; they are valued, but are unable to provide the desired degree of support and protection (Mayseless & Popper, 2007). Often, particularly during times
of stress and threat – and particularly during periods of national crisis – attachment needs shift to leaders rather than close proximity parents, friends, and lovers (Mayseless, 2010). In adults, the attachment system is active during times of stress, threats, and duress (Bowlby, 1969, 1982). Adults show a desire for proximity to the attachment figure when stressed, increased comfort in the presence of the attachment figure, and anxiety when the attachment figure is inaccessible (Weiss, 1982). These stressors often cause individuals to turn (or return) to internal models or actual attachment figures who serve as symbolic and representative sources of comfort and security during times of need (Mikulincer et al., 2003).

Adults, however, have key advantages that infants do not. Weiss (1982) suggested that attachment figures in adult life need not be protective figures but rather they can be seen as “fostering the attached individual’s own capacity for mastering challenge” (p. 173). Adults are generally able to regain proximity with their attachment figures; not only physically, but also in their imaginations. If and when such security and comfort are available, “the individual is able to move off from the secure base provided by the partner, with the confidence to engage in other activities” (Ainsworth, 1991, p. 38).

While the strategy for a return to a source of proximity and consolation may look different in infants and adults, it is not that dissimilar. Attachment behaviors in adulthood however, are not limited to romantic relationships but appear in friendships (Mayseless, Sharanbany, & Sagi, 1997), and work relations (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), as well as in leader-follower relationships (Popper et al., 2000). Anxious individuals may regard work as an opportune place for them to fulfill their attachment needs (Hazan & Shaver, 1990).

Ainsworth (1978) identified three styles of attachment: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant. In secure attachment, there is a positive view of self and others. In insecure styles, there is a low

Ainsworth’s (1978) initial three categories for attachment secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant, continue to be operative today when measuring adult attachment. This is particularly relevant in a study of adult attachment style of clergy. Adults with secure attachment have high self-esteem (Collins & Read, 1990), function better in relationships (Wagner & Tangney, 1991), seek support under stress and support others in distress (Crowell et al., 2008), have more confidence than insecurely attached adults in work settings (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), value relationships more highly than insecurely attached adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), and tend to more positively connect work and family behaviors than insecure adults (Sumer & Knight, 2011). In addition, securely attached adults generally have higher degrees of satisfaction in their relationships, and show more trust, commitment, and interdependence with others than those who are not securely attached (Feeney, Noller, & Collan, 1994). In the workplace, securely attached adults approach their work with confidence and are not burdened by fears of failure (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Mikulincer and Florian (1995) found a positive relationship between secure attachment and peer evaluations. “Persons with secure attachment exhibit a more positive view of leaders than insecure individuals” (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino,
and have positive associations with transformational leadership (Popper et al., 2000).

Adults with an anxious-ambivalent attachment style – or attachment *insecurity* – are going to exhibit different outcomes in relationships. Where securely attached adults have a positive view of themselves and others, insecure adults are characterized by lower self-esteem, anger, resentment and even suspicion of themselves and others (Wagner & Tangney, 1991). These feelings in relationships exist largely because of unmet needs in foundational relationships (DeSanctis & Karantzas, 2009). Bartholomew (1990) found that the avoidance of intimacy should be understood as a “disturbance in the capacity to form interpersonal attachments which stems from the internalization of early adverse experiences in the family” (p. 149).

Anxiously attached adults tend to have excessive worry and preoccupation about relationships, have a need for reassurance, and fear of abandonment and rejection (Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994). Anxiously attached adults have early disappointments with significant others and have difficulty trusting whether they are worthy of having their needs met, or whether a significant other is going to be predictably and reliably responsive (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006). In conflict situations, adults with anxious attachment tend to be defensive and even destructive with themselves, others, and the relationships that do exist between them (Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1995). Anxiously attached adults will view leadership as less relationship-oriented than secure individuals do as tasks and projects have proven more reliable than their relationships (Berson et al., 2006).

Adults with avoidant attachment are those who have had the most significant relational distress and disappointment at a young age. Attachment avoidance is associated with discomfort with closeness, excessive self-reliance and relationships as secondary (Feeney et al., 1994).
Attachment avoidance is believed to stem from consistent experiences of unresponsiveness on the part of the caregiver (DeSanctis & Karantzas, 2009). Those with attachment avoidance possess what Hansbrough (2012) called “a preference for defensive self-reliance” (p. 1544). Their experience in relationship has “taught” them significant things about relationships including, that others are not trustworthy (Shaver, Collins, & Clark, 1996), that they do not want to rely on others for emotional support (Bartholomew, 1993), and that they tend to minimize their own attachment needs (Shaver et al., 1996).

Avoidant individuals tend to focus on completing tasks rather than nurturing, motivating, or inspiring others (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2007), and tend to try to maintain tight control over situations (Fraley & Shaver, 1997). Those with avoidant attachment are also unlikely to be perceived as available, empathetic or responsive to others because of their desire to maintain interpersonal distance. Because of this, they are less likely than those with other attachment styles to recognize the needs and distress of others (DeSanctis & Karantzas, 2009). In sum, attachments begin with a desire for proximity; first with parents and then with parental substitutes throughout the lifespan. In later childhood and adolescence, the pursuit of closer proximity becomes the kind of behavior that fosters support-seeking. As those support needs are met through repeated experiences – whether from peers, a romantic partner, or a reliable work relationship – the corresponding anxiety or distress reduction allows the responder to become a safe haven and secure base for the one seeking proximity (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). That availability to be a safe haven and secure base makes it possible for confident exploration; whether an infant, adolescent, or adult (Crowell & Treboux, 1995).
Leadership and Attachment

Even though Bowlby (1969, 1982) conceived of attachment as a dynamic between parents and children, attachment theory can be applied to any relationship that satisfies three functions: maintaining proximity, the provision of a safe haven, and the provision of a secure base (DeSanctis & Karantzaz, 2009). According to Mikulincer and Shaver (2007), leaders can take on the role of an attachment figure by fulfilling these three key functions. “The leadership relationship is another important relationship in which attachment models are activated” (Berson et al., 2006, p. 178). Popper and Mayseless (2003) observed that attachment theory provides a fitting theoretical framework to explore leader-follower dynamics. Like parents, leaders guide, direct and are capable of nurturing followers so they can explore and develop new skills. Followers need leaders to provide advice and resources for personal development and advancement (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

The first known research correlating attachment style and leadership was a study by Mikulincer and Florian (1995) involving 92 Israeli military recruits. The result was that securely attached recruits were perceived to have the qualities needed for leadership and anxiously attached recruits were not. Specifically, recruits with secure attachment styles found combat less threatening than their counterparts who had ambivalent or avoidant styles. In a related study involving Israeli officers and their cadets, Popper et al. (2000) focused on transactional and transformational traits of similar leaders and confirmed a relationship between leadership and attachment.

Brennen et al. (1998) identified the four adult relationship patterns: preoccupied, secure, fearful, and dismissive. Concurrently, Doverspike et al. (1997) also began to extend adult attachment into the area of leadership. Brennan, Clark and Shaver (1998) identified four adult
relationship patterns that are congruent with earlier categories. They include: preoccupied, secure, fearful, and dismissive. Those with preoccupied attachment score high on anxiety and low on avoidance. Those who are secure score low on anxiety and low on avoidance. Finally, those who are avoidant fall into two categories; fearful and dismissive. Those who are fearful score high on anxiety and low on avoidance while those who are dismissive are low on anxiety and high on avoidance (Van Sloten, 2011).

Doverspike et al. (1997) discovered that a relational leadership style is correlated to secure attachment while task-oriented leaders could be correlated with avoidant attachment. More recently, Popper and Amit (2009) began to research attachment style qualities of the individual rather than in relationships with others. Secure leaders seem more open to new experiences than insecure ones, including seeing others and detecting followers’ relational needs. Van Sloten (2011) observed that avoidant attachment is likely related to a self-orientation to the degree that others can fall into the background.

Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, and Popper (2007) observed that “the attachment perspective is an extension of Freud’s (1930/1961) metaphor of the leader as a father figure and therefore, the leader-follower relationship can be conceptualized in terms of attachment theory” (p. 632). “Leaders, like parents, are figures whose role includes guiding, directing, taking charge, and taking care of others less powerful than they and whose fate is highly dependent upon them” (Popper & Mayseless, 2003, p. 42). Like previous attachment figures, leaders provide a similar security-enhancing function for followers. Good leaders function as a safe haven and a secure base for followers and that security and stability counts for much. Research demonstrates that when followers’ experience the supportive encouragement of leaders, those followers flourish personally and professionally (Bass, 1985; House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988; Shamir,
That support and personalized interest can come in a variety of expressions including presence, proximity, support, resources, and affirmation.

Observed through the lens of attachment theory, the leader-follower dynamic parallels that of the antecedent relationship with parent and child. Followers “look up to” leaders in ways that were first learned in the parent-child relationship. Followers take on the role of the child in need of proximity while leaders represent the older, stronger and wiser who are able to address needs. In adults as well as children, it is “need” that activates the attachment behavioral system. Bowlby (1969/1982) referred to the activators as threats in light of the survival interests of infants. In adults, the kinds of threats are different than they are for infants, but are no less threatening. During such occasions, the early-learned remedy of seeking out another who can protect and confer safety is something adults look for in their leaders. Bowlby strongly criticized his psychoanalytic predecessors who saw the activation of the attachment system in adults as a sign of regression (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Instead, Bowlby and several other leadership theorists have seen the seeking-out of an attachment figure who is a leader a sign of healthy growth and self-actualization (Bass, 1985; Howell, 1988; Shamir et al., 1993). “Just as students with caring teachers become increasingly independent learners and performers, and as well-parented children become higher-functioning adults, organizational followers can become better, stronger, and wiser adults” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007, p. 141).

Good leaders foster followers’ independence, exploration, freedom, and fulfillment when they provide them with emotional safety and security. This safe haven and secure base cannot be undervalued. Popper and Mayseless (2003) observed that a leader’s most effective tool of empowerment is in increasing their self-esteem, creativity, and autonomy. Not unlike infant and adolescents, when individuals are safe and secure enough so as not to have to worry about threats
and survival needs, they are free to explore and thrive. Attachment security becomes the leadership platform from which followers can develop and grow. That platform exists – in large degree – because of the leader’s capacity for empathy. Empathy is the ability to enter into the emotions of others and psychological studies regard empathy as the foundation of both moral and social behaviors (Hoffman, 2008). According to the evidence, empathy develops when an individual’s emotional life is characterized by loving, giving, and secure relationships. This foundation is present in relational leaders and is absent in leaders who possess more narcissistic traits (Popper, 2000, 2002).

Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) found that it is unlikely that leaders high on attachment anxiety are perceived by followers to be reliable, security-enhancing figures who will respond sensitively to followers’ needs. In addition, anxious individuals tend to be preoccupied with their own needs and distress regulation. This reduces their capacity to attend to the needs of others (DeSanctis & Karantzas, 2009). Individuals low on anxiety and avoidance are securely attached. Secure individuals report feeling comfortable with closeness, willing to forego their own needs to help others (Popper et al., 2000). Links have also been discovered between those securely attached with those who practice transformational leadership. Recall that transformational leadership is a process where mutual needs are met and where “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Transformational leaders have been identified as those who provide sensitive and responsive care in leading followers on paths of self-development. These leadership behaviors tend to emerge as a result of a history of positive, warm, loving and secure relationship that arise from childhood (Popper et al., 2000). When that security is absent however, adults – as well as children – are prone to anxiety, uncertainty, self-doubt, suspicion, and crying out in protest and attention-
seeking behaviors. Leaders who are indifferent, unavailable, avoidant, and generally indifferent or unresponsive to others’ needs risk either alienating their followers or heightening their anxiety. Not only does that undermine the leader-follower relationship, but it activates all kinds of survival defense mechanisms that become a higher priority than growth and exploration. The individual who lives in survival mode does not have either the attention or the energy for exploration, socialization, or self-actualization. Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) found that it is unlikely that leaders high on attachment anxiety are perceived by followers to be reliable, security-enhancing figures who will respond sensitively to followers’ needs. Anxious individuals tend to be preoccupied with their own needs and distress regulation. This reduces their capacity to attend to the needs of others (DeSanctis & Karantz, 2009).

As it relates to leadership, attachment theory reminds us that leader’s and follower’s attachment styles will have an impact on the quality of the leader-follower relationship. Secure leaders who are able to recognize and embrace the attachment needs of followers will be well-positioned to enhance the safety, security, and growth of their followers. By focusing on their own unmet needs, insecure leaders’ (avoidant and anxious/ambivalent) neglect of their followers will only deepen followers’ insecurities and stifle their development. The contrast is striking. Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) put it this way when referring to becoming a leader who is a “stronger and wiser caregiver:”

This approach to leadership infuses a sense of courage, hope, and dedication to followers, whereas an insecure approach to leadership encourages anxiety, anger, disorganization, dishonesty, and despair. Moreover, followers who are attached to a security-enhancing leader are more likely to trust him or her, rely on the leader’s advice and guidance, and organize
themselves effectively to carry out the group’s functions. This is likely to result in increased success of the group and an enhanced sense of competence and value in group members. (p. 441)

Popper, Amit, Gal, Mishkal-Sinai, and Lisak (2004) identified three external traits (which they prefer to call capacities) and five internal traits of leaders that form positive influence. The three external traits include self-confidence, proactive orientation, and pro-social relations (pp. 246-247). Self-confidence is required to convey security; one of the basic needs of the leader-follower relationship (Bass, 1985; Popper & Mayseless 2007; Smith & Foti, 1998). Leadership also requires proactive orientation. This presumes that leaders see ahead in ways that anticipate how those changes will impact followers. Good leaders recognize that changes bring followers into an adult version of a “strange situation” and help followers navigate through it (Bresnan et al., 1986; Kotter, 1988). Research shows that outstanding leaders tend to have a future orientation on their words, behaviors, and decisions (Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001; Mumford & Strange, 2002). Leadership requires what Popper et al. (2004) called pro-social relations. The literature distinguishes between socialized and personalized leaders and suggests that the most effective leaders will have empathy for their followers and are characterized by lower levels of narcissism (House & Howell, 1992). Finally, Popper et al. (2004) also discovered five internal traits of effective leaders. These include: higher levels of internal locus and control, lower levels of anxiety, higher levels of self-efficacy, higher levels of optimism, and secure attachment style (p. 257).

**Personalized Versus Socialized Leaders**

In the discipline of attachment and leadership, the descriptors of personalized or socialized have come to describe the orientation and motivation of leaders in relationship to
themselves and their followers. Howell (1998), and House and Howell (1992), termed the positive leaders socialized-charismatic leaders and the negative leaders personalized. Socialized leaders use their power to serve others, align their vision with their followers’ needs and aspirations, maintain open, two-way communication, and rely on moral standards. By contrast, personalized charismatic leaders use power for personal gain only, seek to promote their own personal vision, maintain one-way communication, and rely on convenient external moral standards to satisfy self-interests (Howell & Avolio, 1992). From these descriptions, the charisma that is often associated with transformational leadership is more of the socialized type than that of the personalized one (Popper et al., 2000). Socialized charismatic leaders are highly similar to the ones ascribed to the transformational leader (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

Some leaders’ greatest need is to be needed. There are several studies that compare and contrast the motives and behavior of personalized versus socialized leadership style (House & Howell, 1992; Howell 1998; Popper, 2002). Personalized leaders – a term Popper (2002) and Davidovitz et al. (2006) used to describe narcissism - put their own interests over their followers’ needs and lead by a managerial or dictatorial style. In addition, these leaders are much more reluctant to delegate authority or responsibilities to those under them and are even more likely to create systems and structures for them (Johnson, 1994). Such leaders create a culture that orchestrates attention to themselves and will then minimize, belittle, and even punish followers for failing to cooperate with their construct. Conversely, socialized leaders use their role and power for empowerment of followers. Socialized leaders respect their followers in both senses; namely, they see them as distinct others and honor their needs and wishes. Socialized leaders also care about follower feelings, dreams, fulfillment, and growth.
Charismatic leaders can be either personalized or socialized in their leadership style. For some time, researchers have been critical of the inherent ambiguity of the word charismatic to describe leaders (Heifetz, 1994; Rost, 1991). Some refer instead to positive or negative charisma (Howell, 1998; House & Howell, 1992; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Popper, 1999, 2000, 2001). Research by Popper (2002) demonstrated that not only is there a noticeable gap in the literature on what might be called negative leadership, but that narcissism is a significant variable in personalized leadership. While “Plato argued that a leader must not have any self-interest, Machiavelli (1985) believed leaders are not driven by ideals but by their urge to rule in order to gain personal benefit” (p. 798). Narcissism drives personalized leaders (House & Howell, 1992; Popper, 200, 2001) who use others to promote and magnify themselves. Socialized leaders are characterized by how they regard others; in the case of transformational leadership, this is particularly characteristic of leaders who nurture personal development of their followers (Popper & Mayselless, 2002). For Burns (1978), the distinguishing marker of socialized leadership is the moral-ethical dimension that leaders have for their followers. This includes justice, integrity, and Bass (1985) would add a favorable developmental orientation to their followers.

A leader like Adolf Hitler was both personalized and charismatic by having addressed followers’ idealized needs for a strong authority figure, and by implementing power for personal gain. A socialized leader like Martin Luther King used his charismatic influence to empower others. Although both categories of leaders are charismatic, only socialized leaders are considered transformational (House & Howell, 1992). Two studies have shown that avoidant attachment is associated with higher levels of personalized leadership and lower levels of socialized leadership (Davidovitz et al., 2006; Popper, 2002). In light of their own need for close
proximity to others – in this case, their followers - anxious leaders are more likely to adopt a socialized style than a personalized one (Davidovitz et al., 2006). This suggests that anxious leaders are capable of a more relational form leadership as a result of their need to stay in proximity to their followers. Avoidant leaders – who tend not to be musical in the language of relationship or need (theirs or someone else’s) – have a smaller reservoir for leadership that is cast in relational terms. Keller (2003) concluded that the combination of an avoidant leader and anxious followers, or, an anxious leader and avoidant followers is the most dangerous of the leader-follower relationships. The smothering dependency needs of the terminally anxious frustrate those who seek distance in their avoidance. In turn, the unresponsiveness of the avoidant only increases the anxiety of the anxious as unmet expectations continue to be minimized, ignored, or viewed with disdain.

**Followers and Attachment**

If leadership is about relationship (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), then the attachment style of leaders is not the only important dynamic in play in the leader-follower relationship. Followers may form attachment relationships with leaders to fulfill the function of attachment (Hansbrough, 2012). Hazan and Shaver (1990) found that highly anxious individuals tend to view work as an opportunity to have their attachment needs met. Those who are high on anxiety tend to have work behaviors that reflect the activation of attachment behaviors (Mikulincer, Brinbaum, Woddis, & Nachmias, 2000; Mikulincer, Gillath, & Shaver, 2002). The leadership role is very similar to the roles that come with parenting; roles such as guiding, directing, taking charge, and taking care of others who are less powerful and who are dependent on them (Popper & Mayseless, 2002). Followers will seek protection from leaders who are expected to serve as safe havens during these times of crisis or uncertainty (Hansbrough, 2012).
A study of 238 graduate students by Keller (1999) revealed that mental models of leaders are significantly impacted by the role their parents played in their lives. Parents are a child’s first experience with someone “older and wiser” and in a position of authority. Put another way, parents are a person’s first model for what it means to be a leader. Secure followers who have had sensitive and responsive parents are more likely to have positive and constructive images for leaders who are supportive and attentive (Keller, 2003).

Followers with high attachment anxiety are likely to project their unmet attachment needs on leaders in the hope that these needs might be fulfilled. Because of this motivation, such followers are likely to see their leaders as meeting their attachment needs in ways that have them construct or reconstruct their leaders (Hansbrough, 2012). But the “construction” of a leader, or more accurately the projection onto a leader of follower perceptions, happens in other ways as well. In the context of military leadership, Davidovitz et al., (2007) found that military commanders who had been identified by external observers as thoroughly socialized leaders were perceived by avoidant followers as personalized. This suggests that “followers’ prior negative relationship experiences with unresponsive authority figures may indeed provide a negative perception and interpretation of leader behaviors” (Game, 2011, p. 331). This is congruent with attachment theory that suggests that unresolved previous relational disappointments can certainly inform future perceptions and experiences with others.

**Transformational Leadership and Attachment**

Popper (2002) suggested that attachment theory helps explain the development of leaders in either a personalized or socialized direction. Transformational leaders tend to have secure working models of attachment that involve secure caregiving and provide followers with responsiveness (Popper & Mayseless, 2002; Popper et al., 2000). Transformational leaders
provide followers with a sense of security and empower followers to pave the way for exploration (Popper & Mayseless, 2002). Transformational leaders may provide a corrective experience by meeting previously unmet attachment needs, as well as providing alternative views of relationships (Hansbrough, 2012). As seen previously, it is likely that attachment style shapes follower perceptions even when personalized or transformational leadership may be absent (Game, 2011).

One of the hallmark differences between transformational and transactional leaders is that transformational leaders devote their attention and energies to people and relationships while transactional leaders devote their primary energy to tasks and contingent rewards (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership is characterized by a leader’s ability to clearly articulate the necessary performance standards that must be met for performance to be rewarded (Bass, 1985). Transactional leadership is also demonstrated when the leader actively monitors performance to anticipate mistakes or only intervenes when problems arise that may mitigate task completion. Transactional leaders are primarily focused on task completion. (Bass, 1985). The effective transactional leader can identify the expectations of followers and can respond to them with the goal of establishing a close link between effort and reward; though researchers such as Zalenznik (1992) somewhat pejoratively regards this as “management” more than leading.

Transactional leadership is a style of leadership where leaders “approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another” (Burns, 1978, p. 3). Transformational leadership appeals to values and emotions. Edwards, Knight, Broome, and Flynn (2010) intriguingly observed that transformational leaders appeal to higher places on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs. Transactional leadership tends to focus on concerns for personal security and compensation whereas transformational leadership focusses on development and actualization.
Transformational leaders use power as a means to empower others (Howell & Howell, 1992). In order to have the capacity to function as a transformational leader, a person needs to be self-assured and have a positive model of self and others. Most important of all is the dynamic of empathy; the key trait that is shared by secure attachment and transformational leadership theories.

Popper et al. (2000) observed that secure leaders tend to embody the four characteristics of transformational leaders as identified by Bass and Avolio (1990), including: individualized consideration, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. These traits, however, were often absent in insecure leaders who were either anxious or avoidant. Mikulincer and Shaver (2007) observed that attachment style impacts both the leadership style and the follower’s responsiveness to that leader. For the leader who is anxious, it is unlikely that followers will perceive their leadership figure as responsive to their needs. For leaders who are avoidant, Mikulincer and Shaver found that followers are likely to perceive their leaders as unavailable, and non-empathetic. Such leaders are perceived to be those who do not recognize the needs of others in large part because of their reluctance to engage in meaningful relationships. Those scoring low on anxiety and avoidance are those who are measured as securely attached. Secure leaders are likely to manifest transformational traits and behaviors as they are comfortable and secure in their relationships to help, motivate, inspire others, set aside their own needs in order to tend to the needs of their followers (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), and are comfortable in one-on-one situations to advance followers’ growth and performance (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

Insecure attachment has been associated with fear, apprehension, suspicion, inconsistency, and disorganization. Those with anxious attachment, like those with secure
attachment, tend to bring and apply those experiences to future relationships. As anxious, fearful, and preoccupied adults, the insecurely attached tend to have low self-esteem, exaggerate their problems, and hold others in higher regard than they hold themselves (Kilmann et al., 2013).

One of hidden dynamics facing transformational leadership advocates is that anxious followers may project their leadership perceptions and needs on leaders who are not transformational. “Leadership is in the mind of the respondent; it remains to be established if it is anything more than that” (Eden & Leviatan, 1975, p. 741). Since leadership may be in the eye of the beholder, Lord and Emrich (2001) located and measured it in the perceptions of followers. Multiple researchers have recognized that follower perceptions can be influenced by followers’ needs and wishes – particularly when they are troubled (De Vries & Van Gelder, 2005; Emrich, 1999; Hollander & Offerman, 1990; Hunt, Boal, & Dodge, 1999; Meindl, 1995). Hansbrough (2012) has confirmed that followers’ needs are occasionally met when their attachment needs are projected upon a leader who does not practice transformational leadership.

**Clergy Leadership Theories**

There are multiple lenses that clergy (and those who write about them) bring to the table in terms of what is either distinctive or characteristic about the *kind* of leadership that a pastor offers the congregation. Most seminary graduates in the United States are well-familiar with the colloquialisms that a pastor’s job is to be like Jesus as a prophet, priest, and pastor or to preach, teach, and reach. However, one need not ground that commonplace expression in the American experience as its roots drill much deeper in history. As early as the mid-4th century, the three “great” Cappadocian Fathers Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus wrote about and advocated for the kind of leadership that clergy offer. Of the three, Gregory of
Nazianzus, perhaps the most eloquent of early Christian orators, wrote at length about “elements” he considered essential to serving the faithful as their pastor. Gregory of Nazianzus is recognized by both the Eastern and Western traditions of Christianity as a highly regarded saint.

For Gregory of Nazianzus, ministry is clearly about leadership first. For him, leadership means a form of rule and self-discipline that consists in “taking on the leadership of souls and authority over them” (Oration 2.78), serving as a “physician of souls” (Oration 2.16), and one who serves as a “place” that mediates between God and humanity (Oration 2.74-75) and puts both within reach of each other (Daley, 2004, pp. 111-113). This version of pastoral leadership as a theological guardian and physician of the soul is finding increasing interest today among historians who find a long line of historical continuity with this understanding of the nature of clergy leadership (Vanhoozer & Strachan, 2015).

In the last several decades, many churches have evolved from simple communities to more complex organizations and even small to large businesses. During this time, both the role of the pastor and the literature has grown more stratified and specialized. In fact, there are no known resources that differentiate between models of how clergy offer leadership within their congregations in spite of the fact that every book on clergy leadership presumes a preferred working model. In some cases, the preferred leadership style, trait, or lens runs parallel to the development of leadership theory. In other cases, the literature reflects the traditional understanding of pastor but now in a more highly evolved new arena where the pastor presides over not just people but an organization. Nearly all advocate for high levels of moral character and functioning and several write for Christian leaders who are functioning in environments other than churches.
Many regard the religious community as a “place” that intersects the identity of the pastor which contributes to the formation of the clergy person (Harbaugh, 1984; Hamman, 2014; Hester & Walker-Jones, 2009; Koppel, 2008; McNeal, 2011; Peterson, 1993; Williams, 2005). Others extend the ministry of the great prophets and ultimately the ministry of Jesus to the role and identity of the pastor. As such, the pastor reenacts, recapitulates, repeats and actually continues the work of Jesus in the congregational setting (Blanchard & Hodges 2008; Greenleaf & Spears, 2002; Nouwen, 1979, 1999). In the United States during the last two decades, much has been written about church or Christian leadership in strategic terms that include both coaching and mentoring images. The group identified as “Christian leaders” may include pastors but in many cases is intended to include church boards and Christian business leaders (Carroll & McMillan, 2006; Hybels, 2008; Kouzes, & Posner, 2004; Malphurs, 2003; Miller & Hall, 2007; Pope, 2006). Others trend toward offering advice as to what to do to avoid failure, or, what steps to take after leadership failure has occurred (Briggs, 2010; Cloud, 2013; Lehr, 2006; Maxwell, 2007, 2009).

The emerging approach to clergy leadership taken by many seminaries is significantly informed by Bowen’s (1974) family systems theory. A family systems approach does not begin with the traits or styles of a leader or the congregation. Instead, systems theory looks at the relationships within the congregation. Those relationships include the role of the pastor within that web of relationships. Multiple clergy and researchers find this to be a valuable approach (Friedman, 2007, 2011; Gilbert, 2006; Hamman, 2005; Herrington et al., 2000; Herrington & Taylor, 2003; Jones & Armstrong, 2006; Malony, 1998; Rendle, 1998; Richardson, 2005; Steinke, 2006; Sisk, 2005; Van Deusen-Hunsinger & Latini, 2013).
Intriguingly, a single, known resource relates the clergy-leader role in light of attachment theory. McFayden (2009) observed that the role of the clergyperson is to walk a congregation through the experience of loss. Following Hamman (2005) and Heifetz and Linsky (2002), McFayden recognized that “people do not resist change per se. People resist loss” (p. 21). Drawing deeply on attachment theory and Bowlby’s (1969, 1973, 1980) language of grief and loss, McFayden emphasized that healthy change cannot come about without acknowledging the experience of loss. Good pastoral leaders recognize, see, know, and recognize this loss-dimension in strategic leadership – a theme confirmed by Heifetz and Linsky in the first two chapters of their book *Leadership on the Line*, when they write about the perils of leading people: “at the heart of danger is loss” (p. 26). “As leaders consider the losses and grief embedded in the congregations they serve, it is crucial that they consider the degrees of attachment to those dimensions of congregational life that are lost or that people fear losing” (McFayden, 2009, p. 31).

**Secure Base Leadership**

Another resource on leadership and attachment worth noting is a pioneering blend of leadership and attachment called *Secure Base Leadership*. Although they do not specifically address clergy leadership, Kohlreiser, Godsworthy and Coombe (2012) utilized Bowlby’s (1980) notion of a secure base and apply it to leadership. Secure base leadership is characterized by leaders’ desire to consider the needs of their followers and by providing them with all the necessary tools to free them from their fears and all that holds them back. Secure base leadership is about providing a secure base for followers and “a high level of caring and high levels of daring” (p. 241). Secure base leadership is characterized by nine key practices: leaders stay calm, accept the individual, see potential, use listening and inquiry, deliver a powerful message,
focus on the positive, encourage risk-taking, inspire through intrinsic motivation, and signal accessibility (Kohlreiser et al., 2012, p. 243).

**Studies of Pastors and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

There are multiple studies using the MLQ to measure clergy transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant leadership qualities. The majority of these studies use the MLQ rater form where followers are asked to rate their leaders. There are ten known studies that measure follower’s positive associations with transformational leadership under categories like morale, approachability, follower job satisfaction and perceived effectiveness as leaders (Corbett, 2006; Lee, 2005; Ledgister, 2015; Scuderi, 2010; Freeman, 2008; Ra, 2015; Butler, 2016; Choi, 2006; Sosik et al., 2011; Willis, 2015).

The next most frequent use of the MLQ for pastor-leaders’ is in the measurement of the impact of transformational leadership and church growth. Eight known studies see a positive correlation between the transformational leadership behaviors of pastors with effectiveness, change, church growth, and vitality (Adams, 2010; Bae, 2001; Carpenter, 2006; Carter, 2009; Gaston, 2005; Gibson, 2004; Rumley, 2011; Vardman, 2013), while four known studies see no correlation between transformational leadership and church growth trends (Burton, 2010; Carmen, 2013; Knudsen, 2006; White, 2012).

Three known studies have used the MLQ to measure the transformational leadership of pastors and then correlated those scores with the ratings of those same pastors by their followers (Christopherson, 2014; Jackson, 2010; Nguyen, 2015). In each of the studies, the clergy rated themselves lower in transformational leadership – and in some cases, significantly lower – than their followers did. Three known studies used the MLQ to measure pastor burnout (Exantus, 2011; Hessel, 2015; Wasberg, 2013) and each found reduced levels of burnout among pastors.
who scored higher in transformational leadership. All three of these studies cited higher burnout levels among pastors with lower relational skills and management abilities. Other known MLQ studies of pastors – all of which find positive correlation with transformational leadership characteristics – include two which explore conditions that contribute to transformational leadership of pastors (Son, 2003; Strangway, 1999). Other MLQ clergy studies see transformational leadership as tied to higher developmental forms of engagement like acculturation (Wu, 2013), and increased congregational socio-political activity (Langley, 2000) and clergy establishment of developmentally advanced meaning systems in the congregation (Cannell, 2002). A final known study utilizing the MLQ measures relationships between youth pastors’ learning styles and their leadership behaviors (Casamento, 2009). In this study, 50.3% found that they had idealized behaviors as their predominant self-perceived leadership style.

**Studies on Clergy and Attachment**

There are only two known studies on clergy attachment style; both of which lie far beyond the horizon of this study. Bleiberg and Skufca (2005) unsuccessfully attempted to survey attachment style of clergy with dual relationships (i.e., those pursuing consensual romantic relationships) within their congregation. Of the 33 surveyed, only six responded to the attachment questionnaire. A second known study on clergy and attachment by Markham and Mikail (2004) related attachment theory with clergy and childhood sexual abuse. Each of these studies is quite different and tangential in terms of a study on the relationship between clergy attachment style and leadership behaviors and, further demonstrates a research gap in terms of attachment and leadership theories. Neither of these studies utilize the ASQ measure for attachment behaviors.
Summary

Bowlby (1969/1988) contended that the attachment behavioral system is operative from cradle to grave. Intriguingly, Bowlby began his work by observing infants and their caregivers. In the years following his work, researchers have demonstrated that the attachment behavioral system is at work in infancy and early childhood, adolescence and friendships, among lovers and coworkers, in leader-follower relationships, and most recently, researchers are beginning to investigate attachment and end of life issues.

At the core of the research is that from a very early age, individuals utilize mental constructs that shape the way they “do” relationships. This lifelong curriculum begins with the dynamic relationship between infants and their primary caregiver and continues throughout the remainder of our life. When those early bonds are secure, we are free to explore, to engage in other relationships, and are ripe to cultivate empathy for others. When those bonds are held in anxiety, individuals are preoccupied with self-doubt, uncertainties, and have ambivalence about ourselves and others. Those who are insecure in relationships or are avoidant tend to be suspicious of others, suppress their own wounds and emotions, and not only minimize the emotional needs of others, but tend to lack the equipment, language, capacity, and ability to see others’ emotional needs.

In adult relationships, and in leadership relationships in particular, insecurely attached people tend to put more stock in contingent-reward and transactional leadership styles. Secure leaders are more prone to practice transformational leadership and excel at relationships and navigating change. The secure style of attachment is characterized by trust, security, and independence. These qualities flow from a positive view of self and others. The insecure styles of anxious/ambivalent and avoidant do not possess this positive view or the freedom that come
with them. The anxious/ambivalent style is characterized by doubt and uncertainty, fears of rejection and abandonment, and a preoccupation on the responses of others. The avoidant style is characterized by diminished view of self, suspicion of others, discomfort with intimacy, and a preference for emotional distance over investment. Leaders or followers with an insecure attachment style are more prone to be motivated by anxiety and doubt, use others disrespectfully or inappropriately, and either claim or refer too much authority.

Leaders with secure attachment style are more apt to exhibit transformational leadership practices. The significant points of connection between secure attachment and transformational leadership include a positive view of self and others and the ability to have empathy for others. In attachment theory, early childhood experiences of positive and responsive authority figures create the conditions for a relational curriculum that continues to form how one exercises leadership. While pastoral leaders are often highly visible and important leaders of small or large organizations, they are also leaders within a relational system. Since narcissism, disorganization, and an inability to connect (Van Meris & VanHoek, 2006) continue to be significant personal and interpersonal dynamics in clergy-congregational failure, we might presume that the opposite factors should characterize success. A study measuring clergy attachment and leadership style is warranted; the research from which could help inform denominations, seminaries, pastors and their congregations and lead to better effectiveness, stronger bonds and greater longevity together.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

My primary question for this study is to explore whether there is a relationship between clergy attachment style and leadership behaviors. I have combined two respected instruments that measure attachment and leadership respectively. A secondary aim of this study is to examine to what extent, if any, attachment and leadership style can predict clergy longevity in their congregation and any involuntary separations. Multivariate multiple regression and multi-regression are used to build models to examine these potential relationships.

Research Design

This quantitative study is a non-experimental design and involves surveying a convenience sample of approximately 995 Protestant clergy within a small, bi-national denomination. The confidential, electronic survey asked for simple demographic information from the respondents, including: gender, years in ordained ministry, years in their previous congregations, years in their current congregation, and whether they have ever had an involuntary separation from a congregation. Creswell (2009) noted that surveys provide “a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (p. 145). My study quantifies the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership behaviors, and any connections to longevity in a congregation.

In addition, the survey combines two established instruments: the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) to measure adult attachment style and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure transformational and transactional leadership. These established surveys help with the “development of knowledge” and the test of theories by
utilizing “predetermined instruments that yield statistical data (Creswell, 2003, p. 18). This data was acquired by means of voluntary, interval responses to Likert Scales. These responses were recorded and analysis was completed via descriptive statistics to explore what if any correlation exists between attachment and leadership style in my sample.

**Population and Sample**

The sample for this study is a targeted population of approximately 995 clergy men and women from a small Protestant, Christian denomination whose churches are in the United States and Canada. While 1,280 ministers met the criteria in the selected denomination of being ordained and active, 75 of these were serving as chaplains in non-parish settings, 25 were foreign missionaries, 110 met the criteria of being “miscellaneously ordained,” and another 75 did not have active, current, accurate or available email addresses. This left 995 ministers who met the criteria of ordained, active, and church-based as their full-time profession. Population surveying was utilized using a publicly available, printed directory of ministers for this particular denomination. As such, this sample included all available ministers within the selected denomination who met the criteria of being ordained, active and church-based for their full-time occupation.

The clergy shared multiple things in common: they were active, parish pastors of congregations in the same denomination and were predominantly in the United States and Canada. The clergy were parish-based pastors who were ordained ministers in good standing; either active in their congregational settings, or eligible and waiting for a congregational position to become available. This sample deliberately excluded ordained ministers who were seminary professors, chaplains, foreign missionaries, retired, and those ministers who were in “specialized ministries” as none of them were parish or congregation-based. In sum, the sample targeted all
ordained, congregation-based pastors who were currently working or eligible to be working in churches. Targeted questions revealed differentiation according to gender, ethnicity, years of service, years in current congregation and congregation size.

**Survey Implementation**

Access to participants’ primary and preferred email addresses were available through a publicly available, printed and purchasable denominational directory of ministers. The Executive Director of the denomination instructed the office that oversees that directory to provide an electronic copy of it once the Human Subjects Review Board had approved my study.

The firm Mind Garden assisted in constructing a single survey instrument (see Appendices A, C, G) and provided the electronic link for this survey. One of the benefits of an electronic survey was that it made it possible to reach a large number of potential recipients (Creswell, 2003). Additionally, the confidentiality afforded with the electronic survey design likely increased participation and honesty of those surveyed (Rubin, Rubin, & Piele, 2000).

Each participant received a personalized email that included a URL link to the electronic survey. Aan email invitation to all potential participants with a description of the purpose of the study and a request to complete the online survey. The survey had three sections: a section that measured attachment using the Attachment Survey Questionnaire (ASQ), a second section that used the Multifactor Questionnaire (MLQ), and a third section with simple demographic questions.

Before the study began, a detailed application was submitted to the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board to ensure that the study would be conducted ethically and that each potential participant understood what the study would involve, how the data would be collected, and how it would be used. All potential participants had the opportunity to review the
informed consent (see Appendix D), contact the lead or student researcher with questions, or discontinue participation in the survey at any time. Participation in the research was voluntary, ensured anonymity and the data remained confidential.

A week after the survey had been distributed, an email reminder was sent out thanking participants (see Appendix F) and reminding, encouraging and inviting potential participants to participate. A second reminder was sent one week later. As an incentive, all participants were invited to voluntarily enter into a random drawing to win one of four $25 gift cards from Amazon.com.

Instrumentation

Attachment Style

There are three common ways of measuring adult attachment including two approaches which are qualitative in nature, and a third which is quantitative. Qualitative approaches include the Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985), with several variations and several corresponding scoring variations. A second qualitative approach is the Adult Attachment Projective (George & West, 2001), which involves a researcher showing subjects pictures and then asking for a personal story that comes to mind following reflection on that picture. The third reputable approach is to measure adult attachment quantitatively by the use of self-report surveys.

Review of previous research revealed seven respected survey instruments to measure adult attachment. First, Hazan and Shaver (1987, 1990) developed the first self-report instrument to measure romantic attachment using Ainsworth’s (1978) categories of avoidant, secure and anxious. Second, Simpson (1990) was one of the first to convert Hazan and Shaver’s (1990) three categories into a Likert-scale and called it the Adult Attachment Questionnaire to
measure attachment and avoidance. Third, Collins and Read (1990, 1996) developed the Adult Attachment Scale and added other items including discomfort with closeness, discomfort with relying on others, and anxious concern with not feeling loved. Fourth, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) developed the Relationships Questionnaire that measures anxious and avoidant attachment within Bartholomew’s (1990) four-category framework of secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful. Fifth, Brennan, Clark, and Shaver’s (1998) Experiences in Close Relationships measures how respondent’s feel about romantic partners, close friends and family members and measures attachment and anxiety. Sixth, Fraley, Waller, and Brennan’s (2000) Experiences in Close Relationships Revised is a revision of Brennen et al. (1998), but reduces the number of questions and enhances the focus on anxiety and avoidance. Seventh, Feeney, Noller, and Hanrahan (1994) reconstructed Hazan and Shaver’s (1987, 1990) attachment measure and developed their own attachment survey which they call the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ). This instrument removed the “romantic” language from previous instruments in the tradition in order to make it more accessible to all adults and to bring it more in line with Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) and Ainsworth’s (1978) theories on attachment. All seven of these potential attachment surveys were reviewed for potential use in my study.

This study used the Attachment Survey Questionnaire (ASQ) as developed by Feeney et al., (1994) for my research. The ASQ’s questions are among some of the clearest of the attachment surveys and do not have a disproportionate number of questions related to “romantic partners.” Second, the ASQ not only measures attachment and avoidance, but is an instrument that also measures factors like confidence, discomfort with closeness, relationships as secondary, anxiety, and need for approval. These factors are of particular research interest in relationship to clergy. The ASQ has proven reliability and validity. Feeney et al. (1994) reported alpha
coefficients for the five scales that range from .76 to .84, and stability coefficients that range from .67 to .78 across a 10-week period. Researchers have used the ASQ reliably to measure attachment in many samples providing further evidence of its validity and reliability (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

The ASQ consists of 40 questions scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree). The instrument has eight questions for each of the five characteristics it measures: confidence, discomfort with closeness, relationships as secondary, need for approval, and preoccupation. These characteristics are congruent with previous research. The confidence factor reflects secure attachment by measuring a positive view of self and others; a key component of those with secure attachment (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Discomfort with closeness is a key aspect of other attachment avoidance measures (Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998; Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990). Relationships as secondary to achievement is consistent with both Bartholomew’s (1990) dismissing attachment and Mikulincer and Shaver’s (2003, 2007) attachment avoidance; both favoring independence as a defense against vulnerability and hurt. Need for approval is consistent with Bartholomew’s (1990) fearful style that is concerned with rejection and abandonment and seeks validation from others. Last, preoccupation represents both Bartholomew’s (1990) preoccupied attachment and Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) anxious attachment. Anxious attachment involves relational neediness and an over-reliance on an attachment figure to fulfil attachment needs (Karantzazas, Feeney, & Wilkinson, 2010).

These five characteristics are listed in the ASQ Characteristics column in Table 1. A score for each of the five characteristics is calculated by averaging the score for each of the eight questions in each section. For example, the confidence score will be the average of questions 1,
The corresponding survey questions for each ASQ characteristic can be found in Table 1. The ASQ is designed in such a way that its 40 questions are able to be collapsed into five variables for analysis.

Table 1

*Attachment Style Questionnaire and Corresponding Survey Questions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASQ Characteristic</th>
<th>Corresponding Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 19, 31, 33, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>4, 5, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>11, 12, 13, 15, 24, 27, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>18, 22, 28, 29, 30, 32, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avoidant Attachment 3*, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19*, 20*, 21*, 23, 25, 34, 37*

Attachment Anxiety 11, 13, 15, 18, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31*, 32, 33, 38*

As the second level of analysis requires a composite of multiple factors, measurements for confidence need to be reverse-keyed in order to score attachment security. As Feeney (2010) has observed in regard to measurements for avoidant attachment and attachment anxiety, “less is more” (p. 749).

*As the second level of analysis requires a composite of multiple factors, measurements for confidence need to be reverse-keyed in order to score attachment security. As Feeney (2010) has observed in regard to measurements for avoidant attachment and attachment anxiety, “less is more” (p. 749).

The ASQ also has two additional broader measures that can be used for a higher level of analysis. These can be calculated by averaging each of the 13 questions that respectively measure avoidant attachment and attachment anxiety. These can also be found in Table 1. Higher scores on the anxiety dimension indicate a negative model of self and interpersonal anxiety or a fearful preoccupation with the relationship. Higher scores on the avoidance
dimension indicate a negative view of others and avoidance of closeness and dependence in relationships. Low values in each of these dimensions reflect a positive model of self and others and a secure attachment style. The ASQ is designed in such a way that in every area except the confidence factor, less is more. The additional level of analysis measures attachment anxiety and avoidance and includes the confidence factor, but reverse keys its scoring as a means of correlating confidence and attachment anxiety and confidence and avoidant attachment. Attachment security is found in lower levels of anxiety and avoidance and higher scores in confidence. This study analyzed the five variables and did an additional analysis of the composite scores measuring avoidant attachment, attachment anxiety, and confidence.

Minor modification of the wording of some of the survey questions was done in order to make the survey clearer and more user-friendly for the targeted sample (see Appendix B). Dr. Feeney, the developer of the attachment survey instrument – confirmed the minor wording changes for select questions. In each case where the developer raised concerns about wording changes, the original wording of the question was used. The final form of the survey instrument used only minor modifications about which the developer did not object.

Leadership Style

The most widely used transformational leadership measure is the MLQ (Northouse, 2013), although Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) Leadership Practices Inventory is also a reliable tool. The MLQ was chosen because of its recognition for being the standard measurement tool for transformational and transactional leadership. Use of the MLQ requires that it be licensed and purchased through Mind Garden. The survey is copyrighted and the terms of use allow for Human Subjects Internal Review of the questionnaire, but prohibit publication of the questionnaire in a completed dissertation.
The MLQ survey uses 45 questions to measure leadership behaviors at two levels. The first level uses the 45 questions and collapses them into nine qualities/practices including: _idealized influence attributed_, _idealized influence behaviors_, _inspirational motivation_, _intellectual stimulation_, _individual consideration_, _contingent reward_, _management by exception – active_, _management by exception – passive_, _laissez-faire_. A second and higher level of analysis was performed which then categorizes these behaviors/qualities into three leadership styles including: _transformational_, _transactional_, and _passive-avoidant_. An overall composite score can be compiled from these measurements that is called the five I’s of transformational leadership (_idealized influence attributed_, _idealized influence behaviors_, _inspirational motivation_, _intellectual stimulation_, and _individual consideration_). Mind Garden provided this score.

Subjects were asked to complete 45 MLQ related questions in the survey using a Likert scale ranging from 0 (_not at all_) to 4 (_frequently if not always_). Mind Garden’s program categorized responses, tallied them, and reported them as raw data. See Table 2 for the nine leadership styles and the three corresponding leadership approaches. The validity and reliability of the MLQ has been tested and the scales that it uses have demonstrated sound internal consistency with alpha coefficients above the .80 level for all of its scales. The MLQ has been completed by thousands of respondents and translated into several languages. The MLQ has been revised since its original six-characteristic form, and additional factors have been added to the most recent edition (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The most updated version that was available was used for this study through a license with Mind Garden.
Table 2

Multifactor Questionnaire Leadership Characteristics and Corresponding Survey Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ Leadership Style</th>
<th>Characteristics and Practices</th>
<th>Corresponding Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>10, 18, 21, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>6, 14, 23, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>9, 13, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2, 8, 30, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>15, 19, 29, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>1, 11, 16, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Mgmnt by Exception – active</td>
<td>4, 22, 24, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>Mgmnt by Exception – passive</td>
<td>3, 12, 17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>5, 7, 28, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Questions

The demographic section asked questions about gender, race, years of ordained service, number of congregations served, duration of service to each, current congregation size, and whether they have ever formally separated from a congregation. These questions along with the Attachment Style Questionnaire and the Multifactor Questionnaire were collapsed into a single survey. These questions were used to create new variables whose coefficients were correlated.
Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership. Three specific research questions were addressed in the analysis of the survey results.

First Research Question

The first research question investigated: “For clergy affiliated with a small, bi-national denomination, what are the:

a) attachment styles,

b) leadership styles, and

c) average longevity and involuntary separation rates within their congregations?” To address this, I used descriptive statistics.

The descriptive statistics for this research question are listed in Table 3. In the second column of this table, 19 variables are listed. Each of these variables is listed with descriptive statistics (i.e., frequency, median, standard deviation) subset by demographic variables.

The first five variables in the table are confidence, discomfort with closeness, relationships as secondary, need for approval, and preoccupation. The variables under the construct of attachment are from the ASQ and are a combination of the scores from several different survey questions (see Table 1). Each variable under this construct were investigated to see what kind of attachment behaviors are associated with the respondents within the denomination being investigated in this study. The ASQ also has two measures to analyze attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety. These measures were derived from composite scores from specific questions from the ASQ and are measurements common in attachment research. A secondary analysis using these measures provided the regression analysis.
The next nine variables listed in the second column of Table 3 fall under the construct of leadership. These variables come from the MLQ and were collapsed combinations of individual questions from the MLQ (see Table 2). The variables under leadership included: *idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management by exception – active, management by exception – passive, and laissez-faire.* Each of these variables are measurements of different kinds of leadership behaviors. The first level of analysis used descriptive statistics to investigate which kinds of leadership were most common among this population. A secondary and higher analysis of the variables of the MLQ’s leadership measure was also conducted. The MLQ allows researchers to further collapse the nine variables into three descriptive categories for leadership behaviors: *transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant.* A secondary analysis included using multiple regression to correlate these outcomes with attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety.

Questions for the demographic section of the questionnaire also had descriptive statistics calculated. In Table 3, there are three questions listed under the construct of longevity: *how many congregations have you served; how long have you served at each; and have you ever separated from your congregation?* These three variables pinpointed the average longevity of a clergyperson’s duration within their congregation.

**Second Research Question**

The second research question in this study investigated: “What is the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership style?” This question is about investigating and analyzing the strength of the relationship between clergy attachment style and leadership behaviors. The seven Attachment Style Questionnaire measurements as well as demographic
information are the independent variables and the nine Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire measurements (also from question one) are the dependent variables. See Table 4 for a list of all the independent and dependent variables. Correlation coefficients are found for sets of the independent and dependent variables. A multivariate, multi-regression model of analysis was used to measure leadership style (the outcome) involving multiple variables to determine the overall significance of each independent variable. The analysis for research question two is described in Table 4.

**Third Research Question**

The third research question (Table 5) investigated “To what extent can a clergyperson’s attachment and leadership style be used to predict average longevity and involuntary separations within their congregations?” The study used a multiple regression model to analyze the data. There is only one outcome variable, namely, the average of all previous years of congregations served. The same five attachment measurements for attachment style from the ASQ and the nine leadership style measurements from the MLQ were considered to be explanatory variables and are all listed in Table 5. The study examines measurements that found to be significant predictors of longevity by looking at the p-values of the predictors as well as their slopes.

All of these analyses were performed using SAS® version 9.4. For this study, PROC CORR was used to examine the correlation coefficients and PROC GLM was used for both regression models.
Table 3

*Data Analysis Summary for Research Question 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What are the attachment and leadership characteristics, average longevity within their congregation, and involuntary separation rates for clergy affiliated with a small, bi-national denomination?</td>
<td>Attachment scores:</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discomfort with closeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationships as secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need for approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preoccupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoidant attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attachment anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership scores:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Idealized attributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Idealized behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspirational motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contingent reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management by exception – active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management by exception – passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Laissez-faire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longevity responses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How many congregations have you served?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How long have you served at each?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have you separated from your church?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Data Analysis Summary for Research Question 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2) What is the relationship between clergy attachment characteristics and their leadership characteristics? | **Independent Variables**  
- Confidence  
- Discomfort with closeness  
- Relationships as secondary  
- Need for approval  
- Preoccupation  
- Avoidant attachment  
- Attachment anxiety  
- Demographic Variables | **Dependent Variables**  
- Idealized attributes  
- Idealized behaviors  
- Inspirational motivation  
- Intellectual stimulation  
- Individual consideration  
- Contingent reward  
- Management by exception – active  
- Management by exception – passive  
- Laissez-faire | Multivariate Multiple Regression                                 |
Table 5

Data Analysis Summary for Research Question 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3) To what extent can a clergyperson’s attachment and leadership style be used to predict average longevity and involuntary separations within their congregations? | Independent Variables:  
  - Confidence  
  - Discomfort with closeness  
  - Relationships as secondary  
  - Need for approval  
  - Preoccupation  
  - Avoidant attachment  
  - Attachment anxiety  
  - Idealized attributes  
  - Idealized behaviors  
  - Inspirational motivation  
  - Intellectual stimulation  
  - Individual consideration  
  - Contingent reward  
  - Management by exception – active  
  - Management by exception – passive  
  - Laissez-faire | Multiple Regression |

Dependent Variables

- How many congregations have you served?
- How long have you served at each?
- Have you separated from your congregation?
Delimitations and Limitations

This study has several recognized delimitations and limitations. The focus of this study is delimited to Protestant, Christian, clergy from one denomination that has representation in the United States and Canada alone. In addition, because of the nature of this denomination, the vast majority of the clergy of this study are Caucasian and male. Additional research is needed to capture a wider demographic of clergypersons who are female and more ethnically diverse. This study examined a limited sample of 995 clergypersons and as such, the results of this study may not be generalizable to all clergy.

A key limitation of this study is that, by design, it is subjective. Two self-report measures are used and correlated. Additional studies should include a measurement strategy that uses the MLQ rater form, or that achieves deliberate triangulation so that followers rate a leader’s leadership qualities and characteristics. This study does not attempt to measure early childhood, adolescent, or romantic relationships; each of which impact adult attachment. An additional limitation of this study is that was anonymous. In light of this, response bias could be present in the results.

Finally, this study investigated active and eligible parish clergy in a particular denomination, but did not investigate clergypersons in that denomination who had separated from their congregation and then discontinued their ministerial service altogether. As noted in the introduction to this study, collecting reliable data on these separations is not easy. Churches, pastors, and denominations do not always disclose why these separations have taken place and sometimes, the distinction between a forced resignation and leaving for other reasons is not very clear (Schultz, 2013). The denomination selected for this study reported a 580% increase in terminations from the 1990’s to the 2000’s; from 25 cases between 1990-1999 to 146 cases
between 2000-2009. During the same time period, the same denomination reported nearly a tripling in the number of clergy resignations from 11 to 30 (Schuurman, 2014). It is unclear how many of these clergypersons did not return to full time ministry. The data from this study does not target or capture those who left ministry altogether.

**Summary**

This research study examined the relationship between the self-reported attachment style and leadership style of clergy of a small, bi-national Protestant denomination. The research examines the limited research that is currently available linking attachment theory and transformational leadership. The Attachment Style Questionnaire (1994) and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (2004) were used to examine correlations between clergy attachment style and leadership characteristics. Further, the research explored relationships between attachment style, leadership behaviors and clergy longevity. There was no known research like this at the time of this study. Denominations, seminaries, churches and pastors will now have new data that can help inform clergy preparation, curriculum, and support structures regarding the clergy-congregation relationship.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

This study explores the relationship between clergy attachment style and leadership behaviors, and to what extent, if any, attachment and leadership style can predict clergy longevity in their congregation and any involuntary separations. The research questions posed in this study are:

1. For clergy affiliated with a small, bi-national denomination, what are their:
   (a) attachment styles;
   (b) leadership styles; and
   (c) average longevity and involuntary separation rates within their congregations?

2. What is the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership style?

3. To what extent can a clergyperson’s attachment and leadership style be used to predict average longevity and involuntary separations within their congregations?

To address these research questions, 995 clergy of a small, bi-national denomination were invited to participate in an online electronic survey during a three-week time period beginning in April, 2016. Of the 995 clergy in the target population, 348 completed it for a response rate of 35%. An additional 118 respondents began the survey but did not complete it. This suggests that they opened the link to the survey and discontinued it after reading the informed consent, or they began the survey and then voluntarily discontinued it, or they completed the survey but did not submit it. Thus, the analysis of this study was based on the sample of 348 participants who completed and submitted their survey. Of 348 participants who completed the survey, 268 furnished an email address to participate in the random drawing for one of four $25 Amazon gift cards used as an incentive to participate. These email addresses were generated into an Excel
spread sheet by Mind Garden’s secondary, random drawing survey. After my survey had been available for three weeks, I ordered four $25 Amazon electronic gift cards. I used an online random number generator to choose four numbers that I corresponded with lines on the Excel email report form. I then sent them electronically to the winners of the random drawing. Each of the cards has been received and redeemed. Each participant received a personalized email that included a URL link to the electronic survey. The survey had three sections: a section of 40 questions that measured attachment using a 1-6 Likert scale on the Attachment Survey Questionnaire (ASQ), a section of 45 questions that used the Multifactor Questionnaire (MLQ) using a 0-6 Likert scale, and a third section that asked six simple demographic questions related to gender, ethnicity, congregations served, years of service in each congregation, church size, and whether the clergy had separated from their congregation.

**Description of Population**

The target population for this study included 995 clergy of a small, bi-national, Protestant denomination. Of the 995 potential participants who met the criteria for this study, 348 (35%) completed the online survey and were used in the analysis. In reference to gender, 92.24% selected male, 6.61% selected female, and 1.15% were non-responders. In light of this denomination’s disproportionate number of male clergy, the low number indicating a response of “female” was not a surprise. Table 6 contains demographics by gender.

Table 6

*Respondent Demographics by Gender (n=348).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>92.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of respondents were White (94.54%), and the second most common race reported was Asian (2.01%). Five respondents reported a race of Other (1.44%) and two respondents did not report race (0.57%). Table 7 contains demographics by ethnicity/race.

Table 7

**Respondent Demographics by Race (n=348).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>94.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1

In order to address research question one, descriptive statistics were performed on attachment styles, leadership styles, and average longevity and involuntary separation rates. Table 8 and Table 9 report descriptive statistics and frequencies for these areas of inquiry.

Table 8

**ASQ Descriptive Statistics for Attachment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort w/ Closeness</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=totally disagree; 2=strongly disagree; 3=slightly disagree; 4=slightly agree; 5=strongly agree; 6=totally agree
All respondents (N=348) answered the complete 40 question Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) which used a 1-6 Likert scale. The ASQ measures the five characteristics of: confidence, discomfort with closeness, relationships as secondary, need for approval, and preoccupation. Therefore, each respondent had an attachment score for the five characteristics. The attachment characteristic with the highest score was Confidence (m = 4.25). Subsequent characteristics and scores are as follows: Discomfort with Closeness (m = 3.37), Need for Approval (m = 3.25), Preoccupation (m = 3.23), and Relationship as Secondary (m = 2.78). All five ASQ characteristics had similar standard deviations with the highest belonging to Need for Approval (std dev = 0.64) and the lowest characteristic of Confidence (std dev = 0.45). Table 8 contains the descriptive statistics for the ASQ characteristics.

In addition to measuring particular traits associated with relationships, the ASQ also provides a measure that aggregates those scores in relationship to Confidence. The aggregate scores measure Attachment Anxiety and Avoidant Attachment. The two broader measures of analysis of Avoidant Attachment and Attachment Anxiety were also calculated. The mean score for Avoidant Attachment was 3.05 (std dev = 0.56) and the mean score for Attachment Anxiety was 3.02 (std dev = 0.59). Table 9 contains the descriptive statistics for these two measures.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Anxiety</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=totally disagree; 2 strongly disagree; 3=slightly disagree; 4=slightly agree; 5=strongly agree; 6 totally agree

All respondents also completed the 45 question MLQ Leadership Survey (N=348) that used a Likert scale of 0-4 for all responses. The highest leadership characteristic for this demographic is Idealized Behaviors (m = 3.04). The lowest average leadership characteristic is
Laissez-faire \( (m = 0.80) \). As with ASQ, the standard deviations of the scores are similar across all characteristics. They range from 0.51 (idealized attributes) to 0.68 (management by exception active). Table 10 contains the descriptive statistics for the MLQ characteristics under the header Leadership Scores.

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Leadership Scores.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmnt by Exception Active</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmnt by Exception Passive</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Once in a while; 2=Sometimes; 3=Fairly often; 4=Frequently, if not always

The MLQ also provides additional aggregate measurements that allow researchers to explore respondents’ overall transformational leadership score, and leaders’ perceptions of outcomes related to work satisfaction, effectiveness, and capacity to labor above and beyond expectations. The mean of the transformational leadership score was 2.85 with a standard deviation of 0.42. The outcomes of leadership are not directly related to leadership styles, but the data is included for the purpose of information. The three outcomes of leadership are work satisfaction \( (m= 3.10, \text{std} \ 0.51) \), effectiveness \( (m= 2.92, \text{std} \ 0.54) \) and extra effort \( (m= 2.51, \text{std} \ 0.66) \). Table 11 contains the descriptive statistics for these aggregate scores.
Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics: Aggregated MLQ Leadership Scores.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Score</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Satisfaction</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Once in a while; 2=Sometimes; 3=Fairly often; 4=Frequently, if not always

The last area of inquiry for research question one is measurements for longevity.

Respondents were asked to report the number of years served at each of their congregations and the mean duration of service was calculated for each clergyperson. One respondent reported -1 for years of service. This response was omitted from all subsequent calculations due to the impossibility. The average service duration for all respondents 7.15 years with a standard deviation of 4.39. The lowest mean service duration was one year and the highest was 38 years.

The mean number of years of service at a clergyperson’s current congregation is 6.47 years with a standard deviation of 4.95. Note: Table 12 contains the descriptive statistics for this section of research question one under the header longevity responses, and Table 13 shows the frequencies of all free text responses.

Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics: Longevity Responses (Years).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity Responses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg of Years Served as Ordained Minister²</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Served at Current Congregation</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Congregations Served¹</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹response of 422 congregations served was omitted
²response of -1 years served was omitted
The survey contained a free text field for Number of Congregations Served. The average number of congregations served for the 341 responses (this number excludes six respondents who did not answer and one outlier response of 422) was 2.46 with a standard deviation of 2.45. The responses ranged from zero congregations to 29. While 29 congregations served is also unlikely, this response remains part of the calculations because there is no clear line as to what an unlikely value should be. Table 13 shows the summary statistics for Number of Congregations Served and Table 14 shows the frequencies for this variable.

Table 13

*Number of Congregations Served (n=348).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congregations served as Ordained Minister</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last area of inquiry under longevity is whether or not a clergyperson had undergone a formal separation process with their congregation. There were 347 responses; 33 of reported having undergone a formal process of separation. Respondents were also asked how many terminations they had undergone. There were 31 respondents who reported a single termination,
and one respondent reported having separated twice. Table 14 contains the frequencies for this section of research question one.

Table 14

Frequencies of Termination Responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminated with Formal Separation Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>90.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Congregations Terminated with formal terms
1                                         31  96.88
2                                         1    3.13

As a secondary analysis for research question one, the relationship between ASQ measurements were investigated. Correlation coefficients were found between each of the five primary ASQ measurements as well as between the two ASQ composite measurements (Avoidant Attachment and Attachment Anxiety). These linear correlation coefficients were calculated and can be found in Table 15.

Table 15

Correlation between ASQ Measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence vs. Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>-0.4476</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence vs. Relationships Secondary</td>
<td>-0.4443</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence vs. Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.2883</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence vs. Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.1318</td>
<td>*0.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort w/ Closeness vs. Relationships Secondary</td>
<td>0.5697</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness vs. Need for Approval</td>
<td>0.5383</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness vs. Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.3865</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary vs. Need for Approval</td>
<td>0.3576</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary vs. Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.1395</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval vs. Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.4665</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Attachment vs. Attachment Anxiety</td>
<td>0.5430</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤0.05
Confidence and Discomfort with Closeness were found to be negatively associated; the relationship was considered moderate ($r = -0.4476$). As confidence increases, there is a tendency for Discomfort with Closeness to decrease. Relationships as Secondary also had a moderately negative relationship with Confidence ($r = -0.4443$). As Confidence increases, Relationships as Secondary decreases. Need for Approval ($r = -0.2883$) and Preoccupation ($r = -0.1318$) also both had negative relationships with Confidence, although these relationships are both considered weak but still significant.

As mentioned, Discomfort with Closeness and Confidence were negatively associated. The other ASQ measurements were all found to be positively associated with Discomfort with Closeness. Discomfort with Closeness and Relationships as Secondary was the strongest of these positive relationships ($r = 0.5697$). As clergy Discomfort with Closeness increases, Relationships as Secondary increases. The correlation for Need for Approval was almost as strong ($r = 0.5383$). Just as with Relationships as Secondary, as Discomfort with Closeness increases, Need for Approval also increases. Preoccupation also had a moderate relationship with Discomfort with Closeness, although not as strong ($r = 0.3865$).

Need for Approval and Preoccupation were both found to have positively associated relationships with Relationships as Secondary, just as Discomfort with Closeness. These relationships were not as strong as with Discomfort with Closeness. Relationships as Secondary and Need for Approval were considered moderately associated ($r = 0.3576$) while Preoccupation had a weak relationship with Relationships as Secondary ($r = 0.1395$). As Relationships as Secondary increases, both Need for Approval and Preoccupation increase.

Consistent with the other ASQ measurements, Need for Approval was positively associated with everything except Confidence. Preoccupation and Need for Approval were
found to have a moderate, positive relationship ($r = 0.4665$). As Need for Approval increases, Preoccupation also increases. This relationship, though moderate, is stronger than the relationship between Relationships as Secondary and Need for Approval; it is weaker than the relationship with Discomfort with Closeness and Need for Approval.

The two composite measurements of Avoidant Attachment and Attachment Anxiety were also correlated with each other. They were found to have a moderate, positive relationship ($r=0.5430$). As Avoidant Attachment increases, Attachment Anxiety also increases. It should also be noted that all of these correlation coefficients were found to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Correlation coefficients were also found for the composite ASQ and MLQ scores against congregation size. Neither ASQ nor MLQ measurements were significantly correlated with the size of the congregation, and the size of the congregation is not related to the Attachment style of the leader. The five I’s of Transformational leadership have a weak positive correlation with congregation size. As congregation size increases, transformational leadership scores increase, though weakly. See Table 16 for these measurements.

Table 16

*Correlations with Congregation Size.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregation Size vs. Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>-0.0504</td>
<td>0.3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation Size vs. Attachment Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.0598</td>
<td>0.2682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation Size vs. Five I’s* of Trans. Leadership</td>
<td>0.1483</td>
<td><strong>0.0058</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Five I’s include: Idealized Influence Attributes, Idealized Influence Attributed, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration. **p≤0.05
Research Question 2

My study investigates the strength of the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership style. To begin, the correlation coefficients for all five ASQ characteristics and all nine MLQ leadership characteristics were found. This resulted in the 45 correlation coefficients and corresponding p-values as found in Table 17.

Table 17

Correlations of Confidence vs. MLQ Leadership Characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ASQ measurement vs. MLQ measurement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence vs. Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>0.3599</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>0.3311</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>0.3918</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>0.2246</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Individual Consideration</td>
<td>0.2618</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Contingent Reward</td>
<td>0.1177</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Management by Exception – Active</td>
<td>-0.1088</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Management by Exception – Passive</td>
<td>-0.1702</td>
<td>*0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.2146</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness vs. Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>-0.1765</td>
<td>*0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.2301</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>-0.2341</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.1116</td>
<td>*0.0376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Individual Consideration</td>
<td>-0.2211</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Contingent Reward</td>
<td>-0.0833</td>
<td>0.1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Management by Exception - Active</td>
<td>0.2198</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Management by Exception – Passive</td>
<td>0.1929</td>
<td>*0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary vs. Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>-0.1938</td>
<td>*0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.2366</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>-0.1986</td>
<td>*0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.1919</td>
<td>*0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Individual Consideration</td>
<td>-0.3031</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Contingent Reward</td>
<td>0.0455</td>
<td>0.3975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Mgmt by Exception – Active</td>
<td>0.3030</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Mgmt by Exception – Passive</td>
<td>0.1290</td>
<td>*0.0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>0.1529</td>
<td>*0.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval vs. Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>-0.2252</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.2316</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>-0.2748</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.1429</td>
<td>*0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Individual Consideration</td>
<td>-0.2427</td>
<td>*&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Contingent Reward</td>
<td>-0.0268</td>
<td>*0.0268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the characteristic of Confidence, six leadership characteristics were positively associated and three leadership characteristics were negatively associated. Inspirational Motivation had the strongest correlation with Confidence \((r = 0.3918)\) followed by Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation and Contingent Reward. The Laissez-Faire had the strongest negative relationship with Confidence \((r = -0.2146)\) followed by Management by Exception Passive, and Management by Exception Active.

For the characteristic Discomfort with Closeness, Contingent Reward did not have a significant relationship \((p \text{ value} = 0.1208)\). However, of the remaining MLQ characteristics, three had a positive association with Discomfort with Closeness, and five had a negative association. Management by Exception Active had the strongest positive relationship \((r = 0.2198)\) followed by Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception Passive. Inspirational
Motivation had the strongest negative relationship \( (r = -0.2341) \) followed by Idealized Behaviors, Individual Consideration, Idealized Attributes, and Intellectual Stimulation.

For the characteristic Relationships as Secondary, once again, Contingent Reward did not have significant relationship \( (p \text{ value} = 0.3975) \). There were five leadership characteristics that had a negative relationship and three that had a positive relationship. Management by Exception Active had the strongest positive relationship \( (r = 0.3030) \) followed by Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception Passive. Individual Consideration had the strongest negative relationship \( (r = -0.3031) \), followed by Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Attributes, and Intellectual Stimulation.

For the characteristic Need for Approval, three leadership characteristics had a positive relationship and six leadership characteristics had a negative relationship. Laissez-Faire had the strongest positive relationship \( (r = 0.2911) \), followed by Management by Exception Active, and Management by Exception Passive. The following characteristics had a negative correlation in order of strength from strongest to weakest: Inspirational Motivation \( (r = -0.2748) \), Individual Consideration, Idealized Behaviors, Idealized Attributes, Intellectual Stimulation, and Contingent Reward.

For the characteristic of Preoccupation, there were two leadership characteristics that were not significant: Idealized Behaviors \( (p \text{ value} = 0.4554) \) and Contingent Reward \( (p \text{ value} = 0.1141) \). Three leadership characteristics had a positive relationship with Preoccupation. These include: Management by Exception Active \( (r = 0.2933) \), Management by Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire. Inspirational Motivation had the strongest negative relationship with Preoccupation \( (r = -0.1737) \) followed by Individual Consideration, Idealized Attributes and Intellectual Stimulation. I observed that the same three MLQ characteristics had positive
correlations with all of the ASQ measurements, except confidence. The MLQ characteristics were Management by Exception Active, Management by Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire. It also holds that the remaining six MLQ characteristics had negative relationships with all of the ASQ characteristics except Confidence (except for the case of Contingent Reward and Relationship as Secondary that had an insignificant, weak, positive relationship).

As a follow up to the correlations found between the primary ASQ and MLQ measurements, significant correlations were found between the composite ASQ measurements (Attachment Anxiety and Avoidant Attachment), and the composite MLQ measurement (known as the five I’s). The ASQ composite scale for Avoidant Attachment measures participants’ tendencies to avoid relationships, view others and self with some suspicion and invest in solitary tasks. The ASQ composite scale for Attachment Anxiety measures uncertainty with self and others in relationships. A significant correlation between the ASQ and MLQ factors means that there is a relationship between attachment and leadership measures.

The MLQ composite scale measures the five markers of transformational leadership – often referred to as the “Five I’s” - namely, idealized influence attributed, idealized influence behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration. Linear correlation coefficients were calculated for each pairing of these variables. These can be found in Table 18 and are listed as the MLQ five I’s and their correlation with Avoidant Attachment and Attachment Anxiety.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Five I’s vs. Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>-0.3279</td>
<td>**&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Five I’s vs. Attachment Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.3672</td>
<td>**&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Five I’s include: Idealized Influence attributed, Idealized Influence Behaviors, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, Individual Consideration. **p≤0.05
The composite MLQ was found to be negatively associated with both ASQ composite measurements. The MLQ composite and Avoidant Attachment are moderately, negatively correlated ($r=-0.3279$). As MLQ composite increases, Avoidant Attachment decreases. The MLQ composite and Attachment Anxiety are moderately, negatively correlated ($r=-0.3672$). As MLQ composite increases, Attachment Anxiety decreases. The two ASQ composite measurements have a moderate, positive relationship ($r=0.5430$). As Avoidant Attachment increases, Attachment Anxiety also increases.

In order to investigate the relationship between clergy attachment characteristics and leadership characteristics a multivariate multiple regression was performed. The five primary ASQ measurements were the independent variables and the nine MLQ measurements that were of interest serve as the dependent variables. Because of small numbers in each of the minorities, no demographic information was included as independent variables. The primary results of the multivariate, multiple regression analysis, are broken down according to dependent variable and are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

*Multivariate Multiple Regression.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>*0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>*0.0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.3595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 Continued

*Multivariate Multiple Regression.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.7063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.3346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>*0.0112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>*0.0091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.6338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.9069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>*0.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>*0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>*0.0302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.3491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>0.1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>*0.0112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>*0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>0.0705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingent Reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>*0.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>*0.0243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.4059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>*0.0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.7334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 Continued

*Multivariate Multiple Regression.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management by Exception – Active</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management by Exception – Passive</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laissez-Faire</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort with Closeness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤0.05

In order to reveal which relationship characteristics were most influential to predict leadership characteristics, the p values were considered in each part of the multivariate, multiple regression. Confidence, Need for Approval, and Relationship as Secondary continually showed up as significant predictors of the MLQ measurements while Discomfort with Closeness and Preoccupation were not significant in any of the models. Confidence was considered a significant predictor of Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, Contingent Reward, and Laissez-Faire. Relationships as Secondary was significant in predicting Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, and Management by Exception Active. Need for Approval
was significant in the following: Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Management by Exception Active, Management by Exception Passive, and Laissez-Faire.

**Research Question 3**

The third research question investigated the extent to which a clergyperson’s attachment and leadership style can be used to predict average longevity and their likelihood of involuntary separation. A multiple regression analysis was performed using the mean of all previous years of congregations as the dependent variable. The independent variables were the five attachment measurements for attachment style from the ASQ and the nine leadership style measurements from the MLQ. A backwards selection method was used to eliminate insignificant predictors. A significance level of 0.05 was used to keep variables in the model. Variables with the highest p value were removed and the process was repeated. The first variable removed from the regression model was ASQ Discomfort with Closeness (p value = 0.7685). Subsequent eliminations can be seen in Table 20.

Table 20

*Summary of Backwards Regression for Predicting Professional Longevity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Removed</th>
<th>Number Variables</th>
<th>Model R-Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ASQ Discomfort Closeness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0773</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.7685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MLQ Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.7385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASQ Preoccupation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.4908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLQ Contingent Reward</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0742</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.4727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MLQ Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0725</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.4380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MLQ Mgmt by Exception – (a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.3789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MLQ Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0675</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.3089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MLQ Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0650</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.3386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ASQ Confidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MLQ Individual Consideration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0564</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MLQ Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.1698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three variables were in the final model as significant predictors of average professional longevity: ASQ relationships as secondary (p value = 0.0210), ASQ need for approval (p value = 0.0003), and MLQ management by exception passive (p value = 0.0105).

An overall model for average longevity is as follows:

$$\text{average longevity} = 8.10 + 0.92 \text{ (relationship as secondary)} - 1.46 \text{ (need for approval)} + 1.00 \text{ (management by exception passive)}$$

This model can be used to predict average longevity for clergy by using the ASQ and MLQ measurements. The parameter estimates for the model can be found in Table 21.

Table 21

**Final Regression Model for Predicting Professional Longevity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Type II SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>8.10019</td>
<td>1.36545</td>
<td>648.117</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>*&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASQ_Relationships_Secondary</td>
<td>0.91884</td>
<td>0.39612</td>
<td>99.094</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>*0.0210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASQ Need for Approval</td>
<td>-1.4551</td>
<td>0.39847</td>
<td>245.596</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>*0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmnt by Exception - Passive</td>
<td>0.99158</td>
<td>0.38549</td>
<td>121.852</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>*0.0105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p≤0.05

The overall R-squared for the model is 0.0512. This means that this model with the two ASQ and one MLQ measurements found to be significant can explain 5.12% of the variation in average longevity of clergy. The model is significant overall (F=6.13, p value = 0.0005).

A logistic regression model was formulated to see if any of the ASQ attachment style measurements or MLQ leadership measurements were predictors of involuntary termination of clergy. All five ASQ measurements and all nine MLQ measurements were utilized during a backward selection process to build a logistic regression model. The first variable excluded from the model to predict termination was Laissez-Faire (p value = 0.9299). Subsequent elimination steps can be seen in Table 22.
Table 22

Summary of Backwards Logistical Regression for Predicting Involuntary Separation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Removed</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Number Variables In</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Squared</th>
<th>Pr &gt; ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MLQ Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.9299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASQ Preoccupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.9018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MLQ Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>0.8557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLQ Individual consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.8162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MLQ Mgmnt by Exception – Passive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0724</td>
<td>0.7878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ASQ Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1983</td>
<td>0.6561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MLQ Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5554</td>
<td>0.4561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MLQ Contingent Reward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6101</td>
<td>0.4348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ASQ Relationships Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7424</td>
<td>0.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ASQ Need for Approval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8107</td>
<td>0.3679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ASQ Discomfort Closeness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5481</td>
<td>0.2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MLQ Mgmnt by Exception – Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8076</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MLQ Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7279</td>
<td>0.1887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one variable remained in the final model: MLQ Idealized Behaviors (p value = 0.0423). The other variables were all insignificant; whether or not that is of practical use is discussed in Chapter V. The final model estimates can be found in Table 23.

Table 23

Final Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Involuntary Separation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr &gt; ChiSq</th>
<th>Odds Ratio Estimate</th>
<th>95% Wald Confidence Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4.5813</td>
<td>1.1913</td>
<td>14.7876</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7449</td>
<td>0.3667</td>
<td>4.1251</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>(1.026, 4.322)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model is as follows: F(x)=1/(1+e^-(-4.5813+0.7449x)). The estimated odds ratio is 2.106 (calculated as e^(0.7449)). The estimated odds of termination happening is 2.106 times higher
for every one point of increase in MLQ Idealized Behavior score, with a corresponding confidence interval of 1.026 to 4.322. Since this model is a logistic regression, an equivalent statistic to the R-squared does not exist.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the data that explored the relationship between clergy attachment style and leadership behaviors that might exist for clergy in a small, Protestant, bi-national denomination. Different analysis techniques were used, including linear correlation coefficients, multiple linear regression, logistic regression, and multivariate, multiple regression. While the analysis results are reported in chapter IV, the practicality of these results will be discussed in Chapter V as well as the congruence with existing research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As described in Chapter II, attachment theory and leadership theory share the common terrain of human relationships. Since at least one body of literature has demonstrated that leaders are like parents who provide a teaching, guiding, caring, and directing role for those who are either dependent or less strong than their followers (Popper & Mayseless, 2003), it is fitting to think about the relationship between attachment theory and clergy leadership. Like good parents, leaders function as those who are “stronger and wiser” (p. 42), and effective ones provide a secure base and a safe haven from which followers can explore, create, and derive security, availability, nurture, and reassurance – particularly in times of need. Relationships are a key component of much leadership theory and may very well be the most important factor (Gardner et al., 2005).

The experience of attachment security, attachment anxiety, and attachment avoidance informs one’s leadership style. “The leadership relationship is yet another important relationship within which attachment models are activated” (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006, p. 178). Attachment theory also provides a theoretical framework in which to investigate leader-follower dynamics (Popper & Mayseless, 2003); followers want to be close to leaders who provide advice and resources for personal development and advancement (Davidovitz et al., 2007).

While multiple studies have been done on attachment and leadership, there is precious little research in the domain of attachment theory and the clergy-congregational relationship – particularly in regard to failed clergy-congregational relationships. This study investigated clergy attachment and leadership styles, correlated the strength of the relationship between the two, and also examined the working longevity rates of clergy in light of their attachment and
leadership styles. In addition, the study investigated the impact of involuntary separation rates of clergy in light of their attachment and leadership styles.

**Key Findings**

The findings that are presented in this study are based on the self-report survey information provided by 348 Protestant clergy within a small, bi-national denomination. Respondents represent approximately 35% of the clergy in this population. Not surprisingly for the population, 92% of respondents identify themselves as male, almost 7% identify as female, and 1% chose not to identify their gender. Almost 95% of respondents identify themselves as White and 2% reported themselves as Asian. Almost 1.5% of respondents reported “Other” for race and less than 1% did not respond to a question related to race. The over-representation of both White and male respondents in this sample is consistent with the population of the denomination in this study. By comparison, according to a recent U.S. National Congregations Study (Chaves & Anderson, 2015), of 3,815 congregations nationwide, 11% of U.S. congregations are led by women clergy. The same study revealed that 41% of full-time and 53% of part-time ministerial staff are female. Women comprise only 27% of full-time secondary ministerial staff within white evangelical congregations, compared to 46% to 56% for other traditions (p. 16).

**Findings Related to Research Question One**

My first research question investigated (a) clergy attachment styles, (b) leadership behaviors, and (c) average longevity and separation rates within their congregations. Data was gathered using the Attachment Style Questionnaire developed by Feeney and Noller (1994). The measure used determines where a person falls on two dimensions: one’s view of self and one’s view of others. As such, it does not categorically classify a participant as “anxious,” “secure,” or
“avoidant,” but instead explores attachment dimensions that may not be reducible to one style. “This way of measuring also allows researchers to consider patterns of scores across attachment style, rather than focusing on the dominant style” (Feeney, 2008, p. 462).

**Attachment Results.** For the purposes of this study, all five measures were utilized on a six-point Likert scale. The traits labeled Need for Approval and Preoccupation pertain to attitudes about oneself; higher scores in each area reflect a higher need for approval and a greater preoccupation with relationships. The factors labelled Discomfort with Closeness and Relationships as Secondary relate to attitudes about others; the higher the scores in each of these areas, the higher the discomfort with closeness and the stronger tendency to appraise relationships as secondary. The fifth scale measuring Confidence relates to participants’ view of self and others. Higher scores reflect greater self-regard and greater regard of others; traits that are always paired with attachment security (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007, p. 494). Higher scores in the scale measuring confidence also suggests a leader who is “sensitive and responsive, like other security-enhancing attachment figures, who can support a broaden-and-build cycle of attachment security in followers” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016, p. 480).

In regard to the attachment measurements, the sample of the population in this study scored highest in Confidence suggesting a high view of self and others and scored lowest in the area of Relationships as Secondary. This suggests that the clergy in this study are the kinds of leaders who have attachment security and are capable of transmitting and sharing that security with others. The population in this study does not show significant Preoccupation with other relationships. The other scores in this measurement suggest that the clergy of this study value people and relationships more than tasks, but are also reluctant to become too close to others. This is a curious paradox and is one of the reasons why Feeney et al. (1994) resisted making the
ASQ a categorical measure that places labels on leaders. Instead, the ASQ’s scales are independent so that it is more appropriate to identify ratings relative to the other ones. Table 24 ranks ASQ scores for this population.

Table 24

**ASQ Descriptive Statistics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort w/ Closeness</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Approval</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupation</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships as Secondary</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=totally disagree; 2 strongly disagree; 3=slightly disagree; 4=slightly agree; 5=strongly agree; 6 totally agree

Typically, Discomfort with Closeness is a measure that often is characterized by avoidant leaders who tend to dismiss the needs of followers. This characteristic can interfere with a leaders’ effective ability to be attentive to needs, provide care, and be attuned to followers’ distress. Such leaders tend to focus on job completion, possess a more transactional leadership style, and be more focused on meeting objectives. Avoidant leaders also tend to possess excessive self-reliance and tend to diminish the weight of stress and worry in others and are generally uncomfortable with or unaware of the emotional needs of others (De Sanctis & Karantzaz, 2009). The measurements in this study however, showed consistency as they explored the role of confidence in relationship to the other relational characteristics. All ASQ measurements were found to be negatively correlated with the Confidence measure. This means that as Confidence increases in the sample, the measurements of Discomfort with Closeness, Need for Approval, Preoccupation, and Relationships as Secondary decrease. The reverse is also true; as Confidence decreases, the four other traits (Discomfort with Closeness, Need for Approval, Preoccupation, and Relationships as Secondary) increase among the sample. In
addition, the four measurements of Discomfort with Closeness, Need for Approval, Preocclusion, and Relationships as Secondary are also positively correlated with one another. This means that as any of the non-Confidence measures increases, the other characteristics also increase. Overall, the clergy leaders in this study were average in regard to avoidant attachment and attachment anxiety; though their scores reflected higher avoidance than anxiety.

**Leadership Results.** Avolio and Bass (2004) have also developed a dimensional tool to measure leadership traits and behaviors. The MLQ also resists making categorical measures that places labels on leaders. Instead, the MLQ’s scales are independent so that it is more appropriate to identify ratings relative to the other ones. Nonetheless, because of their strong advocacy for transformational leadership, Avolio and Bass have established what they refer to as “benchmarks” for each of the styles and outcomes of leadership. Table 25 shows clergy scores in comparison with the optimal benchmarks and leadership outcome scores. While clergy in this study scored highest in confidence and transformational leadership, they still scored below the normal range of transformational leadership compared to Avolio and Bass’ (2004) benchmark score for “all leaders.” While the difference is slight, the benchmark allows for a range of scores. Clergy in this study are not just low in the established range, but are beneath it. The reason for this is not entirely clear but additional studies could confirm this difference and identify potential causes.

Table 25

*Benches marks and MLQ scores from Sample Clergy.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style and quality</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Clergy score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All five transformational scales</td>
<td>3.00-3.75</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-0.15-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>2.0-3.0</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-0.81-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception - Active</td>
<td>1.0-2.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.85-0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 - Continued

Benchmarks and MLQ scores from Sample Clergy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style and quality</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Clergy score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception – passive</td>
<td>0-1.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>0-1.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Once in a while; 2=Sometimes; 3=Fairly often; 4=Frequently, if not always

Avolio and Bass (2004) established normative means for all leaders on the basis of a total sample of 27,285 respondents (p. 74). Table 25 shows how the clergy in this study compare with the normative means established by Bass and Avolio. Clergy in this study scored highest in idealized influence (behaviors) suggesting that they talk about their most important values and beliefs, specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose, consider the moral and ethical consequences of their decisions, and emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission (Bass & Avolio, p. 103).

Clergy in this study scored the lowest in laissez faire leadership, but higher than the normative means established by Bass and Avolio. This suggests that the leadership provided by participants in this study may have behaviors that are often characterized as “no leadership;” namely, the absence of intervention, interfering or involvement. Bass and Avolio (2004) described laissez faire as “avoid making decisions, absent when needed, avoids making decisions, and delays response to urgent questions” (p. 105). In both idealized influence, behaviors and laissez faire, the clergy in this population scored higher than the means established by Bass and Avolio.
Table 26

*Normative Means for MLQ Compared to ClergyMeans of Current Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ Attribute</th>
<th>Normative Mean (n=27,285)</th>
<th>Clergy Mean (n=348)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception Active</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception Passive</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Score</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Once in a while; 2=Sometimes; 3=Fairly often; 4=Frequently, if not always

*Figure 2*

*Graph of the Normative Means for MLQ Compared to Clergy Means of Current Study*
The MLQ has three aggregate measures that explore outcomes of leadership. Work satisfaction is measured by evaluating two elements of leadership outcomes: (a) using methods of leadership that are satisfying, and (b) working with others in a satisfying way (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 106). In this study, clergy satisfaction is consistent with all other leaders. Clergy in this study scored just slightly higher than all other leaders.

The MLQ also measures effectiveness by analysis of four elements of leadership:

(a) being effective in meeting others’ work-related needs,

(b) effectively representing group members to a higher authority,

(c) effectively meeting organizational requirements, and


Clergy in this study scored slightly lower than all leaders in terms of effectiveness. This outcome suggests that the clergy in this study are less likely than other leaders to meet others’ work-related needs, effectively represent group members to higher authorities, effectively meet organizational requirements, and lead an effective group. The reasons for this are unclear and may warrant further investigation. One possible reason for this outcome may be that the vast majority of clergy followers are strictly voluntary. In many cases, clergy-congregant relationships do not have the strong – or clear - work-related needs, representative functions, or well-defined organizational requirements that exist in other leader-follower contexts. It is likely that the majority of other studies of leader-follower relationships have clearer parameters that could measure effectiveness or provide effectiveness experiences for those who participate in MLQ surveys.

The MLQ also measures extra effort by evaluating three facets of leadership:

(a) getting others to do more than expected,
(b) elevating others’ desire to succeed, and

(c) increasing others’ willingness to try harder (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 105).

Clergy in this study scored significantly lower than other leaders in the area of extra effort. This outcome suggests that clergy in this study are significantly less likely to effectively get others do more than expected, elevate others’ desire to succeed, and increase others’ willingness to try harder. Once again, further investigation may be warranted as to why clergy in this study scored significantly lower than other leaders in the area of extra effort. It is entirely possible that the voluntary follower environment that characterizes the clergy context for leadership does not lend itself to clergy-leaders regarding themselves as those who can effectively elevate follower functioning.

Transformational Leadership. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), transformational leadership is a process of influence in which leaders change followers’ awareness of what is important and then move them to see both challenges and opportunities in new ways. Transformational leaders are proactive and help their followers to develop, not just meet expectations (p. 103). The quality of idealized influence attributed, measures four behaviors:

(a) instill pride in others for being associated with me,

(b) go beyond self-interest for the good of the group,

(c) act in ways that build others’ respect for me, and

(d) display a sense of power and confidence (p. 103).

Clergy in this study scored lower than the average leader in this area suggesting that they are less likely than the average leader to draw others to themselves in ways that instill pride and respect. Further investigation that explores why clergy scored lower than other leaders may be warranted. One possibility for lower scores within the sample is that the clergy in this study may
see themselves as teachers rather than as leaders. If this is the case, the characteristics of idealized influence attributed may not be as significant to survey respondents who see themselves as teachers rather than leaders.

Four measures are explored for idealized influence (behaviors). They include:

(a) talk about my most important values and beliefs,

(b) specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose,

(c) consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, and

(d) emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 103).

Clergy in this study scored higher than the average for leaders in this area suggesting that they are much more likely than other leaders to consider ethical consequences and talk about values, beliefs, purpose, and collective mission. In light of the population sample, this outcome is not surprising. Most – if not all – of the clergy in this sample have some kind of weekly public platform in which to consider ethics and talk about values, beliefs, and collective mission.

The MLQ also measures inspirational motivation. Inspirational motivation is about providing meaning and challenge to followers’ work in ways that elevate enthusiasm, optimism, and team spirit. Inspirational motivation is measured by these four characteristics:

(a) talk optimistically about the future,

(b) talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished,

(c) articulate a compelling vision of the future, and

(d) express confidence that goals will be achieved (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 103).

Clergy in this study scored lower than the average leader in this area suggesting that they are less likely than the average leader to inspire and motivate their followers. The lower-than-
average leadership scores for the clergy of this sample likely warrant further investigation for causation. It is likely however, that the context of clergy leadership – namely a voluntary one – and the fact that clergy in this study may regard themselves as teachers more than leaders may play a role, and even a significant role, in this kind of outcome.

A fourth area of exploration performed by the MLQ is intellectual stimulation. Intellectual stimulation measures leaders’ self-perceptions on their ability to challenge assumptions, reframe problems, and approach situations in new and innovative ways. Intellectual stimulation uses four characteristics:

(a) the ability to re-examine critical assumptions and question whether they are appropriate,
(b) seek differing perspectives when problem-solving,
(c) get others to look at problems from many different angles, and
(d) suggest new ways of looking at how to complete tasks (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 104).

The clergy in this study were consistent with the average for leaders in this area suggesting that they are similar to other leaders who invite others to reexamine, reframe, and collaborate with others when problem solving.

The final area of exploration for transformational leadership practices was individual consideration. This area measures a leaders’ self-perception of their attention given to followers’ need for achievement and growth. Leaders scoring high in this area provide opportunities and a supportive climate for followers to develop and grow. Individual consideration is measured using four characteristics:

(a) spends time teaching and coaching,
(b) treats others as individuals rather than just a member of the group,
(c) considers each individual as having distinct needs, aspirations, and abilities, and
(d) helps others develop their strengths (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 104).

The clergy who participated in this study scored higher than the average for leaders in this area suggesting that they are much more likely than other leaders to coach, help, and develop their strengths. This higher-than-average score for clergy-leaders in this sample may be further evidence that this clergy group see themselves more as those who instruct as teachers, coaches, and helpers rather than those who imagine themselves as leaders.

**Transactional Leadership.** The MLQ also measures transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio (2004) described transactional leaders as those who “display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions” (p. 104). The constructive style is labeled contingent reward and the corrective style is labeled management by exception. Transactional leaders define expectations and promote performance in order to achieve these levels of expectation. Both contingent reward and management by exception are characteristic of management functions within organizations. The MLQ measures contingent reward using the following characteristics:

(a) provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts,
(b) identifies those responsible for achieving performance targets,
(c) is clear about what will happen when performance goals are achieved, and
(d) expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 104).

The clergy who participated in this study scored significantly lower than other leaders in the area of contingent reward. This outcome suggests that the clergy in this study are less likely than other leaders to provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts, identify those
responsible for achieving performance targets, be clear about what will happen when performance goals are achieved, and express their satisfaction when others meet expectations.

The second measure of transactional leadership is management by exception active. This leadership trait features leaders who set standards for compliance, closely monitors for deviances and mistakes, and takes corrective action as quickly as mistakes occur. The MLQ measures management by exception active by analyzing four characteristics:

(a) focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards,
(b) concentrates full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures, 
(c) keeps tracks of all mistakes, and 
(d) directs attention toward failures to meet standards (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 105).

The clergy who participated in this study scored significantly lower than other leaders in the area of management by exception active. This outcome suggests that the clergy in this study are less likely than other leaders to focus and concentrate attention on mistakes and deviations, keep track of mistakes, and direct their attention toward failures to meet standards. The lower scores in both transactional leadership measures suggest that the clergy in this study are less likely to practice transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is based upon a leader-follower relationship that offers rewards or punishments for compliance. In light of the unique voluntary context of the clergy leader-follower relationship where followers could disassociate with their leader, and the likelihood that most clergy-leaders would not want to relate in reward-punishment terms, this outcome is not surprising.

**Passive / Avoidant Leadership.** In addition to transformational, transactional, a third category of leadership behavior is measured by the MLQ entitled passive/avoidant. This is another form
of management by exception but is more passive. It does not respond to situations and problems systematically, but instead, reacts. This style has a negative effect on desired outcomes. The MLQ measures passive/avoidant leaders in two broad categories: management by exception passive and laissez-faire. Management by exception passive uses four criteria as measurements. They include:

(a) failure to interfere until problems become serious,

(b) waiting for things to go wrong before taking action,

(c) shows a firm belief in “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it,” and

(d) demonstrates that problems must become chronic before action is taken (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 105).

The clergy who participated in this study scored significantly higher than other leaders in the area of management by exception passive. This suggests that the clergy in this study are more likely than other leaders to delay intervention before things become a serious problem. These higher scores are likely an area for further investigation. It is entirely possible that the congregational context for leadership may be a significant factor as to why management by exception passive may be a preferred style of clergy in this sample.

The second style of passive-avoidant behavior that is measured by the MLQ is laissez-faire. Laissez-faire is sometimes referred to as “no leadership” and is characterized by an absence of intervention, interfering or involvement. The MLQ measures four characteristics of laissez-faire leadership including:

(a) avoid getting involved when important issues arise,

(b) is absent when they are needed,

(c) avoids making decisions, and
(d) delays response to urgent questions (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 105).

The clergy who participated in this study scored significantly higher than other leaders in the area of laissez-faire leadership. This suggests that the clergy in this study are much more likely than other leaders to avoid getting involved, may be absent when they are needed, avoid making decisions, and delay their responses to urgent questions. Intriguingly, this outcome has a relationship with the next section on professional longevity. It is entirely possible that clergy have learned that a passive style of leadership in congregations may increase their professional longevity in their congregation.

**Professional Longevity.** Research question one also explored within the sample the number of congregations that clergy have served, the duration of their service to particular congregations, and whether they had ever experienced a formal separation from their congregation. The average number of congregations served is 2.46, the average duration of service to a congregation is 7.15 years, and the average termination rate for the population was 9.48%. This study however, does not account for those who have completed their careers and therefore, seems congruent with other norms. This study also revealed that the average duration of service is 7.15 years.

As observed in Chapter I, it is increasingly difficult to measure some forms of data. Some of this is due to protecting clergy and congregations, while other challenges relate to the ministry settings and roles. For example, some clergy are assigned by denominational officials only to be reassigned at those same officials’ discretion. Other clergy – whether denominationally bound or not – are the primary determiners of the length of their service. Nonetheless, this study’s average of 7.15 years is consistent with a ten-year-old study of Protestant, Evangelical, Baptist ministers that found an average duration of 7.7 years (Barnes, 2005). The termination rate of 9.48% for this population is lower than what might be expected in
light of other research. As described in Chapter I, clergy termination and separation rates are increasingly problematic to quantify. This study however, revealed a clergy termination rate at 9.48%, with one respondent (3%) reporting more than one termination. This number seems to be substantially lower than most existing research. This outcome may suggest that the denomination involved in this study has lower separation rates for its clergy than other denominations. It may also suggest that those with ecclesiastical separations may not complete a survey that inquires about termination history. As observed in Chapter III, 466 clergy began this survey; 348 completed it.

**Findings Related to Research Question Two**

The second research question in this study investigated the strength of the relationship between clergy attachment style and their leadership behaviors. As observed in research question one, confidence is the ASQ’s key measurement for security as it measures a positive view of self and others. Those who score higher in confidence nearly always score lower in avoidant attachment, anxiety, and their measures. Research question two explores the strength of the relationship between clergy-leader attachment behaviors and their leadership behaviors. The study offers five key findings.

First and most significantly, avoidant attachment and attachment anxiety are negatively correlated with the five I’s of transformational leadership (idealized influence – attributes, idealized influence – behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration). As avoidant attachment scores and attachment anxiety scores rise, transformational leadership markers go down. As avoidance and anxiety scores go down, transformational leadership markers rise. This correlation is moderate but significant. This suggests that there is a relationship between anxiety and avoidance and transformational
leadership. This result is consistent with those who have seen a theoretical link between attachment and transformational leadership (Mayseless, 2010; Popper, 2004; Shaver & Mikulincer; Simpson & Rholes, 2010) and studies that demonstrate secure attachment with transformational leadership behaviors (McMannus, 2009; Popper, 2002; Popper & Amit, 2009; Popper et al., 2000; Shalit et al., 2010).

Second, there were three MLQ characteristics that are negatively correlated with the ASQ value of Confidence and a positive correlation with the other ASQ measurements. This means that as Confidence/security rises, the transactional leadership value of management by exception (active) reduces, as does the avoidant values of management by exception passive and laissez faire. Confidence reduces some of transactional leadership and all of avoidant leadership. The reverse is true: as confidence goes down, avoidant and passive leadership goes up. This suggests that more secure the clergy in this population are, the more likely they are to practice transformational leadership and the less likely they are to practice transactional or passive-avoidant leadership.

These findings are consistent with previous research related to the avoidant attachment style (Mayseless, 2010; Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003; Keller, 1999; Popper, 2000). Secure leaders tend to be socialized, charismatic leaders who seek positive outcomes on behalf of the groups they represent, while avoidant leaders are likely to be personalized charismatic leaders who are motivated by self-serving objectives (Popper, 2002). In addition, secure individuals are able to show more transformational leadership behaviors than the other attachment types (Popper et al., 2000).

Third, as one would expect, there are six MLQ leadership characteristics that have a positive correlation with confidence and a negative correlation with all of the other ASQ
attachment measurements. The six include: idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward. For the most part, these come as no surprise as confidence measures a positive view of self and others and each of the measurements have an interpersonal dimension. Contingent reward is somewhat surprising as this is a transactional leadership value. In this study, the correlation of these six is weak and sometimes fluctuates – particularly, contingent reward. This suggests that conclusions should be drawn cautiously and that these correlations are not necessarily firm or predictable.

Fourth, attachment anxiety and avoidant attachment have a positive correlation. Meaning, as avoidant attachment rises, so does attachment anxiety and vice versa. In some respects, this is both predictable and a surprise. The correlation is predictable in that avoidant attachment is both insecure and anxious; it is a surprise in the sense that avoidant leaders tend to avoid relationships and relational proximity while those anxiously attached tend to hyper-focus on relationships. Those with more anxious attachment tend to need a relationship and often, excessively. Anxiously attached clergy may be over-focused on their own feelings and preoccupied with relationship issues so that they may be less likely to be perceived as leaders (Mayseless, 2010; Popper, 2000).

Some leaders who are avoidant tend to deny any need for relationship as they regard themselves or others with suspicion. While some avoidant leaders may seem cold and deactivated, they may not require close relationships with followers, and may still find ways of having a high regard for themselves and may still be in settings where they are highly effective leaders (Popper, 2000). More secure attachment however, is still a preferred attachment orientation over attachment anxiety or avoidant attachment. When controlling for either, “secure
attachment continues to be positively associated with leadership qualities while avoidant and anxious-ambivalent attachment styles are negatively associated” (Game, 2011, p. 329). The outcome of this study demonstrated a consistent link between secure attachment and higher transformational leadership scores.

Fifth, confidence was a significant predictor of seven MLQ variables, including: idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, and laissez-faire. This outcome is not surprising as a positive view of self and others is linked to confidence. In addition, confidence, need for approval, and relationship as secondary consistently and continually proved to be predictors of the MLQ measurements. This suggests that clergy personal and relational orientation is significant in predicting the kind of leadership that parish pastors are likely to provide; those with higher confidence scores will have higher transformational leadership scores. Those with a need for approval or who regard relationships as secondary are likely to have lower transformational leadership scores.

Sixth and last, there were a number of findings in this study that did not necessarily “fit” what one would expect or predict in this study. Discomfort with closeness and relationships as secondary – traits one would expect to be markers of transactional and avoidant leadership - were not predictors for any of the measurements. Additional pairings that were not significant include: discomfort with closeness and contingent reward, relationships as secondary and contingent reward, preoccupation and contingent reward, preoccupation and idealized behaviors.

The failure of each of these pairings to fit within a predictable model is yet another reminder that leadership relationships involve “attachment dynamics” more than actual attachment bonds (Game, 2011, p. 328). It is likely that leader-follower relationships share
common terrain with attachment bonds that relational working models are activated when leaders interact or think about their leader-follower relationship (Collins & Read, 1994; Mayseless, 2010). This suggests that while attachment and leadership dynamics likely interface in this population, more research is warranted to see how and why they interrelate.

**Findings Related to Research Question Three**

The third research question in this study investigated whether clergy attachment and leadership style could be used to predict average longevity and involuntary separations within their congregations. As stated in Chapter I, it is increasingly difficult to cite specific reasons why clergy-congregational relationships fail; sometimes to protect clergy, sometimes to protect congregations. The denomination utilized for this survey witnessed a 580% rise in terminations from the 1990s to the 2000s and a tripling in clergy resignations during that same time period (Schuurman, 2014).

In this study, a model of multiple regression was used to examine three variables that predict longevity; two of which are ASQ attachment variables and one that is an MLQ leadership variable. Predictors include the ASQ variables of Relationships as Secondary and Need for Approval and the MLQ variable of Management by Exception Passive. Unexpectedly, two of these three “negative” characteristics actually predicted increased longevity within the sample. As all other variables were held constant, for every increase in Relationships as Secondary by one point, average longevity actually *increased* by 0.92 years. In addition, the MLQ leadership behavior Management by Exception Passive, demonstrates an increase in leader professional longevity in a congregation: for every one-point rise in Management by Exception Passive, average longevity increases by one year.
Not surprisingly, the ASQ attachment value of Need for Approval has a negative correlation. For every one-point increase in Need for approval, clergy professional longevity decreases by 1.46 years. Need for approval is a marker of anxiety in the clergy-congregation relationship on the clergy side. These variables suggested that if the clergy who are part of this study have relative independence and a reduction in Need for approval, “they will likely increase the staying power of clergypersons in their congregations. The study demonstrates that the greater the clergyperson’s need for approval, the shorter professional longevity he or she is likely to have in his or her congregation. This is consistent with research that suggests that followers are likely to detect a negative self-model or a need for closeness that followers will experience as intrusive, self-preserving, and controlling (Davidovitz et al. 2007; Mayseless, 2010). Leaders who overly “present themselves as vulnerable (with the goal of achieving closeness) are unlikely to be perceived as effective” (Game, 2011, p. 330).

A logistical regression was also used to determine if there were any predictors for clergy separation from their congregation. The only predictor with statistical significance is the MLQ variable of “idealized influence – behaviors.” All other ASQ and MLQ variables were not statistically significant. This suggests that as clergy persons in the sample become more transformational in their leadership behaviors, the more likely they are to experience a separation from their congregation. For every one point of increase in idealized influence behaviors that clergy have, their estimated odds of termination are 2.106 higher. These findings certainly challenge assumptions of the effectiveness of transformational leadership as a leadership style.

For the purposes of this study, I have uncovered an important leadership insight for this population in terms of their professional longevity in their congregations: clergy who are in need of regular approval and affirmation are likely to have shorter professional longevity in their
congregation. A second, and less obvious insight is this: those who passively practice management by exception are likely to last longer in their congregation than those who seek to enact transformation in their behaviors. Put more pointedly, churches may prefer a leadership style that is passive and resembles priestly management more than a style that resembles prophetic engagement that might involve transformation.
### Table 27

**Summary of Key Findings of this Study and Comparisons to Previous Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings (Nelesen, 2016)</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The negative attachment relationship traits of anxiety and avoidance are related to each other.</td>
<td>- Both anxious preoccupation with closeness in relationships and avoidance in relationships is linked with negative self-reliance (Davidovitz et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low security (measured by confidence) is a significant predictor for anxiety and avoidance</td>
<td>- Leaders with anxious attachment styles may be less suited for leadership roles and less likely to be perceived as leaders (Mayseless, 2010; Popper, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attachment behaviors and leadership behaviors are related to each other.</td>
<td>- Attachment and leader-follower behaviors mirror one another in the development of supportive and emotional regulation strategies (Popper, 2000; Mayseless, 2010; Yukl, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety and Avoidance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neither discomfort with closeness nor preoccupation were significant predictors of any MLQ measurements in this study.</td>
<td>- Those who are anxious tend to ruminate on relationship events (Mikulincer, Shaver, &amp; Pereg, 2003). Anxious employees tend to focus more on their feelings and need for approval to the detriment of task performance (Hazan &amp; Shaver, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security (measured by confidence) is a significant positive predictor for transformational leadership. (Lower security raises non-relational styles of leadership)</td>
<td>- Securely attached leaders have transformational leadership behaviors (Shalit et al. 2010). Leaders’ attachment security positively linked with pro-social, empowering leadership with positive outcomes (Mayseless, 2010). Secure attachment is associated with a transformational leadership style in both leaders and followers (Popper, Mayseless &amp; Castelnovo, 2000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 Continued

Summary of Key Findings of this Study and Comparisons to Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings (Nelesen, 2016)</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need for approval and relationships as secondary predict transactional and passive-avoidant leadership</td>
<td>• In achievement contexts, avoidant individuals may have high self-efficacy and be competent leaders in situations that do not require close relationships with followers (Popper, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strongest Leadership Style**
- Clergy highest scoring leadership style: Transformational leadership.

**Strongest Leadership Traits**
- Clergy highest scoring leadership traits; idealized Influence (both behaviors and attributed)

**Weakest Leadership Trait**
- Laissez Faire (passive leadership) is lowest in the sample (0.80), but higher than the average for leaders in general (0.65) (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 74).

Affirms:
- Transformational leadership is pastors’ highest scoring leadership style (Carpenter, 2006; Carter, 2009; Casamento, 2009; Corbett, 2006; Gaston, 2005)

Affirms:
- Pastors identify idealized behaviors as their predominant self-perceived leadership style (Carpenter, 2006, Casamento, 2009). Senior Pastors with highest MLQ score in Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Influence – behaviors and attributed (Lee, 2005)

Disputes:
- Pastor-leader effectiveness measured best by Individual Consideration (Carter, 2009)

Affirms:
- Lower rates of laissez faire leadership within samples among clergy (Rumley, 2011).
- Higher burnout rates for clergy who have laissez faire style of leadership (Exantus, 2011).

Disputes:
- Christopherson (2014) study: 71% of clergy sample identified themselves as having laissez faire leadership (mean 1.08)
Summary of Key Findings of this Study and Comparisons to Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings (Nelesen, 2016)</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Longevity in Congregations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional longevity increases slightly with some transactional and passive leadership styles.</td>
<td>New Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clergy leader professional longevity is reduced with increased need for approval.</td>
<td>New Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transformational leadership as expressed in Idealized Influence Behaviors in congregational settings increases the likelihood of clergy separation</td>
<td>New Finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clergy / Congregation Separation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current study reflects a 9.48% clergy-congregation separation rate</td>
<td>• 1,700 US pastors separate from their congregation per month (Kreijer, 2007). Between 19-41% of all pastors experience a forced termination (Tanner, 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications and Recommendations

While select studies have used the MLQ to examine clergy leadership, this is the first known study to explore the relationship between clergy attachment and transformational leadership behaviors. Attachment theory poses that humans bring previous relational patterns, experiences, and feelings to our current and new relationships. These previous relationship patterns (in the field known as prototypes or antecedents) become paradigms or outlines of how individuals configure new relationship patterns. Like most transference, human beings usually bring with them these working models of interpersonal relationships unconsciously and unintentionally. Awareness of attachment dynamics is helpful when considering transformational, transactional, and avoidant leadership styles of relating; each of which seems to
be at least moderately informed by attachment behaviors. Yet, awareness of attachment dynamics in leadership is one part and his or her leadership practices is another. These are separate, but overlapping systems in play for leadership.

We now suggest that leader’s internal world involves at least two relevant affective representational systems - attachment which deals with followers’ feelings of distress and caregiving which deals with the leader’s motivation to help others develop and thrive (Mayseless, 2006, 2012). This motivational system develops somewhat in tandem, yet they are separate and distinct…a transformational leader is expected to have internalized a general secure stance in his or her attachment representations; yet such a leader also needs to develop caregiving representations whereby others are perceived as worthy of care and whereby the leader is also motivated to care for the other as well as to have developed adequate capacities to do so. Hence, a secure attachment style is only a prerequisite yet not a sufficient condition for the development of a transformational leader. (Popper & Mayseless, 2013, p. 266)

In light of this, this study offers the following four recommendations for clergy, congregations, and seminaries. First, those who are concerned with developing clergy leadership within congregations would be wise to develop clergy understanding and discernment around attachment dynamics; both their own and those at work within their congregations. Clergy self-understanding is key. Leadership however, takes two (or more) and it is essential that leaders “know their stuff,” meaning, not just have expertise, but know how their past interpersonal dynamics influence current relational pattern formation. In light of the fact that the process of leadership takes two or more, clergy leaders would also be wise to carefully learn the attachment
dynamics of their prospective followers. “Motivating people – a central role of a leader – is not dependent solely on the leader’s behavior but is also dependent with emotional dispositions – some of which can be identified with attachment theory” (Popper & Mayseless, 2013, p. 267).

Highly anxious, avoidant, or traumatized congregations – or pastors for that matter - may not be immediately ready or eager for all of the attention, relationality, and depth of engagement that comes with those who are securely attached. Prior research has demonstrated that insecure people can become more secure when matched with a secure partner but this security takes time (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Hazan, 1994). This study demonstrated that clergy in this sample scored highest in the area of confidence; a category that measures how one regards self and others. The study also demonstrated that confidence was a significant predictor for the five I’s of transformational leadership (idealized attributes, Idealized behaviors, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation). If the ideal is clergy who are high scoring in confidence and transformational leadership, the population for this study exhibit it. These characteristics however, will not ensure professional longevity; in fact, they may reduce it. Congregations may be environments that need transformational leadership but may not want it.

Second, it would be wise for clergy, congregations, and seminaries to learn the dynamics of loss. Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980, 1988) has shown the immense power of the dynamic of loss to impact the capacity for relating to others, having and maintaining security, and cultivating a safe haven and secure base from out of which to live our lives. It is unlikely that most people, let alone religious communities, are aware of the way previous relational losses impact our capacity to form new bonds or feel safe and secure in current ones. In attachment terms, fear and anxiety are the direct result of having lost or fearing losing. This interpersonal dynamic is a human one and certainly one that exists between leaders and their followers. Multiple leadership theorists
and practitioners are recognizing that some of the first and most important work of leadership is doing “grief-work” with followers (Bridges, 1991; Dittes, 1999; Goleman et al., 2013; Hamman, 2005; Heifetz & Linskey, 2002; Kohlreiser, 2006; Kohlreiser et al., 2012).

Third, it would be wise for clergy, congregations and seminaries to nurture the development of the interpersonal and empathetic skills of clergy. Central to both attachment behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors is the role of empathy in interpersonal relationships. Empathy is nurtured in early childhood and is a result of the quality of early attachment relationships with one’s primary caregiver (Henderson, 1974) and expresses itself in attunement with the experience of others. Empathy is commonly characterized by perspective taking, concern, and awareness of another’s personal distress (Davis, 1983). Empathy is at the heart of pro-social behaviors, emotional intelligence, and the kind of charismatic leadership advocated by Bass (1985). Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1987) saw leadership as leaders meeting the attachment needs by someone who was older, stronger, and wiser. Whether a child or an adult, times of distress and protest are best worked out with someone who is accessible, empathetic to that concern, attentive, and responsive.

Those with insecure attachment styles tend to have lower levels of empathy, more interpersonal problems (Khodabakhsh, 2012) and reduced capacity for engagement as a result of having a view that regards the self as unworthy or others as hostile and uncaring (Ainsworth, 1985). Kohlreiser (2012) suggested that leaders should strive for high levels of caring and daring. For him, this creates a “sweet spot” of leadership where dynamics exist between leaders and followers whereby each hit their highest levels of performance and have positive impact on others.
While Kohlreiser does not use the nomenclature of transformational leadership – and instead refers to it as “secure base leadership” – elevated functions of leaders and followers is a result of engagement and empathy; something that cannot be found without dealing with one’s own hurts and needs. Clergy in this study scored high on laissez faire leadership (0.80 compared to the normative mean of 0.65) suggesting that they may be slow to intervene as problems arise. Such a leadership posture may delay important conversations and engagements in themselves and in the congregation. Mikulincer and Shaver (2016) suggested that part of leadership involves intentionally and “constructively dealing with existential concerns – death, freedom, and isolation – may also make it easier to adopt a compassionate, responsible, and respectful attitude toward other people” (p. 514). Clergy, congregations, and seminaries would be wise to find ways of nurturing and cultivating leaders who have engaged these questions as a means of developing a capacity for support for others.

Last, clergy, congregations, and seminaries might find it hopeful that clergy-congregation separation rates may not be as high as they seem. As observed in Chapter I, there are multiple challenges in measuring what constitutes and causes separations between clergy and their congregations. Like divorce rates, clergy-congregation separation rates may be exaggerated so that it seems as though they are higher than they really are; and like divorce, the reasons are complicated to determine causation. This study put the separation rate below 10% for this population. In actuality, this number is likely higher for the whole population given the number of respondents who began the survey but did not finish or submit it.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Although this study provides rare and valuable data on clergy attachment, leadership style, longevity, and separation rates, it is not without limitations. For example, this study used
population sampling for a small, bi-national, Protestant denomination based in the Midwest. As such, the results of the study cannot be generalized to all clergy who might represent other denominations and faith traditions.

Second, as observed in chapter II, clergy leadership is a unique species of leadership. Unlike most leader-follower settings, churches are multifaceted, voluntary associations of followers. As such, clergy leadership in congregational settings may not be transmittable to all other arenas of leadership.

Third, this study focused on those parish-based pastors who are serving congregations or who are eligible to serve. As such, the data in this study does not represent those who have served congregations, separated or terminated, and then went on to pursue other careers. Future studies could investigate clergy who previously served congregations but then did not remain in the vocation of clergyperson.

Fourth, although the sample size for this study is appropriate to generate a 95% confidence rate or more, the denomination utilized for this study is comparatively small to other denominations and is predominantly and disproportionately represented by those who are male and white. Future studies might target larger denominations, be more ecumenical in nature, and include more gender and ethnic diversity. Several studies suggest there is no link between gender and attachment style (Fraley & Shaver, 1998; McManus, 2009; Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Rholes et al., 2007; Roberts et al., 1996; Pietromonaco & Barrett, 1997; Pistole & Arricale, 2003), while others find significant gender-based variations in attachment style (Mickelson et al., 1997; Moller et al., 2003; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). Specifically, links were found where men have significantly lower attachment anxiety than women (Creasely & Hesson-McInnis, 2001) and women have significant lower levels of avoidant attachment than men (Birnbaum, Reis,
Mikulincer, Gillath, & Orpaz, 2006; Impett et al., 2006). Women have also been found to have higher levels of transformational leadership than men (Druskat, 1994). The population utilized for this study is severely underrepresented by women and ethnic minorities. Future studies could offset this disparity.

Fifth, the data used in this study was derived from instrumentation that was self-reported by the clergy of this population. Although collecting self-reported data is legitimate, helpful, practical, and reliable, it is measuring respondents’ self-perceptions. As such, it may be biased and cannot be verified. Participants were also aware that this study was measuring leadership and relationships in ways that might affect their expectations about preferred responses; this is endemic of all self-report surveys. In particular, attachment surveys are exclusively self-report instruments. In addition, the ASQ attachment instrument is designed to yield scores on continuous scales and not to assign individuals to groups or “styles;” neither are there “cut-off scores” for any clinical purposes. Future studies however, could measure clergy leadership style using the perceptions of the local church board, board chair, or congregation. The MLQ leadership instrument used for this study is a self-report measurement tool, but is also available in a format that allows followers to score their leader.

Sixth, the data for this study was gathered using an electronic survey. While there are multiple advantages to measuring in this manner, surveys, by their very nature, can create response bias. Some respond immediately, some take time, others ignore, and some forget. There were 118 respondents who began the survey but did not complete it and whose data were not a part of this study. It is likely that the clergy who did not finish the survey are of a similar kind, yet there is no way to discern their attachment or leadership styles. The absence of their response may create a non-response bias that may differ in meaningful ways from those who did
respond. Future studies might garner greater respondent retention by reducing the size of the survey, asking less specific personal and leadership questions, and by removing questions related to clergy separation.

Seventh, this study used the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Feeney, et al., 1994) to measure attachment and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) which measured leadership behaviors. While both of these research tools are proven and respected instruments to measure attachment and leadership behaviors, there are no known studies that use the ASQ with clergy and few that utilize the MLQ for clergy in parish settings. It is likely that both of these instruments have limitations given the nature of both attachment and leadership dynamics in parish-based clergy. Future studies could utilize different attachment and leadership measurement instruments to explore the relationships between attachment and leadership.

Eighth, attachment theory presumes that subjects have working models for how relationships work and leadership theory presumes working relationships with followers. The research surveys used in this study do not specifically control for clergy subjectivity in how they contextualize their relationships or their leadership. For example, depending on the context for their relationships and their leadership, some clergy in this study might be imagining their relationships with staff, others with their church board, and others, responding according to their relationship with their congregation. Future studies might be more specific about the object of clergy relationship and leadership.

Finally, one of the limitations of this study relates to measuring the average years served by the clergy of this study. Participants were asked to provide the number of congregations served and list how many years of service to each congregation. Average years of service was
based upon all congregations served including service to their current congregation. Clergy, who
in general have had longer-term pastorates in the past but who are relatively new to their current
congregations, will have longevity rates that may not be representative or reflective of career
longevity. For this reason, a secondary analysis was done to determine professional longevity in
their current congregation. While the number of years served on average and in the current
context was within a year of each other, it is possible that those serving shorter pastorates would
choose not to complete the survey or that section of the survey, thereby creating the possibility of
response bias. Future studies could also investigate attachment and leadership dimensions by
one’s maturity in ministry. It is likely that one’s attachment and leadership behaviors are
nuanced over prolonged time and experience.

Closing Thoughts

Common sense would suggest that clergy need to be strong in relationships in order to be
effective in their leadership. Yet, this study demonstrates that if “effectiveness” is measured in
transformational leadership as measured by the MLQ instrument, it is likely going to result in
shorter professional longevity. If one seeks longer professional longevity in a particular
congregation, then a more passive leadership style may be warranted. Yet, passive leadership
works against the grain of clergy vocation and the discipline of good leadership. If leadership is
about relationships (Popper, 2004) and likely, the most important component of leadership
(Gardner et al., 2005), then good preparation and practice for ministry will cultivate relational
forms of leadership. As this study demonstrates, anxiety and avoidance interfere with both
confidence and transformational leadership. It also follows that clergy success and effectiveness
is likely going to be rooted – if not dependent – on one’s ability to feel and be secure. Personal,
relational, and congregational crises can challenge and uproot clergy security. Clergy who are
not secure in their relationships and in their work are highly unlikely to have the resources to be able to provide a safe haven and a secure base for their congregations.

Anxiety generally results from loss or a fear of losing and tends to be contagious for individuals and communities. Human beings have reduced capacity for connection and fulfillment when preoccupied with survival needs. The clergy leader has an important role in anxiety management. Depending on the functioning of the clergy leader, anxiety can be reduced or amplified. She or he will set an important tone and model a way of being and working together. Exploration, fulfillment, socialization and transformation happens when we are able to feel safe, secure, and see the benefits of working together with others.

Accepting the role of a leader transforms an individual – at least for a time – and therefore makes the leader an important attachment figure. Secure people provide a safe haven and a secure base as they function as parents, partners, or helpers and can “focus fully and accurately on others’ needs without being deflected by personal distress or cynical lack of empathy. The positive view of self and others are likely to sustain sensitive, responsive and effective caregiving” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016, p. 481). For clergy, perhaps the most significant beginning for congregational leadership lies within finding one’s own attachment security in from their safe havens and secure bases. Such “places” are the only platforms for empathetic care and transformational leadership.
REFERENCES


Creasey, G., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (2001). Affective responses, cognitive appraisals,


Davidovitz, R., Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Leaders as attachment figures:


Jackson, R. B. (2010). *Feedback and coaching for african american pastors: An application project for development of leadership capabilities* (Order No. 3429357). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest


Wiley & Sons.


Langley, W. M. (2000). *The role of pastoral leadership in the sociopolitically active African American Church* (Order No. 9961630). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (304608942). Retrieved from


Pietromonaco, P. R., & Barrett, L. F. (1997). Working models of attachment and daily


Popper, M., Amit, K., Gal, R., Mishkal-Sinai, M., & Lisak, A. (2004). The capacity to lead: Major psychological differences between leaders and nonleaders. *Military...


Appendix A

Permission to use Attachment Style Questionnaire
From: Judith Feeney
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2015 4:00 PM
To: Marc Nelesen

Mark,

The ASQ is not copyright, and you are welcome to use it in your research.

Please note that the ASQ is designed to yield scores on continuous scales, and not to assign individuals to groups or 'styles'; neither do we have 'cut-off scores' for any clinical purposes.

I attach three documents that you will need to read: a pre-formatted version of our original (1994) book chapter on the ASQ which describes the five scales it measures; a copy of the measure with scoring information for the five scales, which you can format as you need; and a more recent article describing a shorter version that yields scores on two scales.

The two scales are formed as follows from the original 40 items:

Note: Items 3, 19-21, 31, 37, and 38 must be reversed-scored prior to computing the two scales:

(1) The Attachment Avoidance score is computed by averaging (or summing) items 3-5, 8-10, 14, 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 25, 34, and 37.

(2) The Attachment Anxiety score is computed by averaging (or summing) items 11, 13, 15 ,18, 22, 24, 27, 29-33, and 38.

Kind regards,

Judith
Appendix B

Attachment Style Questionnaire

ASQ
Attachment Style Questionnaire


1-6 Response Scale:

Show how much you agree with each of the following items by rating them on this scale:

1 = totally disagree;  2 = strongly disagree; 3 = slightly disagree  
4 = slightly agree; 5 = strongly agree; 6 = totally agree

1. Overall, I feel\(^a\) like I am a worthwhile person.
2. I am easier to get to know than most people.
3. I feel confident that people will be there for me when I need them.
4. I prefer to depend on myself rather than other people.
5. I prefer to keep to myself.
6. To ask for help feels as though I am inadequate\(^b\)
7. People's worth should be judged by what they achieve.
8. I tend to put more energy into getting tasks done than into relationships\(^c\).
9. Doing your best is more important than connecting with others\(^d\).
10. If you've got a job to do, you should do it even if people get in the way\(^e\).
11. It's important to me that others like me.
12. It's important to me to avoid doing things that others won't like.
13. I find it hard to make a decision unless I know what other people think.
14. My relationships with others tend to be somewhat superficial.
15. Sometimes I feel like I am no good at all.
16. I find it hard to trust other people.
17. I find it difficult to depend on others.
18. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to other people.
20. I find it easy to trust others.
21. I am comfortable depending on other people.
22. I worry that others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.
23. I worry about people getting too close to me.
24. I worry that I won't measure up to other people’s expectations.
25. I have mixed feelings about being close to others.
26. While I want to get close to others, I feel uneasy about it.
27. I sometimes wonder why people would want to be involved with me.
28. It's very important to me to have a close relationship.
29. I worry a lot about my relationships.
30. I wonder how I would cope without someone to love me.
31. I feel confident about relating to others.
32. I often feel left out or alone.
33. I often worry that I do not really fit in with other people.
34. Other people have their own problems so I don’t bother them with mine.
35. When I talk over my problems with others, I generally feel ashamed or foolish.
36. I am too busy with other activities to put much time into relationships.
37. If something is bothering me, others are generally aware and concerned.
38. I am confident that other people will like and respect me.
39. I get frustrated when others are not available when I need them.
40. Other people often disappoint me.
Survey adaptations:

1a – addition of “feel”
6b – “to admit that you are a failure” changed to “feels as though I am inadequate”
8c – “Achieving things is more important than building relationships” changed to “I tend to put more energy into getting tasks done than relationships”
9d – “getting on with others” changed to “connecting with others”
10e – “you should do it no matter who gets hurt” changed to “even if people get in the way”
23f – addition of “to me”.
24g– “measure up to other people” changed to “measure up to others’ expectations”
Appendix C

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

(*copyrighted; copy for HSIRB only*)
Appendix D

Informed Consent
Please read this consent information before you begin the survey.

You are invited to participate in a research project “Transformed Attachments: The Relationship Between Clergy Attachment and Transformational Leadership Behaviors.”

This survey will take between 10-15 minutes of your time. Your responses are important as they will help pastors, churches, seminaries and denominations. This research is designed to better understand the relationship between how a pastor’s relational skills impacts his or her leadership style.

After completion of the survey, you will be entered into a random drawing to win one of four $25 Amazon gift cards.

Your responses will be kept confidential, and they will not be connected to you in the data analysis or results section of the survey.

When you begin the survey, you are consenting to participate in the study. If you do not consent, simply exit now. If after beginning the survey, you decide that you do not wish to continue, you may stop at any time. You may also choose not to respond to a particular question for any reason. There are no right or wrong answers. What is important is that you respond to each statement as honestly as you can.

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on ____________________.

Should you have any questions prior or during this study, you can contact the principal investigator, Dr. Sue Poppink at Western Michigan University Department of Educational Leadership Research and Technology at (269) 387-3569 or sue.poppink@wmich.edu or the student investigator marc.a.nelesen@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (269) 387-8298 or the Vice President for Research at (269) 387-8294 if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

Thank you for your participation!

*This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.*
Appendix E

Email to Potential Participants
From: [Researcher’s email address]  
To: [Group email address]  
Subject: Clergy Survey on Leadership and Relationship Styles  

Dear Colleague:

Grace and peace to you…

My name is Marc Nelesen, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership, Research and Technology at Western Michigan University. I am sending you this email to request your participation in a research study. This research is being conducted as part of the requirements for my doctorate degree in Educational Leadership. The research is designed to better understand how a pastor’s relational skills impacts his or her leadership style.

As a fellow Christian Reformed pastor and Regional Pastor, I am deeply invested in this topic. I have long-believed that we have the best and hardest vocation. Best because we have opportunities to be at the most important moments in peoples’ lives, and hardest because being a pastor in the current U.S. and Canadian environments is increasingly challenging for both pastors and churches. It is my hope that this research will aid in your reflection on leadership and relationships and ultimately, will enhance clergy effectiveness and longevity.

The online survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. All your responses will be kept anonymous and confidential.

Once you have completed this survey, you will be entered into a random drawing to win one of four $25 gift cards to Amazon.com.

The link to the survey is: _____________________

Your email address was obtained from the Christian Reformed Church Yearbook.

As a measure to protect your privacy, a blind copy email format is being used so that the list of recipients will not appear to others.

Thank you for taking the time to assist in this research.

Sincerely,
Rev. Marc Nelesen
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Follow-up Email Reminder to Potential Participants
Dear Colleague:

My name is Marc Nelesen, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership, Research and Technology at Western Michigan University. If you have already completed the survey I sent to you about two weeks ago, thank you for your time! I am grateful for your participation in my study. If you have not, please continue to read this email.

I am sending you this email to request your participation in a research study. This research is being conducted as part of the requirements for my doctorate degree in Educational Leadership. The research is designed to better understand the relationship between a pastor’s relational skills and his or her leadership style.

As a fellow Christian Reformed pastor and Regional Pastor, I am deeply invested in this topic. I have long-believed that we have the best and hardest vocation. Best because we have opportunities to be at the most important moments in peoples’ lives, and hardest because being a pastor in the current U.S. and Canadian environments is increasingly challenging for both pastors and churches. It is my hope that this research will aid in your reflection on leadership and relationships and, that ultimately it will enhance clergy effectiveness and longevity in our congregations.

The confidential, online survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. All your responses will be kept confidential.

Once you have completed this survey, you will be entered into a random drawing to win one of four $25 gift cards to Amazon.com.

The link to the survey is: _________________________

Your email address was obtained from the CRC Yearbook.

As a measure to protect your privacy, a blind copy email format is being used so that the list of recipients will not appear to others.

Thank you for taking the time to assist in this research.

Sincerely,

Rev. Marc Nelesen
Appendix G

Additional Survey Questions
Additional Survey Questions

1. Are you male or female?

2. With what race do you identify? (White, Hispanic, Asian, Black, American Indian, other (please identify)

3. Including your current congregation, how many different congregations have you served as an ordained minister?

4. For each congregation you have served as an ordained minister, please list the number of years you have served at each one (beginning with your current congregation and listing up to 6 congregations):

   ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

5. Approximately how many members are in your current congregation?

6. Have you ever terminated your relationship with your congregation or had your congregation terminate their relationship with you in a way that called for “terms” or for a formal separation agreement?
   - No
   - Yes,
   - If yes, with how many different congregations?
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Human Subjects Internal Review Board Approval Letter
Date: April 11, 2016

To: Sue Poppink, Principal Investigator
   Marc Nelesen, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 16-04-05

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Transformed Attachments: The Relationship between Clergy Attachment Style and Their Leadership Behaviors” has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., **you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study”).** Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

**Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.**

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

**Approval Termination:** April 10, 2017