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Abstract

Work-home interference is increasing due to challenges in balancing the demands of home and work environments. Yet, certain individuals are more susceptible to interference than others. We predicted that individuals’ attachment styles would influence the effects of work-home interference on relationship and job satisfaction. Participants ($N = 150$) completed online questionnaires measuring relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, perceived work-home interference, and attachment styles. We examined the associations between work-home interference and relationship/job satisfaction, and attachment styles as moderators of these associations using regression analysis. Results indicated significant negative main effects of attachment avoidance on relationship satisfaction, and work-to-home interference on job satisfaction. Contrary to our predictions, attachment styles did not moderate the effects of work-home interference on job and relationship satisfaction. Although results indicate associations between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction, as well as work-home interference and job satisfaction, it is unclear how individual differences influence the effects of work-home interference.
The Moderating Role of Attachment Style in the Relationships between Work-Home Interference, Relationship Satisfaction, and Job Satisfaction

A harmonious balance between work and home domains can be challenging to achieve for many individuals. Work-home interference, also known as perceived spillover, exists when individuals receive competing demands from independent domains, such as work and family domains (Grzywacz & Marks 2000). These domains are competing for physical energy, time, and mental capabilities (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-home interference is increasingly becoming a problem because of the competing demands made by home and work environments, in which the tasks and roles that are needed to be fulfilled are becoming harder to balance. This increased strain can lead to maladaptive outcomes on an individual’s daily life in areas such as relationship and job dissatisfaction.

However, not all individuals experience work-home interference to the same degree. Some are more negatively affected than others. Certain individuals in particular feel unable to adapt and adjust their behaviors in order to cope with the demands of these different domains (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). The reasons as to why this may be has not been explored in great detail in previous literature. One reason for potential differences in work-home interference may be because of an individual’s attachment style. By exploring the different facets of work-home interference, as well as the role of attachment, we can begin to understand the associations these have with one another and
why work-home interference can influence relationship and job quality and satisfaction to such a high degree for certain individuals.

**Work-Home Interference**

Work-home interference occurs because of several types of distinct conflicts that occur within work and family domains (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985). Time-based conflict occurs when the multiple roles demanded of an individual cannot all be fulfilled due to a lack of time. For example, participating in one specific role in the work-place may make it difficult to fulfill a role within the home domain. Strain-based conflict occurs when an individual feels symptoms of stress due to having to fulfill obligations of different roles simultaneously. For example, an individual can work a full-time job as well as be a mother who has several duties and obligations needed to be completed in the home domain. Feelings of depression, anxiety, fatigue, and/or other related symptoms can heavily influence an individual’s experience transitioning between different domains. The last type of conflict is behavior-based conflict, which is when independent domains have different behavioral expectations of an individual. When an individual is unable to easily regulate and adapt his/her behaviors to meet the different expectations of the different domains, work-home interference levels rise (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985). Work and family domains interact in a reciprocal cycle and are in competition with one another. Often the stresses of work leak into the family-home environment when an
individual is experiencing fatigue, is distracted, or preoccupied with work-related activities (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985).

Due to the many types of interference affecting individuals in all areas of their daily lives, it is no surprise that one area that can suffer from the consequences of interference is romantic relationships. Research shows that having tension and strain due to work-home interference can have a negative impact on relationship outcomes (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Individuals who have high levels of conflict between the home and work environments report lower levels of relationship satisfaction and quality. For these individuals, their relationships and romantic partners suffer the consequences of them being unable to balance the competing demands. Keeping relationships stable and satisfying becomes increasingly more difficult when adding on the stress of obligations from both work and home. Greenhas and Beutell (1985) found that women with more work-home interference also report lower levels of relationship satisfaction, overall lower levels of quality within their romantic relationship, less perceived support from their partner, as well as more confrontational situations with their romantic partner. This study provides empirical support that work-home interference can weigh heavily on the relationship between romantic partners. In addition, Judge, Ilies, and Scott (2006) found that increased work-home interference was associated with emotions of guilt and hostility. These negative emotions were found to be carried over from the work place of individuals into their home lives, which resulted in a general decrease in marital satisfaction. From these data, one can conclude that there is indeed a link between work-home interference and relationship satisfaction.
Work-home interference can also negatively affect individuals’ work environments. Hopkins (1983) identified job satisfaction as an individual fulfilling his/her needs that are necessary with one’s work. That is, individuals being emotionally content in the work place environment. A vast body of literature supports the association between job satisfaction and work to home conflict. A study conducted by Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2002) showed that when employees who experience time-based conflict, and thus spillover between the two domains, they experienced more job dissatisfaction. Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer (2007) also suggested that stress sources from both family and work domains are related to job satisfaction. Their results showed that family stress and conflict was the strongest variable related to job dissatisfaction, suggesting that individuals who experience more stress at home are more likely to be dissatisfied with their work or work environment. Kossek and Ozekk (1998) argued that there is a negative relationship between all types of work-home interference and job satisfaction, with the work to family interference direction being the strongest in relation. To further support the negative association between work-home interference and job satisfaction, a study conducted by Lourel, Ford, and Gamassou (2008) showed that there is a positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and work-home interference. This can be interpreted as the more work-home interference an individual experiences, the more job dissatisfaction the individual also experiences.
Attachment Styles

Although the negative influence of work-home interference on individuals’ relationship and job satisfaction is well noted, the question still arises as to why this strain in work-home interference seems to affect certain individuals more than others. Why are certain individuals experiencing more relationship and job dissatisfaction due to stress spillover between domains than others? Attachment style is thought to be a potential factor in moderating work-family interference and its influence on relationship and job satisfaction. Attachment styles could explain why certain individuals are impacted more negatively in their relationships and jobs by work family interference. Attachment theory can first be broken into two categories: secure vs. insecure styles (Ainsworth, 1979).

Securely attached individuals are efficient at accepting the emotions, perceptions, and ideas of others. Insecure styles can then be broken down into two separate styles, anxious and avoidant. Anxious individuals sometimes react in hostile ways to conflict while avoidantly-attached individuals are often emotionally distant with others. These insecure styles can have particularly serious and negative consequences as an individual progresses into adulthood.

Role of Attachment Styles in Relationship Satisfaction

There is much evidence that supports a link between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. A study conducted by Towler and Stulmacher (2013) showed that securely attached individuals reported the highest quality of relationships. These securely attached relationships consisted of free and reciprocated emotional
expressiveness and high levels of perceived social support. Avoidantly attached individuals tend to have less satisfactory or cohesive romantic relationships and are less likely to invest emotionally (Hazan & Shaver 1990). Avoidantly attached individuals have trouble with emotional expressiveness (Hazan & Shaver 1990). They are usually emotionally distant from their partner, and tend to withdraw from the relationship in confrontational situations (Hazan & Shaver 1990). They do not like discussing emotions or feelings and often do not cope well when others open up to them emotionally. Creating space and establishing independence is one of the key behaviors of an avoidantly-attached individual (Hazan & Shaver 1990). Simpson, Rhodes, and Phillips (1996) also showed that avoidantly-attached men were less warm and expressive with their partners.

Anxiously attached individuals tended to view their relationship as more negative and felt their partners were less supportive and affectionate (Simpson et. al 1996). Individuals who are anxiously attached often perceive their partner’s actions as negative and have overall lower levels of quality within their relationship (Hazan & Shaver 1990). They tend to report higher levels of anxiety, stress, as well as higher levels of conflict within their romantic relationship (Hazan & Shaver 1990). These findings support the idea that insecure attachment styles are associated with lower levels of relationship satisfaction.

Role of Attachment Styles in Job Satisfaction

Research shows that attachment styles influence perceptions of work-home interference. According to a study done by Sumer and Knight (2001), securely
attached individuals have a more positive attitude towards work and are less likely to experience work-home interference. In addition, Hazan and Shaver (1990) found that securely attached individuals were unburdened by the thought of failure and overall enjoyed work activity. These individuals tended to not let their personal and romantic relationships affect their work productivity. Harms (2011) suggested that in the workplace, securely attached individuals create supportive and positive relationships with fellow coworkers thus increasing their overall satisfaction.

In terms of insecure attachment styles, avoidantly attached individuals use work as an escape and tend to avoid interactions with fellow co-workers. When these individuals experience a conflict at home, they often emotionally distance themselves by diving into their workload and solely focusing on work tasks (Sumer & Knight 2001). Avoidantly-attached individuals are found to disengage from social settings within the workplace when experiencing an imbalance in their work and home domains (Harms 2011).

Lastly, anxious individuals are more likely to let their home domains interfere with productivity in their work environments. When experiencing a personal issue or home to work interference, often anxiously attached individuals become overwhelmed with that problem and have trouble concentrating on work tasks (Sumer & Knight 2001). Anxious individuals are often too preoccupied with their personal relationships outside of the workplace, and thus report having higher levels of stress and burnout in their work environments, becoming less satisfied with their job (Harms 2011). They also reported being less appreciated and more misunderstood by their coworkers (Hazan & Shaver...
1990). Together, the literature suggests that there is strong support for an association between work-home interference and attachment styles.

When exploring attachment style and its influences on job satisfaction, the literature provides a clear distinction between insecure and secure attachment styles. Vasquez, Durik, Hyde (2002) suggested that men who are securely attached, experience significantly less “work-concerns” and overall report being more satisfied with their job when compared to other anxious or avoidant men. When compared specifically to anxiously attached men, securely attached men reported less role overload, which can be defined as imbalance in being committed to several roles and expectations within the workplace. Women in the workplace who were classified as being anxiously attached reported overall more role overload in their work environment, more home-work interference, and less job satisfaction when compared to both avoidant and secure attachment styles (Vasquez et. al, 2002). Insecure attachment styles are generally associated with less job satisfaction than secure attachment. Furthermore, anxiously attached individuals experience the most job dissatisfaction in the work domain. Thus the literature supports the idea attachment style does play a role in influencing job satisfaction, with insecure attachment styles negatively influencing job satisfaction and secure attachment positively influencing job satisfaction.
The Current Study

As previously stated, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggested that work home interference can have a prominent and negative impact on relationship satisfaction, while Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer (2007) found evidence that supported the idea that work-home interference has several effects on an individual’s satisfaction with their work environments. When you combine these two analyses with Hazan and Shaver’s (1990) findings on the influence of an individual’s attachment style on personal relationships, as well as with Sumer and Knights’ (2001) study on adult attachment styles influencing the workplace and job satisfaction, a question arises as to whether all these associations are intertwined with one another. There seem to be distinct links between work-home interference and attachment styles, as well as between attachment styles and both relationship and job satisfaction. However, prior studies have not examined these associations in a single study. Thus, the current study seeks to test attachment style as a potential moderator in the associations between work-home interference and relationship satisfaction as well as between work-home interference and job satisfaction. That is, attachment style could be a reason as to why certain individuals who experience work-home interference have more detrimental relationship outcomes and less satisfaction in the workplace compared to others.

I predict that attachment style will moderate the association between work-home interference and relationship and job satisfaction. Specifically, the negative influences of home and work interference on relationship and job satisfaction will be stronger for individuals who are more avoidantly and/or anxious attached (see Figure 1 for conceptual
model). Furthermore, avoidant and more anxious attached individuals will experience lower levels of relationship and job satisfaction and report more strain between the competing domains of work and home life.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedures**

Previous work on home and work spillover has focused on early adult to middle aged populations, thus, we recruited a community sample through the online marketplace, Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk; [www.mturk.com](http://www.mturk.com)). MTurk is an online website that allows people to complete surveys for pay. Participants ($N = 155$) were compensated $1.00 for their participation. In order to participate, individuals were required to be working full-time (at least 35 hours per week), be married or cohabiting (to assess adequate work-home interference), and be at least 18 years of age. Participants completed a series of online questionnaires which measured their relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, perceived work/home interference, and attachment style.

The sample consisted of 55% women and 45% men, were primarily White/European (80.6%), and were 34.7 years old on average (range: 19 to 65; $SD =10.26$). The majority of participants have completed some university/college (93.5%), and 60% were married (40% were not married but were in committed relationships). Half (50%) of the participants also had children ($M=2.08$, $SD=1.03$). Participants worked an average of 41 hours a week ($M = 41.69$; $SD =6.07$).
Measures

Perceived spillover/work-home interference. Two directions of interference were measured in the study; the work domain negatively interfering with the home domain, and the home domain negatively interfering with the work domain. Interference of both directions was measured using the scale from Gryzwacz and Marks (2000), which consists of eight items, four assessing home-to-work interference (e.g., In the past year how often have you experienced personal or family worries that distract you when you are at work?”, $M = 2.39$, $SD = .82$, $\alpha = .84$), and four assessing work-to-home interference (e.g., In the past year, how often have you experienced your job/school work reduces the effort you have to give at home/in your personal life?” $M = 2.60$, $SD = .72$, $\alpha = .80$). Items were rated on 6-point scales ($1 = never$, $5 = all\ of\ the\ time$). For each direction, an average score of the four items was computed, with a higher score indicating more interference between the home and work domains.

Attachment styles. To assess participants’ attachment styles, the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECR; Wei et., al 2007) was used. This scale involves asking participants to report on aspects of their relationship such as their own needs to be reassured and their level of desired closeness with their romantic partner. This measure is a self-report measure, using six items to measure anxious attachment (e.g “I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner,” $M = 3.21$, $SD= 1.31$, $\alpha = .82$), and six items to measure avoidant attachment (e.g “I try to avoid getting too close to my partner”, $M = 2.52$, $SD = 1.21$, $\alpha = .87$). Participants responded using 7-point scales, ranging from 1 =
strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. A higher score on each subscale indicated a participants’ a stronger identification with the particular attachment.

**Relationship satisfaction.** Relationship satisfaction was measured using the Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI; Furman & Buermester, 1985). The questionnaire contains three items assessing participants’ overall satisfaction with their romantic relationship using 5-point scales ranging from 1 = little or none to 5 = the most (e.g., “How happy are you with your relationship with your partner?” \( M = 3.75, SD = 1.22, \alpha = .96 \)). A higher score indicated higher level of satisfaction.

**Job satisfaction.** To determine participants’ overall satisfaction with their job, the Job Satisfaction Test (Oshagbemi, 1999) was administered. The questionnaire included four items rated on 5-point scales, with higher scores indicating higher job satisfaction (e.g., How much of the time do you feel satisfied with your job, 1 = never – 5 = all the time, \( M = 2.49, SD = .84, \alpha = .91 \)).

**Results**

Bivariate correlations were conducted on all major study variables. Correlations revealed that both directions of work-home interference were negatively related to both relationship and job satisfaction. See Table 1 for correlations of all major study variables. We tested a series of regression models that examined home and work interference (home-to-work and work-to-home), attachment styles (avoidant and anxious) and their interactions as predictors of relationship and job satisfaction. First, we examined the main
and interactive effects of home-to-work interference and attachment styles on relationship satisfaction. Results indicated a main effect of attachment avoidance on relationship satisfaction, such that higher attachment avoidance was uniquely related to lower relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.69$, $SE = .07$, $p < .01$; 95% CI = -.83 to -.55), while controlling for the effects of anxious attachment. The main effect of attachment anxiety on relationship satisfaction was non-significant with the inclusion of avoidant attachment style. Home-to-work interference was marginally related to relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.12$, $SE = .10$, $p = .07$; CI = -.36 to .01). Together, these variables accounted for a significant amount of the variance in relationship satisfaction, $R^2 = .54$, $F (3, 151) = 58.23$, $p < .01$. The interaction terms of home-to-work interference and avoidance (home-to-work x avoidance), and home-to-work interference and anxious attachment did not significantly predict relationship satisfaction. Overall, results suggested that attachment styles did not moderate the association between home-work interference and relationship satisfaction.

Next, we examined the main and interactive effects of work-to-home interference and attachment styles on relationship satisfaction. Results indicated a significant main effect of attachment avoidance on relationship satisfaction, indicating that higher attachment avoidance was uniquely associated with lower relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.72$, $SE = .07$, $p < .01$; CI = -.86 to -.60), while controlling for anxious attachment. The main effect of attachment anxiety on relationship satisfaction was non-significant with the inclusion of avoidant attachment. The association between work-to-home interference and relationship satisfaction was also non-significant. These variables accounted for a
significant amount of variance in relationship satisfaction, \( R^2 = .53, F(3, 151) = 56.17, p < .01 \). The interactions between work-to-home interference and anxious attachment and work-to-home interference and avoidant attachment did not significantly predict relationship satisfaction. These results suggest that overall, attachment style does not moderate the relationship between work-to-home interference and relationship satisfaction.

Next, the main and interactive effects of home-to-work interference and attachment styles on job satisfaction were examined. The results revealed no significant main effects. The interactive effects between both attachment styles (avoidant and anxious) and home–to-work interference on job satisfaction were also non-significant. This suggests that overall, attachment styles do not moderate the relationship between home-to-work interference and job satisfaction. Due to non-significance of both the main and interactive effects, the model did not explain job satisfaction well, \( R^2 = .02, F(3, 151) = 1.23, p = .30 \).

Finally, we examined the main and interactive effects of attachment styles and work-to-home interference on job satisfaction. The main effect of work-to-home interference on job satisfaction was significant, indicating that more work-to-home interference is related to experiencing less job satisfaction (\( \beta = -.50, SE = .90, p < .01; CI = -.76 \) to -.40). The main effects of both anxious and avoidant attachment on job satisfaction were non-significant. These variables accounted for a significant amount of the variance in relationship satisfaction, \( R^2 = .22, F(3, 151) = 14.46, p < .01 \). When examining the interactive effects of work-to-home interference and the attachment styles
on job satisfaction, no significant associations were found. Overall, the results suggest that avoidant and anxious attachment do not moderate the relationship between work-home interference and job satisfaction.

**Discussion**

Although there is an extensive amount of research that highlights the dynamic relationships between attachment style and relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, and work and home interference, attachment style has not yet been explored as a moderator of the effects of work and home interference on relationship and job satisfaction. The aim of the study was to explore whether attachment style accounts for individual differences and moderates these associations. I predicted that attachment style will moderate the effects of work and home interference on relationship and job satisfaction. However, results from the current study suggested that attachment styles did not moderate the association between work and home interference, relationship satisfaction, and job satisfaction. Rather, only a main effect between attachment style and relationship satisfaction, as well as an effect between work-home interference and job satisfaction were found. Below I discuss explanations for findings.

Results showed that avoidant attachment style was negatively associated with relationship satisfaction, suggesting that the more avoidantly attached an individual was, the less satisfied he or she was with his or her romantic relationship. This finding aligns
with the previous literature. Hazan and Shaver (1990) found that avoidant individuals tended to have less satisfying or cohesive romantic relationships, and were less likely to be emotionally invested in their relationships, which could contribute to their lower relationship satisfaction. Perhaps individuals who are not putting in as much emotional effort as their partner, are more likely to be dissatisfied.

Anxious attachment was unrelated to relationship satisfaction. This did not support the initial hypothesis. These results were somewhat align with previous literature as there is mixed findings on whether anxious attachment is predictor of relationship dissatisfaction. For example, Butzer and Campbell (2008) found anxious attachment to have a stronger relationship with martial and sexual satisfaction compared to avoidant attachment. However, previous findings on the association between anxious attachment and relationship satisfaction are inconsistent. Simpson (1990) conducted a longitudinal study on the influence of attachment style on relationship satisfaction, and found that anxiously attached individuals did, in fact report less relationship satisfaction, trust, and commitment, when compared to securely attached individuals. In contrast, Kirkpatrick and Hazan (1994) conducted a four-year long longitudinal study exploring attachment style and romantic relationship stability and satisfaction, and found that when comparing “Year 1” to “Year 4”, anxiously attached individuals were just as likely to be in the same relationship and be stable as securely attached individuals (Kirkpatrick & Hazan 1994). Thus, findings vary throughout the literature and it is not certain whether anxious attachment and relationship satisfaction are directly related.
There was also an association between work to home interference and job satisfaction, indicating that the more interference an individual experienced from the work domain that placed a strain on the home domain, the less satisfied an individual was with their job. This finding is in line with prior work. For example, Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2002) found that when workers experience time-based conflict or strain, stress spillover occurs between the work and home domains. Due to this occurrence, individuals reported being less satisfied with their jobs, supporting the idea that interference from the work domain into the home domain directly influence an individual’s job satisfaction. Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer (2007) also found that stress that stems from both family and work domains directly influence an individual’s job satisfaction.

There are several possible explanations as to why higher work-home interference is associated with lower job satisfaction. Perhaps personal relationships are more important to people when compared to work or other types of relationships. When an individual’s job interferes with their relationships, they are more likely to be less satisfied with their jobs. A study conducted by Adams, King, and King (1996) supported the idea that family and the roles it plays in managing conflict yields a more valuable asset to an individual’s life compared to work relationships. The study also showed that both work and family play an essential role in determining life and job satisfaction. Thus, perhaps individuals who feel too much pressure in their work environment and experience the spillover of this stress into their family lives end up feeling less satisfied with their jobs.
The association between home-work interference and relationship satisfaction was found to be marginally significant. Results indicated that the more interference experienced at work from the home domain, the less relationship satisfaction an individual also experiences. Again, when the stressors of home life seems to be interfering with the work environment, less relationship satisfaction is reported. Interestingly, the association between work-home interference and relationship satisfaction was found to be non-significant, meaning these two constructs do not influence one another. However, work-home interference is in fact related to job satisfaction. So why is one direction of work home interference related to job satisfaction, but not the other? This is most likely due to source matching. Carlson, Hunter, Ferguson, & Whitten (2011) stated that the initial source of stress is the domain that will experience the most stress and negative emotions. Thus, work-to-home interference doesn’t influence satisfaction with home life, but instead the work domain (job satisfaction), because the work domain is the original source being affected by stress. This theory explains why the two directions of work home interference affect and influence the two different constructs of relationship and job satisfaction.

Although we found an effect of work-home interference on job satisfaction as originally predicted, we found that the other direction, home to work interference, did not predict job satisfaction. It is important to note that, once again, there is pattern between the origin of the initial stress and the domain of satisfaction. When work stress impacts the home, individuals are less satisfied with work because it is the culprit of the stress. On the other hand, when home stress causes conflict or interference in the work domain, it
does not impact job satisfaction because the origin of stress is within the home environment, not work. Prior research also shows that the initial source of stress is important for job satisfaction (Carlson et al. 2011). Carlson et al. found that when focusing on work to family enrichment, job satisfaction increased, and when implementing family to work enrichment, job satisfaction was not affected. This supports the possibility that family boundaries are more accessible and subject to change than work environment. The work domain was not the cause of interference, thus being the reason as why it was not affected (Carlson et al. 2011).

Contrary to the hypothesis, neither anxious nor avoidant attachment moderated any of the associations between either direction of work and home interference and job or relationship satisfaction. The results indicate that regardless of attachment style, secure, anxious or avoidant attachment, work and home interferences influence job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction the same way across individuals. For both insecure and secure attachment styles, the more work-home interference experienced, the less satisfaction was experienced in the work domain. Insecurely attached individuals are just as likely to report poor job satisfaction when experiencing work-home interference as securely attached individuals. Furthermore, for both insecure and secure attachment styles, more home-work interference was associated with marginally less relationship satisfaction. Secure and insecure individuals were equally likely to experience lower relationship satisfaction when their home life interfered with their work. There was no impact on relationship satisfaction on individuals who also experienced work-home interference.
Another reason for no moderation may be that I focused on a measure of attachment style specific to romantic relationships and how it relates to relationship and job satisfaction. Perhaps by using a scale that measured attachment style in all types of relationships, such as work-based relationships, a different result could have emerged.

Attachment styles to romantic partners may not be associated with job satisfaction. There are some studies that support the idea that an individual’s job satisfaction can be influenced by attachment style. According to a study done by Sumer and Knight (2001), there are individual differences in the workplace based on attachment style. Securely attached individuals have a more positive attitude towards work tasks and are less likely to experience work-family interference, while anxious individuals are more likely to let their home domains interfere with productivity in their work environments. Results also indicated that when experiencing a personal issue or home-work interference, often anxiously attached individuals become overwhelmed with that specific problem and have trouble concentrating on work tasks, thus creating less productivity. Finally, it was found that avoidantly attached individuals use work as an escape when experiencing personal problems in the home domain, as well as tend to avoid interactions with fellow co-workers due to their emotionally withdrawn characteristic. However, Sumer and Knight’s scale measured family relationships and social relationships in general, whereas our study specifically measured romantic relationships, which again, could account for why there were no individual differences found based on attachment styles.
Limitations

Like in most research, there were limitations when conducting this study. As previously stated, if the attachment style scale used was too narrow in solely focusing on romantic relationships, the results may have differed if the scale used was broader in measuring relationships. For instance, romantic, platonic, as well as work-based relationships could have all been measured. A measure of attachment style that assesses general relationships, similar to the one used in Hazan and Shaver (1990) could be beneficial.

Also, the population assessed was not as diverse as preferred. Participants were predominantly white/Caucasian. Racial diversity in the sample could provide insight on individual differences in several of the previously stated concepts. It also would have been more ideal if there was more diversity in education levels of participants. It would be interesting to examine if people with lower educational backgrounds have the same job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction in terms of attachment styles. Overall, there needed to be a more diverse population with more diversity in the demographics assessed.

In continuing research in the future, there are several ideas that could be addressed. Perhaps we needed to look at attachment style in the workforce to see a clearer and direct association between attachment style and job satisfaction. By doing so, there could be more differences between people on the two constructs. To further that possible research idea, it could be more beneficial to look at work productivity of an individual
based on attachment style, instead of focusing solely on their work satisfaction. For example, Braunstein-Bercovitz, Cohen Geller, and Benjamin (2013) found that avoidant attachment was indirectly related to career indecision, due to avoidantly attached individuals being too critical of themselves and their work. They concluded that insecure attachment style may be associated with hesitation in career decision making (Braunstein-Bercovitz et. al 2013). In another study, Littman-Ovadia, Oren, and Shiri Lavy (2013) concluded that in work environments, avoidantly attached employees are at a disadvantage when it comes to high job autonomy. Anxiously attached employees tend to feel more distress at work and experience more “burn out” when compared those who are not avoidantly attached.

Although the original hypotheses were not supported, and we did not find what was expected, this study contributes to the literature. This study confirmed previous findings that attachment style does in fact impact relationship satisfaction. This study also confirmed other findings of work home interference negatively influencing job satisfaction. This study also contributed new findings to the literature. I examined attachment style in a new light. While most research highlights the direct associations between attachment styles and either job and relationship satisfaction, or work home interference, the current study looked at the implications of attachment style being used as a moderator. This is an entirely new concept that has not yet been explored in great detail in the previous literature. This research set up a framework where the domains of relationship and job satisfaction can influence one another through an individual’s attachment style. Although I did not find the results I expected, this approach opens the
door for new research to be conducted. We need to explore the questions that remained unanswered, such as why work home interference influences job satisfaction but home-work interference does not influence job satisfaction. It is also important to continue to look at the potential associations that attachment styles could moderate. There needs to be more research conducted to further contribute to this idea.
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Figure 1. Proposed conceptual moderation model
Table 1. Zero-Order Correlations for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Attachment anxiety</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Attachment avoidance</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Relationship satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>-0.73**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>Work-Home interference</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.43**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Home-Work interference</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01