

Schusterschitz, Claudia; Geser, Willi; Nöhammer, Elisabeth; Stummer, Harald

Article

Securely attached, strongly committed? On the influence of attachment orientations on organizational commitment

Zeitschrift für Personalforschung (ZfP)

Provided in Cooperation with:

Rainer Hampp Verlag

Suggested Citation: Schusterschitz, Claudia; Geser, Willi; Nöhammer, Elisabeth; Stummer, Harald (2011) : Securely attached, strongly committed? On the influence of attachment orientations on organizational commitment, Zeitschrift für Personalforschung (ZfP), ISSN 1862-0000, Rainer Hampp Verlag, Mering, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, pp. 335-355,
https://doi.org/10.1688/1862-0000_ZfP_2011_04_Schusterschitz

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/71056>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Claudia Schusterschitz, Willi Geser, Elisabeth Nöhammer,
Harald Stummer*

Securely Attached, Strongly Committed? On the Influence of Attachment Orientations on Organizational Commitment**

The paper at hand is the first that explores the notion of attachment orientations, i.e. attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance, influencing individual attachment towards an organization, i.e. employees' affective, normative and continuance commitment. Findings of a questionnaire survey reveal positive correlations of attachment anxiety with affective, normative and continuance commitment. Attachment avoidance in contrast was found to contribute only to the prediction of affective commitment. Reconsidered, our results imply low affective, normative and continuance commitment for secure employees, i.e. for employees low in anxiety and low in avoidance. Implications of the findings, regarding the question of whether organizations should abstain from the employment of secure workers, are discussed.

Sichere Bindung, starkes Commitment? Zum Einfluss von Bindungsorientierungen auf organisationales Commitment

Im vorliegenden Artikel wird die bislang unerforschte Annahme eines Einflusses von dispositioneller Bindungsangst und Bindungsvermeidung auf die Bindung an Arbeitsorganisationen, d.h. auf affektives, normatives und austauschbezogenes Commitment, untersucht. Ergebnisse aus einer Fragebogenuntersuchung belegen mittlere Zusammenhänge zwischen Bindungsangst und affektivem, normativem sowie austauschbezogenem Commitment, während Bindungsvermeidung sich nur in Bezug auf das affektive Commitment als signifikanter Prädiktor erweist. Umgekehrt betrachtet implizieren unsere Ergebnisse niedriges affektives, normatives und austauschbezogenes Commitment bei ArbeitnehmerInnen mit sicherer Bindung, d.h. bei ArbeitnehmerInnen mit niedriger Bindungsangst und niedrigerer Bindungsvermeidung. Basierend auf diesen Ergebnissen wird diskutiert, ob sicher gebundene ArbeitnehmerInnen die schlechteren ArbeitnehmerInnen sind und Organisationen daher besser beraten wären, Personen mit sicherer Bindung nicht einzustellen.

Key words: attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment
(JEL: D23, J24, L20, M12, M50)

* Claudia Schusterschitz, UMIT – University for Health Sciences, Medical Informatics and Technology, Institute of Applied Psychology, Eduard Wallnöfer Zentrum 1, A – 6060 Hall in Tirol, Austria. E-Mail: claudia.schusterschitz@umit.at.
Willi Geser, Leopold-Franzens University Innsbruck, Institute for Psychology, Innrain 52, A – 6020 Innsbruck, Austria. E – Mail: willi.geser@uibk.ac.at
Elisabeth Nöhammer, Harald Stummer, both UMIT – University for Health Sciences, Medical Informatics and Technology, Department of Public Health & HTA, Opernring 5, A – 1010 Wien, Austria.
E-Mail: elisabeth.noehammer@umit.at, harald.stummer@umit.at.

** Artikel eingegangen: 9.1.2011
revidierte Fassung akzeptiert nach doppelt-blindem Begutachtungsverfahren: 14.9.2011.

Introduction

Over the life course, individuals engage in a broad variety of bonds. They not only make bonds with other individuals, but also commit themselves to certain products, clubs, brands, opinions and, most notable in the present context, to the organization they work for (Schmidt, Hollmann & Sodenkamp, 1998, p. 93). The bond between an employee and the organization he works for is referred to as organizational commitment in the literature (Felfe, Schmook, Schyns & Six, 2008; Moser, 1996/1997). Organizational commitment has received considerable research interest over the past decades. This research interest may at least partly have been stimulated by the conviction that a committed workforce is beneficial for organizational functioning and effectiveness (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Vandenberghe, & Becker, 2004).

The very first bond human beings make however is the bond between a child and its primary caregiver, known as attachment bond (Bowlby, 1975; Ainsworth, 1979). This bond is said to be based on the quality of interactions between an attachment figure and a child. Children who perceive their primary caregiver as available and responsive are said to develop secure attachment. The according experiences between the child and its primary caregiver are assumed to be stored in the child's internal working models of attachment (Bowlby, 1975). These internal working models consist of cognitive representations of the self and others, and, following proponents of early attachment theory, do guide human behavior, our expectations and emotions throughout the life span.

In line with that reasoning, already Bowlby (1975) argued that in adolescence and adulthood attachment behavior is not only of relevance in intimate relationships. It may also be directed towards groups and, of special relevance to us, towards institutions. In detail, Bowlby (1975, p. 193) postulated that school or a university, a work group, as well as a religious or political association, may represent a central attachment figure for some individuals, and one of inferior importance for others. This notion not only implies the relevance of attachment theoretical considerations in a workplace context, but also addresses the possibility of interindividual differences in organizational commitment, based on attachment orientations. In other words, it suggests that interpersonal attachment orientations may influence individual attachment towards an organization, i.e. organizational commitment. Such interplay also seems plausible since definitions of both constructs – interpersonal attachment and organizational commitment – are based on the same underlying concepts. Thus, attachment and commitment both are considered as specific bonds or linkages. Moreover, the term “attachment” is also part of definitions of (affective) commitment (Bowlby, 1975; Meyer, Becker & Van Dick, 2006). The difference between the two constructs lies in the respective attachment figure: in the case of interpersonal attachment the primary caregiver or in adulthood varying significant others, such as close friends, team members, leaders or romantic partners may represent potential attachment figures; in the case of (high) organizational commitment the organization may function as attachment figure and accordingly may also be the focus of adult attachment behaviors.

The previous comments stress the fact that the generalizability of attachment theory to the sphere of work life has already been hypothesized over three decades

ago. Astonishingly, researchers so far have only paid little attention to this field. The few existing works however, such as the initial work of Hazan and Shaver (1990), or the more recent research of Geller and Bamberger (2009), consistently provide empirical evidence for the explanatory value of attachment theory in understanding workplace behavior. Nonetheless, to the authors' best knowledge, the intuitively appealing and theoretically plausible link between individual attachment orientations on the one hand and organizational commitment on the other has not been addressed in previous studies. Considering these facts, the aim of the work at hand is to explore the hypothesized link between interpersonal attachment and organizational commitment. In doing so, we seek to contribute to the literature by providing further empirical evidence (1) for the potential value of attachment theory in a workplace context in general, and (2) for interindividual, attachment-related differences in organizational commitment in particular. Furthermore, with our focus on attachment orientations, we consider personal antecedents of organizational commitment. The latter have been neglected so far in favor of situational predictors of organizational commitment (Johnson & Chang, 2006).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment is understood as "a bond or linking of the individual to the organization" (Mathieu & Zajac; 1990, p. 171) and within the majority of definitions "as a stabilizing and obliging force that gives direction to behavior and binds a person to a course of action" (Felfe et al., 2008, p. 82).

The prevailing conceptual basis in more recent research is the Three Component Model of Commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997), which is also used in the study at hand. This model claims to encompass the different perspectives regarding "the nature of the psychological state being described" (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11), i.e. the nature of the bond or linkage between the employee and the organization. The three commitment components suggested by Meyer and Allen (1997) are affective, normative and continuance commitment. Affective commitment to the organization is based on emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Normative commitment refers to the felt obligation to remain with the organization due to according values, such as loyalty towards the employer. Affectively committed employees are thus said to maintain organizational membership because they want to do so, whereas normatively committed workers stay in the organization because they ought to do so. If staying with the organization is based on the fact of high costs associated with leaving, or on lacking occupational alternatives, workers continue membership in the organization because they need to do so. This form of organizational commitment is referred to as continuance commitment.

Especially affective commitment has been found to lead to a number of favorable consequences, e.g. job satisfaction, reduced turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behaviors or enhanced job performance. Correlations with such positive work variables are weaker for normative commitment, or may even be negative, as in the case of continuance commitment (Meyer et al., 2006). Regarding antecedents of commitment, the bulk of research focuses on work experience variables, i.e. situational variables, such as organizational supportiveness and fairness, job scope or task au-

tonomy (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). Amongst the individual difference variables studied were demographics, but results were not promising (Johnson, Chang & Yang, 2010). In addition, cultural value orientations and personality variables have been studied as antecedents of commitment. With regard to the former, Felfe, Schmook and Six (2006) found collectivism to be related to organizational and work group commitment. In addition, they found positive correlations between power distance and uncertainty avoidance on the one hand and continuance commitment on the other. Uncertainty avoidance also had positive relationships with normative commitment. For neuroticism, negative correlations with affective commitment were found. However, when neuroticism functions as one predictor variable amongst other personal and work characteristics, its relationship with affective commitment is not significant anymore (Herz, Beck & Felfe, 2009). In sum, according to Johnson, Chang and Yang (2010) or Johnson and Chang (2006), of all individual variables only locus of control and self-efficacy received considerable research interest. Nonetheless, even for those variables identified correlations turned out to be weak.

With respect to commitment, not only different components but also different foci have been distinguished in the literature. Felfe et al. (2008) for example suggested that employees may not only commit themselves to the organization (organizational commitment), but also to their profession (occupational commitment). Furthermore, taking into account the presence of new and varying employment forms, workers may also commit themselves to a special employment form (commitment towards the form of employment). The focus of the present research, building on Bowlby's (1975) assumptions presented above, is on workers commitment to the organization, i.e. organizational commitment.

Attachment

Originally observed in children, also adults have been found to show attachment behaviors, which are functionally equivalent to those of children (Fraley & Shaver, 1998). Building on attachment styles previously identified in children (Ainsworth, 1979), Hazan and Shaver (1987) initially differentiated three attachment styles in adults: a secure, an anxious ambivalent and an avoidant attachment style. Subsequently, and against the background of Bowlby's (1975) concept of internal working models, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) suggested a four category model of adult attachment, which is based on the two underlying attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. The anxiety dimension is characterized by a negative view of the self and a positive view of others. High anxiety goes along with a strong need for attention and care and a strong tendency to seek proximity of and dependence on valued others. Anxious individuals, feeling unworthy themselves, constantly worry about not being accepted, being disliked or rejected. The dimension of avoidant attachment in contrast is characterized by a negative view of others and a positive self. Accordingly, high avoidance is related to perceptions of others as unavailable, unresponsive and untrustworthy. Consequently, it leads to the suppression of attachment needs and behaviors in contact with others. Avoidant attachment further goes along with discomfort with closeness and intimacy as well as with a strong need for autonomy and independence (Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998; Game, 2008; Miculincer & Shaver, 2005).

The described adult attachment orientations of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance assist in explaining numerous psychological phenomena, such as altruism (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005), perceptions of social support, coping behaviors (Ognibene & Collins, 1998), and affect regulation (Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg, 2003). Moreover, as will be shown below, the few existing works provide evidence for the contribution of attachment theory to an understanding of human behavior and attitudes in work life.

Attachment and work

Hazan and Shaver (1990) were the first who extended attachment theory to the work domain. Based on their findings, they argue that secure attachment goes along with a secure orientation towards work. The secure work orientation is characterized by an ability to experience pleasure in work life and by confidence in one's own abilities instead of constant fears of failure. In spite of this, secure individuals were found to value personal relationships more than work. Accordingly, they clearly prioritize private over work life. For secure individuals, neither work nor private life serve to compensate deficits or unmet attachment needs. Anxious individuals, due to their negative self perception, constantly strive for respect and admiration from valued others, and they view work as a mean to gain these (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). At the same time however, they always fear being rejected by other team members or colleagues, because anxious persons do not feel loveable. For avoidant employees, Hazan and Shaver (1990) finally reported that they willingly use obligations at work to avoid private obligations, such as meeting friends or spending time with the partner or the family. In line with that, avoidant individuals do not seem to be able to derive pleasure from holidays and tend to work long hours (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Although Hazan and Shaver's (1990) findings paved the way to extend attachment theory to the work domain, interest in this field of research has been comparably modest. Nonetheless, the few existing studies stress generalizability to and meaningfulness of attachment theoretical assumptions in a work context.

Hardy and Barkham (1994) for example succeeded in a replication and extension of Hazan and Shaver's (1990) findings. In line with attachment theory, they found anxious employees to be dissatisfied with relationships at work and to experience feelings of shame with respect to their performance. For avoidant workers, their findings imply dissatisfaction and conflicts with colleagues, dissatisfaction with task variety as well as with the number of working hours, and the experience of their own work as boring.

In a conceptual paper, Popper and Mayseless (2003) started from the premise of an analogy between transformational leaders and good parents. They suggested the application of attachment theory to understand developmental processes and psychological aspects of leadership issues. Empirical evidence for the relevance of attachment theoretical assumptions regarding leadership issues was provided by Schirmer and Lopez (2001) as well as by Game (2008). The former found lower levels of perceived supervisor support for anxious and avoidant attachment and demonstrated that considering attachment orientations improves the prediction of work strain. Game (2008) showed that emotional reactions on perceived supervisor behavior are dependent on

attachment orientations. Their findings suggest anxious attachment to be related to emotions of distress and anger. Avoidant attachment only was associated with anger but not with emotions of distress.

The role of secure attachment as a health resource of working adults was illustrated by Simmons and colleagues (Simmons, Gooty, Nelson & Little, 2009). According to their results, low avoidance and low anxiety (i.e. secure attachment) were positively related to hope and trust and negatively to employee burnout.

Attachment orientations further have been found to be linked to employees' helping (Geller & Bamberger, 2009) and citizenship behaviors (Desivilya, Sabag & Ashton, 2006). In detail, attachment anxiety and avoidance were negatively related to helping behaviors directed at coworkers. In line with that, secure individuals, i.e. individuals low in anxiety and avoidance, showed significantly higher tendencies towards OCBs compared to their insecure counterparts.

Also ethical standards and behaviors seem to be influenced by an individual's attachment orientation. Thus, Albert and Horowitz (2009) found that consumers as well as managers with secure attachment dispose of more ethical beliefs.

Krausz and colleagues (Krausz, Bizman & Braslavsky, 2001) finally tried to explain preferences for different employment contracts on the basis of individual differences in attachment security. In contrast to their expectations grounded in attachment theory, anxious workers disposed of a relatively higher preference for the external contract and a relatively lower preference for the internal contract than respondents with secure or avoidant attachment. With their unexpected preference for the internal contract, secure and avoidant employees did not differ significantly from each other in terms of employment contract preferences. In their work, Krausz and colleagues (Krausz et al., 2001) strongly claim further analysis of the role of interindividual differences in attachment with regard to human behavior at work. They deem this ... "particularly important in today's world of work, which is characterized by fast changes, high rates of labor-market insecurity, and the ensuing demand upon both organizations and individuals for flexibility. Studies have shown that insecurely attached persons are particularly vulnerable in those circumstances as their capability to cope with and adapt to stressful situations is inferior compared to that of the secure persons" (Krausz et al., 2001, p. 302).

Attachment and commitment

In terms of antecedents of organizational commitment, Meyer and colleagues (2002) clearly recommend focusing on organizational variables, such as perceived organizational support, instead of person variables. Their opinion is based on their meta-analytical finding that "correlations involving the work experience variables were generally much stronger than those involving personal characteristics" Meyer et al., 2002, p. 32). From that, Meyer and coworkers (Meyer et al., 2002, p. 38) concluded: "...attempts to recruit or select employees who might be predisposed to being affectively committed will be less effective than will carefully managing their experiences following entry. We agree that post-entry management of work experiences is of importance. Just because of that we think the consideration of personal characteristics is necessary, since it allows organizations to promote those work experiences that not

only fit with an employees' commitment form but also with his personality, in our case with an employee's attachment orientation. Thus, we argue in line with Johnson and Chang (2006) that individual difference variables deserve research attention, since "...some employees may be oriented toward specific types of commitment. In these cases, it may be easier for organizations to cultivate commitment by focusing on the specific type that fits with employees' personal characteristics." (Johnson & Chang, 2006, p. 550).

Starting from these assumptions, the present study wishes to explore the hypothesized link between individual attachment orientations and organizational commitment. To the authors' best knowledge no study to date has explicitly addressed the link between the two attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance on the one hand and the three commitment components on the other. Nonetheless, as far as possible and plausible against the background of the available literature, we still try to deduce hypotheses from past research on the influence of individual attachment orientations on work attitudes other than commitment, and on workplace behaviors. In spite of the attempt to formulate hypotheses, we wish to especially point to the fact that we consider our hypotheses exploratory in nature.

Before deducting the hypotheses, the authors would like to comment on their inherent assumption that low avoidance and low anxiety, i.e. secure attachment, are negatively related to organizational commitment. Due to our methodological conceptualization of attachment on the basis of the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance however (see methods section), explicit research hypotheses will only be formulated and tested for attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance.

For secure individuals, Hazan and Shaver (1990) reported a clear prioritization of private over work life and that they value relationships more than work. These results suggest a rather low work centrality for secure workers, and low work centrality has been found to be negatively related to organizational commitment (Dubin, Champoux & Porter, 1975). Building on these findings, one may assume high commitment of secure individuals towards the non-work domain. Furthermore, one can expect attachment needs, needs for identification and involvement, all of which present core components of affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997), to be satisfied outside the workplace. As a consequence, secure individuals may experience less of a need to develop affective bonds with organizations.

Considered against the background of role conflict theory (Greenhaus & Beutel, 1985), the described high involvement of secures in private life and non-work relationships may limit their investments in other domains. Put differently, we posit that the favored non-work commitments may interfere with other commitments, in the present case with organizational commitment. This line of reasoning fits with Reichers (1986, p. 508), who points to "the potential for conflict that may exist among multiple commitments". She argues that facing multiple commitments, individuals may experience conflict insofar as they have to decide upon where to invest their energy and towards whom to direct their loyalty. These reflections are inherent in the thesis of conflicting commitments (Gould & Werbel, 1983; Randall, 1987).

Taken together, these arguments imply a lower propensity for secure individuals - i.e. for individuals low in anxiety and low in avoidance - to affectively commit themselves to an organization.

Considering that multiple commitments also imply questions of where to direct one's loyalty (Reichers, 1986), we further assume lower normative commitment for secure employees, i.e. for individuals low in anxiety and low in avoidance. Due to their prioritization of private over work life or low work centrality, we suppose them to be more likely to experience feelings of obligation and loyalty towards their friends and families than towards organizations.

Another relevant finding for secure individuals is that they easily adopt to new (work) environments. Such environments always confront individuals with changes and challenges and thus may be experienced as stressors (Blustein, Prezioso & Palladino Schultheiss, 1995). In that regard, Krausz et al. (2001) argued that secure individuals are more likely to derive pleasure from varying and challenging environments and to strive for possibilities of personal advancement and growth than their insecure counterparts. Krausz et al. (2001) build their arguments on the fact that secure individuals are optimists, who perceive themselves as worthy and competent in interaction with their environment – assumingly because of their inner confidence in being able to master it. Consequently, we suppose leaving an organization and starting in a new one will rather be experienced as a manageable challenge than an impending misery by secure workers. Due to their more optimistic perception of potential costs of leaving as well as of available alternatives, we think of secure employees to be unlikely to stay in an organization because they need to do so. Thereby, we finally allege also lower continuance commitment amongst securely attached employees (i.e. employees low in anxiety and low in avoidance).

With the previous comments and considerations regarding secure attachment on the one hand and affective, normative and continuance commitment on the other, we generally suggest comparably lower organizational commitment for secure individuals, i.e. for individuals low in both anxiety and avoidance. Reconsidered, this implies higher levels of affective, normative and continuance commitment amongst employees high in anxiety and high in avoidance. In the following, we thus present our hypotheses regarding the specific relationships of attachment anxiety and avoidance with each of the three commitment dimensions.

For anxious individuals, Hazan and Shaver's (1990) findings imply a strong emphasis on relationships at work. They are said to view work as a mean to satisfy unmet attachment needs and to dispose of a strong preference for team-work (Hardy & Barkham, 1994). In addition, "due to their concern with issues of self worth and value, they are particularly vulnerable to the frequent changes of supervisors, peers, and the entire work environment" associated for example with leaving an organization (Krausz et al. 2001, p. 304). The latter authors further point out the general vulnerability of anxious individuals in environments characterized by low levels of security and continuity, due to their reduced ability to cope with and adjust to such situations. From that we deduce that anxious employees prefer remaining with the organization. On the one hand, they do so because of being emotionally attached to the organization on the basis of relationships with co-workers and their need to work with others.

On the other hand, even if not being completely satisfied, they prefer staying, because of perceiving leaving as too costly. Leaving is perceived costly facing the threatening perspective of a new and unfamiliar work environment, including new and unknown co-workers. Leaving also may seem costly, because current relationships might get lost. Whereas the former reasoning implies high affective commitment for anxious individuals, the latter implies high continuance commitment. Thus within our hypotheses 1 and 2 we posit that:

H₁: Attachment anxiety is positively related to affective commitment.

H₂: Attachment anxiety is positively related to continuance commitment.

With respect to normative commitment, we start from the fact that anxious individuals, with their already mentioned self-worth focus and their negative self-image, constantly seek to enhance their self-worth by gaining the admiration and acceptance of valued others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). One possibility to gain the acceptance and attention of valued others is to engage in desirable and norm-conform behaviors. In a work context, loyalty towards the employer, a main feature of normative commitment, may be seen as such a behavior. This line of reasoning fits well with Hazan and Shaver's (1990, p. 278) findings according to which anxious individuals' "central motivation at work is to gain respect and admiration from others". Also in line with our considerations is the reported tendency of anxious-ambivalent workers to become over-obligated. Their over-obligation serves to satisfy highly valued colleagues and superiors (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), from whom in turn they hope to gain affirmation and reassurance. Accordingly, we further assume high normative commitment amongst anxious employees. Put differently: the more anxious employees, the more likely they are to stay in an organization because they ought to do so. Our third hypothesis thus is that

H₃: Attachment anxiety is positively related to normative commitment.

Avoidant workers are said to use work as an escape from interpersonal and emotional problems (Krausz et al., 2001). Accordingly, Hazan and Shaver (1990) portray avoidant workers as real workaholics, who use work as an excuse for not being forced to participate in social interactions with friends or family members. As a consequence, they work long hours, take few holidays and prefer working alone. Thus, avoidants are said to "work at the expense of health and relationships" (Hardy & Barkham, 1994, p. 267). This tendency to overwork and to become over-involved with work is also reported by Krausz et al. (2001).

Being an insecure attachment orientation, attachment avoidance is further associated with difficulties in adapting to changes (Mikulincer et al., 1993). In general, the avoidance dimension is characterized by a reluctance of becoming dependent on others, due to a lack of trust in them (Game, 2008). The latter comments imply an aversion of avoidants towards frequent job changes, since new jobs and work environments are associated with insecurity, changes and demand adaptations. Moreover, during the entry period, new jobs and work environments would force avoidants to rely on others and trust in them (Krausz et al. 2001). Taking this picture of the avoidant worker into account implies high organizational commitment amongst avoidants. But

what can we expect in terms of the specific relationships of attachment avoidance with affective, normative and continuance commitment?

Considering their emotional and interpersonal problems in the non-work sphere and their high work engagement, we assume avoidants to compensatorily direct their emotional and attachment needs towards work organizations. In doing so, we assume high affective commitment amongst avoidant employees. We further assume them, based on their affective commitment, to develop consistent normative attitudes. To be precise, we suppose them to ascribe meaning to values such as loyalty and faith towards the organization, thereby suggesting high normative organizational commitment. Our hypotheses four and five, pertaining to the relationship between attachment avoidance on the one hand and affective and normative commitment on the other, therefore are:

H₄: Attachment avoidance is positively related to affective commitment.

H₅: Attachment avoidance is positively related to normative commitment.

Regarding the development of our sixth and last hypothesis, we again would like to draw the reader's attention to avoidants' aversion towards new job and work environments. Such environments not only force them to adapt to and cope with involved changes and challenges, but also to rely on and trust in new colleagues during the initial phase in the new work organization. Leaving an organization, due to these threatening prospects, may seem too costly for avoidant workers. Thus, they may feel the need to remain with the organization in order to avoid those threatening experiences. These arguments lead us to the assumption of high continuance commitment amongst avoidant workers. Accordingly, our sixth and final hypothesis is:

H₆: Attachment avoidance is positively related to continuance commitment.

Methods

To test the presented assumptions, a questionnaire on the basis of existing, standardized scales and a few additional demographic variables was compiled. It was distributed amongst 156 full-time white collar workers who were enrolled in varying professional degree programs at the Management Center Innsbruck, Austria. Questionnaires were distributed and collected personally. This may explain the fact that with 110 completed and returned questionnaires the response rate (64%) was very high.

Study sample

Of the 110 study participants, 32% (35) were female and 68% (75) were male. Average age was 31.6 years, with the youngest respondent being 22 and the oldest being 46 years old. 71% of the respondents had a university entrance degree (A-level), 16% had a university degree, 13% had a professional qualification or had finished a professional school, and one percent of the participants had only completed compulsory education. Average tenure was about seven years.

Measures

Besides demographic variables, the distributed questionnaire consisted of the Scales to Measure Two Dimensions of Attachment Insecurity (Grau, 1999).

Grau's (1999) scales measure attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. Example items for the anxiety dimension are "I often worry about others not liking me enough", "I am concerned about not being important enough for other persons" and "My need for attention is often not met by others.". The items "In close relationships I quickly get the feeling of being restricted in my personal freedom", "If others come to close to me, I distance myself from them" and "I usually prefer being on my own over being in company of others." present example items of the avoidance dimension. Grau (1999) reports internal consistencies of $\alpha=.89-.91$ for the anxiety scale and of $\alpha=.82-.86$ for the avoidance scale.

The dimensional assessment of attachment orientations was used in the present study because more recent research (e.g. Geller & Bamberger, 2009) conceptualizes attachment on the basis of the two underlying dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. In addition, it allows for the avoidance of grouping problems associated with analyses on the basis of styles (Coble et al., 1996).

The questionnaire further comprised of a German version of the Commitment Scales of Allen and Meyer (1990), provided by Schmidt et al. (1998). In line with the three component model of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997), these scales allow for measuring affective, continuance and normative commitment. Example items for the three scales are: "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization" (affective commitment, reverse coded); "I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization" (continuance commitment); "If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization" (normative commitment). Reported internal consistencies are $\alpha=.76$ for affective and continuance commitment and $\alpha=.79$ for normative commitment (Schmidt et al., 1998).

Individuals made their judgments on the attachment and commitment scales on seven point rating scales (1= not at all true to 7 = very true).

Results

Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations together with the reliabilities of the scales can be seen in table 1.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, intercorrelations and reliabilities of the scales

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Sex											
2. Education level			.02								
3. Age	31.56	5.48	.11	-.15							
4. Job tenure	6.96	6.09	.16	-.08	.55**						
5. Anxiety	2.74	1.02	.08	-.01	.02	.05	(.91)				
6. Avoidance	3.67	0.92	.01	.12	.26**	.04	.09	(.80)			
7. Affective Commitment	3.80	0.59	.03	.05	.17	.12	.31**	.39**	(.74)		
8. Continuance Commitment	3.28	1.10	.03	-.02	.13	.21*	.29**	.04	.15	(.71)	
9. Normative Commitment	3.55	0.55	.11	.15	.06	.27**	.26**	.01	.20*	.32**	(.72)

Note: Parenthetical values are alphas; *= $p<.05$; **= $p<.01$; $n=110$.

According to the results in table 1, the two attachment dimensions are uncorrelated. Normative commitment shows positive, albeit weak correlations with affective ($r=.20$) and continuance commitment ($r=.32$).

With Cronbach alphas of $\alpha=.91$ for the anxiety and $\alpha=.80$ for the avoidance subscale, reliability of Grau's (1999) attachment scales is good. Internal consistencies of the affective, continuance and normative commitment scales range from $\alpha=.71$ -.74 and suggest satisfying reliability of the commitment scales.

Before analyzing the present data regarding our research hypotheses, we also tested the validity of the measures by means of factor analysis (see tables 3 and 4 in appendix). In terms of validity, principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation confirmed the two factor structure suggested by Grau (1999). Factor loadings of the 10 anxiety items ranged from .63 to .88, factor loadings of the 10 avoidance items from .44 to .72. Together, the anxiety (30.57%) and avoidance factor (17.99%) explained 48.56% of total variance.

With respect to the commitment scales, the three factor structure identified by Schmidt et al. (1998) was confirmed by a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation. This underlines the construct validity of the questionnaire. In total, the affective commitment factor (8.53%), the continuance commitment factor (10.14%) and the normative commitment factor (25.17%) explain 43.84% in variance. Factor loadings range from .29 to .72 for affective commitment, from .44 to .81 for continuance commitment, and from .43 to .71 for normative commitment. Three items were excluded because communalities were too low.

Considering that the two attachment dimensions as well as the three commitment dimensions explain less than 50% of variance, the amount of explained variance could be higher.

To test our hypotheses (H_1 - H_6) regarding a potential interplay between anxious and avoidant attachment on the one hand and affective, continuance and normative commitment on the other, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. In a first step we entered the demographic variables sex, age, education level and job tenure for control purposes. In a second step we additionally included attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance as predictors. In the third and final step the interaction term anxiety x avoidance was added, in order to test for possible interactions between the two attachment dimensions. The according results are pictured in table 2.

In our hypotheses 1-3 we postulated a positive relationship between attachment anxiety and affective (H_1), continuance (H_2) and normative (H_3) commitment, respectively.

As pictured in table 2, attachment anxiety is a highly significant predictor of affective ($\beta=.28$), continuance ($\beta=.28$) and normative ($\beta=.27$) commitment.

Within hypothesis 4-6 we argued for a positive relationship between attachment avoidance and affective (H_4), normative (H_5) and continuance (H_6) commitment. According to our results shown in table 2, attachment avoidance only is a highly significant predictor of affective commitment ($\beta=.36$), but not of continuance or normative commitment.

Table 2: Regression analysis with demographic variables, anxiety, avoidance and anxiety x avoidance as predictors of affective, continuance and normative commitment.

	Affective Commitment			Continuance Commitment			Normative Commitment		
	B	SD B	β	B	SD B	β	B	SD B	β
Sex	-.06	.12	-.05	-.02	.23	-.01	.13	.11	.11
Age	.02	.01	.15	.01	.02	.03	.01	.01	.10
Education level	.05	.10	.05	.00	.19	.00	.16	.09	.17
Job tenure	.00	.01	.05	.03	.02	.19	.00	.01	-.04
R²	.03			.04			.04		
Δ R²	.01			.01			.01		
F=	.91			1.18			1.16		
Sex	-.10	.11	-.08	-.07	.22	-.03	.10	.11	.09
Age	.00	.01	.00	.00	.02	.02	.01	.01	.12
Education level	-.01	.09	-.01	-.01	.18	.00	.17	.09	.18
Job tenure	.01	.01	.13	.03	.02	.18	-.01	.01	-.07
Anxiety	.16	.05	.28**	.31	.10	.28**	.15	.05	.27**
Avoidance	.22	.05	.38**	.04	.11	.03	-.03	.06	-.05
R²	.23**			.12*			.12*		
Δ R²	.19			.07			.06		
F=	5.19**			2.43*			2.25*		
F change	13.33**			4.79*			4.28*		
Sex	-.10	.11	-.08	-.07	.22	-.03	.10	.11	.09
Age	.00	.01	.00	.00	.02	.02	.01	.01	.13
Education level	-.01	.09	-.01	-.01	.18	-.01	.17	.09	.18
Job tenure	.01	.01	.12	.03	.02	.19	-.01	.01	-.08
Anxiety	.17	.05	.28**	.31	.10	.28**	.15	.05	.27**
Avoidance	.21	.06	.36**	.04	.11	.04	-.04	.06	-.07
Anxiety x Avoidance	-.05	.04	-.10	.03	.09	.03	-.04	.04	-.09
R²	.24**			.12*			.12*		
Δ R²	.19			.07			.06		
F=	4.63**			2.09*			2.07*		
F change	1.21			.14			0.96		

*=p<.05; **=p<.01; n=110.

Thus, hypotheses 1-4 are confirmed, hypotheses 5 and 6 are not supported.

Findings in table 2 do not reveal a significant interaction between anxious and avoidant attachment in the prediction of affective, continuance or normative commitment.

The included demographic variables sex, age, education level and job tenure do not contribute to the prediction of the three commitment dimensions.

Discussion

Organizational commitment, especially affective commitment, has been found to be related to a number of desirable work outcomes, such as decreased withdrawal and turnover intentions, or enhanced performance (Meyer et al., 2002). Thus, it is not sur-

prising that organizations show a considerable interest in ways and means to establish and maintain a committed workforce. As outlined at the onset of the present paper, the according research on antecedents of employee commitment is marked by a focus on contextual factors. Amongst the personal antecedents studied so far were locus of control and self-efficacy (Meyer et al., 2002). The few existing results on relationships between other individual difference variables, such as demographics (Johnson et al., 2010) or neuroticism (Herz et al., 2009), and organizational commitment were less promising. Nonetheless, organizations may profit from the consideration of personal antecedents in promoting employee commitment (Johnson & Chang, 2006). Therefore, our work aimed at shedding a first light on the unique relations between attachment anxiety and avoidance on the one hand and affective, continuance and normative commitment on the other. With this aim, the study at hand not only addresses the negligence of personal antecedents of commitment in past research. It also adds to the attachment literature by linking interpersonal to organizational attachment.

Taken together, current results suggest that the attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance contribute to explained variance in affective, continuance and normative commitment. In detail, explained variance is highest for affective commitment, whereas explained variance for normative and continuance commitment is rather low.

Regarding attachment anxiety, we hypothesized and found positive relationships with all three commitment components. Thus, the according research hypotheses 1-3 are confirmed. Seemingly, high anxiety goes along with commitment towards the organization. As we argued above, anxious employees' commitment may be based on the fact that anxious individuals use work to meet unsatisfied attachment needs (H_1 - affective commitment), perceive job alternatives negatively and leaving too costly (H_2 - continuance commitment) and finally consider loyal behavior as a mean to get acceptance from valued others (H_3 - normative commitment).

Within our hypotheses 4-6, we assumed high avoidance to be positively related to affective (H_4), normative (H_5) and continuance (H_6) commitment. In contrast to our expectations, results only revealed a positive correlation with affective commitment. Thereby, current findings suggest that avoidant individuals experience satisfaction of their otherwise unmet emotional needs through organizational membership. Regarding normative commitment, we expected that avoidants, consistent with their emotional attachment to the organization, develop corresponding attitudes, such as loyalty and faith towards the organization. The present findings however revealed no significant relationship between avoidance and normative commitment. Facing this result, one might argue that the assumed consistency between affective and normative attitudes only holds true for a part of the avoidant employees. Putting this line of reasoning forward, we posit that in the case of strong emotions (i.e. high affective commitment) not all individuals may feel the need for an additional normative justification of their affective commitment. With respect to continuance commitment, we expected high continuance commitment amongst avoidants (H_6). In detail, we argued that the prospect of having to trust in and being dependent on non-valued others when starting a new job, would be perceived as threatening by avoidants. As a consequence, we assumed them to perceive leaving too costly and accordingly to dispose of high continuance commitment. Our results however failed to confirm this notion. The observed

non-significant correlation may be explained by contradictions between the described preference to remain with the organization due to social anxieties of having to trust or becoming dependent and the characteristic positive self-perception of avoidants. While the former prevents avoidants from leaving, the latter can be expected to lead them to positive evaluations of their professional competence and occupational alternatives, which implies low continuance commitment. Statistically, these contradictions may manifest in the failure to detect neither a positive nor a negative correlation between attachment avoidance and continuance commitment.

Considered as a whole, the presented results suggest that attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance do relate differently to affective, normative and continuance commitment. This fact stresses the relevance of considering attachment orientations as an individual difference variable in building and sustaining employee commitment.

Thereby, findings lend support to Johnson and Chang's (2006) pleading for the consideration of individual difference variables. At the same time, they contradict Meyer et al. (2002) who discouraged research on personal antecedents of organizational commitment. Indeed, individual attachment orientations may predispose the employee to certain forms of organizational commitment. Following Johnson and Chang (2006), this individual predisposition towards a certain form of organizational commitment may then allow the organization to promote organizational commitment under consideration of the specific "person-commitment fit" (Meyer et al., 2002).

Person-Organization-Fit research is rooted in the Attraction-Selection-Attrition framework (ASA; Schneider, 1987). The ASA framework suggests that employees actively search for work situations that are attractive to them, instead of being passively assigned to certain jobs. Against that background, it seems reasonable to assume that just as attachment orientations predispose individuals to certain forms of commitment, attachment orientations may as well promote self-selection of individuals into organizations that already differ from each other in terms of their commitment potential. Due to the cross-sectional design of our work we are unfortunately not able to rule out this possibility. Also, the above cited first empirical evidence on attachment orientations and preferences for specific employment contracts (Krausz et al., 2001) does not allow drawing any firm conclusions, since the according findings are exploratory in nature and, at least partly, contradict attachment theory based expectations. Anyway, we are of the opinion that the question of whether attachment orientations are related to a preference for certain types of organizations definitely deserves attention in future research.

Reconsidered, our findings of high commitment amongst anxious and avoidant employees imply low affective, low normative and low continuance commitment for employees low in anxiety and low in avoidance, i.e. for secure employees. As already argued before, this negative relationship may be due to conflicting commitments between non-work obligations on the one hand and professional ones on the other (Gould & Werbel, 1983; Randall, 1987). In addition, we expected secure workers' attachment needs, needs for identification and involvement to be satisfied outside the workplace. Considering these facts together with secures' prioritization of private over work life (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), secure employees may be less affectively committed because they experience less of a need to develop an affective bond with their organi-

zation. Similarly, their normative commitment may be lower because they rather direct their loyalty towards friends and family than towards a work organization. Their lower continuance commitment finally may be traced back to their more optimistic perception of potential costs of leaving, of available alternatives as well as of their personal competencies.

Another plausible but conflicting explanation for the lower organizational commitment amongst secures may have to do with the focus of our work on organizational commitment. Since secure attachment is known to establish individuals with the ability to build and maintain positive relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), it is reasonable to assume that secure attachment goes along with higher levels in other foci of commitment, e.g. in supervisor or team commitment. As our findings do not allow ruling out one of these alternative interpretations, there is a need for further research in this regard.

A very intriguing practical question arising from our results is, whether or not they imply abstaining from the employment of secure workers. Regarding this question, several aspects have to be taken into account. First of all, secure employees have been constantly identified as having a “secure orientation to work” (Hazan & Shaver, 1990, p. 271), i.e. as being the more satisfied and healthier workers, as reporting less conflicts with co-workers, as perceiving and reacting to supervisor behavior more positively, as having a satisfying private life and being able to enjoy leisure, as engaging in helping or citizenship behaviors at work, and so on (Bartley, Head & Stansfeld, 2007; Desivilya et al. 2006; Game, 2008; Geller & Bamberger, 2009; Hardy & Barkham, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Schirmer & Lopez, 2001). So, even though we found secures to be less committed to the organization, the latter findings do not suggest to potential employers that it would be wise to keep the hands off secure employees.

Second, considering the different facets of organizational commitment, not all of them are related to positive outcome variables, and thus not all of them seem desirable from an organizational viewpoint. Following Wasti (2005) for example, continuance commitment has either been found to be unrelated or even negatively related to desirable work behaviors, such as enhanced performance or organizational citizenship behavior. Against the background of these findings, desirability at least of this commitment component seems questionable.

Third, we would like to point to the fact that while suggesting lower affective, normative and continuance commitment for secure employees, our results do not provide evidence for secure employees being uncommitted. In this regard, also potential negative aspects of high commitment have to be mentioned, although according evidence so far is limited (Moser, 1998).

Finally, before drawing the conclusion that secures are poor workers, or before drawing any other conclusions from the present study, we definitely recommend further research due to the exploratory nature of our work. Besides simply replicating the current analysis in other, broader samples, future works should clarify whether or not secures do develop supervisor or team commitment, and if so, whether these commitments outweigh potential negative effects of their lower organizational commitment. Considering the positive relationships of secure attachment with other work at-

titudes and work behaviors, it also seems worth to investigate whether the lower commitment of secures really manifests in lower productivity, or whether the higher commitment of insecure individuals actually leads to higher productivity.

So, coming back to our question of whether or not one should abstain from employing secure individuals because of their lower organizational commitment, we currently opt for answering this question with “no”, based on our reflections outlined above. Instead, we argue for taking into account individuals’ attachment-related commitment preferences in prompting employee commitment. Adequate measures on an organizational level, like the provision of supervisor support (Meyer et al., 2002), the implementation of transformational leadership (Felfe, Tartler & Liepman, 2004) or of work-life balance initiatives (Kaiser, Ringlestetter, Reindl & Stolz, 2010), are practicable strategies in building and sustaining organizational commitment. If secures lower commitment is actually due to conflicting commitments, especially the last-mentioned work-life balance measures seem promising: by reducing potential conflicts between the work and the now-work domain, they contribute to the enhancement of affective and normative commitment,

Related to the practical question of whether organizations should abstain from employing secure workers is a potential practical implication of our study. Thus, when considered in a broader context of personnel selection and placement, current findings imply the possibility of integrating attachment orientations as a further element in test batteries used in employee selection. However, before such and other practical applications are justified, there is a clear need for further research, due to the preliminary nature of our findings.

In particular, future research should seek to overcome the following limitations of the present work. One limitation pertains to the restricted generalizability of the current findings, because of the sample’s characteristics. As described in the method section, our participants are highly educated white collar workers, which is why our findings have to be supported in other, broader samples. In addition, the exclusive use of self-report measures presents a limitation of the current work, as it implies the possibility of common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Regarding attachment measures however, the study of Banai, Weller and Miculincer (1998) provides evidence for a high extent of accordance between self and other ratings of attachment.

In spite of its limitations, in analyzing the hypothesized link between individual differences in attachment orientations and related differences in the various forms of organizational commitment, the present paper contributes to the literature in several ways: First, with the exception of the above cited studies, works on possible contributions of attachment theory to the understanding of workplace attitudes and behaviors are rare (Geller & Bamberger, 2009). Thus, on a broader theoretical level and in addition to the few existing works, our research provides further evidence for the expandability of attachment theory to the workplace domain. Second, the study at hand adds to existing knowledge, since to the authors’ best knowledge it is the very first that explores the impact of attachment orientations on employees’ affective, continuance and normative commitment. As outlined before, we deem the hypothesized link not only intuitively appealing, but also plausible from a theoretical perspective and there-

fore consider it worth of future research. Third, and regarded from the viewpoint of organizational researchers, the present work follows Johnson and Chang's (2006) recommendation, according to which subsequent studies should additionally take individual-difference variables as antecedents of commitment into account. In doing so, it demonstrates that also the role of individual-difference variables, in our case attachment orientations, is worth considering.

References

- Albert, L.S., & Horowitz, L.M. (2009). Attachment styles and ethical behavior: their relationship and significance in the marketplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *87*, 299-316
- Ainsworth, M. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 932-937.
- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*, 1-18.
- Banai, E., Weller, A., & Mikulincer, M. (1998). Interjudge agreement in evaluation of adult attachment style: The impact of acquaintanceship. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 95-109.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L.M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four – category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(2), 226-244.
- Bartley, M., Head, J., & Stansfeld, S. (2007). Is attachment style a source of resilience against health inequalities at work? *Social Science & Medicine*, *64*, 765-775.
- Blustein, D.L., Prezioso, M.S., & Palladino Schultheiss, D. (1995). Attachment theory and career development: Current status and future directions. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *23*, 416-432.
- Bowlby, J. (1975). *Bindung – Eine Analyse der Mutter-Kind-Beziehung*. München, Germany: Kindler Verlag.
- Brennan, K.A., Clark, C.L., & Shaver, P.R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J.A Simpson & W.S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Desivilya, H.S., Sabag, Y., & Ashton, E. (2006). Prosocial tendencies in organizations: The role of attachment styles and organizational justice in shaping organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *14*(1), 22-42.
- Dubin, R., Champoux, J.E., & Porter, L.W. (1975). Central Life Interests and Organisational Commitment of Blue-collar and Clerical Workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *20*, pp.411-421.
- Felfe, J., Schmook, R., Schyns, B., & Six, B. (2008). Does the form of employment make a difference?— Commitment of traditional, temporary, and self-employed workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(1), 81-94.
- Felfe, J., Schmook, R., & Six, B. (2006). Die Bedeutung kultureller Wertorientierungen für das Commitment gegenüber der Organisation, dem Vorgesetzten, der Arbeitsgruppe und der eigenen Karriere. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie*, *5*(3), 94-107.
- Felfe, J., Tartler, K., & Liepman, D. (2004). Advanced Research in the Field of Transformational Leadership. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, *18*(3), 262-288.
- Fraley, R.C., & Shaver, P.R. (1998). Airport separations: A naturalistic study of adult attachment dynamics in separating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(5), 1198-1212.
- Game, A.M. (2008). Negative emotions in supervisory relationships: The role of relational models. *Human Relations*, *61*(3), 355-393.
- Geller, D., & Bamberger, P. (2009). Bringing avoidance and anxiety to the job: Attachment style and instrumental helping behavior among co-workers. *Human Relations*, *62*(12), 1803-1827.
- Gould, S., & Werbel, J.D. (1983). Work Involvement: A Comparison of Dual Wage Earner and Single Wage Earner Families. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(2), 313-319.
- Grau, I. (1999). Skalen zur Erfassung von Bindungsrepräsentationen in Paarbeziehungen. *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, *20*(2), 142-152.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Beutel, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76-88.
- Hardy, G.E., & Barkham, M. (1994). The relationship between interpersonal attachment styles and work difficulties. *Human Relations*, *47*(3), 263-281.

- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(2), 270-280.
- Herz, A., Beck, A., & Felfe, J. (2009). Organisationales Commitment als Mediator zwischen Transformationaler Führung und Kundenzufriedenheit. *Wirtschaftspsychologie*, 3, 106-118.
- Johnson, R.E., & Chang, C.H. (2006). "I" is to continuance as "We" is to affective: the relevance of the self-concept for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 549-570.
- Johnson, R.E., Chang, C.H., & Yang, L.Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: the relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 226-245.
- Kaiser, S., Ringlstetter, M., Reindl, C.U., & Stolz, M.L. (2010). Die Wirkung von Work-Life Balance Initiativen auf das Mitarbeitercommitment: Eine empirische Untersuchung in der Unternehmensberatungsbranche. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 24(3), 231-265.
- Krausz, M., Bizman, A., & Braslavsky, D. (2001). Effects of attachment style on preferences for and satisfaction with different employment contracts: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2), 299-316.
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Kalifornien: Sage Publications Inc.
- Meyer, J.P., Becker, T.E., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social identities and commitments at work: toward an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(5), 665-683.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Meyer, J.P., Vandenberghe, C., & Becker, T.E. (2004). Employee Commitment and Motivation: A Conceptual Analysis and Integrative Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 991-1007.
- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Weller, A. (1993). Attachment styles, coping strategies, and post-traumatic psychological distress: The impact of the Gulf War in Israel. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 817-826.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R. (2005). Attachment Security, Compassion, and Altruism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(1), 34-38.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R. (2007). *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P.R., & Pereg, D. (2003). Attachment Theory and Affect Regulation: The Dynamics, Development, and Cognitive Consequences of Attachment-Related Strategies. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(2), 77-102.
- Moser, K. (1996). *Commitment in Organisationen*. Bern, Switzerland: Verlag Hans Huber.
- Moser, K. (1997). Commitment in Organisationen. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 41(4), 160-170.
- Moser, K. (1998). Gibt es negative Seiten von hohem Commitment? *Gruppendynamik*, 29(3), 263-274.
- Ognibene, T.C., & Collins, N.L. (1998). Adult Attachment Styles, Perceived Social Support and Coping Strategies. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(3), 323-345.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.M., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common Method Bias in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Popper, M., & Mayselless, O. (2003). Back to basics: applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 41-65.
- Randall, D.M. (1987). Commitment and the Organization: The Organization Man Revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(3), 460-471.
- Reichers, A.E. (1986). Conflict and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 508-514.

- Schirmer, L.L., & Lopez, G.L. (2001). Probing the social support and work strain relationship among adult workers: Contributions of adult attachment orientations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 17-33.
- Schmidt, K.H., Hollmann, S., & Sodenkamp, D. (1998). Psychometrische Eigenschaften und Validität einer deutschen Fassung des ‚Commitment‘ – Fragebogens von Allen und Meyer (1990). *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, 19(2), 93-106.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-454.
- Simmons, B.L., Gooty, J., Nelson, D.L., & Little, L.M. (2009). Secure attachment: implications for hope, trust, burnout, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 233-247.
- Wasti, S.A. (2005). Commitment profiles: Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 290-308.

Appendix

Table 3: Results of the factor analysis of the Scales to Measure Two Dimensions of Attachment Insecurity (Grau, 1999)

Item	Factor 1: Anxiety	Factor 2: Avoidance	h ²
Ich mache mir oft Sorgen, dass andere Menschen mich nicht genug mögen.	.88	.06	.78
Ich bin besorgt, für andere Menschen nicht genügend wichtig zu sein.	.87	-.01	.75
Manchmal mache ich mir Sorgen darüber, dass anderen an meiner Freundschaft nichts liegt.	.83	.05	.68
Mein Bedürfnis nach Aufmerksamkeit wird von anderen oft nicht erfüllt.	.81	.02	.66
Ich frage mich manchmal, ob andere mich genauso intensiv mögen, wie ich sie mag.	.73	.02	.53
Ich mache mir öfters Sorgen, dass Leute die Beziehung zu mir abbrechen.	.71	-.02	.51
Es frustriert mich manchmal, dass mir zu wenige Menschen die Liebe geben, die ich brauche.	.70	.10	.50
Andere sind oft wichtiger für mich als ich für sie.	.69	-.03	.47
Ich versuche andere dazu zu bewegen, dass sie mehr mit mir zusammen sind.	.65	.05	.42
Andere zögern oft, mir so nahe zu kommen, wie ich es gerne hätte.	.63	.14	.41
Ich fühle mich durch intensive Beziehungen schnell eingeeengt.	-.04	.72	.52
Wenn mir andere zu nahe kommen, gehe ich auf Distanz.	-.01	.71	.50
Ich bin gewöhnlich lieber allein, als mit anderen zusammen.	.23	.69	.53
Wenn ich Ärger habe oder krank bin, meide ich andere.	.10	.63	.41
Ich finde es schön, mich an Menschen zu binden.	.28	-.62	.39
Ich habe leicht das Gefühl, dass andere mich vereinnahmen wollen.	-.09	.62	.46
Ich erzähle auch nahestehenden Personen nicht alles über mich.	-.07	.56	.32
Andere wollen oft, dass ich vertraulicher bin, als es mir angenehm ist.	.23	.53	.33
Ich möchte anderen Menschen gefühlsmäßig so nahe wie möglich sein.	.37	-.46	.35
Meine intimsten Gefühle gehen niemanden etwas an.	-.02	.44	.20
Variance:	30.57%	17.99%	
Eigenvalues:	6.12	3.59	
Total variance:	48.56%		

Table 4: Results of the factor analysis of the Commitment Scales (Schmidt, Hollmann & Sodenkamp, 1998)

Item	Factor 1: <i>Normative Commitment</i>	Factor 2: <i>Continuance Commitment</i>	Factor 3: <i>Affective Commitment</i>	h ²
Einer der Hauptgründe, in diesem Betrieb weiter zu arbeiten, besteht für mich darin, dass ich glaube, dass Treue dem Betrieb gegenüber wichtig ist. Ich fühle mich deshalb auch moralisch verpflichtet, in meinem Betrieb zu bleiben	.71	.30	.09	.60
Einem Betrieb treu zu bleiben, messe ich eine große Bedeutung bei.	.71	.14	.08	.53
Heutzutage stünde es um die Dinge besser, wenn die Leute die meiste Zeit ihres Berufslebens in einem Betrieb bleiben würden.	.68	.23	-.26	.59
Ich denke nicht, daß es heutzutage noch vernünftig ist, so ein richtiger „Betriebsmensch“ zu werden.	-.56	.01	-.27	.38
Wenn mir ein anderer Betrieb eine bessere Stelle anböte, würde ich es nicht als richtig empfinden, meinen Betrieb zu verlassen.	.55	.02	.16	0.33
Ich glaube nicht, daß man seinem Betrieb immer treu sein muß.	-.49	.28	.10	.33
Ich glaube, daß die Leute heutzutage den Betrieb zu häufig wechseln.	.48	.12	-.06	.25
Es erscheint mir überhaupt nicht unmoralisch, von Betrieb zu Betrieb zu wechseln.	-.43	.13	-.26	.27
Ich glaube, daß ich momentan zu wenige alternative Beschäftigungsmöglichkeiten habe, um einen Betriebswechsel ernsthaft in Erwägung zu ziehen.	-.07	.81	.10	.67
Eine der wenigen ernsthaften Folgen eines Betriebswechsels wäre der Mangel an tatsächlichen Beschäftigungsalternativen.	-.09	.66	-.19	.48
Einer der Hauptgründe, warum ich hier arbeite, besteht darin, daß ein Stellenwechsel beträchtliche persönliche Opfer von mir verlangte, die ein anderer Betrieb nicht aufwiegen könnte.	.08	.59	.07	.35
Zu vieles in meinem Leben würde sich verändern, wenn ich mich entschliesse, meinen Betrieb momentan zu verlassen.	.29	.56	.16	.42
Selbst wenn ich es wollte, würde es mir sehr schwer fallen, gerade jetzt meinen Betrieb zu verlassen.	.38	.56	.35	.58
Ich glaube, ich könnte mich leicht mit einem anderen Betrieb gleich stark verbunden fühlen wie mit meinem jetzigen.	-.32	-.33	.29	.30
Ich fühle mich emotional nicht sonderlich mit dem Betrieb verbunden, für den ich arbeite.	.19	.01	.72	.56
Ich empfinde kein starkes Gefühl der Zugehörigkeit zu meinem Betrieb.	.01	-.14	.65	.44
Ich empfinde mich nicht als „Teil der Familie“ meines Betriebes.	-.09	.13	.55	.33
Mein Betrieb hat eine große persönliche Bedeutung für mich.	-.38	-.24	-.55	.50
Ich wäre sehr froh, mein weiteres Berufsleben in diesem Betrieb verbringen zu können.	.39	.31	-.46	.46
Probleme des Betriebs beschäftigen mich häufig so, als seien sie meine eigenen.	-.11	-.41	-.46	.39
In meinem Betrieb zu bleiben entspricht sowohl der Notwendigkeit als auch meinen Wünschen.	-.23	.44	-.45	.45
Variance:	25.17%	10.14%	8.53%	
Eigenvalues:	5.29	2.13	1.79	
Total variance:	43.84%			

Please note that the final factor solution presented in table 4 does not include the three items that were excluded because of low communalities. One of the excluded items measures affective commitment (Ich unterhalte mich gerne auch mit Leuten über meinen Betrieb, die nicht dort arbeiten). The other two items refer to continuance commitment (Ich mache mir keine Sorgen darüber, was passieren würde, wenn ich kündigte, ohne eine andere Stelle in Aussicht zu haben. Es wäre nicht mit zu vielen Nachteilen für mich verbunden, wenn ich momentan meinen Betrieb verlassen würde.).