

Sussex Research

Relationship functioning following a large-scale sacrifice: perceived partner prosociality buffers attachment insecurity

Gabriela CM Murphy, Rebecca M Horne, Mariko Visserman, Emily A Impett

Publication date

01-09-2022

Licence

This work is made available under the Copyright not evaluated licence and should only be used in accordance with that licence. For more information on the specific terms, consult the repository record for this item.

Document Version

Accepted version

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Murphy, G. C., Horne, R. M., Visserman, M., & Impett, E. A. (2022). *Relationship functioning following a large-scale sacrifice: perceived partner prosociality buffers attachment insecurity* (Version 1). University of Sussex. https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23308931.v1

Published in

Journal of Family Psychology

Link to external publisher version

https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000994

Copyright and reuse:

This work was downloaded from Sussex Research Open (SRO). This document is made available in line with publisher policy and may differ from the published version. Please cite the published version where possible. Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. For more information on this work, SRO or to report an issue, you can contact the repository administrators at sro@sussex.ac.uk. Discover more of the University's research at https://sussex.figshare.com/

Supplement

Relationship Functioning Following a Large-Scale Sacrifice: Perceived Partner Prosociality

Buffers Attachment Insecurity

Section 1: Personal Well-Being

Given that accompanying partners report lower personal well-being after a relocation (e.g., stress; Cui et al., 2017; Martin, 1996) and attachment insecurity is robustly associated with lower personal well-being (e.g., lower life satisfaction; Lavy & Littman-Ovadia, 2011; Marrero-Quevedo et al., 2019), in line with our preregistration, we also examined associations among accompanying partners' attachment insecurity and personal well-being (i.e., life satisfaction and move-related satisfaction) following relocation. In addition, we tested whether perceived partner gratitude (i.e., move-related and general gratitude) and sacrifice (i.e., sacrifice behaviors and willingness to sacrifice) attenuated negative associations among attachment insecurity and personal well-being. We predicted that attachment insecurity would be associated with lower life satisfaction and move-related satisfaction. We also predicted that accompanying partners high in attachment avoidance and anxiety who perceive higher move-related gratitude, general gratitude, sacrifice behaviors, and willingness to sacrifice from their partner would also report higher satisfaction with life and with the move. We also conducted auxiliary (non-preregistered) moderated-mediation analyses to explore whether perceived partner prosociality could buffer insecure accompanying partners against lower personal well-being indirectly via relationship quality.

Methods

Measures

Life Satisfaction. Life satisfaction was measured with one-item from the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985) and was rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = strongly *disagree* to 7 = strongly agree. This one-item scale has been shown to be a reliable and valid measure of the broader, multiple-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (Cheung & Lucas, 2014).

Participants responded to the question: "On the whole, I am satisfied with my life" (M = 5.13; SD = 1.46).

Move-Related Satisfaction. Move-related satisfaction was measured with five items from the Post-Move Attitudes Scale (Fisher & Shaw, 1994). Participants indicated how they currently felt about their recent move on a 7-point scale (1 = very bad to 7 = very good; 1 = very*negative* to 7 = very positive; 1 = pessimistic to 7 = optimistic; 1 = apprehensive to 7 = relaxed; 1 = unhappy to 7 = happy). The mean of the five items was used to form a measure of moverelated satisfaction (M = 5.06; SD = 1.31; $\alpha = .87$).

Data Analytic Approach

We used the same analytic approach as in the main text. We utilized a step-wise procedure to test the main effects of attachment insecurity and relationship functioning. We then conducted multiple linear regression analyses to test whether these associations were moderated by perceived partner gratitude and sacrifice. We utilized separate models for each moderator on each outcome variable (eight models total). Independent variables and moderators were all grand-mean centered. All data and syntax have been made available at the Open Science Framework (OSF) and can be accessed at https://osf.io/zdasq/.

Results

Attachment, Perceived Partner Prosociality, and Personal Well-Being

The correlations among all variables are presented in Table S1. Step-wise analyses indicated that attachment avoidance was significantly associated with lower life satisfaction (b = -0.52, SE = 0.09, p < .001) and move-related satisfaction (b = -0.35, SE = 0.09, p = <.001), but attachment anxiety was not (life satisfaction: b = -0.13, SE = 0.08, p = .128; move-related satisfaction: b = -0.11, SE = 0.08, p = .154). There were no significant interactions between attachment avoidance and

any of the perceived partner prosociality variables in predicting life satisfaction (Table S2) or moverelated satisfaction (Table S3). Thus, we did not find support for our buffering predictions with our personal well-being outcome variables.

Providing Evidence for Generalizability of Effects

Neither relationship length nor gender moderated the link between attachment avoidance and personal well-being (i.e., move-related satisfaction and life satisfaction). We did not proceed to test time since the move as a covariate in the moderation models because there were no significant buffering effects.

Auxiliary Analyses: Indirect Effects Through Relationship Quality and Move-Related Relationship Benefits

One potential reason why perceived partner prosociality may not have buffered insecurely attached individuals against lower personal well-being is because these buffers may operate indirectly through relationship quality. Indeed, past research suggests a strong association between relationship well-being and personal well-being, with relationship wellbeing (e.g., marital quality) being a stronger predictor of personal well-being than personal wellbeing as a predictor of relationship well-being (Proulx et al., 2007). Thus, while not preregistered, we tested a series of moderated-mediation models to explore whether perceived partner gratitude and sacrifice buffered insecure accompanying partners against lower relationship quality and perceived move-related relationship benefits which, in turn, predicted higher personal well-being. We used the PROCESS macro (model 7) in SPSS (Hayes, 2013) where the moderating variable (i.e., perceived partner prosociality) only moderates the a-path in the model (e.g., attachment insecurity predicting relationship quality)—with 5,000 resamples and 95% confidence intervals. An index of moderated-mediation indicated whether the indirect effect of the interaction between attachment insecurity and perceived partner prosociality on personal well-being through relationship quality or perceived partner move-related relationship benefits was statistically significant (Hayes, 2015). The index is interpreted as statistically significant if zero is not in the 95% confidence interval.

Across eight models tested, all eight significant indirect effects emerged (Tables S4-S6). For avoidantly attached accompanying partners, the interaction between avoidance and perceived move-related gratitude predicted life satisfaction through move-related relationship benefits (indirect effect =0.03, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [0.00, 0.07]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was only significant at low levels of move-related gratitude (1 SD below the mean of move-related gratitude: b = -0.09, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.18, -0.02]; 1 SD above the mean of move-related gratitude: b = 0.00, SE = 0.03, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.06]). The interaction between avoidance and perceived partner move-related also predicted move-related satisfaction through move-related relationship benefits (indirect effect = 0.04, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [0.01, 0.10]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was only significant at low (1 SD below the mean of move-related gratitude: b = -0.13, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.26, -0.04]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of move-related gratitude: b = -0.13, SE = 0.00, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.09]) levels of perceived partner move-related gratitude: b = -0.03, SE = 0.00, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.09]) levels of

The interaction between avoidance and perceived partner general gratitude predicted life satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.06, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [0.02, 0.09]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was stronger at low (1 SD below the mean of general gratitude: b = -0.34, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.46, -0.23]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of general gratitude: b = -0.17, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.31, -0.07]) levels of perceived partner general gratitude. The interaction between avoidance and perceived partner general gratitude also

predicted move-related satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.03, SE = 0.01, 95% CI [0.01, 0.05]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was stronger at low (1 SD below the mean of general gratitude: b = -0.15, SE = 0.05, 95% CI [-0.26, -0.06]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of general gratitude: b = -0.08, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.16, -0.02]) levels of perceived partner general gratitude.

The interaction between avoidance and perceived partner willingness to sacrifice predicted life satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.07, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [0.03, 0.10]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was stronger at low (1 SD below the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.46, SE = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.61, -0.32]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.20, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.33, -0.09]) levels of perceived partner willingness to sacrifice. Finally, the interaction between avoidance and perceived partner willingness to sacrifice also predicted move-related satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.03, SE = 0.01, 95% CI [0.01, 0.05]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was stronger at low (1 SD below the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.21, SE = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.08]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.21, SE = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.08]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.21, SE = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.08]) relative to high (1 SD above the mean of willingness to sacrifice: b = -0.21, SE = 0.09, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.19, -0.03]) levels of perceived partner willingness to sacrifice.

For anxiously attached individuals, the interaction between anxiety and perceived partner sacrifice behaviors predicted life satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.08, SE = 0.03, 95% CI [0.02, 0.13]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was only significant at low levels of perceived partner sacrifice behaviors (1 SD below the mean of sacrifice behaviors: b = -0.21, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.32, -0.10]; 1 SD above the mean of sacrifice behaviors: b = 0.00, SE = 0.05, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.09]). The interaction between anxiety and

perceived partner sacrifice behaviors also predicted move-related satisfaction through relationship quality (indirect effect = 0.03, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [0.01, 0.07]), and the conditional negative indirect effect was only significant at low levels of perceived partner sacrifice behaviors (1 SD below the mean of sacrifice behaviors: b = -0.09, SE = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.17, -0.03]; 1 SD above the mean of sacrifice behaviors: b = -0.00, SE = 0.02, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.04]).

Discussion

In line with previous literature on attachment insecurity and personal well-being (Lavy & Littman-Ovadia, 2011; Marrero-Quevedo et al., 2019) and our predictions, accompanying partners higher (versus lower) in attachment avoidance experienced lower life and move-related satisfaction after relocating. However, neither perceived partner gratitude nor sacrifice directly buffered more insecurely attached accompanying partners against experiencing lower personal well-being (i.e., life satisfaction, move-related satisfaction) after moving. Perceived partner prosociality may not be effective in protecting more insecurely attached individuals against poorer personal well-being because, at least in a context in which sacrifice is involved, these perceptions may have little impact on the self directly. Indeed, a recent meta-analysis found that neither partner's behavioral nor their willingness to sacrifice were tied to personal well-being (Righetti et al., 2020).

Another possibility—and one that was supported by some findings from our moderatedmediation analyses—is that attachment insecurity and perceived partner prosociality may be more closely tied to the quality of individuals' relationships and those relationship evaluations, in turn, may have important downstream consequences for personal well-being. This line of reasoning is also consistent with meta-analytic findings that suggest relationship quality may be a stronger predictor of personal well-being than vice versa (Proulx et al., 2007). Indeed, we found that perceived partner general gratitude and willingness to sacrifice buffered more (versus less) avoidantly attached accompanying partners against lower relationship quality which, in turn, protected them against lower life satisfaction and move-related satisfaction. We also found that perceived partner sacrifice behaviors buffered more anxiously attached accompanying partners against lower relationship quality which, in turn, protected them against lower life satisfaction and move-related satisfaction. These findings provide some preliminary evidence that the benefits of a romantic partner's prosociality may extend beyond the relational domain for insecurely attached accompanying individuals by also minimizing dissatisfaction with the move specifically and life more generally. Nevertheless, given the complexity of these analyses and the sample size in our study, we suggest readers interpret the likely underpowered, indirect effects findings cautiously and as preliminary, as these analyses would benefit from further replication with larger samples adequately powered to detect small indirect effects.

RELOCATION SACRIFICE AND RELATIONSHIP FUNCTIONING

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Avoidance	—													
2. Anxiety	.53***													
3. PP Sacrifice Behav	22***	14*	_											
4. PP Move Gratitude	47***	43***	.27***											
5. PP Gen Gratitude	58***	50***	.45***	.67***										
6. PP Will to Sacrifice	35***	28***	.43***	.53***	.59***	—								
7. Life Satisfaction	44***	31***	.38***	.42***	.53***	.41***	_							
8. Rel Quality	68***	50***	.35***	.55***	.68***	.53***	.59***	—						
9. Rel Conflict	.45***	.51***	17*	35***	41***	27***	20**	44***	_					
10. Move Satisfaction	34***	26***	.24***	.45***	.42***	.35***	.53***	.39***	31***	_				
11. Move Rel Benefits	33***	24***	.31***	.39***	.41***	.32***	.34***	.39***	23***	.42***				
12. Time Since Move	02	13	.15*	.07	.09	.01	.05	.05	11	.04	0.03			
13. Gender	03	13*	.25***	.09	.14*	.12	.01	.11	19**	.11	0.10	02		
14. Rel Length	.13*	.08	14*	12	15*	14*	06	11	02	.04	18**	.06	05	
15. Distance Relocated	.02	.11	.16*	.17*	.07	.03	.01	.07	.12	.02	.13	.09	.02	10

Table S1. Correlations Among Focal Study Variables with Life Satisfaction and Move-Related Satisfaction

Note. PP = Perceived partner. Behav = Behavior. Gen = General. Will = Willingness. Rel = Relationship. Move Rel Benefits = Move-related relationship benefits Gender was coded as 0 = women, 1 = men. ***p < .001, **p < .05.

	Life Satisfaction					
	b	SE	t	р	95% CI	f^2
Move-Related Gratitude						
Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	.26***	.07	3.73	< .001	[.12, .40]	.05
Attachment Anxiety	05	.08	-0.63	.527	[22, .11]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	39***	.10	-3.97	< .001	[59,20]	.06
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	02	.05	-0.44	.661	[12, .08]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	.01	.05	0.19	.850	[09, .11]	< 0.01
Sacrifice Behaviors						
Partner Perceived Sacrifice Behaviours	.34***	.07	5.18	< .001	[.21, .47]	.09
Attachment Anxiety	12	.08	-1.46	.146	[27, .04]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	41***	.09	-4.42	< .001	[59,23]	.07
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Sacrifice Behaviours	.04	.07	0.60	.551	[09, .17]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Sacrifice Behaviours	.11	.07	1.53	.127	[03, .24]	.01
General Gratitude						
Perceived Partner General Gratitude	.42***	.07	5.81	<.001	[.27, .56]	.12
Attachment Anxiety	.01	.08	0.07	.946	[16, .17]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	27**	.10	-2.62	.009	[47,07]	.02
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner General Gratitude	03	.05	-0.60	.550	[13, .07]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner General Gratitude	01	.05	-0.20	.842	[11, .09]	<.01
Willingness to Sacrifice						
Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.22***	.05	4.29	< .001	[.12, .33]	.06
Attachment Anxiety	09	.08	-1.15	.252	[25, .07]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	39***	.10	-4.02	<.001	[58,20]	.06
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.01	.05	0.12	.904	[09, .10]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.05	.05	1.13	.259	[04, .15]	<.01

 Table S2. Multiple Linear Regression Analyses Predicting Life Satisfaction

Note. N = 229. CI = confidence interval. ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.

	Move-Related Satisfaction					
	b	SE	t	р	95% CI	f^2
Move-Related Gratitude						
Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	.28***	.06	4.49	<.001	[.16, .41]	.07
Attachment Anxiety	01	.08	-0.13	.900	[16, .14]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	20	.09	-2.25	.026	[38,03]	.02
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	.05	.04	1.04	.299	[04, .13]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Move-Related Gratitude	.05	.05	1.08	.279	[04, .15]	<.01
Sacrifice Behaviors						
Partner Perceived Sacrifice Behaviors	.19**	.06	2.88	.004	[.06, .31]	.03
Attachment Anxiety	10	.08	-1.25	.214	[25, .06]	.01
Attachment Avoidance	30***	.09	-3.27	.001	[48,12]	.04
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Sacrifice Behaviors	.06	.06	0.97	.335	[06, .19]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Sacrifice Behaviors	.06	.07	0.82	.412	[08, .19]	<.01
General Gratitude						
Perceived Partner General Gratitude	.25***	.07	3.65	<.001	[.12, .39]	.05
Attachment Anxiety	03	.08	-0.32	.747	[18, .13]	0.01
Attachment Avoidance	17	.10	-1.72	.087	[36, .03]	.01
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner General Gratitude	.02	.05	0.41	.680	[08, .12]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner General Gratitude	.04	.05	0.87	.386	[05, .14]	<.01
Willingness to Sacrifice						
Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.19***	.05	3.75	<.001	[.09, .28]	.05
Attachment Anxiety	08	.08	-0.98	.329	[23, .08]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance	26**	.09	-2.85	.005	[44,08]	.03
Attachment Anxiety X Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.01	.05	0.24	.807	[08, .10]	<.01
Attachment Avoidance X Perceived Partner Willingness to Sacrifice	.01	.05	0.22	.828	[08, .10]	<.01

 Table S3. Multiple Linear Regression Analyses Predicting Move-Related Satisfaction

Note. N = 229. CI = confidence interval. ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.

RELOCATION SACRIFICE AND RELATIONSHIP FUNCTIONING

Table S4. Moderated-Mediation Analysis of the Interaction Between Attachment Avoidance and Perceived Partner Prosociality

	b	SE	t	p	959	% CI
				r _	LL	UL
Avoidance X Move-Gratitude \rightarrow MRB \rightarrow LS (control anxiety)					.003	.070
Avoidance X Move-Gratitude (a path)	.14	.05	2.88	.004	.05	.24
Move-Related Relationship Benefits (b path)	.21	.06	3.37	.001	.09	.34
Total Effect (c path)	52	.09	-5.47	<.001	70	33
Direct Effect (c' path)	44	.10	-4.58	< .001	63	25
Avoidance X Move-Gratitude \rightarrow MRB \rightarrow MS (control anxiety)					.006	.095
Avoidance X Move-Gratitude (a path)	.14	.05	2.88	.004	.05	.24
Move-Related Relationship Benefits (b path)	.31	.06	5.39	<.001	.20	.42
Total Effect (c path)	35	.09	-3.96	< .001	53	18
Direct Effect (c' path)	24	.09	-2.73	.007	41	07

Predicting Life Satisfaction and Move Satisfaction Through Move-Related Relationship Benefits

Note. Effects are unstandardized. CI = confidence interval;*LL*= lower limit;*UL*= upper limit. MRB = Move-Related Relationship Benefits; LS = Life Satisfaction; MS = Move-Related Satisfaction. Top row CI in each model represents the indirect effect CI. Significant indirect effects are bolded.

Table S5. Moderated-mediation Analysis of the Interaction Between Attachment Avoidance and Perceived Partner Prosociality

	b	SE	t	р	959	% CI
					LL	UL
Avoidance X General Gratitude \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow LS (control anxiety)					.017	.088
Avoidance X General Gratitude (a path)	.07	.02	3.12	.002	.03	.12
Relationship Quality (b path)	.77	.11	7.11	< .001	.56	.98
Total Effect (c path)	52	.09	-5.47	< .001	70	33
Direct Effect (c' path)	11	.10	-1.03	.305	31	.10
Avoidance X Will to Sacrifice \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow LS (control anxiety)					.034	.097
Avoidance X Will to Sacrifice (a path)	.08	.02	4.38	<.001	.05	.12
Relationship Quality (b path)	.77	.11	7.11	< .001	.56	.98
Total Effect (c path)	52	.09	-5.47	<.001	70	33
Direct Effect (c' path)	11	.10	-1.03	.305	31	.10
Avoidance X General Gratitude \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow MS (control anxiety)					.005	.050
Avoidance X General Gratitude (a path)	.07	.02	3.12	.002	.03	.12
Relationship Quality (b path)	.35	.11	3.16	.002	.13	.56
Total Effect (c path)	35	.09	-3.96	< .001	53	18
Direct Effect (c' path)	17	.11	-1.57	.117	37	.04
Avoidance X Will to Sacrifice \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow MS (control anxiety)					.011	.052
Avoidance X Will to Sacrifice (a path)	.08	.02	4.38	<.001	.05	.12
Relationship Quality (b path)	.35	.11	3.16	.002	.13	.56
Total Effect (c path)	35	.09	-3.96	< .001	53	18
Direct Effect (c' path)	17	.11	-1.57	.117	37	.04

Predicting Life Satisfaction and Move-Related Satisfaction Through Relationship Quality

Note. Effects are unstandardized. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. Will = Willingness; RQ = Relationship Quality; LS = Life Satisfaction; MS = Move-Related Satisfaction. Top row CI in each model represents the indirect effect CI. Significant indirect effects are bolded.

Table S6. Moderated-mediation Analysis of the Interaction Between Attachment Anxiety and Perceived Partner Prosociality

	b	SE	t	р	95%	6 CI
					LL	UL
Anxiety X Sacrifice Behaviors \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow LS (control avoidance	.019	.131				
Anxiety X Sacrifice Behaviors (a path)	.10	.03	3.36	.001	.04	.15
Relationship Quality (b path)	.77	.11	7.11	< .001	.56	.98
Total Effect (c path)	13	.08	-1.53	.128	29	.04
Direct Effect (c' path)	<.01	.08	0.02	.982	15	.15
Anxiety X Sacrifice Behaviors \rightarrow RQ \rightarrow MS (control avoidan	.007	.069				
Anxiety X Sacrifice Behaviors (a path)	.10	.03	3.36	.001	.04	.15
Relationship Quality (b path)	.35	.11	3.16	.002	.13	.56
Total Effect (c path)	11	.08	-1.43	.154	26	.04
Direct Effect (c' path)	05	.08	-0.68	.498	21	.10

Predicting Life Satisfaction and Move-Related Satisfaction Through Relationship Quality

Note. Effects are unstandardized. CI = confidence interval;*LL*= lower limit;*UL*= upper limit.; RQ = Relationship Quality; LS = Life Satisfaction; MS = Move-Related Satisfaction. Top row CI in each model represents the indirect effect CI. Significant indirect effects are bolded.

Section 2: Occupational Classification

We categorized participants' occupations according to the Statistics Canada National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2016 Version 1.3 (Statistics Canada, 2016). Twenty-eight had a health-related occupation; 26 worked in education, law and social, community, and/or government services; 24 worked in natural and/or applied sciences related fields; 22 worked in sales and/or service; 15 worked in management; 14 worked in business, finance, or administration; 14 worked in arts, culture, recreation, or sports; four worked in trades, transport, and equipment operators and related fields; four worked in manufacturing and utilities; and one participant worked in natural resources, agriculture, and related production.

Section 3: Distribution of Attachment Measures

Table S7. Distribution and frequencies of attachment anxiety and avoidance measures. Both measures were normally distributed.

	Frequency					
Mean	Anxiety	Avoidance				
<i>m</i> = 1	35 (15.3%)	1 (0.4%)				
1 <m<2< th=""><th>75 (32.8%)</th><th>29 (12.7%)</th></m<2<>	75 (32.8%)	29 (12.7%)				
2< <i>m</i> <3	57 (24.9%)	54 (23.5%)				
3< <i>m</i> <4	40 (17.4%)	68 (29.8%)				
4< <i>m</i> <5	19 (8.3%)	51 (22.3%)				
5< <i>m</i> <6	2 (0.8%)	20 (8.7%)				
6< <i>m</i> <7	1 (0.4%)	5 (2.1%)				
<i>m</i> = 7	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)				
Skewness (SD)	0.32 (0.16)	0.76 (0.16)				
Kurtosis (SD)	-0.477(0.32)	0.15 (0.32)				

Figure S1.

Frequency histogram of attachment anxiety.



Figure S2.

Frequency histogram of attachment avoidance.



Attachment Avoidance

References

- Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2014). Assessing the validity of single-item life satisfaction measures: Results from three large samples. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, 23(10), 2809– 2818. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0726-4
- Cui, D., Arthur, N., & Domene, J. (2017). Accompanying partners of international students: reflections on three issues. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 47(1), 171–190. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v47i1.186193
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Fisher, C. D., & Shaw, J. B. (1994). Relocation attitudes and adjustment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 15(3), 209–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150304
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. Guilford Press.
- Hayes, A. F. (2015). An index and test of linear moderated mediation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 50(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2014.962683
- Lavy, S., & Littman-Ovadia, H. (2011). All you need is love? Strengths mediate the negative associations between attachment orientations and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(7), 1050–1055. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.023
- Marrero-Quevedo, R. J., Blanco-Hernández, P. J., & Hernández-Cabrera, J. A. (2019). Adult attachment and psychological well-being: The mediating role of personality. *Journal of*

Adult Development, 26(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-018-9297-x

- Martin, R. (1996). A longitudinal study examining the psychological reactions of job relocation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26(3), 265–282. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01850.x
- Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital quality and personal well-Being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(3), 576–593. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00393.x
- Righetti, F., Sakaluk, J. K., Faure, R., & Impett, E. A. (2020). The link between sacrifice and relational and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(10), 900–921. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000297
- Statistics Canada. (2016). *National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2016 Version 1.3*. https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/subjects/standard/noc/2016/indexV1.3