

The Negative Side of Office Clutter: Impact on Work-Related Well-Being and Job Satisfaction

Trina N. Dao and Joseph R. Ferrari
DePaul University

Clutter in the home negatively influences a person's well-being, but this tendency has not been investigated in workplace settings. The present study addressed whether *office clutter* impacted work-place well-being (job satisfaction, job tension, employee engagement, burnout, and occupational stress) using a crowd-sourced sample of U.S. adults ($n = 290$; 177 male, 113 female) employed full-time in office and/or home settings. It was hypothesized that office clutter impact would negatively influence job satisfaction and employee engagement, positively relate to emotional exhaustion and occupational stress, and job-related tension would moderate the relationship between office clutter and job satisfaction. Multiple hierarchical linear regressions and a moderated hierarchical regression analyzed the data and tested the hypotheses. Results showed that office clutter impact did predict emotional exhaustion and stress.

KEY WORDS: *office clutter, work-place well-being, crowd source adults*

Clutter's impact is a research topic of interest to psychologists (cf, Crum & Ferrari, 2019a; Crum & Ferrari, 2019b; Roster, Ferrari, & Jurkat, 2016), extending into the corporate world (Roster & Ferrari, 2020). In fact, organizations initiated "clean desk policies" of paper and digitalizing data (Parviainen, Tihinen, Kääriäinen, & Teppola, 2017). Clutter in the workplace seems innocuous but may impact employee performance. The National Association of Professional Organizers (NAPO, 2009) claimed that about 27% of adults feel disorganized while at work and believe they would save over an hour per day in productivity if their workspaces were more organized. The Kelton Research for *Office Max* found that over half of workers (53%) believed that their motivation was negatively affected by their own workspace disorganization. A fifth of the participants also stated that clutter impacted their relationships with peers and coworkers, and 53% admitted that they have negative impressions of their coworkers with messy workspaces. Despite these

Author info: Correspondence should be sent to: Dr. Joseph R. Ferrari, Dept. of Psychology, DePaul University, 2219 North Kenmore Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60614: jferrari@depaul.edu
North American Journal of Psychology, 2020, Vol. 22, No. 3, 397-410.
© NAJP

statistics and the potential consequences of office clutter, few published psychological studies supported or challenged survey results.

Clutter is defined as the over-accumulation of material items that create a chaotic and disorderly space (Roster, Ferrari, & Jurkat, 2016), and may include possessions that are either commonly used or unused. Clutter, however, is not to be confused with *hoarding*, a psychological disorder recognized by the DSM-5 and ICD-10. Hoarding is an obsessive-compulsive disorder that involves over-accumulation of the same types of items, often of little or no worth to the average person, and in turn leads to unsanitary or dangerous living spaces (American Psychological Association, 2013). Clutter is not as severe as hoarding and often involves a wide breadth of items without hygiene implications. Clutter may also appear outside of the home, particularly in office spaces. It may even act as a physical stressor in work environments (Roster & Ferrari, 2020). The present study was an initial step toward understanding the impact of office clutter among adults employed in different settings.

Clutter's Negative Side

Roster et al. (2016) found that clutter was a result of indecision (decisional procrastination: see Ferrari, 2010), such that a person developed clutter because they did not decide which items to keep or remove. These scholars hypothesized that an over-accumulation of items may actually impede an individual's well-being and their connection with their home environment because of the stress and negative stigma associated with clutter. Roster et al. found that self-extension tendencies regarding possessions (a person's need to self-identify with their material possessions), and place attachment (how emotionally dependent a person is on their physical location) had a positive relationship with psychological home (a person's desire to self-identify with their home and physical environment), while clutter had a negative influence on psychological home and sense of well-being. These findings are the first to connect physical clutter with a person's health and well-being, providing support for their claim that material items may have a profound impact on a person and their reactions to other stressors.

Crum and Ferrari (2019a) expanded this research by analyzing whether clutter impacts overall life satisfaction among persons of different demographic profiles. For instance, they explored whether self-identified race reported by 99 women of color (M age = 55.33 years old) might predict how strongly clutter affects their perception of home and satisfaction. Results showed that psychological home was a significant predictor of life satisfaction, without place attachment being a moderator for the relationship between psychological home and life satisfaction. In

a separate study, Crum and Ferrari (2019b) analyzed the effects of clutter on psychological home in a sample of young adults (242 women, 82 men; *M* age = 19 years). They found that the perception of clutter was a significant predictor of psychological home; young persons who were less affected by clutter reported a higher sense of psychological home.

Roster and Ferrari (2020) believed that the negative effects of clutter occurred in work settings. In the first study to look at office clutter, these researchers crowd-sourced 290 employed adults (109 females; 177 males; *M* age range = 25 - 35), finding that a heavy workload at a quick pace was positively related to emotional exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion depleted energy and made decisional delays more likely. Indecision then predicted the negative impact of office clutter. Roster and Ferrari found the relationship between workload and office clutter partially mediated by the effects of emotional exhaustion and its consequential impact on decisional delay, as related to clutter.

If clutter in the home influenced a person's general well-being, then it may be possible that office clutter affects work outcomes. People spend a large amount of time at work and in their organization, so their well-being is not just dependent on their home environments, but their work life as well. Organizations suffer when their employees are unhealthy, unmotivated, or performing at a lower level. Identifying a relationship between office clutter and decreased well-being might potentially inform practitioners of how to approach the issue of clutter and reduce their impact on workplace outcomes that may affect profit, employee motivation, the buildup of slack/extraneous resources, interpersonal conflict, attitudes about work, and employee behavior. An individual's work-related well-being not only impacts their success as an employee, but it may influence their home life and health as well. Higher levels of stress or emotional exhaustion may directly harm persons' health and make them more susceptible to illnesses, which will also impact absenteeism and turnover (House, Wells, Landerman, McMichael, & Kaplan, 1979).

The present study explored several work-related variables and the impact of clutter. For instance, employees' well-being is particularly important to address in corporate settings (Jackson, Rothmann, & van de Vijver, 2006; Rothmann, 2008; Warr, 2002). Rothmann (2008) developed and tested a four-part model of work-related well-being. Results supported his model; stress and burnout negatively affected well-being in the workplace while engagement and job satisfaction were found to positively impact it. Together, job satisfaction, employee engagement, occupational stress, and burnout are first order factors that create the construct of work-related well-being (Rothmann, 2008). In the present study we assessed these employee-related variables impacting office

clutter, and predicted a positive relationship between office clutter and emotional exhaustion and stress. We also predicted a negative relationship between office clutter and job engagement and satisfaction. Finally, we predicted that job-related tension would moderate the relationship between office clutter and job satisfaction. Specifically, the more job-related tension, the stronger the relationship.

METHOD

Participants

Data were previously collected and used in one previous study (Roster & Ferrari, 2019); however, no previous analyses were repeated; that is, the present study focused on different variables. Participants were adults living in the United States, recruited through on-line crowdsourcing outlet (*Prolific Academic*: <https://prolific.ac>), designed to connect researchers with a quality group of participants based on certain selection criteria. The number of participants was 290, after excluding ten persons who did not pass a qualifier and did not pass the attention trap question. Participants answered “yes” or “no” to a qualifier item, namely: *Do you spend at least 20 hours per week working in an “office” workspace, meaning a space allocated specifically for you to conduct either self-employed or employer-related (either profit or non-profit) business activities?* While ‘office’ workspaces might take many forms, we referred to a traditional office space as at least a desk and a chair designated for use to conduct work-related activities, whether it be located in your home or in an office building. Only individuals who spend at least 20 hours per week in an office workspace were included in the present study.

From the 290-total number of participants, 51.4% ($n = 149$) of participants were aged 25 to 35. Most participants ($n = 226$; 77.9%) were Caucasian and male ($n = 177$; 61.0%). Participants frequently self-identified ($n = 116$; 40%) their highest degree earned as a bachelor’s degree. Just more than half of participants (53.8%) classified their current job as part of the “professional” or “office manager” sector. The most commonly reported income was \$50,000 to \$74,999 ($n = 76$; 26.2%), followed by \$35,000 to \$49,999 ($n = 62$; 21.4%). In terms of number of years employed, 98 (27.2%) participants claimed employment for 5 to 10 years, 26.9% for 3 to 4 years, and 24.8% for 1 to 2 years. Most participants ($n = 80$; 27.6%) indicated that they held a staff/administrative position within their organization or worked as an individual contributor ($n = 76$; 26.2%). In total, 202 (69.7%) participants spent most of their time in an office building workspace while the rest used a home office. Power analyses determined the minimum sample size

needed to reach a large effect size of $f^2 > 0.35$; the present study's sample size ($n = 290$) was sufficient.

Demographic and Work Characteristic Items

All participants completed a set of demographic questions, namely: age, state of residence, race, income level, level of education, length of employment, and gender. Participants also indicated whether they did most of their work from a home office or office building workspace, the size of their workspace, how cluttered their workspace is, and what types of clutter they have in their workspace. In addition, respondents completed general questions about their work, including their position within the organization, how many hours they work in a typical week, and their job classification.

Psychometric Measures

Office clutter. All participants completed the 11-item, unidimensional *Office Clutter Impact* scale, adapted from the *Clutter Quality of Life Scale* (Roster, Ferrari, & Jurkat, 2016) examining the negative impact of workplace clutter on the individual's workability of space, emotional well-being, and social aspect of work. Initial reliability conducted by Roster et al. on the *Clutter Quality of Life Scale* showed a Cronbach's alpha of .88 ($M = 31.55$, $SD = 15.40$) and was validated with the original sample of 1,349 adults using both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .88 and an Omega Total of .96. Omega Hierarchical and Omega Total scores test the reliability of scales while taking into account its multidimensionality. Example items from this scale include, "I have to move things in order to accomplish tasks in my office," and "I feel overwhelmed by the clutter in my office." Participants responded by selecting a number on a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). This study used a scale that measures the impact of office clutter rather than the physical amount of clutter because the term "clutter" is subjective; a messy desk full of files may be clutter to one person but not another. Therefore, using the impact of clutter on a person may be more consistent than counting the physical items.

Engagement in work. Participants completed the 4-item, unidimensional *Engagement in Work Scale* (Britt & Bliese, 2003, adapted from Britt, 1999). Initial reliability studies conducted by Britt and Bliese (2003) showed a Cronbach's alpha of .56 ($M = 16.94$, $SD = 2.44$). Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .74 and an Omega Total of .87. Sample items from this scale include "I feel responsible for my job

performance,” and “I am committed to my job.” Participants responded by selecting a number on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Job-related tension. In addition, participants responded to the revised *Job-Related Tension Index* (Wooten, Fakunmoju, Kim, & LeFevre, 2010, adapted from Kahn et al., 1964), a 12-item, multidimensional scale examining job tension related to role ambiguity across three factors – performance, workload, and organizational design (Wooten et al., 2010). Initial reliability studies conducted by Wooten showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 ($M = 25.06$, $SD = 9.03$). Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .77 and an Omega Total of .93. Participants responded by selecting a number on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*nearly all the time*).

Emotional exhaustion – burnout. Participants also responded to the 8-item, unidimensional *Emotional Exhaustion* subscale from the *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), which measures how tired, frustrated, and close to burnout the individual is. Initial reliability studies by the authors showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 ($M = 29.70$, $SD = 11.93$) and internal consistency of the subscale was supported when tested across occupational groups (Schaufeli, & Bakker, 2004). Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .88 and an Omega Total of .95. Example items include “I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job,” and “I feel used up at the end of the workday.” Participants responded by selecting a number from a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). High scores suggest that the person is experiencing much emotional exhaustion and is close to burnout.

Job satisfaction. Ferguson and Weisman’s (1986) unidimensional *Job Satisfaction* scale was completed by all participants; a 5-item measure examining how much an individual likes their job and is satisfied. Initial reliability studies showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .85 ($M = 17.29$, $SD = 4.46$). Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .74 and an Omega Total of .91. Sample items include “I am satisfied with my daily job routine,” and “In general I like my job.” Participants responded by selecting a number from a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Perceived life stress. The 10-item *Perceived Stress Scale* (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) measures self-perception of stress. Initial reliability studies showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .84 ($M = 30.11$, $SD = 4.62$). Reliability analysis conducted for the present study showed an Omega Hierarchical score of .51 and an Omega Total of .80. Validity

of the scale is evidenced by the association of PSS scores with increased colds, less control over blood sugar levels in diabetics, more depressive symptoms elicited by stressful life events, and failure to quit smoking cigarettes (Cohen et al., 1983). Example items include “In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?” and “In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?” Participants responded by selecting a number from a 5-point frequency scale (1 = Never and 5 = Very Often).

Procedure

The self-report survey was created on *Qualtrics* with each scale placed in counterbalanced order and posted on *Prolific Academic* for one day (target sample size = 300 participants). Participants were notified ahead of time that they would be compensated for completing the survey. Participants earned \$2.60 for filling out the entire survey, and must have been at least 21 years old and a United States resident. The survey began with the *qualifier question* (if the individuals spend at least 20 hours working in an office), followed by office space questions, the scales, and lastly, demographic items.

The 130-item survey contained a total of 14 scales but only six key scales were included in the present study. It took participants approximately 20-25 minutes to complete the full survey. Once data were collected, it was examined and cleaned. Individuals with mostly missing data or failed attention trap questions were deleted.

RESULTS

A hierarchical linear regression assessed whether office clutter impact predicted emotional exhaustion, controlling for gender, age, and length of

Table 1: Regression analysis predicting emotional exhaustion from office clutter.

Emotional Exhaustion	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Model 1						3, 284	0.25	0.003
Gender	-0.44	0.66	-0.62	-0.03	1.41	-	-	-
Age	-0.65	0.52	-0.54	-0.05	0.82	-	-	-
Employment Length	0.48	0.63	0.34	0.03	0.72	-	-	-
Model 2						1, 283	13.05	0.16
Gender	-0.22	0.82	-0.29	-0.01	1.30	-	-	-
Age	-0.90	0.37	-0.68	-0.06	0.76	-	-	-

Employment Length	0.38	0.70	0.25	0.03	0.66	-	-	-
Office Clutter	7.16	0.001	0.30	0.39	0.04	-	-	-

Note. $\Delta R^2 = 0.15$, $\Delta F = 51.31$, $p < 0.001$; $n = 290$

employment. Table 1 showed that gender, age, and length of employment did not significantly influence levels of emotional exhaustion, but office clutter impact did significantly predict emotional exhaustion scores, $b = 0.39$, $t(283) = 7.16$, $p < .001$. For every one-unit change in office clutter impact, there was a 0.39 unit increase in emotional exhaustion. Office clutter also explained a significant proportion of variance in emotional exhaustion scores, $R^2 = .16$, $F(1, 283) = 13.05$, $p < .001$. A hierarchical linear regression assessed whether office clutter impact predicted perceived

Table 2: Regression analysis predicting stress from office clutter.

Stress	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Model 1						3, 284	0.13	0.001
Gender	0.32	0.75	0.17	0.02	0.55	-	-	-
Age	-0.34	0.73	-0.11	-0.02	0.32	-	-	-
Employment Length	-0.19	0.85	-0.05	-0.01	0.28	-	-	-
Model 2						1, 283	14.38	0.17
Gender	0.62	0.54	0.31	0.03	0.50	-	-	-
Age	-0.58	0.56	-0.17	-0.04	0.29	-	-	-
Employment Length	-0.35	0.73	-0.90	-0.02	0.25	-	-	-
Office Clutter	7.55	0.001	0.12	0.41	0.02	-	-	-

Note. $\Delta R^2 = 0.17$, $\Delta F = 57.05$, $p < 0.001$; $n = 290$

stress, controlling for gender, age, and length of employment. Table 2 showed that stress levels were not significantly impacted by gender, age, or employment length. However, office clutter impact significantly predicted stress scores, $b = 0.41$, $t(283) = 7.55$, $p < .001$. Therefore, for every one-unit change in office clutter impact, there was a 0.41 unit increase in stress. Office clutter impact also explained a significant proportion of variance in stress scores, $R^2 = .17$, $F(1, 283) = 14.38$, $p < .001$.

A hierarchical linear regression also assessed office clutter impact predicting job engagement, controlling for gender, age, and employment length. Results showed that office clutter did not significantly predict job engagement, $b = -0.02$, $t(283) = -0.34$, $p = .74$ (see Table 3). Subsequently, we examined whether the perception of office clutter negatively predicted job satisfaction. We explored whether job-related tension moderated the relationship between the impact of office clutter and job satisfaction; that is, is it true that the more job-related tension there is, the stronger the relationship? A moderated hierarchical regression assessed whether office clutter impact predicted job satisfaction, and

Table 3: Regression analysis predicting work engagement from office clutter.

Engagement	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Model 1						3, 284	0.52	0.005
Gender	1.13	0.26	0.32	0.07	0.29	-	-	-
Age	0.11	0.91	0.01	0.01	0.17	-	-	-
Employment Length	-0.35	0.73	-0.02	-0.02	0.15	-	-	-
Model 2						1, 283	0.42	0.006
Gender	1.11	0.27	0.32	0.07	0.29	-	-	-
Age	0.12	0.90	0.02	0.01	0.17	-	-	-
Employment Length	-0.34	0.73	-0.05	-0.02	0.15	-	-	-
Office Clutter	-0.34	0.74	-0.003	-0.02	0.01	-	-	-

Note. $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$, $\Delta F = 0.11$, $p = 0.80$

whether job-related tension moderated that relationship controlling for gender, age, and length of employment. Results showed that office clutter impact did not significantly predict job satisfaction scores, $b = 0.04$, $t(280) = 0.66$, $p = 0.51$ (see Table 4 below). Results also found that there was no significant interaction effect between office clutter and any of the three job-related tension subscales. However, the organizational design subscale did significantly predict job satisfaction scores, $b = -0.30$, $t(280) = -3.89$, $p < 0.001$. This means that for every one-unit change in the organizational design subscale, there was a 0.30 unit decrease in job satisfaction. The organizational design subscale also explained a significant proportion of variance in job satisfaction scores, $R^2 = 0.21$, $F(4, 280) = 10.58$, $p < 0.001$.

DISCUSSION

The topic of clutter in the home showed a negative relationship between clutter and a person's well-being. However, this relationship had never been studied in workplace clutter and occupational outcomes (Crum & Ferrari, 2019a; Crum & Ferrari, 2019b; Roster et al., 2016). There is a construct called *work-related well-being* (Narainsamy & Van Der Westhuizen, 2013; Rothman, 2008), consisting of job satisfaction, work engagement, burnout, and occupational stress. Previous research showed that job-related tension may negatively impact job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1983). Our study hypothesized that office clutter negatively impacted job satisfaction and employee engagement, positively impacted emotional exhaustion and occupational stress, and job-related tension moderated the relationship between office clutter and job satisfaction. Using multiple hierarchical linear regressions and a moderated hierarchical regression (controlling for gender, age, and employment length) showed that office clutter impact did predict emotional exhaustion. As office clutter increased by one unit, so did a person's level of emotional exhaustion by 0.39 units. There was also a positive relationship between office clutter impact and perceived stress levels, so as office clutter impact increased by one unit, stress increased by 0.41. Office clutter impact did not predict either work engagement or job satisfaction. However, job-related tension scores predicted job satisfaction scores, supporting previous research relating job-related tension and job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1983; Jackson, 1983). In sum, the presence of clutter positively predicted a person's level of emotional exhaustion and stress, but did not predict work-related well-being, nor did it predict job related tension.

Our study had limitations, including a small sample size and the use of only self-reported measures as opposed to actually assessing one's cluttered office. This study also used the impact of office clutter rather than the actual amount of clutter, which may have yielded different results. Future studies might analyze how office clutter impacts other occupational outcomes, such as organizational commitment, perceived control over time, or job performance. In addition, demographic characteristics such as income level, management status, gender, or education level might affect the impact of office clutter on workplace outcomes. Future studies might determine if there are any important differences between home office clutter and workplace office clutter. Since our sample contained individuals working in a home office, it is possible that clutter from their home environment may affect the clutter within the office and its impact on the person. With technology becoming

more advanced and information and processes becoming more digitalized, future studies might examine electronic and digital clutter.

While our study did not show that office clutter impacts work-related well-being, it did indicate that office clutter significantly impacted certain occupational outcomes that are pertinent to employees' health and performance, such as stress and emotional exhaustion. Previous studies have found that emotional exhaustion has been linked to physical health issues such as colds, headaches, sleep problems, depression, and gastrointestinal problems; it has also been linked to workplace outcomes such as job satisfaction, turnover intention, perceptions of workplace justice, organizational commitment, and even job performance (Belcastro, 1982; Cole, Bernerth, Walter, & Holt, 2010; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

Previous research found that occupational stress may actually increase physical and mental health issues, particularly depression and anxiety (House, Wells, Landerman, McMichael, & Kaplan, 1979; Jamal, 1990). Similarly to emotional exhaustion, stress also affects turnover intention, absenteeism, occupational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance (Arsenault & Dolan, 1983; Jamal, 1990). These studies emphasize the importance of reducing emotional exhaustion and occupational stress within employees as much as possible. Now that the link between office clutter and these variables have been found, this provides organizations with a more tangible, physical way to reduce emotional exhaustion and stress. Office clutter may be a real, physical aspect of the workplace that may easily be changed to improve the way employees work and how they feel. It may possibly be the link that allows organizations to tangibly influence more complex worker characteristics. However, additional studies might provide insights on how clutter in work settings may affect individuals.

Note: A portion of this study was the master's thesis in Industrial/Organizational Psychology by the first author supervised by the second author at DePaul University. The authors express much gratitude to Dr. Catherine Roster (University of New Mexico) for data collection and support for the crowd sourcing process.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Arsenault, A., & Dolan, S. (1983). The role of personality, occupation and organization in understanding the relationship between job stress,

- performance and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56(3), 227-240.
- Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1983). A cross-lagged regression test of the relationships between job tension and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 439.
- Belcastro, P. A. (1982). Burnout and its relationship to teachers' somatic complaints and illnesses. *Psychological Reports*, 50, 1045-1046.
- Britt, T. W., & Bliese, P. D. (2003). Testing the stress-buffering effects of self engagement among soldiers on a military operation. *Journal of Personality*, 71(2), 245-266.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 385-396.
- Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F., & Holt, D. T. (2010). Organizational justice and individuals' withdrawal: Unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(3), 367-390.
- Crum, K.P., & Ferrari, J.R., (2019a) Psychological home, clutter, and place attachment predicting life satisfaction among women of color: Home is beyond physical space. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Social Sciences*, 1(1), 87-96.
- Crum, K.P., & Ferrari, J.R., (2019b) Toward an understanding of psychological home and clutter with emerging adults: Relationships over relics. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 21(1), 45-56.
- Ferrari, J.R. (2010). *Still procrastinating? The no regrets guide to getting it done*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ferguson, G.S. & Weisman, G.D. (1986). Alternative approaches to the assessment of employee satisfaction with the office environment. In J.D. Wineman, (Ed.), *Behavior Issues in Office Design*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, pp. 85 – 108.
- House, J. S., Wells, J. A., Landerman, L. R., McMichael, A. J., & Kaplan, B. H. (1979). Occupational stress and health among factory workers. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 139-160.
- Jackson, S. E. (1983). Participation in decision making as a strategy for reducing job-related strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(1), 3.
- Jackson, S. E., & Maslach, C. (1982). After-effects of job-related stress: Families as victims. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 63-77.
- Jackson, L. T., Rothmann, S., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2006). A model of work-related well-being for educators in South Africa. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, 22(4), 263-274.
- Jamal, M. (1990). Relationship of job stress and Type-A behavior to employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychosomatic health problems, and turnover motivation. *Human Relations*, 43(8), 727-738.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113.
- Parviainen, P., Tihinen, M., Kääriäinen, J., & Teppola, S. (2017). Tackling the digitalization challenge: How to benefit from digitalization in practice.

International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management, 5(1), 63-77.

Roster, C., & Ferrari, J.R. (2020). Does work stress lead to office clutter, and how? Mediating influences of emotional exhaustion and indecision. *Environment & Behavior*, 52, in press.

Roster, C. A., Ferrari, J. R., & Jurkat, M. P. (2016). The dark side of home: assessing possession ‘clutter’ on subjective well-being. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 46, 32-41.

Rothmann, S. (2008). Job satisfaction, occupational stress, burnout and work engagement as components of work-related well-being. *Sabinet African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(3), 11-16.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.

Warr, P. (2002). *Psychology at work*. Penguin UK.

Wooten, N. R., Fakunmoju, S. B., Kim, H., & LeFevre, A. L. (2010). Factor structure of the job-related tension index among social workers. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 20(1), 74-86.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(3), 486.

Table 4: Regression analysis predicting job satisfaction from office clutter, moderated by job-related tension.

Job Satisfaction	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Model 1						3,	1.37	0.01
						284		
Gender	1.83	0.07	0.96		0.11	0.52	-	-
				0.11	0.52	-	-	-
Age	-0.91	0.36	-	-	0.31	-	-	-
			0.28	0.06				
Employment Length	1.08	0.28	0.29		0.27	-	-	-
				0.08				
Model 2						4,	10.58	0.21
						280		
Gender	1.31	0.19	0.62		0.47	-	-	-
				0.07				
Age	-1.82	0.07	-	-	0.28	-	-	-
			0.50	0.11				
Employment Length	1.51	0.13	0.37		0.24	-	-	-
				0.10				

Office Clutter	0.66	0.51	0.01		0.02	-	-	-
				0.04				
JRT Performance	-1.28	0.20	-	-	0.09	-	-	-
			0.12	0.11				
JRT Org Design	-3.89	0.001	-	-	0.13	-	-	-
			0.52	0.30				
JRT Workload	-1.39	0.17	-	-	0.10	-	-	-
			0.13	0.10				
Model 3						3,	7.70	0.22
						277		
Gender	1.24	0.22			0.48	-	-	-
			0.59	0.07				
Age	-1.68	0.10	-	-	0.28	-	-	-
			0.50	0.12				
Employment Length	1.51	0.13			0.25	-	-	-
			0.37	0.10				
Office Clutter	-	0.65	-	-	0.04	-	-	-
	0.46		0.02	0.07				
JRT Performance	0.66	0.51	0.14		0.22	-	-	-
				0.13				
JRT Org Design	-	0.03	-0.67	-	0.31	-	-	-
	2.19			0.40				
JRT Workload	-	0.04	-0.44	-	0.21	-	-	-
	2.08			0.35				
OCLxJRT Performance	-	0.19	-0.01	-	0.01	-	-	-
	1.32			0.47				
OCLxJRT Org Design	0.43	0.67	0.004	0.14	0.009	-	-	-

OC1xJRT	1.61	0.11	0.01	0.01	-	-	-
				0.50			

Workload

Note. Model 1 & 2: $\Delta R^2 = 0.20$, $\Delta F = 17.25$, $p < 0.001$; $n = 290$

Model 2 & 3: $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $\Delta F = 1.00$, $p < 0.001$; $n = 290$