JURNAL ILMU PERILAKU https://jip.fk.unand.ac.id
VOLUME 9, NOMOR 2, 2026: 197-217
ISSN (Online): 2581-0421

Psychometric Validation of the Work-Family Conflict Scale Among Dual-Earner Couples in Indonesia

***Gumi Langerya Rizal*[1], *Priyalatha Govindasamy*[2], *Zulian Fikry*[3]**
[1,3]Faculty of Psychology and Health, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia
[1,2]Faculty of Human Development, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia
e-mail: *[1]gumi.langerya@fip.unp.ac.id

***Received**: 22nd May 2025/ **Revised**: 6th September 2025/ **Accepted**: 29th January 2026*

***Abstract**. Work–Family Conflict (WFC) has been widely examined, yet empirical validation of its measurement remains limited in Indonesia. Many local studies rely on translated instruments without comprehensive psychometric testing, raising concerns about cultural accuracy. This study addresses this gap by validating the bidimensional WFC scale, Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW), among 492 dual-earner spouses in Indonesia. The results confirmed strong internal reliability ($\alpha > 0.78$; CR > 0.85) and adequate convergent validity (AVE > 0.50), supporting a stable two-factor structure in which WIF and FIW emerged as related but distinct constructs. The findings highlight culturally embedded and gendered dynamics of role conflict in Indonesian couples and contribute to cross-cultural work–family research. Practically, the validated instrument provides a reliable tool for researchers and organizations to assess role conflict and develop family-supportive workplace policies.*
***Keywords:** Dual-earner Couples, Psychometric Validity, Work–Family Conflict Scale*

Abstrak. *Work–Family Conflict* (WFC) telah banyak dikaji, namun validasi empiris terhadap alat ukurnya masih terbatas di Indonesia. Banyak penelitian lokal menggunakan instrumen terjemahan tanpa pengujian psikometrik yang komprehensif, sehingga menimbulkan keraguan terhadap akurasi konstruk dalam konteks budaya Indonesia. Studi ini mengisi kesenjangan tersebut dengan memvalidasi skala WFC dua dimensi, *Work Interference with Family* (WIF) dan *Family Interference with Work* (FIW), pada 492 individu dari pasangan suami-istri berpenghasilan ganda di Indonesia. Hasil analisis menunjukkan reliabilitas internal yang kuat ($\alpha > 0{,}78$; CR > 0,85) serta validitas konvergen yang memadai (AVE > 0,50), yang mendukung struktur dua faktor yang stabil, di mana WIF dan FIW terbukti sebagai konstruk yang saling berkaitan namun berbeda secara empiris. Temuan ini menyoroti dinamika konflik peran yang dipengaruhi konteks budaya dan peran gender pada pasangan di Indonesia, sekaligus memperkaya literatur lintas budaya mengenai *work–family conflict*. Secara praktis, instrumen yang tervalidasi ini menyediakan alat ukur yang andal bagi peneliti dan organisasi untuk menilai konflik peran serta merancang kebijakan kerja yang lebih ramah keluarga.
Kata kunci: Pasangan berpenghasilan ganda, Skala Konflik Kerja Keluarga, Validitas psikometrik

Work–Family Conflict (WFC) has long been recognized as a central construct in organizational and family psychology because of its implications for employee well-being, family functioning, and organizational effectiveness. WFC refers to inter-role tension in which pressures arising from work and family domains are mutually incompatible, making participation in one role more difficult due to demands from the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Over the past decade, meta-analyses and large-scale reviews have consistently shown that WFC remains a significant predictor of burnout, psychological strain, reduced job satisfaction, and lower marital quality across occupational and cultural contexts (Allen et al., 2015; Shockley et al., 2017; Michel et al., 2011).

Conceptually, WFC is bidimensional, consisting of Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW) (Netemeyer et al., 1996). WIF occurs when job demands limit time, energy, or emotional availability for family roles, whereas FIW reflects situations where family responsibilities hinder work performance. These two directions of conflict are theoretically related but empirically distinct, with different antecedents and consequences (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014; Wan et al., 2022). Recognizing this bidirectional nature is crucial for accurately capturing the dynamics of work–family interaction.

The relevance of WFC is particularly pronounced in Indonesia, where the number of dual-earner families has increased alongside urbanization, rising living costs, and greater female labor force participation. Despite these structural changes, traditional gender norms remain influential, often positioning women as primary caregivers and household managers even when they are employed full time. This unequal distribution of domestic responsibilities may intensify work–family tensions, especially among married working mothers (Sulastri, 2021; Cerrato & Cifre, 2018).

Research on dual-earner couples indicates that gender plays a crucial role in shaping experiences of WFC. Women tend to report higher family-to-work interference due to caregiving demands, whereas men may experience stronger work-to-family interference linked to breadwinner expectations (Shockley et al., 2017; Adams & Golsch, 2021). These

patterns can be more pronounced in collectivist societies where family obligations and interdependence are culturally reinforced (Allen et al., 2015). In Indonesia, where extended family involvement and communal norms are common, the experience of WFC may differ from that in Western contexts, underscoring the importance of culturally sensitive measurement.

Although WFC has been widely studied, concerns remain regarding the cross-cultural validity of its measurement. The scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996) is among the most frequently used instruments for assessing WIF and FIW and has demonstrated strong psychometric properties in various contexts. However, evidence shows that national and cultural contexts can influence how individuals interpret and experience work–family conflict (Allen et al., 2015). Meta-analytic findings further suggest that gender moderates both the experience and outcomes of WFC (Shockley et al., 2017), reinforcing the need for validation studies that consider cultural and gendered role expectations.

In Indonesia, several studies have adopted translated versions of the WFC scale, yet comprehensive psychometric validation within the local cultural context remains limited (Rizal & Fikry, 2023). Without rigorous evaluation of construct validity and reliability, there is a risk that the instrument may not fully capture culturally embedded forms of role conflict, potentially leading to biased or incomplete conclusions. This gap highlights the need to ensure that widely used WFC measures are empirically sound and culturally appropriate for Indonesian dual-earner couples.

Addressing these theoretical and methodological gaps, the present study aims to examine the psychometric validity and reliability of the Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW) scales among dual-earner couples in Indonesia. Beyond providing technical evidence of measurement quality, this study contributes theoretically by strengthening cross-cultural understanding of WFC and clarifying how gendered role expectations operate within collectivist family systems. Practically, a culturally validated WFC scale offers researchers and organizations a reliable

tool to assess work–family role conflict and to inform the development of family-supportive workplace policies in Indonesia.

Methods

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental design focused on assessing the construct validity and reliability of latent variables through *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling* (PLS-SEM). This approach was chosen due to its suitability for evaluating reflective measurement models, particularly in validating psychological instruments that are relatively new to a local population and when data distribution does not meet the assumption of normality (Hair et al., 2019). The analysis was conducted to evaluate indicator reliability, internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

Participants and Sampling Procedure

Participants in this study were dual-earner couples—married individuals in which both spouses were actively employed—residing in urban areas of West Sumatra, Indonesia. A total of 492 individuals (246 husbands and 246 wives) provided complete and valid responses for analysis.

A purposive sampling technique was employed because the study targeted a specific population relevant to work–family conflict (WFC), namely dual-earner married couples with children. Random sampling was not feasible due to the need to ensure that both partners met defined employment and family criteria. The inclusion criteria were: (a) both spouses had been working full-time for at least one year, (b) they had at least one child, and (c) both partners agreed to participate voluntarily.

Participants were recruited primarily through schools, where parents of students were approached via school communication channels and parent networks. This setting was chosen because it provides access to families in which both parents are actively engaged in work and child-rearing responsibilities, making them highly relevant to the study of work–

family conflict. Additional participants were reached through community and workplace networks to broaden occupational representation.

Data were collected using both offline and online questionnaires distributed via digital communication platforms. To minimize sampling bias, recruitment involved parents from multiple schools across different urban districts and included families from diverse occupational backgrounds (e.g., education, civil service, private sector, and small businesses). Participation was anonymous, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. No identifying information was recorded.

Although purposive sampling may limit generalizability, several steps were taken to improve representativeness within the target population. These included recruiting participants from various employment sectors, income levels, and family sizes. The relatively large sample size also increases the robustness of measurement model estimation.

Demographically, the sample reflects working-age urban dual-earner families. Most wives (56.9%) and husbands (61.8%) were aged 36–45 years. Nearly half of the wives (48.8%) and husbands (43.1%) held a bachelor's degree. The majority of families had two or three children, and most households lived without domestic helpers. Household income levels varied, with a substantial proportion earning above the regional average, reflecting typical middle-income dual-earner conditions in urban Indonesia.

Research Instruments

This study employed the Indonesian-adapted version of the Work–Family Conflict (WFC) scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). The instrument measures two bidirectional dimensions:

1. **Work Interference with Family (WIF)**: the extent to which work demands disrupt family responsibilities.
2. **Family Interference with Work (FIW)**: the extent to which family demands hinder work performance.

Each dimension consists of five items, rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The full Indonesian wording of all items is presented in **Appendix A**, while the English back-translated version is shown below to document the accuracy of the adaptation process.

One WIF item was reverse-worded: "My job gives me enough time to be with my family." This item was reverse-coded prior to analysis. Its factor loading and impact on reliability were examined during measurement model evaluation. As the item met acceptable loading criteria and did not reduce construct reliability, it was retained.

Instrument Adaptation Procedure

The scale was culturally adapted into Indonesian following the cross-cultural adaptation framework proposed by Beaton et al. (2000) to ensure conceptual rather than literal equivalence. The process involved five stages:

1. **Forward Translation**: Two bilingual translators independently translated the original English items into Indonesian.
2. **Synthesis**: The two versions were compared and merged into a single reconciled translation.
3. **Back-Translation**: A separate bilingual expert translated the Indonesian version back into English to check semantic consistency.
4. **Expert Panel Review**: A panel of psychologists and linguists evaluated conceptual accuracy, cultural relevance, and clarity.
5. **Pilot Testing**: The preliminary version was tested on a small group of working parents to ensure item clarity and contextual appropriateness.

Minor wording adjustments were made to improve cultural relevance while maintaining the original meaning of each item.

English Back-Translated Version of the Adapted Items

Work Interference with Family (WIF)

1. My job gives me enough time to be with my family. *(R)*
2. After work, I have little time left for activities at home.
3. My family life is negatively affected by my work commitments.
4. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.
5. Work-related problems make me irritable at home.

Family Interference with Work (FIW)

1. My work performance suffers because of family commitments.
2. Family responsibilities reduce my concentration at work.
3. If I were not married, I would be a better employee.
4. Family matters reduce the time I should devote to work.
5. I find it difficult to concentrate on my job because of family concerns.

(R) = reverse-coded item

Data Analysis

Because WIF and FIW are modeled as reflective constructs, measurement model evaluation followed the reliability and validity procedures recommended for reflective indicators (Hair et al., 2019). Data were analyzed using SmartPLS 4 in a stepwise manner as follows:

1. Indicator Reliability

Indicator reliability assesses how strongly each item reflects its underlying construct. It is evaluated using outer loadings, where values of 0.70 or higher indicate that the item explains at least 50% of the construct variance.

2. Internal Consistency Reliability

This step evaluates the consistency of items within the same construct using three complementary indicators:

a. Cronbach's Alpha (α): A traditional lower-bound estimate of reliability.
b. rho_A: A more accurate reliability estimate in PLS-SEM.

c. Composite Reliability (CR): The preferred reliability index in SEM because it accounts for different item loadings.

Values of 0.70 or above indicate satisfactory internal consistency.

3. Convergent Validity

Convergent validity indicates whether items that theoretically belong to the same construct share a high proportion of variance. It is assessed using Average Variance Extracted (AVE). An AVE ≥ 0.50 means the construct explains at least half of the variance of its indicators.

4. Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity ensures that constructs measure distinct concepts. Three methods were used:

a. Fornell–Larcker Criterion: The square root of AVE for each construct should be greater than its correlation with other constructs.
b. Cross-Loadings: Each item should load higher on its intended construct than on other constructs.
c. Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio (HTMT): Values below 0.85 indicate acceptable discriminant validity.

This comprehensive approach ensures that the WIF and FIW constructs are both internally consistent and empirically distinct.

Results

Measurement Model Evaluation

The psychometric quality of the Indonesian-adapted Work–Family Conflict (WFC) scale was assessed through a series of measurement model evaluations, including indicator reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, following the guidelines of Hair et al. (2019).

Indicator Reliability

Indicator reliability refers to the extent to which each item strongly reflects its intended latent construct. This is assessed through outer loading values. Loadings of 0.70 or

higher indicate that an item explains at least 50% of the variance in the construct, while values between 0.60 and 0.70 are considered acceptable when overall construct reliability remains adequate.

The results showed that all items measuring Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW), for both husbands and wives, achieved loadings above 0.63. Although a small number of items fell slightly below the ideal 0.70 threshold, none were removed because composite reliability and AVE values remained satisfactory. The strongest indicators were WIF3 (for both husbands and wives) and FIW2 and FIW4, suggesting that these items most clearly capture experiences of work–family interference. Overall, these findings indicate that all retained items contributed meaningfully to their respective constructs.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency reliability assesses whether items within the same construct measure the same underlying concept. Three complementary indices were used: Cronbach's alpha (α), rho_A, and Composite Reliability (CR). Values above 0.70 indicate acceptable reliability.

As shown in Table 1, Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.78 to 0.90, while Composite Reliability values ranged from 0.85 to 0.92. These results demonstrate strong internal consistency for both WIF and FIW constructs across husbands and wives, indicating that the items within each dimension consistently measure the same conceptual domain.

Table 1

Construct Reliability of WIF and FIW

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability (CR)
WIF (Wife)	0.82	0.84	0.88
WIF (Husband)	0.78	0.79	0.85
FIW (Wife)	0.88	0.89	0.92
FIW (Husband)	0.90	0.90	0.92

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity evaluates whether items that are theoretically related share a high proportion of common variance. This is assessed using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where values ≥ 0.50 indicate that a construct explains more than half of the variance of its indicators.

As presented in Table 2, all AVE values exceeded the recommended threshold. FIW (Husband) showed the highest AVE (0.71), indicating particularly strong convergence among its items, while WIF (Husband) had the lowest AVE (0.53), which still meets acceptable standards. These findings confirm that each construct demonstrates adequate convergent validity.

Table 2
AVE Values for Constucts

Construct	AVE
WIF (Wife)	0.59
WIF (Husband)	0.53
FIW (Wife)	0.69
FIW (Husband)	0.71

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity ensures that conceptually different constructs are empirically distinct. This was evaluated using three complementary approaches.

a. Fornell–Larcker Criterion

Discriminant validity across constructs was assessed using the Fornell–Larcker criterion. The Fornell–Larcker criterion compares the square root of AVE (diagonal values) with inter-construct correlations. A construct should share more variance with its own indicators than with other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

As shown in Table 3, all diagonal AVE square roots are greater than the correlations with other constructs. This indicates that WIF and FIW are empirically distinguishable for both husbands and wives.

Table 3
Discriminant Validity Assessment

	FIW (Wife)	FIW (Husband)	WIF (Wife)	WIF (Husband)
FIW (Wife)	**0.83**			
FIW (Husband)	0.54	**0.84**		
WIF (Wife)	0.65	0.36	**0.77**	
WIF (Husband)	0.39	0.61	0.52	**0.73**

b. Cross-Loading Analysis

Cross-loading analysis provides item-level evidence of discriminant validity by comparing how strongly each indicator loads on its intended construct relative to other constructs. An item should demonstrate its highest loading on the construct it is theoretically designed to measure. If an item loads similarly or more strongly on another construct, this may indicate conceptual overlap or measurement ambiguity.

As presented in Table 4, all items met this criterion. Each WIF indicator loaded higher on its respective WIF construct (wife or husband) than on any FIW construct, and each FIW item showed the highest loading on its corresponding FIW construct. For example, WIF3 (Wife) loaded 0.84 on WIF (Wife), clearly exceeding its cross-loadings on other constructs. Similarly, FIW4 (Husband) showed its strongest loading (0.88) on FIW (Husband), with lower values on all other dimensions.

Although moderate cross-loadings were observed between WIF and FIW within the same spouse, this is theoretically expected because both dimensions reflect related aspects of work–family conflict. Importantly, in every case, the primary loading remained distinctly higher than cross-loadings, indicating that the constructs are related but empirically separable. These findings provide item-level support for discriminant validity across both spouses.

Table 4
Cross-Loading Values

Item	FIW Wife	FIW Husband	WIF Wife	WIF Husband
WIF 1_ Wife	0.34	0.11	0.63	0.28
WIF 2_ Wife	0.42	0.26	0.79	0.45

Item	FIW Wife	FIW Husband	WIF Wife	WIF Husband
WIF 3_ Wife	0.55	0.35	0.84	0.45
WIF 4_ Wife	0.56	0.28	0.77	0.41
WIF 5_ Wife	0.60	0.34	0.79	0.41
WIF 1_ Husband	0.22	0.21	0.40	0.64
WIF 2_ Husband	0.17	0.33	0.33	0.65
WIF 3_ Husband	0.30	0.47	0.41	0.81
WIF 4_ Husband	0.35	0.57	0.35	0.78
WIF 5_ Husband	0.35	0.62	0.40	0.76
FIW 1_ Wife	0.80	0.39	0.57	0.29
FIW 2_ Wife	0.87	0.46	0.60	0.35
FIW 3_ Wife	0.78	0.40	0.42	0.20
FIW 4_ Wife	0.88	0.47	0.55	0.38
FIW 5_ Wife	0.81	0.51	0.57	0.39
FIW 1_ Husband	0.47	0.81	0.31	0.57
FIW 2_ Husband	0.46	0.88	0.34	0.58
FIW 3_ Husband	0.45	0.77	0.25	0.36
FIW 4_ Husband	0.48	0.88	0.33	0.54
FIW 5_ Husband	0.42	0.86	0.28	0.52

c. Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

The Heterotrait–Monotrait ratio (HTMT) provides a more stringent assessment of discriminant validity by estimating the true correlation between constructs. HTMT values below 0.85 indicate that two constructs are empirically distinct.

As shown in Table 5, all HTMT values ranged from 0.61 to 0.76, remaining well below the recommended threshold. The highest HTMT value was observed between WIF (Wife) and FIW (Wife) (0.76), which is theoretically reasonable because both represent related forms of work–family conflict experienced by the same individual. Despite this association, the value still indicates adequate separation between the constructs.

Table 5
HTMT Ratio Between Constructs

Construct Pair	HTMT Value
WIF (Wife) – FIW (Wife)	0.76
WIF (Husband) – FIW (Husband)	0.72
WIF (Wife) – WIF (Husband)	0.64
FIW (Wife) – FIW (Husband)	0.61

Similarly, the HTMT values between husbands' WIF and FIW (0.72), and across spouses (e.g., WIF Wife – WIF Husband = 0.64), were moderate but clearly below the critical cut-off. This pattern suggests that while work–family conflict dimensions are related within and across spouses, they do not overlap excessively.

Overall, the HTMT results provide strong evidence that WIF and FIW are empirically distinct constructs for both husbands and wives, thereby confirming discriminant validity at the construct level.

Conclusion of Measurement Model Analysis

Overall, the results of the measurement model evaluation demonstrate that the Indonesian-adapted Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW) scales possess satisfactory psychometric properties. All indicators showed acceptable loadings, and both constructs achieved strong internal consistency, adequate convergent validity, and clear discriminant validity across husbands and wives.

These findings confirm that the bidimensional structure of Work–Family Conflict is empirically supported within the context of Indonesian dual-earner couples. The scale not only meets contemporary psychometric standards but also reflects conceptually distinct experiences of work-to-family and family-to-work interference in this cultural setting.

Therefore, the Indonesian version of the WFC scale can be considered a reliable and valid instrument for future research, organizational assessments, and policy-related evaluations concerning work–family dynamics in Indonesia.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide robust empirical evidence that the *Work Interference with Family* (WIF) and *Family Interference with Work* (FIW) scales—two core

dimensions of *Work–Family Conflict* (WFC)—exhibit valid and reliable psychometric properties within the context of dual-earner couples in Indonesia. This validation is particularly significant considering the necessity for measurement tools that are not only statistically sound but also culturally sensitive to the unique socio-family dynamics of modern households (Beaton et al., 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Confirmation of the Bidimensional Structure of WFC

The measurement model results indicate that WIF and FIW can be empirically identified as two correlated but distinct reflective constructs. These findings confirm the widely recognized bidirectional structure of work–family conflict (Allen, 2012; Michel et al., 2011; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Shockley et al., 2017), in which work responsibilities may interfere with family life and, conversely, family demands may encroach upon professional commitments. Discriminant validity, demonstrated through the Fornell–Larcker criterion, HTMT ratios, and cross-loading analysis, reinforces the understanding that WIF and FIW represent psychologically and operationally separate experiences (Hair et al., 2019).

This supports the notion that WFC should not be reduced to a single composite index, as each direction of conflict involves distinct antecedents, consequences, and coping strategies (Allen, 2012; Lapierre & Allen, 2012; Wang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2024).

Construct Validity and Cultural Relevance in the Indonesian Context

The strong psychometric validity of the WIF and FIW scales in this study is also evident in the contextual resonance of the items with the everyday experiences of Indonesian dual-earner couples. For example, statements like *"Keluarga saya jadi terabaikan karena komitmen saya pada pekerjaan"* or *"Perihal pekerjaan membuat saya mudah tersinggung dan sering marah-marah di rumah"* illustrate how job-related pressure spills over into the household domain, both emotionally and in terms of time. Similarly, FIW items such as *"Persoalan rumah tangga dan tanggung jawab pada keluarga membuat saya tidak fokus bekerja"* or *"Seandainya saya tidak berkeluarga, saya akan menjadi pegawai yang lebih baik"* capture the

emotional and cognitive dissonance individuals face when family and professional demands collide.

The semantic clarity and cultural appropriateness of these items suggest that the adaptation process succeeded not only linguistically but also conceptually. This aligns with the *functional equivalence* principle in cross-cultural validation, wherein an item's meaning must reflect local psychological realities (Beaton et al., 2000). Thus, the instrument is not only statistically valid but also meaningful and responsive to the social dynamics of Indonesian working couples.

Gender-Based Analysis: Husbands vs. Wives

Analyzing the responses of husbands and wives separately provides important additional insights. The construct reliability and validity for FIW were stronger among husbands, while WIF showed relatively balanced consistency across both groups. This may suggest that husbands are increasingly engaged in family roles and more consistently report how domestic responsibilities interfere with their work.

Conversely, WIF appeared to be the dominant stressor for wives, reflecting persistent gender norms that position women as the primary caretakers and domestic managers (Adams & Golsch, 2021; Allen & Finkelstein, 2014). This aligns with previous research showing that women in dual-earner households are more susceptible to work–family conflict due to the dual burdens of professional demands and emotional caregiving (Cerrato & Cifre, 2018; Minnotte & Minnotte, 2018).

These findings underscore that work–family conflict among dual-earner couples is shaped not only by work conditions but also by gendered power dynamics and domestic role expectations. The study calls for future research using dyadic and longitudinal methods to better understand crossover effects and interdependent role strain between partners (Westman, 2001; Westman & Etzion, 1995).

Theoretical Implications and Instrument Development

From a theoretical standpoint, the study reinforces the inter-domain spillover model, wherein experiences in one domain (e.g., work) affect outcomes in another (e.g., family) across emotional and temporal dimensions (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The successful validation of the scale in the Indonesian context contributes to the advancement of cross-cultural instrument development by emphasizing the need for conceptual—not merely linguistic—adaptation (Beaton et al., 2000).

Practical Implications: Gender and Family-Inclusive Interventions

The validated scale offers practical utility for organizations, particularly in assessing role conflict and stress through a gender-sensitive lens. HR practitioners can use it to diagnose primary sources of conflict within dual-earner households and design responsive policies, such as flextime, equitable parental leave, and on-site childcare facilities. These interventions can enhance not only job performance but also family well-being (Allen et al., 2013, 2015; Shockley et al., 2017).

Moreover, public policy institutions may employ this instrument to evaluate family protection programs and initiatives aimed at promoting paternal involvement in caregiving roles.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

One of the main limitations of this study is its restricted geographical scope—limited to urban areas in West Sumatra—and a relatively homogeneous middle-class sample. Future studies should consider broader populations, including rural areas and communities with more traditional gender norms. Longitudinal designs and the use of Actor–Partner Interdependence Models (APIM) are also recommended to deepen understanding of spousal role interaction and mutual influence (Kenny et al., 2006).

Contribution

This study makes a significant contribution to the fields of family and organizational psychology by validating a culturally adapted work–family conflict scale. In

addition to reinforcing the two-dimensional theoretical structure of WFC, the study offers rich empirical insight into gendered experiences of role conflict. As such, the scale is suitable for both academic research and practical applications in developing evidence-based work–family policies in Indonesia.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings strengthen the relevance of the dual-role conflict framework and the two-dimensional approach to understanding the interaction between work and family domains. The stable factor structure observed in this study indicates that the WFC model can be cross-culturally replicated with appropriate contextual adaptation. This opens avenues for further development of measurement instruments that are more responsive to local values and cultural characteristics.

Practically, this validated scale can be employed by organizational practitioners, human resource professionals, psychologists, and family service institutions to assess the role-related strain experienced by employees or working couples. The insights generated through such assessments may be utilized to guide the development of flexible work arrangements, stress reduction strategies, and family-based interventions that are more sensitive to the burdens of dual roles.

Conclusion

This study successfully demonstrated that the Indonesian-adapted version of the Work-Family Conflict Scale (*Work Interference with Family* (WIF) and *Family Interference with Work* (FIW) dimensions) possesses strong psychometric properties within the context of dual-earner couples in Indonesia. All measurement assessments confirmed that the two constructs exhibit high internal reliability, adequate convergent validity, and strong discriminant validity. These findings affirm that WIF and FIW represent two distinct and measurable dimensions of work–family conflict that are culturally appropriate and

psychometrically sound for use in the Indonesian setting. The successful validation offers a robust foundation for the application of this scale in both research and evidence-based interventions.

Suggestions

Future research is encouraged to extend this validation by testing the scale among more geographically and demographically diverse populations to enhance its generalizability. Incorporating longitudinal designs will also allow for the examination of the temporal stability of the constructs, while dyadic analyses involving both spouses can shed light on crossover effects and mutual role interdependencies within dual-earner households.

References

Adams, A., & Golsch, K. (2021). Gender-specific patterns and determinants of spillover between work and family: The role of partner support in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Family Research, 33*(1), 72–98. https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-373

Allen, T. D. (2012). The work and family interface. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology* (Vol. 2). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928286.013.0034

Allen, T. D., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2014). Work–family conflict among members of full-time dual-earner couples: An examination of family life stage, gender, and age. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(3), 376–384. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036941

Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). Meta-analysis of work–family conflict mean differences: Does national context matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 90*, 90–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.07.006

Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology, 66*(2), 345–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186–3191.

Cerrato, J., & Cifre, E. (2018). Gender inequality in household chores and work–family conflict. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1330. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01330

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 178–199. https://doi.org/10.2307/259269

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/258214

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. Guilford Press.

Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2012). Control at work, control at home, and planning behavior: Implications for work–family conflict. *Journal of Management, 38*(5), 1500–1516. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385868

Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(5), 689–725. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695

Minnotte, K. L., & Minnotte, M. C. (2018). Work–family conflict among dual earners: Are partner, family, and friends resources or liabilities? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 39*(2), 258–276. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9561-4

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 400–410. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

Rizal, G. L., & Fikry, Z. (2023). Pengaruh work–family conflict terhadap parenting stress ibu yang bekerja. *Jurnal Riset Aktual Psikologi.* https://doi.org/10.24036/rapun.v13i2

Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2018). It's not what I expected: The association between dual-earner couples' met expectations for the division of paid and family labor and well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 104*, 240–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.11.009

Shockley, K. M., Shen, W., DeNunzio, M. M., Arvan, M. L., & Knudsen, E. A. (2017). Disentangling the relationship between gender and work–family conflict: An integration of theoretical perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1601–1635. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000246

Sulastri, R. (2021). Dual-earner family dalam pandangan masyarakat dan pemahaman keagamaan Islam. *Khazanah Multidisiplin, 3*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.15575/kl.v3i1.15808

Wan, M., Shaffer, M. A., Dou, J., Zhang, M., & Zhang, Y. (2022). A dyadic approach to examining dual-earner couples' boundary segmentation preferences and work–family conflict. *International Journal of Stress Management, 29*(3), 292–305. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000262

Wang, X., Zhang, L., Wu, X., & Zhao, M. (2021). Work–family conflict, enrichment, and adolescent academic adjustment in dual-earner families. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 712954. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.712954

Weeks, A., Swerissen, H., & Belfrage, J. (2007). Issues, challenges, and solutions in translating study instruments. *Evaluation Review, 31*(2), 153–165. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X06294184

Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations, 54*(6), 717–751. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726701546002

Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (1995). Crossover of stress, strain and resources from one spouse to another. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(2), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160207

Yang, X., Kong, X., Qian, M., Zhang, X., Li, L., Gao, S., Ning, L., & Yu, X. (2024). The effect of work–family conflict on employee well-being among physicians: The mediating role of job satisfaction and work engagement. *BMC Psychology, 12*(1), 530. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02026-8

Appendix A

Indonesian Version of the Work–Family Conflict Scale

Instrumen berikut merupakan versi Bahasa Indonesia dari skala Work–Family Conflict yang telah melalui proses adaptasi budaya dan bahasa. Skala terdiri dari dua dimensi: Work

Interference with Family (WIF) dan Family Interference with Work (FIW). Seluruh item dijawab menggunakan skala Likert 1–5 (1 = *Sangat Tidak Setuju*, 5 = *Sangat Setuju*).

A. Work Interference with Family (WIF)

No	Item (Bahasa Indonesia)
WIF1	Pekerjaan saya memberi waktu yang cukup untuk berkumpul dengan keluarga. *(R)*
WIF2	Sepulang bekerja, seringkali tidak lagi ada waktu yang cukup untuk melakukan aktivitas yang saya sukai di rumah (misalnya bersih-bersih, bersantai).
WIF3	Keluarga saya jadi terabaikan karena komitmen saya pada pekerjaan.
WIF4	Pekerjaan saya berdampak kurang baik bagi keluarga saya.
WIF5	Perihal pekerjaan membuat saya mudah tersinggung dan sering marah-marah di rumah.

Catatan: ***(R) = item dibalik (reverse-coded)***

B. Family Interference with Work (FIW)

No	Item (Bahasa Indonesia)
FIW1	Kinerja saya di kantor/tempat kerja memburuk karena komitmen saya pada keluarga.
FIW2	Persoalan rumah tangga dan tanggung jawab pada keluarga membuat saya tidak fokus bekerja.
FIW3	Seandainya saya tidak berkeluarga, saya akan menjadi pegawai yang lebih baik.
FIW4	Urusan keluarga menurunkan tanggung jawab saya pada kewajiban pekerjaan.
FIW5	Sulit bagi saya untuk berkonsentrasi dalam bekerja karena memikirkan urusan keluarga.