GENDER, LIFE ROLE IMPORTANCE AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT IN INDONESIA: A NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVE

Indah S.R. Kuntari[1], Jan M.A.M. Janssens[2], Henndy Ginting[3]

[1,2]Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, Nijmegen, NETHERLANDS;
[1,3]Faculty of Psychology, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, INDONESIA.

[1]socark@gmail.com, [2]j.janssens@pwo.ru.nl, [3]henndyg@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined gender differences among profiles based on life role importance on work-family conflict. The sample consisted of 404 Indonesia working couples with children. We found four profiles based on their work and family role importance that is a Family, Work, Dual and a Low profile. More men than women belonged to the Work profile and Low profile; more women than men belonged to the Family profile. There was no difference between men and women in Dual profile. There were differences among the four profiles on Work to Family and Family to Work conflicts. Men in the Dual profile experienced the least Work to Family and Family to Work conflicts. Men in the Low profile group experienced the most Work to Family and Family to Work conflicts. There were no differences in Work to Family conflict among women in the four profile groups. Women in the Dual profile experienced the least Family to Work conflicts. Women in the Low profile experienced the most Family to Work conflicts. Limitations and future research are discussed in the light of these findings.

Keywords: Gender, Role Importance Profiles, Work-family conflicts

INTRODUCTION

Full-time working couples with children have a role in two central domains of their life, work, and family. Many couples find it difficult to perform their role in job and family simultaneously. The role expectations and role demands from work and family often occur at the same time, which may raise a potential conflict of interest in fulfilling work and family roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Inter-role conflict occurs when pressures associated with one role are incompatible with pressures associated with another role (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). The Scarcity theory or the Role Strain theory states that everyone has limited energy to perform multiple roles. Interrole conflict cannot be avoided when an individual has many roles to be executed. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) stated that work-family conflict is a type of inter-role conflict in which the role demands coming from one domain (work or family) are incompatible with the role demands coming from the other domain (family or work).

Work-family conflict can occur in two directions, work-to-family (WF) and family-to-work (FW) conflicts (Barling, Kelloway, & Frone, 2009). For example, a parent might experience a WF conflict when late work hours make it difficult to arrive at home in time to help his/her child completing homework. A parent might experience a FW conflict when facing a dilemma to stay at home to take care of his/her sick child and not being able to attend an important meeting at the office. Research supported the idea that WF and FW conflict are two distinct constructs (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996).

WF and FW conflicts can occur in both men and women. Gender is one of the characteristics most often associated with WF and FW conflicts (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). Several studies have found that women experience more FW conflict than men, while men reported having more WF conflicts than women (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Loscocco, 1997; Pleck, 1977). That women experience more FW conflicts is rooted in traditional gender role expectations (Simon, 1995). Women are still expected to have primary family responsibility and home maintenance rather than to financially contribute to the family, while the role of men is primary to be the economic support provider (Gutek, Nakamura, & Nieva, 1981; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). Therefore, women experience more FW conflicts than men. They feel more responsible for their family and domestic affairs than for work affairs. Men experience more WF conflicts than women because they invest more in work than in their family. Men see their job as the significant contribution to their families and, therefore they spend less time and attention to their family.

Most of the research on WF and FW conflicts has been conducted in Western societies like European countries, US, and Canada (Aryee, Luk, & Leung, 1999). In non-Western societies such as Indonesia, relatively little is known about relations between gender and work-family conflict.

In Indonesia, there was an increasing number of women in the workforce during the past 25 years (BPS, 2015). But in Indonesia, there is still a strongly patriarchal culture with traditional gender roles and attitudes influenced by most ethnic cultures and Islamic religion professed by the majority of the population. It can be seen in two of the articles in the Marriage Law: "Husband is the family head and his wife is a housewife" (RI. 1974. Marriage Laws, 31:3) and "Wife is obliged to manage the affairs of the household as well as possible" (RI. 1974. Marriage Laws, 34:2).

Therefore, Indonesian women are likely to remain bound by traditional gender roles and are more concerned with family than work. A traditional gender role became part of a woman's identity. As a consequence, they may experience physical and psychological exhaustion to meet obligations to their husbands and to provide their children's needs. Therefore, in this study we assumed that Indonesian women spend more time to family affairs than their men and experience more FW conflicts than their men. Indonesian women are also likely to experience WF conflicts. Because women feel more responsibility for family affairs, they spend fewer hours on their work, and therefore we assumed that they perceived that their work interferes with their family obligations.

In contrast, men who spend even relatively few hours in family affairs may perceive that this time interferes with their work. Indonesian men may experience more WF conflicts than women because their role at work is their major role compared to their family role. Men also spend more time on their work because they see their work as a major contribution to their families. In this study, we examined first whether these assumed differences between men and women concerning WF and FW conflicts exist in the Indonesian society.

Studies on gender and WF and FW conflicts should be complemented with studies on the perception of life role importance. Life role importance refers to a role which provides men and women meaning and sense of worth (Noor, 2004). Men and women have two major roles in life, namely a work and a family role. These roles give them a definition of who and what they are (Reitzes & Mutran, 1994). Role importance is related to self-identity and commitment. The perception of life role importance may be different for men and women. According to traditional gender role attitudes, men will value their work role as more important than their family role. Their work role is important for their self-identity.

Conversely, women will perceive their family role as more important than their work role because they psychologically identify themselves with this family role.

Many studies focused on work role importance or family role importance, as separated concepts (e.g. Carlson & Perrewe, 1999; Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus & Kopelman, 1981; Naido & Jano, 2002). But studying the importance of one role without simultaneously considering the importance of the other role may provide only partial understanding (Cinnamon & Rich, 2002b; Reitzes & Mutran, 2002). Other studies constructed profiles based on both work and family role importance. Three profiles have been found in previous research (e.g. Cinamon & Rich, 2002b; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Fournier, Lachance, & Bujold, 2009).

First, a Work profile characteristic for individuals who perceive that their work role is more important than their family role. Second, a Family profile in which people focus more on their family role than on their work role. Third, a Dual profile was found, characteristic for individuals who focus their resources on both work and family roles.

In this study, we examined how gender is related to these three profiles. According to traditional gender role attitudes, men value their work role as more important than their family role, and women perceive their family role as more important than their work role. Therefore, we assumed that there were more women than men with a Family profile and that there were more men than women with a Work profile. Moreover, we hypothesized that there was no gender difference between men and women with a Dual profile because they have the same possibilities to invest in both work and family roles.

Our third research question was how profiles based on work and family role importance were related to WF and FW conflicts. The linking of life role importance with these conflicts has been studied by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). They argued that WF and FW conflicts intensified when either work or family roles are important and central to a person's self-concept (e.g. Work and Family profiles). In more recent studies, Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) suggested that WF and FW conflicts occurred more frequently among individuals who invested more in a single area of life (work or family). These arguments have been supported by Lachance, Gilbert, & Tétreau (in Fournier et al., 2009), who found that individuals with a Work profile experienced more WF conflicts than those did with a Dual Profile. Individuals with a Work profile focussed more on their work role as the most important area of their life and consequently, they experienced that their work role interferes with their family role.

Comparable conflicts also apply for people with a Family profile. Individuals with a Family Profile spend more time on family activities than on their job. Therefore, they experience that family tasks interfere with their work and that their work takes time at the expense of their household chores. Consequently, they experience that their work interferes with their family role. Furthermore, if more than one role is important (Dual profile), conflicts are likely to occur due to the equal pressure to invest resources in both roles (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Carlson & Kacmar, 2000). Therefore, individuals with a Dual profile were expected to experience more WF and FW conflicts.

Our fourth research question was whether there were differences between men and women concerning the relationships between profiles and conflicts. We expected not to find gender differences regarding these relations because both men and women with a Work profile are equally focusing on their work role. Both men and women in the Work profile will focus their time, energy and resources to their work, therefore, have the same opportunities to experience WF and FW conflicts. The same applies to men and women with a Family profile. Both will use time and resources to fulfill their role in the family, so they are equally to

experience FW and WF conflicts. Men and women with a Dual profile invested their resources for fulfilling demands from work and family simultaneously, and therefore both probably experience WF and FW conflicts.

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were 404 couples with children. More than 50% of the couples had one child ($n = 220$; 54.5%) and nearly half of the couples had two or more children ($n = 184$; 45.5%). All participants were full-time employees who worked at least 40 hours a week; this corresponds to the Indonesian Labor Laws on working hours (RI. 2003. Labor Laws No. 13, 77:2). Approximately a quarter of the men were between 20 and 30 years of age ($n = 99$; 24.5%), nearly half of them were between 31 to 40 years old ($n = 188$; 46.5%), over a quarter were more than 40 years old ($n = 117$; 29.0%). Almost half of the men had a university degree ($n = 196$; 48.5%), approximately a half a senior high school degree ($n = 188$; 46.5%), and a small number of men had a junior high school degree ($n = 20$; 5%). More than a third of the women were between 20 and 30 years of age ($n = 145$; 35.9%), a large proportion of women were between 31 to 40 years old ($n = 172$; 42.6%), and about a fifth was older than 40 years old ($n = 87$; 21.5%). Over two-third had a university degree ($n = 276$; 68.3%), more than a quarter had a senior high school degree ($n = 116$; 28.7%), and a very small number of women had a junior high school degree ($n = 12$; 3.0%).

Research Procedure

Human Resource Departments of firms located in Bandung and Jakarta were contacted to request permission to conduct the research involving their employees who were working couples with children. These companies were engaged in manufacturing, banks, telecommunication, security, and education. After obtaining approval of the Human Resources Managers of the companies, 450 packages with questionnaires were distributed to the employees and their spouse; 404 were returned resulting in a response rate of 89.78 percent.

Instrument

Work-Family Role Importance

Work and family role importance was adapted from the Life Role Salience Scale (LRSS) developed by Amatea, Cross, Clark, and Bobby (1986). The participants rated their agreement on 40 5-point Likert items, ranging from *"strongly disagree"* (1) to *"strongly agree"* (5). A sample item of work role importance is, *"Having work/ a career that is interesting and exciting to me is my most important life goal."* A sample item of family role importance is, *"I expect to be intensely involved in the day to day matters of rearing my children."* The LRSS was carefully forward translated into the Indonesian language conducted by two independent translators, native speakers of the Indonesian language and fluent in English, followed by a backward translation by a native speaker of the English language and fluent in the Indonesian language.

A factor analysis was carried out to detect dimensions of life role importance, namely, work role importance (WRI) and family role importance (FRI). This analysis revealed two factors. The first factor was dominated by high loadings (>.40) of items that expressed WRI and consisted of 8 items. The second factor was dominated by high loadings of items that expressed FRI and consisted of 20 items. We deleted 12 items with low loadings (<.40). Cronbach's alpha of WRI was .84 for men and .88 for women, with total scores ranging from 16 to 40. Cronbach's alpha of FRI was .83 for men and .85 for women, with total scores ranging from 58 to 100 for men and 46 to 100 for women.

Work-Family Conflict

Work-family conflict was measured by using Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams's (2000) 18 items scale. The scale consists of two dimensions, work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC). Each dimension consists of 9 items. An example item of the WFC scale is, "My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like."An example of an item from FWC is, "I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities."

The work-family conflict scale was adapted and translated into the Indonesian language conducted by three independent translators using the forward-back translation technique. The translation was done by two independent translators in the forward-translation phase and by one independent translator in the back-translation phase. A factor analysis was conducted to detect dimensions of work-family conflict. This analysis revealed two factors. The first factor was dominated by high loadings (>.40) of 9 items that expressed WFC. The second factor was dominated by high loadings of 9 items that expressed FWC. Cronbach's alphas of WF conflict were high, .81 for men and .87 for women, with total scores ranging from 9 to 41 for men and 9 to 44 for women. Cronbach's alpha of FW conflict was .81 for men and .87 for women, with total scores ranging from 9 to 36 for men and 9 to 44 for women.

RESULTS

The first research question was whether Indonesian men and women differed with regard to WF and FW conflicts? Differences were tested with a two paired dependent sample t-test. We found that there were no differences between Indonesian men and women concerning the level of WF conflict ($t = 1.54$, *n.s.*) and FW conflict ($t = 0.26$, *n.s.*) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for WF and FW Conflicts, WRI and FRI of Men and Women

	Men		Women		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
WFC	23.29	5.30	22.84	6.04	1.54
FWC	20.42	4.76	20.36	5.17	.26
WRI	30.94	4.31	28.73	5.09	8.49**
FRI	83.71	8.44	85.87	8.07	-5.40**

*Note. WFC=Work-to-Family Conflict, FWC=Family-to-Work Conflict, WRI=Work Role Importance, FRI=Family Role Importance. **p<.01*

Our second research question was how gender was related to profiles based on life role importance. To address this question we conducted a series of analyses. First, we analyzed differences in work and family role importance between men and women, using a two paired dependent t-test. We found significant differences on WRI ($t = 8.49$, $p < .01$) and FRI ($t = -5.40$, $p<.01$) between men and women (Table 1). Men had a higher score on work role importance than women, and women had a higher score on family role importance than men.

Second, we constructed life role importance profiles. A k-means cluster analysis was used to form groups of participants based on their similarity on work and family role importance. We found four clusters (profiles). We examined the differences between the clusters on WRI and FRI with ANOVA (Table 2). The results showed significant differences between the four profiles with regard to WRI ($F (3,807) = 288.14$, $p<.01$) and FRI ($F(3,807) = 979.50$, $p<.01$). The first cluster named Family profile ($n = 166$; 20.6%) consisted of individuals who had a high score on FRI ($M = 87.78$) and a low score on WRI ($M = 24.13$). The second cluster

named Work profile (*n* = 258; 31.9%) was characterized by a high score on WRI (*M* = 30.88) and a low score on FRI (*M* = 80.16). The third cluster named Dual profile (*n* = 288; 35.6%) was characterized by high scores on both dimensions of life role importance, WRI (*M* = 33.19) and FRI (*M* = 92.17). The fourth cluster named Low profile (*n* = 96; 11.9%) consisted of individuals who had a low score on both WRI (*M* = 26.83) and FRI (*M* = 69.93).

Table 2. Description of and ANOVA-tests on the Four Profiles

	Family profile (*n* = 166)		Work profile (*n* = 258)		Dual profile (*n* = 288)		Low profile (*n* = 96)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*(3,807)
WRI	24.13	3.40	30.88	3.24	33.19	3.06	26.83	4.38	288.14**
FRI	87.78	4.17	80.16	3.20	92.17	3.81	69.93	4.96	979.50**

Note. WRI=Work Role Importance, FRI=Family Role Importance, **p < .01

Next, we tested differences between men and women with regard to belonging to the four profiles with t-tests (see Table 3). We found significant differences between men and women on the Family profile (*t* = -5.50, *p* < .01) and Work profile (*t* = 2.27, *p* < .05). We also found a significant difference between men and women on the Low profile (*t* = 1.96, *p* < .05) but no gender difference in the Dual profile (*t* = 1.03, *n.s.*). In particular, we found that more men belonged to the Work profile (*n* = 144; 36%) than women (*n* = 114; 28%) and were less likely to be in the Family profile (*n* = 52; 13%) than women (*n* = 114; 28%). With regard to the Dual profile, no difference between men and women was found. With regard to the Low profile, results showed more men (*n* = 57; 14%) than women (*n* = 39; 10%) in that profile.

Table 3. Gender Differences between the Four Profiles

	Family profile			Work profile			Dual profile			Low profile		
	n	*%*	*t*	*n*	*%*	*t*	*n*	*%*	*t*	*n*	*%*	*t*
Men	52	13	-5.50**	144	36	2.27*	151	37	1.03	57	14	1.96*
Women	114	28		114	28		137	34		39	10	
Total	166	20.6		258	31.9		288	35.6		96	11.9	

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01

The third research question was how profiles based on work and family role importance were related to WF and FW conflicts. To address this question, we performed multiple steps. First, analyses of variance were conducted to compare the four profiles on WF and FW conflicts. We found significant differences among the four profiles on WF conflict (*F*(3,807) = 4.05, *p* < .05) and FW conflict (*F*(3,807) = 19.31, *p* < .01) (see Table 4). Second, we conducted Scheffé posthoc comparisons among the profiles. We found a tendency (*p* < .10) that participants in the Work profile had more WF conflicts than participants in the Family and Dual profile. There was also a trend (*p* < .10) that participants in the Low profile had more WF conflicts than participants in the Family and Work profile. The only significant difference found was that more WF conflicts were experienced in the Low than in the Dual profile (*p* < .05).

With regard to FW conflicts, we found that participants in the Family profile had more FW conflicts than individuals in the Dual profile. The results also showed that participants in the Work profile and the Low profile had more FW conflicts than participants in the Dual profile. In sum, we found that participants in the Dual profile experienced fewer FW conflicts than participants in the three other profiles. We also found that participants in the Family profile

had fewer FW conflicts than participants in the Low profile. There was no difference between Family and Work profile on FW conflicts. We also found that participants in the Low profile had more FW conflicts than participants in the Family and Dual profile. There was a tendency ($p < .10$) that in the Low profile there were more FW conflicts than in the Work profile.

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations and F Values among the Profiles

	Family profile		Work profile		Dual profile		Low profile		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*(3,807)
WFC	23.28	5.92	23.38	5.32	22.23	5.90	24.33	5.29	4.05*
FWC	20.39	4.89	21.29	4.85	18.86	4.70	22.56	4.84	19.31**

*Note. WFC=Work-to-Family Conflict, FWC=Family-to-Work Conflict, *p < .05, **p < .01*

Our fourth research question was whether men and women differed concerning the relationships between profiles and conflicts. To address this question we conducted two steps of analyses. First, analyses of variance were conducted to compare differences between the profiles on WF conflicts and FW conflicts (Table 5), for men and women separately. We found differences in WF conflicts ($F(3,403) = 3.16$, $p < .05$) and FW conflicts ($F(3,403) = 14.45$, $p < .01$) among the four profiles of men. For women, we found differences on FW conflicts ($F(3,403) = 6.85$, $p < .01$) between the four profiles, but no differences on WF conflicts ($F(3,403) = 1.95$, $p > .05$).

**Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations and F Values of Gender Differences
in WF and FW Conflicts between Profiles**

		Family profile		Work profile		Dual profile		Low profile		
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F*(3,403)
Men	WFC	22.69	5.35	23.62	5.02	22.57	5.36	24.91	5.50	3.16*
	FWC	19.46	4.78	21.45	4.65	18.86	4.12	22.81	5.06	14.45**
Women	WFC	23.55	6.17	23.09	5.68	21.86	6.44	23.49	4.90	1.95
	FWC	20.82	4.90	21.08	5.10	18.85	5.28	22.21	4.54	6.85**

*Note. WFC=Work-to-Family Conflict, FWC=Family-to-Work Conflict, *p < .05, **p < .01*

Second, we carried out Scheffé posthoc analyses. We only found that men in the Low profile had more WF conflicts than men in the Dual profile. With regard to FW conflicts, we found that men in the Low profile had a higher level of FW conflicts than men in the Family profile. We also found that men in the Low profile had more FW conflicts than men in the Dual profile. Moreover, men in the Work profile were more likely to have FW conflicts than men in the Dual profile.

Women in the Work profile had a higher level of FW conflicts than women in the Dual profile. We also found that women in the Family profile had a higher level of FW conflicts than women in the Dual profile. Women in the Low profile had more FW conflicts than women in the Dual profile. As mentioned for women, there were no differences found in WF conflicts among the four profiles.

DISCUSSION

In this study, no significant differences were found in WF and FW conflicts between male and female participants. The present findings contradict the gender role expectations hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, women experience more FW conflicts than men

because they have more family responsibilities than men, whereas WF conflicts occur more often for men than for women because they spend more time on their work and have more work responsibilities than women (e.g. Frone et al., 1992b; Pleck, 1977). We may explain the present findings with the Rational theory which suggest that the more time spent at work or family, the more WF or FW conflicts are experienced by an individual (Gutek et al., 1991). Men and women in this study worked full time for a minimum of 40 hours a week, and they had the same amount of time spent at work. As a spouse and as a parent, men and women had duties and responsibilities in their families. They had to arrange the time and share their home chores. Consequently, there were no significant differences in the level of WF and FW conflicts between these men and women. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992a), Grzywacz and Marks (2000), and confirmed by a meta-analysis by Byron (2005) that there are no gender differences in either WF or FW conflicts.

The differences in WRI and FRI between male and female participants were statistically significant. Men scored higher on WRI than women, and women scored higher on FRI than men. These findings are in accordance with Cinnamon and Rich (2002b). It may be explained by the gender role hypothesis (Greenhaus et al., 1987) which proposes that traditional gender roles impose different levels of importance for work and family roles for men and women. Traditionally, men are the breadwinners of their family, so their roles in the workplace are more important than those in their family (Major, 1993; Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996). For women, being a wife and a mother has a higher priority than their roles in the workplace (Gilbert, 1993). This finding confirms the traditional gender roles which are still common in Indonesia, where men tend to focus more on their work roles and women on their family roles.

Based on the level of life role importance of work and family, we found four profiles: a Work profile, a Family profile, a Dual profile, and a Low profile. Out of the 808 participants, most of them had a Dual profile. More than one-third of the men and women in this study ascribed high importance to both work and family roles. Men and women with a Dual profile focus their attention, time, and resources on work as well as on family roles.

The present finding confirmed our hypothesis that there was no gender difference in the Dual profile. This finding was also found by Cinamon and Rich (2002a) and by Mencken and Winfield (2000). A possible explanation is that men and women in the Dual profile have egalitarian/non-traditional gender role attitudes. Individuals with egalitarian/non-traditional gender role attitudes believe in an equal role distribution at work and in the family (Korabik, McElwain, & Chappell, 2008).

In this study, we found no gender differences in the Dual profile group, but there were significant gender differences concerning the Work profile group and the Family profile group. There were more male participants than female participants in the Work profile group, but it was the other way around in the Family profile group. These findings were also found by Cinnamon and Rich (2002b) and by Friedman and Greenhaus (2000), and confirm our hypothesis that was based on traditional gender role attitudes. Men value their work roles as more important than their family roles (Major, 1993; Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996). Women value their family roles as more important than their work roles (Gilbert, 1993).

Furthermore, the study showed that less than one-fifth of the participants had a Low profile. Men and women in this profile group valued neither their work nor family roles as most important. According to the Social Identity theory, men and women classify themselves into various social categories or groups such as religious affiliations, hobby-based or social communities or political groups (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Stets &

Burke, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). There were more men than women in the Low profile group. From the literature, it is clear that status and power differences typically favor men according to gender hierarchy or patriarchy (e.g. Jagger & Rosenberg, 1984; Lerner, 1989; Walby, 1990). Men need status and power more than women do, not only in their workplace or family but also in their hobby-based or social communities, religious affiliations or political interest groups. This study focussed only on the major life role importances of men and women in the workplace as an employee and at home, as a parent and a spouse. If we should had expanded the study on the Low profile group by adding roles in hobby-based or social communities, religious affiliations or political interests groups, we probably would have found that men and women with a Low profile valued their roles in this kind of organizations as more important than their role at work or at home.

This study also disclosed that there were differences between the extent of WF and FW conflicts between the four profile groups. The participants in the Dual profile group experienced the least WF and FW conflicts compared to the participants in the Work, Family, and Low profile. These results contradict the hypothesis of Cinnamon and Rich (2002b) that there is a high expectation for men and women with a Dual profile to have WF and FW conflicts. The present findings confirm the Enhancement Role theory or the Expansion theory which states that involvement in multiple roles provides benefits, satisfaction and that men and women have plentiful and widespread energy (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). Participation in multiple roles will add energy and attention that might be given to each role (Rothbard, 2001). Based on the Enhancement Role theory, a possible explanation as to why men and women in the Dual profile group have less WF and FW conflicts is that they are able to manage their time and resources well. They are capable of managing and focusing on their work optimally and are able to do their family chores and to fulfill their responsibilities at home. The capability to manage work and family roles maybe avoids conflicts of interests between work and family. We propose more studies in the future that involve the positive sides of work and family that are root in the Enhancement or Expansion theory. Some scholars suggested work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), work-family integration (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999), and work-family positive spillover (Crouter, 1984; Kirchmeyer, 1992) with regard to the Dual profile.

Another possible explanation why those in the Dual profile experienced the least WF and FW conflicts is that men and women in this profile are egalitarian and have non-traditional gender-role attitudes. Some studies stated that men and women with egalitarian/non-traditional gender-role attitudes benefit more from combining work and family roles than those with traditional gender attitudes (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Brennan, Barnett, & Gareis, 2001; Hoffman, 1989; James, Barnett, & Brennan, 1998). Gender equity in Indonesia has become a national issue in the last twenty years. The Indonesian government *has conducted gender equity programs in education, politics, and economics (RI. 1984.* Presidential Decree, 7; RI. 2000. Presidential Instruction, 9). *The implementation and socialization of these programs have probably increased egalitarian gender attitudes in Indonesian men and women.*

Another finding in this study showed that there was no significant difference between people in the Work and Family profile with regard to the extent of WF and FW conflicts. The possible explanation for it can be found in the Segmentation theory. Work-family segmentation is the separation between work and family, such that the two domains do not affect one another (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992). Men and women can participate or be involved in the workplace without negative influence on their family, and vice versa (Greenhaus & Singh, 2004). Men and women in the Work profile and the Family profile devote their time and resources to their most important role and reduce

their involvement in other roles. They intentionally and actively separate work roles from family roles. So, they can reduce the extent of WF and FW conflicts.

We also found that the participants in the Low profile group experienced the most WF and FW conflicts compared to those in the other three profile groups. The Social Role theory may explain this finding (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The main developmental tasks for adults are working and taking care of their families (Havighurst, 1948) so the roles at work and in the family should become couples main roles. Men and women in the Low profile group attach less value to their work and family roles. They feel that duties and responsibilities in their work and family roles are burdensome because they are not involved in these roles. They do not focus their attention and energy on completing their duties in the workplace and the family, but nevertheless they are obliged to perform in both domains. This condition may increase their work-family conflicts.

The second possible explanation why people in the the Low profile group experienced the most WF and FW conflicts compared to those in the other three profile groups may be based on the Resource Drain theory. This theory refers to the transfer of resources from one domain to another; because resources are limited (Morris & Madsen, 2007). Resources can also be shifted to other domains that are not work or family related, such as community or personal pursuits (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Maybe, men and women in the Low profile group devote their resources to other roles in addition to work and family, so their available resources in the workplace and their family are reduced. Therefore, they do not have enough resources to meet the demands of work and family. This situation may lead them more than people in the other profiles into multiple conflicts in work, family, and other roles.

Additionally, we found differences in the extent of WF and FW conflicts between men in the four profile groups. Men in the Dual profile group experienced the least WF and FW conflicts compared to those in the Work, Family, and Low profile, while men in the Low profile group experienced the most WF and FW conflicts.

The fact, that men in the Dual profile experienced the least WF and FW conflicts is consistent with the Enhancement or Expansion theory (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). According to this theory, simultaneous involvement at work and in the family provides benefits and increases satisfaction. Involvement in the family and work roles will add energy and attention that might be given to each role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). This condition may help them to avoid WF and FW conflicts.

On the other hand, men in the Low profile group experienced the most WF and FW conflicts compared to men in other profiles. It may be explained by the Resource Drain theory (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Morris & Madsen, 2007). Men in the Low profile group transfer their personal resources such as time, energy, and attention not only to fulfill work and family roles but also to their other roles. Hence, their resources are reduced to meet the demands of their work and family roles. This situation may lead them into more WF and FW conflicts.

Among women in the four profile groups, there were no differences in WF conflict. According to the Border theory (Clark, 2000), borders are lines of demarcation between work, family, and other role domains. Borders are characterized in part by their permeability. Permeability is the degree to which elements from other domains may enter (Hall & Richter, 1988; Piotrkowski, 1978). Based on this theory, it is possible that the family domain is more permeable to inference than the work domain for the women in all profile groups. This argument is in agreement with Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992b) who suggested that the family domain is more permeable than the work domain.

Women in the Dual profile experienced the least FW conflicts. This result is consistent with the Enhancement or Expansion theory (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). Women with a Dual profile devote their time, energy, and attention to perform in their workplace and in the family. High involvement in these roles provides benefits such as role privileges, status security, status enhancement, and enrichment in personality (Sieber, 1974). Therefore, they experience less conflicts between family and work.

Women in the Low profile experienced the most FW conflicts. This finding may be explained by the Resource Drain theory (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Morris & Madsen, 2007). Women with Low profile have limited psychological and social resources, so participation in multiple roles reduces their resources in work and family domains. This condition increases their conflicts between family and work.

There are limitations of the present study that should be noted. This research design was cross-sectional, prohibiting conclusions about the dynamics of role importance and work-family conflict on individual life stages. We encourage longitudinal research in the future. Participants in this research were taken from two major cities in Indonesia, where the cities fairly represented the urban area. We suggest future research to use participants from various major cities in Indonesia to increase the possibility of generalizing.

But, this study has also strenghts. First, we found a Low profile group which has not been found by other studies (e.g. Cinamon & Rich, 2002b; Fournier et al., 2009). Second, we conducted this study in Indonesia, a non-western country with a collectivist culture. Most studies on work-family conflicts have been conducted in the individualistic Western culture. Thirdly, in this study we used married couples as respondents to describe the gender differences more comprehensive in the context of interpersonal relations between husband and wife.

REFERENCES

[1]   Adams, A.G., King, L.A., & King, D.W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*, 411-420.

[2]   Amatea, E.S., Cross, E.G., Clark, J.E., & Bobby, C.L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-oriented men and women: The life role salience scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 48*(4), 831-838.

[3]   Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, inter-role conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*, 259-278.

[4]   Ashforth, B.E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

[5]   Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia (2015). *Sensus Penduduk Indonesia* [Indonesia Population Census]. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[6]   Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K., & Frone, M.R. (2009). *Handbook of Work Stress.* Thousand Oak, CA: Sage. doi.org/10.4135/9781412975995.

[7]   Barnett, R.C. & Hyde, J.S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, *56*(10), 781-796.

[8]   Brennan, R.T., Barnett, R.C., & Gareis, K.C. (2001). When she earns more than he does: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 168–182.

[9]   Burke, R.J. & Greenglass, E.R. (1987). Work and family. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 273–320). New York, NY: Wiley.

[10] Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work–family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*(2),169–198.

[11] Carlson, D.S. & Kacmar, K.M. (2000). Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference? *Journal of Management*, *26*(5), 1031–1054.

[12] Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., & Williams L.J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*, 249-276.

[13] Carlson, D.S. & Perrewé, P.L. (1999). The role of social support in the stress or strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, *25*(4), 513-540.

[14] Cinamon, R.G. & Rich, Y. (2002a). Gender differences in the importance of work and family roles: Implications for work-family conflict. *Sex Roles*, *47*(11-12). 531-541.

[15] Cinamon, R.G. & Rich, Y. (2002b). Profiles attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for the work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *49*(2), 212-220.

[16] Clark, S.C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, *53*(6), 747–770.

[17] Crouter, A.C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work–family interface. Human Relations, 37, 425–441.

[18] 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*, 178–199.

[19] Fournier, G., Lachance, L., & Bujold, C. (2009). Nonstandard career paths and profiles of commitment to life roles: A complex relation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *74*, 321-331.

[20] Friedman, S.D. & Greenhaus, J.H. (2000). *Work and family allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices?* New York, NY: Oxford University.

[21] Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1992a). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 65-78.

[22] Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1992b). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*, 723-729.

[23] Geurts, S.A.E. & Demerouti, E. (2003). Work/non-work interface: A review of theories and findings. In M.J. Schabracq, J.A.M. Winnubst, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of work and health psychology* (pp. 279-312). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

[24]   Gilbert, L. A. (1993). *Two Careers One Family.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[25]   Greenhaus, J.H., Bedeian, A.G., & Mossholder, K.W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *31*, 200–215.

[26]   Greenhaus, J.H. & Beutell, N.J. (1985). The source of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76-88.

[27]   Greenhaus, J.H. & Kopelman, R.E. (1981). Conflict between work and nonwork roles: Implications for the career planning process. *Human Resource Planning*, *4*(1), 1-10.

[28]   Greenhaus, J.H. & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future direction. In G.N. Powel (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391–412). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[29]   Greenhaus, J.H. & Powell, G.N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work–family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*,72−92.

[30]   Greenhaus, J.H. & Singh, R. (2004). Family-work relationships. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology* (pp. 687-698). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

[31]   Grzywacz, J.C. & Marks, N.F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: an ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5,* 111–126.

[32]   Gutek, B.A., Nakumara, C.Y., & Nieva, V.F. (1981). The interdependence of work and family roles. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *2*, 1-16.

[33]   Gutek, B.A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 560-568.

[34]   Hall, D.T. & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work and life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy Management Executive*, *11*, 213-223.

[35]   Hammer, L.B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T.D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 185-203.

[36]   Havighurst R. (1948). *Developmental tasks and education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McKay.

[37]   Hoffman, L.W. (1989). Effects of maternal employment in the two-parent family. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 283–292.

[38]   Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.

[39]   Jagger, M.A. & Rosenberg S.P. (1984). *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoritical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

[40]   James, J.B., Barnett, R.C., & Brennan, R.T. (1998). The Psychological effects of work experiences and disagreements about gender-role beliefs in dual-earner couples: A longitudinal study. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior, and Policy, 4,* 341-368.

[41]   Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D. & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley.

[42] Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations (*2nd ed.*).* New York, NY: Wiley.

[43] Kelloway, E.K., Gottlieb, B.H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*, 337–346.

[44] Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Perceptions of nonwork-to-work spillover: Challenging the common view of conflict-ridden domain relationships. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *13*, 231-249.

[45] Korabik, K., McElwain, A., & Chappell, D. (2008). Integrating gender-related issues into research on work and family. In K. Korabik, D.S. Lero, & D.L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of Work-Family Integration: Research, Theory, and Best Practices* (pp. 215-232). London: Academic Press.

[46] Lachance, L., Gilbert, M..H., & Tétreau, B. (2006). Étude des conflicts entre le travail rémunéré et la famille auprès de travailleurs vivant en couple selon leur profil d'engagement dans divers rôles de vie et leur sexe [A study of the conflicts between paid work and family of workers with various life roles and their gender]. *Carriérologie*, *10*(3-4), 483-506.

[47] Lambert, S.J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: a critical review and research agenda. *Human Relation, 43*, 239–257.

[48] Lerner, G. (1989). *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[49] Loscocco, K. (1997). Work-family linkages among self-employed women and men. *Journal of Vocational Behavio*r, *50*(2), 204-226.

[50] Major, B. (1993). Gender, entitlement, and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues*, *49*, 141–159.

[51] Marks, S.R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 921–936.

[52] Mencken, F.C. & Winfield, I. (2000). Job search and sex segregation: Does sex of social contact matter? *Sex Roles*, *42*, 847–864.

[53] Morris, M.L. & Madsen, S.R. (2007). Issue Overview: Advancing work-life interaction in individuals, organizations, and communities. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *9*(4), 439-454.

[54] Naidoo, A.V. & Jano, R. (2002). Role salience of dual-career women managers. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *28*(3), 69-74.

[55] Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and work-family conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 400-410.

[56] Noor, N.M. (2004). Work-family conflict, work and family role salience, and women's well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology. 144*(4), 389-405.

[57] Piotrkowski, C.S. (1978). *Work and the family system: A naturalistic study of working-class and lower-middle-class families*. New York, NY: Free Press.

[58] Pleck, J. (1977). The work–family role system. *Social Problems*, *24*, 417–427.

www.savap.org.pk
152
www.journals.savap.org.pk

[59] *Reitzes, D.C. & Mutran, E.J. (1994). Multiple roles and identities: Factors influencing self-esteem among middle-aged working men and women. Social Psychology Quarterly, 57, 313-325.*

[60] Reitzes, D.C. & Mutran, E.J. (2002). Self-concept as the organization of roles: importance, centrality, and balance. *Sociological Quarterly*, *43*(*4*), *647-667.*

[61] Republic Indonesia (2003). *Labour Laws No. 13, 2003, Working Hours*, *77: 2*. Ministry of the State Secretariat. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[62] Republic Indonesia (1974). *Married Laws No. 1, 1974, Conjugal Rights and Responsibilities, 31:3*. Ministry of the State Secretariat. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[63] Republic Indonesia (1974). *Married Laws No. 1, 1974*, *Conjugal Rights and Responsibilities*, *34:2*. Ministry of the State Secretariat. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[64] Republic Indonesia. (1984). *Presidential Decree No. 7, 1984, Elimination of Forms of Discrimination against Women.* Cabinet Secretariat RI. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[65] Republic Indonesia (2000). *Presidential Instruction No. 9, 2000, Gender Mainstreaming in National Development.* Cabinet Secretariat RI. Jakarta, Indonesia.

[66] Rothbard, N.P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 655–684.

[67] Schwartzberg, N.S. & Dytell, R.S. (1996). Dual-earner families: the importance of work stress and family stress for psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *1*, 211-223.

[68] Sieber, S.D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, *39*(4), 567-578.

[69] Simon, R.W. (1995). Gender, multiple roles, role meaning, and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *36*, 182-194.

[70] Stets, J.E. & Burke, P.J. (2000). Identity theory and Social Identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(3), 224-237.

[71] Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1985). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 6-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

[72] Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[73] Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (ed.), *Work, Family and Organizations* (pp. 1–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.