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Abstract

The main purpose of this study were threefold (1) to specify the level of agreement between work/family related demand and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job-family satisfaction (2) to identify the effect between work/family related demand and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction (3) find work-family conflict mediate work/family related demand and job/family satisfaction, Data were collected from a sample of 415 employees in service and industry companies. LISREL 8.72(student edition) was used to analyzed the model.

The findings showed both of work related demand and family related demand have positive effect on work-family conflict, moreover, the work-family conflict had the negative effect on job satisfaction and family satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the introduction of the research.

First, the research background was introduced, then the problem was stated, later the objectives and the research questions were presented. Scope of the study and expected benefits were talked. At last, the operational definitions and organization of this study were discussed. The main topics have been presented as follow:

1.1 Research Background

1.2 Statement of the problem

1.3 Objective of the study

1.4 Research Questions

1.5 Scope of the study

1.6 Expected Benefits

1.7 Operational Definitions
1.1 Research Background

For a long time it was the men who worked to earn money while women took care of the household responsibilities and accomplished the tasks of raising children (Abbott, Wallace and Tyler, 2005). However, the scenario has changed. Women’s participation in the workforce have increased all the world (Davidson and Burke, 2004). Davidson and Burke (2005) further noted that this increase has significantly effects families. Women’s involvement in paid work contributed to the rise of dual-career family and has become the norm in many societies. These changes may cause the work-family conflict between women and men.

In Thailand, more and more men and women join in the work environment, compared to year 2001, the population of Thai men who were employed in 2009 was increased more than 16%, for Thai women, it was increased more than 24% (Thailand National Statistical Office). Otsuki Nami (2005) found the rate of Thailand’s dule-career family was 66%, which meaned it was easier to experience work-family conflict by employees (Lewis and Gambles, 2007).

And the demand for working is also increasing. In 2001, 36.1% of men and 29.1% of women worked longer hours per week than what was stated in Thailand Labour Law. In 2003, this rose to 37.9% for male and 30.1% for female, showing that both female and male’s working hour were increased (Thailand Ministry of Labour, 2001—2003). More and more organizations require employees to work longer, thus the work-family conflict can be stronger in organizations (Kyoko, 2006).
Since 1970s, foreign scholars have done many researches on work-family conflict. A large number of documents discusses the definition, dimensions, the influence factors, the consequences and the strategies and so on of work-family conflict. Work-family conflict is defined as inter role conflict where the participation in one role interfere with the participation in another. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) differentiate three sources for conflict between work and family, which are Time-based, Strain-based, Behavior-based.

Conceptually, the conflict between work and family is bi-directional, which are work interference with family and family interference with work (Duxbury, Higgins, Mills, 1992). Allen, Herst, Bruck, and Sutton (2000) describe in their paper three categories of consequences related to work-family conflict, which are work related outcomes, non-work related outcomes, and stress related outcomes.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Work-family conflict is the subject which has been studied widely by the western organizational behavior researchers in contemporary, and it is also the new theory of corporate human resources management field in recent years. This research was first to carried out because of the changes in the contents and structures of work and family domains: organizations required employees to input more time and energy to work to improve the competitiveness; more and more women began to work to get rid of the original single housewife roles. So the arrangements of family things were absent from the traditional gender roles, both men and women had the responsibilities to take care
of family. These two aspects had led to competition of the personal role between work and family.

Due to the development of economy globalization, work-family conflict is also very necessary to be concerned by developing countries. The researches of work-family conflict are mainly carried out in western countries, and there are relatively few scholars who study on this subject in Thailand cultural background. However, connotation of work-family conflict in the different cultural backgrounds may differ materially, it is not useful to promote the research results achieved in the western cultural background to the other countries directly. Therefore it is very necessary to study the topic in a different population structure and cultural background for testing these theoretical results can be generalized or not.

Thailand is one of the most economically developed countries in South East Asia. Employees’ working life rhythm is relatively faster, and it is very easy to perceive work-family conflict. However, for the study of this subject in Thailand is almost blank. Thus, a study on employee’s work-family conflict in Thailand becomes important for both organizations and employees.

Moreover, previous research has focused on the direction of work-family conflict (Stone, 2003) or the form of work-family conflict (Calson, 1999). Many scholars pay attention to the antecedent variables of work-family conflict, or analysis the consequent variables of work-family conflict. Few research focus on both antecedences and consequences of work-family conflict. So it is very necessary to study the antecedence
and consequence of work-family conflict in Thailand background.

1.3 Objectives of the study

Objectives of this study are explored as follows:

1.3.1 To specify the level of agreement between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction.

1.3.2 To indentify the effect between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction.

1.3.3 To find work-family conflict mediate work/family related demands and job/family satisfaction.

1.4 Research Questions

The research questions of this study are discovered as follows:

1.4.1 What are the level of agreements between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction?

1.4.2 What are the effects between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction?

1.4.3 How can work-family conflict mediate work/family related demands and job/family satisfaction?
1.5 Scope of the study

This research endeavors to study the work-family conflict of employee in Thailand. To overcome the area of this research, this study scope on service and industry companies in Thailand. The participants of the study are employees who work in Thailand. Service sector and industry sector are chosen.

1.6 Expected Benefits

1.6.1 Information in this study can be useful for employers improving the employees’ satisfaction in order to handle the work-family conflict.

1.6.2 Researchers can make use of these results in this study to be references and to conduct further studies.

1.7 Operational Definitions

Work-family conflict: a form of inter role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role. It composed two directions, which are work interference with family and family interference with work.

Work interference with Family: In the work area, the demands, time, strain, duties, things of work interfere with the family life.

Family interference with Work: In the family area, the demands, strain, things of family
interfere with the work.

Work related demand: Psychological and organizational features of the work, requiring physical or psychological effort and energy from an employee, and are consequently related to physiological or psychological costs.

Work Time: The amount of time that employee work, which includes work in organization and in home.

Work Flexibility: Employees could control their work time, contents, conditions within broad parameters.

Work Involvement: Employees actively participate in work by thoughts, emotions, and enthusiastic about their work.

Work Overload: The hypothetical relationship between a group or individual human operator and task demands.

Family Related Demand: Psychological, social features of the family, requiring physical or psychological effort and energy from people, and are consequently related to physiological or psychological costs.

Family Involvement: Employees actively participate in family by thoughts, emotions, and enthusiastic about their family.

Family Objective Demand: The obligation to care for others who are either formally or informally sanctioned family members and do the house works.

Job Satisfaction: It is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from individuals’ job experiences, which include satisfying with the co-work relationships, management,
wages, and employee themselves performance.

Family Satisfaction: The extent to which employees are satisfied with family life.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the work-family conflict related theories. The definition and dimension of work-family conflict are expressed, the antecedence and consequence of work-family conflict also be illustrated. The main topics have been presented as follow:

2.1 work-family linkage and related theory
   2.1.1 Role Theory
   2.1.2 Spillover Theory

2.2 Work-family conflict
   2.2.1 The concept of work and family
   2.2.2 The concept of work-family conflict
   2.2.3 The dimensions of work-family conflict
   2.2.4 The current research of work-family conflict

2.3 Antecedence and consequence of work-family conflict
   2.3.1 Antecedence
      2.3.1.1 Work-related demand
      2.3.1.2 Family-related demand
   2.3.2 Consequence
      2.3.2.1 Job satisfaction
      2.3.2.2 Family satisfaction

2.4 Related research

2.5 Conceptual framework of this study
2.1 Work-family linkage and related theory

Various theories have been established to explain the reasons for work-family conflict. Some main theories are: role theory, compension theory and spillover theory.

2.1.1 Role Theory

In sociology domain, sociologist hold the idea that industrial revolution lead work and family separate which roots from sex role difference. It sees family and work as a distinctive system, domestic area for women and public area for men (Zedeck, 1992), role segmentation from different expectations on men and women. Sex role has psychology and social dimension. Women are expected to be good wife and mother. Men are expected to work for family. Such social expectation is not changed much as society development. Further, family and work should remain separate in order to function properly and the division of labor by sex should be maintained in order to avoid conflict, work and family are separated, absolutely from each other and not effected each other (Lambert, 1990). From the role theory, two spheres do not affect each other; work and family treat as independent issues. However, in nowadays, female are not only housewife but also working-woman, such as lawyer, journalist, nurse.

Kahn (1964) noted that employees could experience conflict between work and family role. However, in response to better explaining possible outcomes of inter-role conflict, the scarcity approach was developed.

Goode (1960) defined role strain as the felt difficulty in performing role obligations,
and the scarcity approach suggested that the quantity of time, energy and attention of people are limited. Consequently, people's resources could quickly deplete if they were not allocated properly, with Goode (1960) suggesting that people with greater number of roles were more likely to deplete their resources, and thus result in role overload or role conflict. This role strain was similar to inter-role conflict (Kahn, 1964). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) thought that the scarcity approach was a useful introduction to work-family conflict, which related to the conflict between employee's job and their family responsibilities. Frone, Barnes, and Farrell (1994) suggested that work-family conflict was an important source of stress that could influence employee's well being, because it reflected the overall goodness-of-fit between an employee's job and family life. Boles, Johnston and Hair (1997) thought that role ambiguity can be caused if the employee was not certain what type of job behaviours to execute in the given work situation. Boles (1997) also illustrated a wide range of attitudes and behaviours across a variety of work settings could be influenced by role conflict and role ambiguity.

2.1.2 Spillover Theory

It recognizes that either work or family may have spillover effects on the other (Staines, 1980). Simultaneous membership in the two systems often entails strain and overload for individuals, families, and work units. In general, the spillover effects model shifts attention from the effects of social institutions on each other to the effects of family members on each other, ignoring the social and political consequences of the
context in which family and work are located.

Spoilover theory reflects two distinct sets of concepts. One set represents negative spillover between work and family and is most frequently characterized by various types of work and family conflict or interference. Co-occurring negative events, such as stressors, on the same day in multiple domains or from one person to another (Almeida, Wethington, Chandler, 1999; Repetti, 1997) also have been viewed as a form of negative spillover. Another, more recent set of concepts represents positive spillover between work and family, such as resource enhancement and work-family success or balance (Milkie and Peltola, 1999; Moen and Yu, 1999). Previous research also has indicated that negative forms of spillover are related, yet distinct from positive spillover (Grzywacz and Marks, 2000).

2.2Work-family conflict

2.2.1The Concept of work and family

Before the concept of work-family conflict is introduced, it is better to understand the definitions and boundaries of work and family. However, the definitions of work and family are still controversial.

The focus of the dispute is whether work is employment related compensation task, or also include those tasks without financial compensation (Voydanoff, 2004). Family is simply refers to the traditional family model that husband works outside, wife stays in home to deal with the housework, or dual-career family, single parent family, no child
Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) pointed out that it was a big flaw to limit work family conflict on the traditional family model only. According to the U.S. Census Bureau statistics in 1987, the traditional family model was less than 4%, and in the families with children, 25% of whom were brought up by single parents.

Otsuki Nami (2005) found the rate of Thailand’s dual-career family was 66%, which was the highest during this six countries—Japan, Korea, Thailand, U.S.A., France, Sweden, and Japan just accounted 42%. We can find the family model has greatly changed, If only focus on the 4% of the traditional family model, regardless of the other model, which will make work-family conflict research’s result is incomplete.

Therefore, this study includes the traditional family, dual-career family, single parent family, reorganized family, unmarried young people and so on. And this paper’s interest is paid work and family activities’ conflict. So we define work as paid employment activities, including full-time, part-time, those activities without payment are not included.

2.2.2 The concept of work-family conflict

There are many words to describe the concept of work-family conflict in English, such as work-family conflict, work-family interface, work /family role incompatibility, inter-role conflict. Now it is more common to use work-family conflict. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) first examined this inter-role conflict that people
experienced between their work roles and other life roles.

Later Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined work-family conflict as a form of inter-role conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domain are mutually incompatible in some respect competing work activity or when family stress has a negative effect on performance in the work role.

Role of demand comes from the requirements of the organization and family members, as well as the individual's attitude towards work and family. In modern society, owing to the fierce competition, the requirements of the work are very high. Furthermore, with the increase of dual-career families, the pressure from family also improves. But the individual’s time and energy are limited, which result in the individual time and energy can not meet the demands of work and family at the same time. So work-family conflict is becoming increasingly serious.

2.2.3 The Dimensions of work-family conflict

Earlier researchers believed that work-family conflict is unidirectional, in other words, they only measure work interfere family, it is one-way measurement.

Later, A group of scholars including: Carlson and Kacmar (2000); Eagle, Icenogle, and Maes (1998); Eagle, Miles, and Icenogle (1997); Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1996); Greenhaus and Powell (2003); Gutek, Searle, Klepa (1991); Matsui, Ohsawa and Onglotco (1995); Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996); Williams and Alliger (1994) agreed that conflict in the work-family conflict had a bidirectional nature. And they made
two directions, which are work interfere family and family interfere work (Duxbury, Higgins, Mills, 1992).

The analysis also showed that the work to family conflict and family to work conflict were related but not identical concepts. The former occurred when experiences at work interfered with family life, like inflexible work hours, work stressors, interpersonal conflict at work, unsupportive supervisor or organization and so on. The later occurred when experiences in the family interfered with work life, like elder care responsibilities, children care responsibilities, unsupportive family members and so on (Neteneyer, Boles, Mcmurrian, 1996).

Both of them had different antecedents and consequences, and required different interventions and solutions to prevent or reduce their incidence (Byron, 2005). Therefore, to full understand the interaction relationships between work and family, the two directions of work-family conflict must be considered. In the universality of the work-family conflict, the western scholars, especially the U.S. scholars agreed that work interfere family is more common than family interfere work (Frone, Russell, Copper, 1992).

In figure 2.1, Greenhaus and Beutell divide work-family conflict into three types, which are Time-based conflict, strain-based conflict and behavior-based conflict (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985).

Time-based conflict refers to the conflict arises when the time devoted to one role makes it difficult for the individual to participate in the other role. There are two forms:
(1) Time pressures associated with membership in one role may make it physically impossible to agree with expectations arising from another role; (2) Pressures also may produce a prejudice with one role even when attempt to meet the demands of another role.

Strain-based conflict refers to when strain in one role affects one's performance in another role. The roles are incompatible in the sense that the strain created by one makes it difficult to agree with the demands of another.

Behavior-based conflict refers to when the behavioral styles that one exhibit at work (impersonality, power, authority) may be incompatible with behaviors desired by their children and spouse within the family field.

**Figure 2.1 Work and Family Role Pressure Incompatibility**

Source: Greenhaus J. H.; Beutell N. J., Sources of Conflict Between Work and Family Roles, 1985

Carlson developed multi-dimensional scale of work-family Conflict (Figure2.2), and tested its reliability and validity. The results showed that both of the six dimensional
Tables had a very good reliability and validity, and had the different antecedents and consequences. Thus, it was an effective measurement of work-family conflict by considering the directions and forms of work-family conflict.

**Figure 2.2 Dimensions of work and family conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of WFC</th>
<th>Directions of WFC (Work and Family Conflict)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time Based WIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Strain Based WIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Behavioral Based WIF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource: Dawn Carlson; K. M. Kacmar; L.J. Williams, Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Work-Family Conflict, 2000

**2.2.4 The current research of work-family conflict**

Many scholars have done a lot of researches about the six dimensions. This paper selects six authority magazines in the field of work-family conflict (Carlson, 2000), which are Academy of Management Journal (AMJ), Human Relations (HR), Journal of Organizational Behavior (JOB), Journal of Management (JOM), Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP), Journal of Vocational Behavior (JVB), in order to make a description on the of work-family conflict research profiles in the past 26 years (from year 1986 to year 2012). In 1986-1996, Calson had done a research overview (2002). See Table 2.1, in 21 articles, Five articles analysis work-family conflict from the single dimension, Seven articles analysis conflict from the different forms (time and strain), Nine articles take into account both the direction of the work-family conflict and its different forms (time and strain). In 1997-2012, see Table 2.2, in 31 articles, most scholars do
the work-family conflict just consider different directions (Nineteen Articles), only a small amount of scholars consider both of the forms and directions (Three Articles).

Table 2.1 Representation of the Six Dimensions of Work–Family Conflict in Existing Measures (1986—1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (magazine, year)</th>
<th>Conflict Measured</th>
<th>Distinguish between direction? (WIF/FIW)</th>
<th>Distinguish between form?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single dimension of work—family conflict (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedeian, Burke and Moffett (JOM, 1988)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryee (HR, 1992)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruee and Luk (JVB, 1996)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, and Mossholder (AMJ, 1989)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams and Alliger (AMJ, 1994)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguish the different forms of work—family conflict, but do not distinguish the directions (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, Russell, Cooper (JOB, 1993)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and Ganster (JAP, 1995)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose, Rabinowitz, and Beutell (JVB, 1989)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury and Higgins (JAP, 1991)</td>
<td>Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loerch, Russel and Rush (JVB, 1989)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based, Behavior-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasuraman, Greenhaus and Granrose (JOB, 1992)</td>
<td>Time-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice, Frone and Mcfairlin (JOB, 1992)</td>
<td>Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis work—family conflict from the directions and forms (9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams and King (JAP, 1996)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, Russell and Cooper (JAP, 1992a)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, Russell and Cooper (JOB, 1992b)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutek, Searle and Klepa (JAP, 1991)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge, Boudreau and Bretz (JAP, 1994)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsui, Ohsawa and Onglatco (JVB, 1995)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netemeyer, Boles and Mcmurrian (JAP, 1996)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasuraman, Beutell (JVB, 1994)</td>
<td>Time-based WIF, Strain-based FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, and Cooper (JOB, 1994)</td>
<td>Time-based, Strain-based WIF</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dawn Carlson; K.M. Kacmar; L. J. Williams, Construction and Initial Validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict; 2000
Table 2.2 Work-Family Conflict Research Status (1997—2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Magazine, year)</th>
<th>Conflict Measured</th>
<th>Distinguish between direction? (WIF/FIW)</th>
<th>Distinguish between form? (time/strain/behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single dimension of work—family conflict (6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie B. Hammer and Elizabeth Allen (JVB, 1997)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Carlson and K.M. Kacmar (JOM, 2000)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Gary and Greenhaus, Jeffre (HR, 2006)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus, Jeffrey; Powell, Gary (JVB, 2012)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Gary; Greenhaus, Jeffrey (JOM, 2010)</td>
<td>General WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis the directions of work—family conflict, but do not distinguish the forms (19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Magazine, year)</th>
<th>Conflict Measured</th>
<th>Distinguish between direction? (WIF/FIW)</th>
<th>Distinguish between form? (time/strain/behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kossek Ellen Ernst and Ozeki C. (JAP, 1998)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone Michael R. (JAP, 2000)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major, V.S.; Klein, K.J. and Ehrhart (JAP, 2002)</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltes Boris B. and Heath (JAP, 2003)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse, Lindsey, Jacqueline (JOM, 2010)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Byron (JVB, 2005)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica and Chochalingam Visvesvaran (JVB, 2005)</td>
<td>WFC, FWC</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Holliday Wayne, Nicholas Musisca and William Fleeson (JVB, 2004)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyn A. Loscocco (JVB, 1997)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Carlson; T. R. Nelson; and M. Lankau (JVB, 2001)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Frone, John K. Yardley and Karen S. Markel (JVB, 1997)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Aryee, Viiviene Luk and Dail Fields (JOM, 1999)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson S. E., Coffery B. S. (JOM, 2002)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Zheng, Powell, Gary (JVB, 2009)</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiRenzo, Greenhaus, Weer (JVB, 2010)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell and Greenhaus (AMJ, 2010)</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell and Greenhaus (JOM, 2010)</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus, Ziegert, Allen (JVB, 2012)</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consider different forms of conflict, but do not distinguish the direction (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Magazine, year)</th>
<th>Conflict Measured</th>
<th>Distinguish between direction? (WIF/FIW)</th>
<th>Distinguish between form? (time/strain/behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Carlson; K.M. Kacmar; L.J. Williams (JVB, 2000)</td>
<td>Time-based; Strain-based; behavior-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean E. Wallace (JVB, 1999)</td>
<td>Time-based; Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consider both of the forms and directions (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Magazine, year)</th>
<th>Conflict Measured</th>
<th>Distinguish between direction? (WIF/FIW)</th>
<th>Distinguish between form? (time/strain/behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Butler, Gasser, Michael, and Smart Lona (JVB, 2004)</td>
<td>Time-based WIF/FIW; Strain-based WIF/FIW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summary by the author.
2.3 Antecedence and consequence variables of work-family conflict

2.3.1 Antecedence

Based on Role theory, many scholars analysis the antecedents of work-family conflict (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal, 1964) and they think role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload are the role variables (Greenhaus, Beutell, 1985; Aryee, 1992).

Except Role theory, scholars also analysis work-family conflict from demographic factors such as gender, marital status, and the children numbers (Gutek, Klepa, 1991; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, 2001) and work hours per week (Gutek, 1991; Frone, 1997). Moreover, to find the antecedence, previous scholars focus on both the directions (Stone, 2003) and the forms (Carlson, 1999) of work-family conflict.

Generally, work-family conflict antecedences are divided into three distinct domains, which are work domain, family domain and individual differences (Byron, 2005; Michel, 2009). In this study, only work domain and family domain are discussed. The theoretical background for each domain is introduced as following.

2.3.1.1 Work Related demand

Burke and Greenglass (1999) and Voydanoff (1988) found that job stressors and work demand could predict work interference with family strongly. A lot of studies showed that work demand such as work time, work overload, work flexibility were positively and strongly associated with work-family conflict (Burke, 2002; Saltzstein et al,
If employee’s work time is long, which can limit the time that employees are available for family activities. Frone et al. (1997) proved that the total work time had a positive relationship with work-family conflict and a strong factor that can influence the level of work-family conflict. Barnett and Hyde (2001) thought when the total demand on time and energy are too great for an individual to perform the roles adequately or comfortably, role overload occurs. Fu and Shaffer (2001) had also demonstrated a significant relationship between role overload and work-family conflict. Freidson (1973) thought that work flexibility was the control which over the terms, conditions, and contents of work. Research on narrower samples shows the results that adopting the scheduling flexibility could decrease the work-family conflict among managers (Friedman and Greenhaus, 2000) and employees in a financial company (Wharton and Blair-Loy, 2006). Many researchs have examined work involvement as an antecedence of work-family conflict. Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate (2000) thought there was a recognition that individuals may be actively participating in one role while simultaneously feeling distracted by thoughts, emotions, or demands that are tied to another role. According to the spillover theory, moods, stress, and thoughts generated in one role domain often influence or spill over into other domains (William and Alliger, 1994).

It seems that work time, work overload, work flexibility, and involvement are the important indicators of work demands and may be antecedents of work-family conflict. Past research has shown that domain-specific antecedents were related to different
directions of work interference with family (Adams, King, 1996; Frone, Yardley, Markel, 1997); therefore, work time, work overload, work flexibility, and involvement can also be expected as antecedents of family interference with work.

**Work Time**

Generally, working is defined as the amount of time spent by an individual to carry out a job or task (Brett and Stroh, 2003). Goode (1960) had identified that the time constraints, energy and commitment were barriers in performing various roles as he emphasized in the scarcity hypothesis. The scarcity hypothesis debated that the more responsibilities that an individual needed to execute, the lesser his resource would be dealing with in executing other responsibilities. In particular, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), had conceptualized work-family conflict into three sources of conflict, namely time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based. The time-based source had been highlighted as long work time in paid jobs that would reduce the amount of time available for family activities, thereby making it difficult for employees to perform family duties and maintain family relationships (Voydanoff, 2004).

Many studies, especially those done in the west have proved that the total working time had a positive relationship with work-family conflict and a strong factor that can influence the level of work-family conflict (Frone et al.1997, Judge Boudreau and Brets, 1994). Many researchers, for example, Grzywacz and Marks (2000), Carlson (2000), Major and Klein (2002), Darcy (2007) also found that time committed to work
contributes to conflict between employees’ work and family roles. Berg, Kalleberg, Appelbaum (2003), Wharton and Blair (2006) also thought that long hours could increase work-family conflict. So long work hours could have negative consequences for workers who struggle to balance the demands of work and family roles. Rothbard (2001) and Voydanoff (2004) thought that heavy engagement in paid work may invade the time needed for family and personal commitments, and work stress may lead to energy depletion and evoke negative emotions that were carried into one’s family life. According to the total working time and roles in a family result showed that when more time is allocated for one role, it shows that there is a decrease in carrying out another role (Frone, 1997; Netemeyer, 1996).

Besides the above, the result constantly shows there was a relationship between working long hours and the difficulty in balancing work and personal life (Moen and Yu, 1999). Working long hours was also frequently associated with stress, exhaustion, insomnia as well as chronic health disorders such as back pains, coronary heart disease and an increase in accidents (Sparks, 1997).

Consistent with this view, research generally shows that as the number of work hours increases, the greater the likelihood that individuals will report experiencing work-family conflict (Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992; Gutek, 1991; Holahan and Gilbert, 1979).

These findings have held in studies conducted in nonwestern countries such as Singapore (Aryee, 1992) and Israel (Shamir, 1983).
Work Flexibility

Freidson (1973) thought that work flexibility was the control which over the terms, conditions, and contents of work. Casey and Chase (2004), and Meiksins and Watson (1989) defined work scheduling flexibility as employees control over their work schedule within broad parameters. Allen (2000) stated the importance of flexible work arrangements including job schedule flexibility. They found it was related to less work-family conflict if adopted job schedule flexibility. Similarly, many scholars also found schedule flexibility was negatively related to work-family conflict (Carnicer, Sanchez, Perez and Jimenez, 2004). Research on narrower samples shows the results that adopting the scheduling flexibility could decrease the work-family conflict among managers (Friedman and Greenhaus, 2000) and employees in a financial company (Blair and Wharton, 2004; Wharton and Blair-Loy, 2006).

Work schedule flexibility include many abilities, which are the ability to alter their daily starting and ending times of work (Golden, 2001); the ability to take time off from work to attend to family and personal matters (Voydanoff, 2004); the ability to control over the timing and sequencing of tasks during the day and week (Briscoe, 2007).

Scholars studying large, occupationally diverse samples had found that flexibility was highly desirable among employees (Glass and Estes, 1997; Golden, 2001). Because flexible scheduling could reduce the overlap of work and family responsibilities in the same block of time (Golden, 2001).
Moreover, just like the above, scheduling flexibility reduced work-family conflict (Glass and Finley, 2002; Golden, 2001; Jacobs and Gerson, 2004; Tausig and Fenwick, 2001; Voydanoff, 2004).

In addition, studies linked scheduling flexibility to increased organizational commitment (Grover and Crooker, 1995), less stress and burnout (Grzywacz, Carlson and Shulkin, 2008), and other positive outcomes (Glass and Finley, 2002; Gareis and Barnett, 2002; Hill, 2008; Voydanoff, 2007).

Overall, one thing can be predicted is that work-family conflict should be lower among employees who can control their schedules.

**Work Involvement**

Many research have examined work involvement as an antecedent of work-family conflict. Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate (2000) thought there was a recognition that individuals may be actively participating in one role while simultaneously feeling distracted by thoughts, emotions, or demands that are tied to another role. According to the spillover theory, moods, stress, and thoughts generated in one role domain often influence or spill over into other domains (William and Alliger, 1994).

Moorehead (2001) argued that this overlap is a relatively positive one and refers to this as synchronizing work and family. In contrast, one might argue that these overlapping thoughts are distractions, which are the product of poor role quality, and may thus result in negative outcomes. Research has demonstrated a positive
relationship between job involvement and work-family conflict (Hammer, 1997). This implies that individuals with high levels of psychological involvement in their work role may be more preoccupied with their work and, hence, may devote an excessive amount of energy to their role at the expense of their family role, resulting in work-family conflict.

**Work Overload**

When the total demand on time and energy are too great for an individual to perform the roles adequately or comfortably, role overload occurs (Barnett and Hyde, 2001). Individuals who occupy work roles and perceive that their workload is more than they can handle, would experience negative emotions, fatigue and tension. These feelings would then have positive effects on work-family conflict. Aminah Ahmad and Maznah Baba (2003) examined the role overload experienced at work and its relationship with work-family conflict among Malaysian female physicians in public hospitals. The study found that 87.7% of the physicians experienced moderate to heavy workload which could be attributed to the relatively high frequency of on-calls and an increase in the number of outpatients to be attended as well as the increase in the number of patients in the ward leading to a high patient to physician ratio. The physicians also experienced a considerable intensity of work-family conflict and the conflict tended to increase with an increase in the workload. Other researchers have also demonstrated a significant relationship between role overload and work-family
conflict (Fu and Shaffer, 2001).

2.3.1.2 Family Related Demand

Family related demand mainly involve caring for families (Luo Lu et al, 2008). Rothausen (1999) believed that number of dependent children was an objective indicator of the level of family demands. For example, Herman and Gyllstrom (1977) revealed that married employees experienced higher family interference with work than unmarried employees, and parents experienced higher family interference with work than those who didn’t have children. What’s more, Pleck et al (1980) found that parents with young children experienced higher family interference with work. Parasuraman et al (2002) and Calson and Perrewe (1999) showed there was a significant effect between time spent on caring for families and family interference with work. Luo Lu et al (2008) also agreed that household maintenance was another aspect of family objective demands, especially salient in societies with high rates of dual career families. Family objective demand is an objective branch, but family involvement is another factor to consist perceiving family demands, which is a subjective branch. There were also some scholars illustrated that family involvement is positively and directly related to family interference with work (Greenhaus and Kopelman, 1981; Frone et al, 1992; Adams et al, 1996).
Family Involvement

Yoge and Brett (1985) defined family involvement as the degree to which individuals are identified psychologically with their family roles, the relative importance of the family to individuals’ self-image and self-concept, and the individuals’ commitment to their family. In last century, many studies had found that family involvement was related to family interfering with work (Adams, King, 1996; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992). There were also some scholars illustrated that family involvement is positively and directly related to family interference with work (Greenhaus and Kopelman, 1981; Frone, 1992; Adams, 1996).

Frone (1992) even noted job involvement was significantly related to work interfering with family among white-collar workers but not among blue-collar workers, and he also found family involvement was significantly related to family interfering with work.

In this century, scholars still do the study on the relationship between family involvement and work-family conflict. Carlson and Kacmar (2000) found that employees who were more involved in family domain experienced more family interference with work conflict. For example, a mother with an sickness child may not be able to stop thinking about her child even though she must be at work and fulfill her work-role responsibilities. Greenhaus, Parusuraman, and Collins (2001) found a positive relationship between family involvement and work-family conflict. From the above literature, it is predicted that family involvement will be positively related to work-family
Family Objective Demand

Family objective demand mainly involve caring and providing for children of married employees. Number of dependent children is an objective indicator of the level of family demands (Rothausen, 1999). For example, past research had shown that married employees experience higher family to work conflict than their single counterparts, and parents experienced higher family to work conflicts than nonparents (Herman and Gyllstrom, 1977). Furthermore, parents with young children experience higher family to work conflict than those with grown children (Pleck, 1980; Beutell, Greenhaus, 1980).

Household maintenance is another aspect of family objective demand, especially salient in societies with high rates of female employment and dual career families. Fong (1992) did a survey of Taiwanese working women, having too many household chores to do topped the list of various role stressors.

In a marital alliance, and partly as a result of societal progression toward gender equality in all realms of life, more and more is now expected of husbands in the sharing of responsibilities for family maintenance. Keith and Schafer (1980) noted that husbands’ working hours (less time allowance for home care) was positively related to wives’ family to work conflict. Similarly, husbands of female managers or professionals experienced higher family to work conflict (Greenhaus, Kopelman, 1981), presumably
because these women devoted more time to their careers, thus forcing their spouses to share more home care responsibilities. As a whole, existing research has established connections between family demand (number of dependent children and working spouses) and family to work conflict. However, no consistent direct connection has been established between family demand and strain (Major, Klein, Ehrhart, 2002; Noor, 1999).

2.3.2 Consequence

Consequence of work-family conflict is usually divided in three categories, which are work-related and family-related consequences, individual healthy consequences (Allen, 2000). In this study, job satisfaction and family satisfaction are discussed.

2.3.2.1 Job satisfaction

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. Schneider and Snyder (1975) on the other hand defined job satisfaction as a personal evaluation of conditions present in the job, or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job. Job satisfaction thus, has to do with an individual’s perception and evaluation of his job, and this perception was influenced by the person’s unique circumstances like needs, values and expectations. People would therefore evaluate their jobs on the basis of factors, which they regard as being important to them.

Then Brief (1998) thought job satisfaction was an internal state that is expressed
by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor and is one of the most frequently examined work-domain consequences of employees’ family to work conflict (Grandey, Cordeiro and Crouter, 2005).

Job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from individuals’ job experiences. Many scholars have shown a negative relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction (Carlson, Grzywacz and Kacmar, 2010; Carly, Allen and Spector, 2002; Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, 1996).

Boles (2001) reported that two directions of work-family conflict, work interference with family and family interference with work, were significantly related to job satisfaction in general. Results showed that increased levels of work to family conflict and family to work conflict were negatively related to employee job satisfaction. The results also suggested that work interference with family was a possible predictor of job satisfaction. Another research by Aryee (1999) also demonstrated that family interference with work was negatively related to job satisfaction among Chinese employed parents in dual-earner families.

Furthermore, Martins (2002) indicated that work-family conflict had contributed a negative significant influence on job satisfaction when he did a research among 976 managers. Another study by Howard (2004) investigated the relationship between work-family conflict with employee job satisfaction among police officers in a large south-eastern state in the USA. Results indicate that, when an employee was
experiencing conflict between work and family, satisfaction with the job in general and the actual work itself suffered the greatest declines. And Namasivayam and Mount (2004) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work-family conflict among employees of seven hotels in Spain. They found when work roles interfere with family roles and family interference with work roles, the individual’s job satisfaction was lower.

Moreover, according to research findings by Karimi (2008) work-family conflict had significant and negative effects on job satisfaction among 387 Iranian employees, which meant that higher level of work-family conflict was associated with lower job satisfaction. Cohen and Liani (2009) examined work-family conflict among female employees in Israeli hospitals.

The result of this study found a strong significant relationship between work attitudes, particularly job satisfaction, and work-family conflict. The results also showed that higher level of job satisfaction was associated with lower levels of work-family conflict. This study suggested that an effective way to reduce the work-family conflict was to create positive attitudes among employees regarding their job and work setting.

2.3.2.2 Family satisfaction

Many scholars have studied that work-family conflict has also been related to family satisfaction. Ahmad (2005) thought family satisfaction was the extent to which an individual was satisfied with family life.
A few studies have reported that lower level of family satisfaction have related to higher level of work-family conflict. Ahmad (1996) found that work-family conflict was shown to significantly lead to lower family satisfaction by among 120 married female secretaries in Malaysia, which implied that work-family conflict reduced job satisfaction as well as family satisfaction and hence will reduce life satisfaction. Same to Ahmad, Aryee (1999) examined the relationship between role stressors, inter-role conflict, well-being, the moderating influences of spousal support and coping behaviors among 243 Hong Kong employed parents in dual-career families, they found that work-family conflict was negatively related to family satisfaction.

However, some scholars hold the opposite idea. Karatepe and Baddar (2006) found that work-family conflict was not related to family satisfaction among frontline employees in international five-star hotels in Jordan. However, they also found employees who could not solve problems associated with the conflict between family and work domains report lower satisfaction with their family life.

Table 2.4 The antecedences and consequences of work-family conflict in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-family conflict</th>
<th>Antecedent variables</th>
<th>Consequent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Related Demand</td>
<td>Work flexibility; Work time; Work involvement; Work overload</td>
<td>Job satisfaction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Related Demand</td>
<td>Family involvement; Family objective demand</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Related Research

Michael, Marcia, Cooper (1992) studied Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface, and they developed and test a comprehensive model of work-family conflict which distinguished work interference with family and family interference with work. This distinction allowed testing of hypotheses concerning the unique antecedents and outcomes of both forms of work-family conflict. The influence of gender, race, and job type on the generalizability of the model was also examined.

Patrice (2004) studied Consequences of work-family conflict: Testing a new model of work-related, non-work-related and stress-related outcomes. The author indicated that work-family conflict resulted in work, non-work and stress related consequences that were evidenced in a complicated network of direct and indirect relationships.
Remus (2007) studied When can employees have a family life? The effects of salient workload and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviors at home. This article presents a longitudinal examination of antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict. The study revealed that employees’ perceptions of workload predicted work-family conflict. Workload influenced affect at work, which in turn influenced affect at family.

Jesse, Lindsey and Jacqueline (2011) studied Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review, the aim of this paper was to examine a theoretical model of work-family conflict. The model indicated that work time, work involvement, work social support, work type, and personality are antecedents of work interference with family; while number of children/elderly dependents, family involvement, family social support, family characteristics, and personality are antecedents of family interference with work. In addition to hypothesized results, a revised model based on study findings indicated that work time and work social support are predictors of family interference with work; while number of children or dependents, family involvement, family social support, and family characteristics are predictors of work interference with family.

Carlson, Grzywacz, Kacmar (2010) studied The relationship of schedule flexibility and outcomes via work-family interface. The purpose of this paper was to examine the relationship of schedule flexibility with performance and satisfaction in the work and family domains, and whether these associations were mediated by the work-family interface. They found work-family conflict was mediating mechanisms in the relationship of schedule flexibility with outcomes.
Nilgun (2011) studied the relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction, the aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between work-family conflict two directions (work interference with family, family interference with work) and job satisfaction. Results indicate that there was a reciprocal relationship between work interference with family and family interference with work and work interference with family had an influence on job satisfaction whereas family interference with work did not affect job satisfaction.

2.5 Conceptual Framework of this study

The theoretical framework of the study is constructed based on the basis of previously presented theories and according to the objective of the research.

Figure 2.3 Framework conceptual of this study

Source: Michael, Marcia, Cooper (1992); Patrice (2004); Remus(2007); Jesse, Lindsey and Jacqueline (2011); Carlson, Grzywacz, Kacmar (2010); Anderson(2002); Nilgun (2011)
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter addresses the methodological part of the study which provides information on the selection of method and the approach taken in the questionnaire design stage. A plan outlining how information is to be gathered for an assessment or evaluation that includes identifying the data gathering methods, the instruments to be used, how instruments managed, and how the information organized and analyzed. In short, following items were illustrated in details:

3.1 Population

3.2 Sample Size

3.3 Data Collection

3.4 Variables of the Research

3.5 Questionnaire Design

3.6 Pretest of the Research

3.6.1 Validity Test

3.6.2 Reliability Test

3.7 Data Analysis

3.7.1 Correlation Analysis

3.7.2 Factor Analysis

3.7.3 Structural Equation Model (SEM)
The study was completed using quantitative research method by collecting primary data according to the objective of the study. In order to conduct the research, the information was complied from the Thai employees who work in Thailand by questionnaire survey.

The personal information data such as gender, age, marital status, educational level, occupation field, number of dependent children, number of dependent elder, average work hours per week, managerial responsibility and family responsibility are also collected.

3.1 Population

According to the survey result by Thailand National Statistical Office (2009), it is approximately 38,251,600 Thai employees in the whole Kingdom. The formula is illustrated as the following topic.

3.2 Sample Size

According to Yamane(1967) formula:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where \( n \) = sample size

\( N \) = population size
\[ e = \text{level of precision} \]

Hence, the sample size has been calculated as:

\[ n = \frac{38,251,600}{1 + 38,251,600(0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = 399.996 \text{ rounded up to } 400 \]

Consequently, according with \( N = 38,251,600 \), \( e = 5\% \) (at 95\% confidence level), the sample size comes to 400 respondents.

3.3 Data Collection

This research used a selected sampling from the number of employees who work in Thailand, according to the information from Thailand National Statistical Office (2009).

There are three main industry in Thailand which are agriculture, service, industry (Work Bank, 2010). The employment in industry sector (% of total employment) in Thailand was 19.50\%, the employment in agriculture sector (% of total employment) in Thailand was 41.50\%, The employment in service sector (% of total employment) in Thailand was 38.90\%, according to a World Bank report, published in 2010. Employment in service sector and industry sector totally are 58.5\% of total employment, however, the two industries accounting for more than 85\% of gross domestic product (GDP), according to World Bank report (2010). Therefore, this study focus on service
and industry this two sectors.

See Table 3.1, The researcher distributed 500 sets of questionnaires to the employees who work in Thailand. For service, there were 250 copies, for industry, there were 250 copies, either. Total overall feedback rate is 87.00%, for service is 88.00%, for industry is 86.00%; and the total valid feedback rate is 83.00%, for service is 82.80%, for industry is 83.20%.

**Table 3.1 Respondent Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaires Distribution</th>
<th>Questionnaires Feedback</th>
<th>Effective Questionnaires</th>
<th>Overall Feedback Rate</th>
<th>Valid Feedback Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>83.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4 Variables of the Research**

After reviewing various literatures and research journals, the following variables was utilized for the study.

**Dependent Variables:** Based on the literature review, the dependent variables are classified as job satisfaction, family satisfaction.

**Mediate Variables:** Work interference with family, family interference with work are the mediate variables in this study.

**Independent Variables:** Based on the literature review, the independent variables are classified as work related demand, family related demand. Furthermore, for work
related demand, it concludes four dimensions which are work time, work involvement, work flexibility, work overload. For family related demand, there are two dimensions which are family involvement and family objective demand.

3.5 Questionnaire Design

The researcher uses the self-reported questionnaire as a tool for data collecting, and a questionnaire was developed based on the knowledge of literature review. The questionnaire is divided into 2 parts as follow:

**Part 1** comprises questions about the respondents’ basic individual information, which includes: gender, age, educational level, occupation, marital status, number of dependent children, number of dependent elderly, average work per week, managerial responsibility, the percent of family responsibility the respondent takes.

**Part 2** comprises questions about work-family conflict

Part 2 use 5 point rating scale to measure respondent’s attitude. By which:

5=Strongly agree  
4=Agree  
3=Neutral  
2=Disagree  
1=Strongly disagree

Work time was measured with 3 items which the author constructed. I think my work
time is long, Because of working responsibilities, I have little time to stay with my families, My work time is more than the time I stay with my families.

Work flexibility was measured by the scale updated by Kim et al. (1996), and according to the definition of work flexibility in this study, the author constructed the items. Total four items were tested, which were: Generally, I cannot control the time at which I start working for the day. To meet the need of family life, I cannot coordinate work time. I will be punished when I do the part-time job. I cannot do job well and take my family responsibility at the same time.

Work involvement was measured with Kanungo’s (1982) Involvement Questionnaire. Kanungo’s scale originally used a 6-point Likert type scale. However in this study, for consistency in the survey, a 5-point scale with the same anchors was used. This scale has been called the clearest and most precise conceptualization of work involvement (Brown, 1996). The higher score means the higher work involvement. Total four items were tested, which were: Most of my interests are centered around my job. I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

Work Overload was measured using question updated by Kim et al (1996). The higher score means the higher workload. Total four items were tested, which were: I don’t have enough time to get everything done in my job, because there are a lot job to do. My workload is very heavy on my job. I have to work very hard in my job. I have to work too fast to ensure quality of my work.
To assess family involvement, items from the job involvement scale were modified so that all the items referred to family instead of job. An overall family involvement score were calculated as the average of these four items for each participant. Total four items were tested, which were: Most of my interests are centered around my family. I have very strong ties with my family that would be very difficult to break. Most of my personal life goals are family-oriented. I like to be absorbed in my family most of the time.

Family objective demand were measured by questions developed by Bjorkquist (1984). Total four items were tested, which were: I must organize family recreation and entertainment. I must do the housework by myself (for example, wash clothes, wash dishes, clean house, etc). I must take care of my family members. I must spend time with my family members.

Work-family conflict was measured by using Netemeyer’s scale (1996). It includes two directions, which are work to family conflict and family to work conflict. Each direction includes 5 items. A high score in work interference with family indicates that demands and responsibilities at work have a negative spillover on household and family responsibilities. A high score in family interference with work means that demands related to the household and the family have a negative spillover on performing work duties. For work interference with family: The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties. Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.
Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me were tested; for family interference with work: The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home. My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime. Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties. Things I want to do at work don’t get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner were tested.

Job Satisfaction refers to the extent to which one is happy or satisfied with his or her job. The job satisfaction scale developed by Scott, Peter MacIntyre (1997) were used to measure job satisfaction. Total four items were choosed to tested, which were: I feel close to the people at work. I believe management is concerned about me. My wages are good. I feel good about my job environment.

Family Satisfaction were measured by FSS (Family satisfaction scale, Brayfield and Rothe, 1951). Total four items were tested, which were: Most days I am enthusiastic about my family life. I am very satisfied with my family life. I find real enjoyment in my family life. I like my family life better than the average person does.
3.6 Pretest of the Research

3.6.1 Validity Test

A pretest was conducted in order to assess validity and reliability of instrument used in this study. It was divided into two parts:

The first part is IOC test, it was handed to three persons of the lecturers who helped making comments, giving scores, reviewing and making correction out of IOC test.

The second part was tested by the pretest which composed 30 employees who were a group of sample that worked in Thailand. The pretest was conducted on August 2012. Purpose of the pretest was to find out simplicity and comprehensiveness of the survey questionnaire in order to make a proper tool to collect required information. As well, the collect data would be initially analyzed in the pretest. Once the pretest was done, modification of questionnaires were done according to advice of experts and respondents.

The following is an index evaluation (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1997):

Over 0.75 — the items are valid

Equal 0.75 — the items with item objective congruence

Below 0.75 — the items are invalid

The index of IOC was used as follows (Hair et al., 2006)

\[ IOC = \frac{\sum R}{n(n-1)} \]
Table 3.2 Item-Objective Congruence result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>IOC results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work time</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work flexibility</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family involvement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family demand</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IOC based on the expert rating are itemize in Table 3.2. The IOC result shows that the variables have rating greater than 0.75, which rank from 0.83 to 1.00. Therefore, the questions are considered valid and it measures the research objectives.

Validity concerns the test and assessment procedures and the extent to which these measure what they purport to measure. It refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of the test scores entailed by proposed used of tests. The validity of this instrument was checked by using index of IOC developed by Rovinelli and Hambleton (1977).

The validity test was the $\text{IOC} \geq 0.75$ (Hair et al., 2006). IOC is a process to content the experts’ rate the individual items on the scale to the question which used to measure the exact objectives of the individual item on the scale. The content experts evaluated the validity of each research instruments, the items are done with ranging of $+1$ (for congruence or for clearly measuring), 0 (for the measure with unclear), $-1$ (for incongruence or for not clearly measuring) as pursues each objectives.
After the pretest, the questionnaire used in the thesis were modified according to latest information, opinions and recommendations given by employees who work in Thailand.

### 3.6.2 Reliability Test

Based on the empirical study measured the reliability of the questionnaires by using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, it indicates the level of the items are correlated to each other. The reliability as the consistency and stability of the score from the measurement scale was defined by Hair et al.(2006) that the score of 0.70 or higher will be reliable enough in the data collection. The score in Table 3.3 was ranked from 0.82 to 0.97; it can imply that the data were acceptable.

**Table 3.3 Cronbach’s alpha result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 copies</td>
<td>415 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Flexibility</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Demand</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Interference with Family</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interference with Work</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Data Analysis

According to the collecting data, the personal information was used descriptive
The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and correlations are conducted to evaluate the underlying structure bases on the data using statistical program. The LISREL 8.7 computer program (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1993) applied to test the causal relationship in the model. The purpose of LISREL 8.7 is to evaluate the goodness of fit, as the absolute fit indices like chi-square $X^2$, goodness of fit (GFI), average goodness of fit (AGFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used. Furthermore, the goodness of fit also use the increment and decrement indices such as norm fit index (NFI), non-norm fit index (NNFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and norm chi-square are used to assess the goodness-of-fit.

Five point Likert scale were applied to the present study.

For the question items with positive meaning, the interval for breaking the range in measuring each variable in calculated as follow:

It means items with scores fall between the range of:

4.21-5.00 are considered as strongly agree
3.41-4.20 are considered as agree
2.61-3.40 are considered as neutral
1.81-2.60 are considered as disagree
1.00-1.80 are considered as strongly disagree

3.7.1 Correlation Analysis

Correlation is a statistical tool used to measure strength of relationship between
two variables. It can be used to measure a linear relation between two or more variables. A sign and an absolute value correlation coefficient $r$ are used to describe and a magnitude of the relationship between two variables. However, usages of correlation in this study are list as follow:

3.4.1.1 A value of the correlation $r$ range between -1 to 1.

3.4.1.2 The greater the absolute value of correlation coefficient, the stronger the relationship.

3.4.1.3 The weakest relationship is indicated by correlation coefficient equal to 0.

3.4.1.4 The positive correlation means if one variable becomes bigger, the other variable tends to directly become bigger, either.

3.4.1.5 The negative correlation means if one variable becomes bigger, the other variable tends to inversely become smaller.

**3.7.2 Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis is the techniques use linear combinations of variables to explain sets of observations on many variables. It familiar to uncover the latent structure dimensions of a set of variables. It reduces attribute space from a larger number of variables to a smaller number of factors. In principal components, the intrinsic interest is in the observed variables. The combination of variables is primarily a tool for simplifying the interpretation of the observed variables. In factor analysis, the intrinsic interest is in the underlying factors, the observed variables are relatively of little interest. Linear
combinations are formed to derive the factors.

The factor loading are correlation coefficients between the variables and factors. Factor loadings are the basis for imputing a label to different factors. Analogous to Pearson’s $r$, the squared factor loading is the percentage of variance in the variable, explained by a factor.

The sum of the squared factor loadings for all factors for a given variable is the variance in that variable accounted for by all the factors, and this is called the communality. In complete principal components analysis, with no factors dropped, communality is equal to 1.0, or 100% of the variance of the given variable.

The factor analysis model does not extract all the variance; it extracts only that proportion of variance, which is due to the common factors and shared by several items. The proportion of variance of a particular item that is due to common factors (shared with other items) is called communality. The proportion of variance that is unique to each item is then the respective item’s total variance minus the communality.

Various rotation strategies are used as an instrument: Varimax, Oblimin, Quartimin, but the most common rotation strategy is the Varimax Rotation. The goal of these rotation strategies is to obtain a clear pattern of loadings, such as the factors are somehow clearly marked by high loadings for some variables and low loading for other variables. This general pattern is called Simple Structure.

Varimax rotation attempts to maximize the variances of the squared normalized factor loadings across variables for each factor. This is equivalent to maximizing the
variances in the columns of the matrix of the squared normalized factor loadings.

The eigenvalue for a given factor reflects the variance in all variables, which is accounted for by that factor. A factor's eigenvalue may be computed as the sum of its squared factor loading for all variables. If a factor has a low eigenvalue, then it is contributing little to the explanation of variance in the variables and may be ignored.

3.7.3 Structural Equation Model (SEM)

For the purpose of testing the research model, the structural equation model (SEM) was performed to investigate the relationships between the criterion variable of job satisfaction, family satisfaction and the respective predictor variables of work related variable, family related variable, work interference with family, family interference with work.

The analysis was using LISREL8.72 (Joreskog and Sorbom) to accomplish. The LISREL model assumes that casual structure among the set of dependent and independent variable are specified. There are set of observed variables and latent variables, that the latent variables appear the all of the observed variables. The straight arrows depict the effect of independent variables on the dependent variables.

The absolute fit measure which is a combination of increment fit measure and parsimonious fit measure are used to test model. The absolute fit measure determines the degree to which the all model predicts the observed correlation or covariance matrix and the incremental fit measure compare the proposed measure to some baseline
model referred to as the null model. The parsimonious fit measure related the goodness of fit of the model into the number of estimated coefficient required to achieve the level of fit. The maximum likelihood parameter estimate and the overall maximum goodness of fit for the model were used to determine the path of the variable. The maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) is ordinarily manipulated in structural equation models.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of analysis and the interpretation of the data obtained from the research questionnaires which based on the conceptual framework. Both descriptive and the statistical tools were used to analyze the finding of the study. The following matters have been discussed.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

4.2 Analysis of the level of Agreement

4.3 Data Analysis and Findings

4.3.1 Correlation Analysis

4.3.2 Factor Analysis

4.3.3 Structural Equation Model (SEM)

4.3.4 Hypothesis Testing
4.1 Demographic Characteristics

Two occupational fields named service and industry were chosen for the research study. Total five hundreds questionnaires were submitted. Service occupational field and Industry occupational field shared half and half. There are 415 questionnaires from respondents found to be usable for this study. For service occupational field, there are two hundred and eight questionnaires (50.1% of total), for Industry occupational field, there are two hundreds and seven questionnaires (40.9% of total).

The sample represented a diversity of age group, education, marital status, and other backgrounds. Numbers of respondents in each category are shown as in Table 4.1.

In the first category, female participated in the survey by 63.9% while male participated by 36.1% which are lower than that of female. The most respondent for age category is the rage of 26 to 30 years old being 26.0% of total number of respondents, while the second is the rage of 31-35 years old, and Less or equal 25 years old, 36 to 40 years old, 41 to 45 years old being 16.6%, 14.9%, 8.2%, respectively.

Under marital status category, there are 51.6% of respondents are single, 44.8% of respondents are married, and 3.6% of respondents are divorced or widow.

In terms of education, 46.3% respondents experienced below or equal high school education, 27.7% respondents got bachelor degree, 12.8% respondents got master degree, 11.6% respondents got associate degree, only 1.7% respondents got doctor degree.
There were 46.5% respondents who didn’t have the dependent children to take care, 28.9% respondents’ family had one dependent child to care for, 17.1% respondents’ family had two dependent children, 4.1% respondents’ family had three dependent children, 3.4% respondents’ family had more than three dependent children.

For the dependent elder category, 33.0% respondents’ family had two dependent elder, 30.4% respondents’ family had one dependent elder, 30.1% respondents’ family don’t had dependent elder 3.6% respondents’ family had three dependent elder, 2.9% respondents’ family had more than three dependent elder.

There were 48.7% respondents who worked 41 to 50 hours per week, 21.9% respondents worked 51 to 60 hours per week, 15.5% respondents worked more than 60 hours per week, 14.0% respondents worked below 40 hours per week.

Most of respondents who had none-managerial responsibilities by 79.3%, Lower-level managerial responsibilities by 9.6%, middle-level managerial responsibilities by 7.5%, High-level managerial responsibilities by 3.6%.

There are 21.7% respondents who must take 21-40% family responsibilities, as for 22.7%, 23.6%, 18.1% and 8.0% respondents take 0-20%, 42-60%, 60-80%, 80-100% family responsibilities, respectively.
Table 4.1 Respondents’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Samples (415)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>36.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>63.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less or equal 25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below or Equal High school</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>46.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>50.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>49.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>51.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>44.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Widow</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>46.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>33.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 40 hours</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 hours</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>48.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 hours</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60 hours</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None-managers</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>79.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-level</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-level</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-60%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Analysis of the level of Agreement

An analysis demonstrates degree of agreement of the respondents on work time, work flexibility, work involvement, work overload, family involvement, family basic demand, work interference with family, family interference with work, job satisfaction, family satisfaction being shown in Table 4.2.

The mean value of the results reveal the respondents totally feel neutral with work time (M=2.81), disagree with work flexibility (M=2.58), neutral with all work involvement (M=2.76), neutral with all work overload (M=2.77). Overall, the respondents totally feel neutral with work related demand (M=2.73).

The mean value of the results also reveal the respondents totally feel neutral with family involvement (M=2.68), disagree with family basic demand (M=2.60).

Moreover, the respondents totally feel disagree with work interference with family (M=2.59) and family interference with work (2.57). The respondents totally feel agree with job satisfaction (M=3.41) and family satisfaction (M=3.47).

Table 4.2 Level of agreement of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work related demand</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Flexibility</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family related demand</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Basic Demand</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Data Analysis and Findings

Data analysis and findings were based on the statistical analysis from correlation analysis, factor analysis, path analysis and hypothesis testing. Abbreviations used for analysis performed as the following data in the Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>WT1</td>
<td>Long work time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WT2</td>
<td>Little time stay with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WT3</td>
<td>Work time more than family time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Inflexibility</td>
<td>WF1</td>
<td>Can’t control work time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WF2</td>
<td>Can’t coordinate work time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WF3</td>
<td>Can be Punished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WF4</td>
<td>Can’t take family responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>WI1</td>
<td>Centered with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI2</td>
<td>Strong ties with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI3</td>
<td>Job-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI4</td>
<td>Absorbed with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>WO1</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WO2</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WO3</td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WO4</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>FI1</td>
<td>Centered with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI2</td>
<td>Strong ties with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI3</td>
<td>Family-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI4</td>
<td>Absorbed with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Basic Demands</td>
<td>FD1</td>
<td>Organize recreation and entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD2</td>
<td>Do housework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD3</td>
<td>Take care family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD4</td>
<td>Spend time with my family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work interference with</td>
<td>WIF1</td>
<td>Work demands interference with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>WIF2</td>
<td>Work time interference with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF3</td>
<td>Work strain interference with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF4</td>
<td>Work duties interference with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF5</td>
<td>Work things interference with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family interference with</td>
<td>FIW1</td>
<td>Family demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>FIW2</td>
<td>Family time interference with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW3</td>
<td>Family strain interference with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW4</td>
<td>Family life interference with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW5</td>
<td>Family things interference with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>Wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>Job environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stisfaction</td>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>Much more like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Correlation Analysis

A correlation matrix in Table 4.4 shows relationship among the dependent variables job satisfaction, life satisfaction; and the mediate variables namely: work interference with family, family interference with work; and the independent variables namely: work related demand, family related demand. An interpretation of the correlations is based on a significant of the correlation among the independent variables.

The WIF based on the correlation matrix as tabulated in Table 4.4, and the correlation is significant at 0.01 level. It has positive correlation with FIW (r=0.94, p=0.01), negative correlation with JS (r=-0.94, p= 0.01); negative correlation with FS (r=-0.89, p=0.01); positive correlation with WRD (r=0.97, p=0.01); positive correlation with FRD (r=0.96, p=0.01).

The FIW has significant correlation at 0.01 level. It has negative correlation with JS (r=-0.89, p=0.01); negative correlation with FS (r=-0.90, p=0.01); positive correlation with WRD (r=0.97, p=0.01); positive correlation with FRD (r=0.95, p=0.01).

The JS has significant correlation at 0.01 level. It has positive correlation with FS (r=0.84, p=0.01), negative correlation with WRD (r= 0.97, p=0.01); negative correlation with FRD (r=-0.90, p=0.01).

The FS has significant correlation at 0.01 level. It has negative correlation with WRD (r=-0.90, p=0.01); negative correlation with FRD (r=-0.88, p=0.01).

The WRD has significant correlation at 0.01 level. It has positive correlation with
Conclusively, the correlation matrix revealed that all the variables specified above were related and significant with each other such as the WIF related with FIW, JS, FS, WRD, FRD. While the FIW related with JS, FS, WRD, FRD. Moreover, JS related with FS, WRD, FRD. Furthermore, FS related with WRD, FRD. Lastly, WRD related with FRD.

**Table 4.4 Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Matrix between latent variables</th>
<th>WIF</th>
<th>FIW</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>WRD</th>
<th>FRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

**4.3.2 Factor Analysis**

Based on the study, the factor analysis is performing as mentioned above (see Table 4.3).

The first variable to be tested by factor analysis is WIF which is consisting of five components: work demands interference with family, work time interference with family, work strain interference with family, work duties interference with family, work things interference with family.

Second, FIW variable comprises of five components which are family demands interference with work, family time interference with work, family strain interference with work, family things interference with work, family duties interference with work.
work, family life interference with work, family things interference with work.

The third variable is JS which is divided in four dimensions: people, management, wage, job environment.

The fourth variable is FS which consist of four components: enthusiastic, satisfied, enjoyment, much more like.

The fifth variable is WRD which consist fifteen variables, which are long work time, little time stay with family, work time more than family time, can’t control work time, can’t coordinate work time, can be Punished, can’t take family responsibility, centered with work, strong ties with work, job-oriented, absorbed with work, a lot, heavy, hard, fast.

The last variable is FRD which is consisting of eight components, which are centered with family, strong ties with family, family-oriented, absorbed with family, organize recreation and entertainment, do housework, take care family members, spend time with my family members.

Table 4.5, it provides the information about how much the variance in items explained. The communities’ value with less then 0.3, it is represent that the item does not fit well with other items in its components (Hair et al., 1998), The components for this study in Table 4.5 range from 0.66 to 0.92. While components of WRD have values range from0.79 to 0.83. Components of FRD have values keep the same 0.92, WIF components range from 0.66 to 0.72, and FIW components range from 0.73 to 0.79. Components of JS have values range from 0.66 to 0.77, and FS components range
from 0.74 to 0.81.

**Table 4.5 Extraction of communalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work related demands (WRD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family related demands (FRD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work interference with family (WIF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family interference with work (FIW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction (JS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family satisfaction (FS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 accomplish the factor loadings of the rotated matrix and the percentage of variability explained by each factor of each variable ranked in order of Eigenvalue.

The table describes the statistic for each factor before and after the components was extracted. The cumulative percentage of variance before and after the rotation has changed. For example, the before rotation the first component, WRD accounted the percentage of variance for 80.388% while after rotation accounted the percentage of variance for 80.322%. The second component FRD, accounted for 91.881% before and
after 91.879%. The third component WIF, accounted for 77.955% before and after 77.795%. The fourth component FIW, accounted for 83.787% before and after 83.702%. The fifth component JS, accounted for 80.042% before and after 79.858%. The sixth component FS, accounted for 88.681% before and after 88.603%. The difference in factor loading before and after rotation was due to the redistribution of factor loading pattern and also the percentage change in variance for each factor variance in different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>80.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>91.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>77.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>5.520</td>
<td>83.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>4.157</td>
<td>80.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>5.444</td>
<td>88.681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the extraction, all the factors with the Eigenvalue (latent root criterion) of greater than one are considered significant (Hair et al., 2006).

Factor analysis with principal component and VARIMAX rotation methods was performed to ascertain that WRD and FRD, direct measure of WIF, FIW, and JS, FS are distinct constructs. The main purpose of the rotation is to make larger loadings larger and smaller loadings smaller than their unrotated values. In addition, the rotated loadings are useful in naming the factors (see Table 4.7). The rotation was performed as to redistribute the variance more evenly and to make the factor loading move meaningful and easier to interpret. The Table 4.7 rotated component matrix had grouped have 24 variables into six components where the naming and grounding of the
Table 4.7 Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWT</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWF</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWI</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWO</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFI</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 revealed that AVGWT, AVGWF, AVGWI, AVGWO are rotated significantly in component one and are grouped in work related demands factor. The factor loading for work related demands factor are 0.896, 0.910, 0.888, 0.890 respectively for AVGWT, AVGWF, AVGWI, AVGWO.

AVGFI, AVGFD are rotated significantly in component two and are grouped in family related demands factor. The factor loading for work related demands factor are 0.958, 0.959, respectively for AVGFI, AVGFD. Besides, WIF1, WIF2, WIF3, WIF4, WIF5 are grouped in work interference with family. The factor loading for work interference...
with family are 0.879, 0.897, 0.915, 0.853, 0.866 respectively for WIF1, WIF2, WIF3, WIF4, WIF5. FIW1, FIW2, FIW3, FIW4, FIW5 are grouped in family interference with work. The factor loading for family interference with work are 0.914, 0.891, 0.914, 0.927, 0.928 respectively for FIW1, FIW2, FIW3, FIW4, FIW5. JS1, JS2, JS3, JS4 are grouped in job satisfaction. The factor loading for job satisfaction are 0.903, 0.873, 0.890, 0.907 respectively for JS1, JS2, JS3, JS4. FS1, FS2, FS3, FS4 are grouped in family satisfaction. The factor loading for family satisfaction are 0.927, 0.957, 0.951, 0.930 respectively for FS1, FS2, FS3, FS4.

Table 4.8 Summarized result of rotated analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work related demand</td>
<td>AVGWT</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AVGWF</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AVGWI</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AVGWO</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family related demand</td>
<td>AVGF1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AVGFD</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>WIF1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WIF2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WIF3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WIF4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WIF5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>FIW1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIW2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIW3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIW4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIW5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>FS1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FS2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FS4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Structural Equation Model (SEM)

A confirmatory factor analysis for the multi-item scales was carried out using the maximum likelihood procedure in SEM. The fit between the structural model and data was evaluated by means of three standard indices: goodness-of-fit (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit (AGFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) which will be discuss in the following point.

Minimum fit function chi-square ($X^2$) is the fundamental measure used in SEM to quantity the differences between the observed and estimated covariance matrices (Hair et al., 2006). The probability value associated with $X^2$ indicates the likelihood of obtaining a $X^2$ value that exceeds the $X^2$ value when hypothesis is true (Byrne, 1998). Thus, the higher the probability associated with $X^2$, the closer the fit between the hypothesized models. Based on the absolute fit measure in the table 4.9 the $X^2$ measure of the model fit is 216.50 which it is small to reject the hypothesis of a good fit ($P = 0.083$) at the minimum acceptance level of 0.083. This indicates that the difference between the observed and predicted variance-covariance matrix is statistically significant.

The goodness of fit index (GFI) represents overall degree of fit without adjusting for degree of freedom. GFI values range from 0 to 1, with one for the best possible fit. The GFI values greater than or equal to 0.90 were used to justify the final model and considered acceptable and good fit. The goodness of fit index of this research is 0.96 as depicted in Table 4.9 more than 0.90 which represent a good fit of the model.

The standardized root mean square (SMR) is another absolute fit index. SRMR is
the standardized difference between the observed covariance and predicted covariance. A value of zero indicates perfect fit. This measure tends to be smaller as sample size increases and as the number of parameters in the model increases. A value less than 0.08 is considered a good fit. In this study SRMR was 0.013, which is demonstrative of good model fit. The SRMR is interpreted as the average absolute discrepancy between the predicted and observed correlations. Thus, the overall absolute fit of the model is good.

The root means square error approximation (RMSEA) is one of the most important fit indices and it attempts to correct the tendency of the $X^2$ statistic to reject any specific model with sufficiently large. The RMSEA of this study is 0.018 as depicted in Table 4.9, a popular criterion is to accept models that RMSEA less than 0.05 which represents a good fit.

The adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) is a variant of GFI which uses mean squares instead of total sums of squares. Equivalently, the AGFI is adjusted for the degree of freedom a model relative to the number of variables (Schumacker and Lomax, 1996; Joreskog and Sorborm, 1996). AGFI values range from zero to one, with one for the best possible fit. The AGFI values greater than or equal to 0.90 were used to justify the final model and considered acceptable. The adjusted goodness of fix index (AGFI) of this research is 0.93 as depicted in Table 4.9 above the 0.90 which explains an acceptable.

The normed fit index (NFI) is one of the original incremental measures of fit, the
normed fit index represents a ratio of the difference in the $X^2$ value for the fitted model and a null model divided by the $X^2$ value for the null model. The index ranges between 0 and 1, and a model with perfect fit would produce an NFI of 1.00 (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980). The normed fit index (NFI) of this research is 1.00 as depicted in Table 4.9 which explains an perfect fit.

The non-normed fit index (NNFI) is a modification of NFI that rewards parsimonious models. NNFI values range from 0 to 1, with the values above 0.90 for the best possible fit (Dhuganna et al., 2007). This study NNFI is 1.00 as depicted in Table 4.9 which explains an perfect fit.

The comparative fit index (CFI) is a measure of relative non-centrality between the tested model and the independence model, because it can rewrite as where $\lambda$ represents an estimate of the non-centrality for each model. The CFI values range from 0 to 1, with the values above 0.90 for the acceptable (Dhuganna et al., 2007). However, this study CFI equal 1.00 as depicted in Table 4.9 which explains an perfect fit.

The normed chi square (Normed $X^2$) of the parsimonious fit measure is calculate by dividing the $X^2$ by df. The normed $X^2$ access the inappropriateness of the model. If the value of the normed $X^2$ is less than 1.0, the model can be termed as Over-Fitted and fit the normed $X^2$ is greater than the upper threshold level of 2.0 or 3.0, than the model is not true representative of the observed data and needs improvement (Hooper et al., 2008).
Table 4.9 Goodness of fit statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Fit Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fit Function Chi-Square (X²)</td>
<td>23.17 (P = 0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Theory Weighted Least Squares Chi-Square</td>
<td>22.97 (P = 0.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual (RMR)</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incremental Fit Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parsimonious Fit Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normed Chi-Square (Normed X²)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4.1 condition the normed X² is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Normed } X^2 = \frac{X^2}{df}
\]

\[
\text{Normed } X^2 = 23.17 / 15 = 1.54
\]

Therefore, the Normed X² of 1.54 is a good fit with the acceptable less than 2.0. The absolute fit measure indicate that the model is a good fit with X² of 23.17 df of 15 (P=0.081); GFI=0.99; RMR=0.0061; SRMR=0.0069; RMSEA=0.036; all the absolute fit measure are within the acceptable level. The incremental fit measure that including AGFI, NNFI, NFI and CFI have greater than values more than or equal 0.90, however all the incremental fit values more than 0.90, Consequently, the absolute fit measure, the incremental fit measure and parsimonious fit measure indicated that the model is good fit.

For this research, the Parameters of statistic is showed in Table 4.10. There are four parts in this section: LAMBDA-X, LAMBDA-Y, GAMMA and BETA. LAMBDA-X tell
the weight of how the x side, namely, the x side are the latent variable work related demand and family related demand, or WRD and FRD in table 4.10, then as the observed variables could measure the related latent variables. WRD has four observed variables. The work time (AVGWT in table 4.10) had weight of 0.70 (st=0.70, SE=0.04, t=19.91) of the measurement on work related demand, which indicated that the level of positive side of work time could present 70% of positive level of work related demand. The work flexibility (AVGWF in table 4.10) had weight of 0.88 (st=0.88, SE=0.03, t=22.37) of the measurement on work related demand, which indicated that the level of positive side of work flexibility could present 88% of positive level of work related demand. The work involvement (AVGWI in table 4.10) had weight of 0.85 (st=0.85, SE=0.03, t=21.43) of the measurement on work related demand, which indicated that the level of positive side of work involvement could present 85% of positive level of work related demand. The work overload (AVGWO in table 4.10) had weight of 0.85 (st=0.85, SE=0.03, t=21.17) of the measurement on work related demand, which indicated that the level of positive side of work involvement could present 85% of positive level of work related demand. FRD has two observed variables. The family involvement (AVGFI in table 4.10) had weight of 0.91 (st=0.91, SE=0.04, t=23.88) of the measurement on family related demand, which indicated that the level of positive side of family involvement could present 91% of positive level of family related demand. The family basic demand (AVGFD in table 4.10) had weight of 0.92 (st=0.92, SE=0.04, t=24.33) of the measurement on family related demand, which indicated that the level of
positive side of family basic demand could present 92% of positive level of family
related demand.

Secondly, for the parameters of statistic on LAMBDA-Y, there were four observed
variables, which were distributed as one dimension for work interference with family,
one dimension for family interference with work, one dimension for job satisfaction, one
dimension for family satisfaction (same as table 4.10 below). The work interference with
family (AVGWIF) had weight of 0.93 (st=0.93) of the measurement on work interference
with family. The family interference with work (AVGFIW) had weight of 0.97 (st=0.97) of
the measurement on family interference with work. The job satisfaction (AVGJS) had
weight of 1.00 (st=1.00) of the measurement on job satisfaction. The family satisfaction
(AVGFS) had weight of 1.00 (st=1.00) of the measurement on family satisfaction.

Thirdly, parameter of GAMMA, which presented the weight of exogenous variables,
or work related demand and family related demand in this study, could measure the
related endogenous variables (which were work interference with family and family
interference with work in this study). The work related demand (WRD in table 4.10) had
weight of 0.54 (st=0.54, SE=0.19, t=2.80) of measurement on work interference with
family, which could be described that the level of positive side of work related demand
could present 54% of positive level of work interference with family. The work related
demand (WRD in table 4.10) had weight of 0.85 (st=0.85, SE=0.24, t=3.61) of
measurement on family interference with work, which could be described that the level
of positive side of work related demand could present 85% of positive level of family
interference with work. The family related demand (FRD in table 4.10) had weight of 0.44 (st=0.44, SE=0.19, t=2.33) of measurement on work interference with family, which could be described that the level of positive side of family related demand could present 44% of positive level of work interference with family. The family related demand (FRD in table 4.10) had weight of 0.13 (st=0.13, SE=0.23, t=2.53) of measurement on family interference with work, which could be described that the level of positive side of family related demand could present 13% of positive level of family interference with work.

Finally, the parameter of BETA was the level of weight that the endogenous variables as independent variables (which was work interference with family and family interference with work) could measure the exogenous variables as dependent variables (which were job satisfaction and family satisfaction). The work interference with family (WIF in table 4.10) had weight of -0.94 (st=-0.94, SE=0.03, t=-34.67) of measurement on job satisfaction, which could be described that the level of negative side of work interference with family could present -94% of negative level of job satisfaction. The work interference with family (WIF in table 4.10) had weight of -0.41 (st=-0.41, SE=0.17, t=-2.39) of measurement on family satisfaction, which could be described that the level of negative side of work interference with family could present -41% of negative level of family satisfaction. The family interference with work (FIW in table 4.10) had weight of -0.51 (st=-0.51, SE=0.17, t=-2.96) of measurement on family satisfaction, which could be described that the level of negative side of family interference with work could present -51% of negative level of family satisfaction.
Table 4.10 Parameters of statistic table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Std. Solution</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix LX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWT</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWF</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWI</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWO</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFI</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFD</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix LY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGWIF</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFIW</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGJS</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGFS</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Equation Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD → WIF</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD → FIW</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD → WIF</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD → FIW</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF → JS</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-34.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF → FS</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW → FS</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher can develop a lot of structural equation to construct the structural model and can be used for testing the hypothesis. The structural equation of this study can be show in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11 Total Effects and Indirect Effect of Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>WIF</th>
<th>FIW</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>FS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRD</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TE = Total Effect  DE = Direct Effect  IE = Indirect Effect

Table 4.11, work interference with family has positive direct effect to work related demand at 0.54, and also has positive direct to family related demand at 0.44, hence work interference with family has significant in structural model.

Family interference with work has positive direct effect to work related demand at 0.85, and also has positive direct to family related demand at 0.13, hence Family interference with work has significant in structural model.

In addition, job satisfaction has negative indirect effect to work related demand at -0.51, and also has negative indirect effect to family related demand at -0.42, and also has negative direct effect to work interference with family at -0.94, hence job satisfaction has significant in structural model.

At last, family satisfaction has negative indirect effect to work related demand at
-0.66, and also has negative indirect effect to family related demand at -0.25, and also has negative direct effect to work interference with family at -0.41, also has positive direct effect to family interference with work at -0.51, hence family satisfaction has significant in structural model.

The full structural model shown in Figure 4.1 represent for the final model of the employee’s work-family conflict in Thailand. It was derived from the eleven hypotheses since the proposed measurement relationships were consistent with the data.

Figure 4.4 demonstrates the structural model parameters and summarizes the degree to which the data fit the model where abbreviations were defined as follow:

AVGWT=work time, AVGWFi=work flexibility, AVGWI=work involvement, AVGWO=work overload, AVGFI=family involvement, AVGFD=family basic demand, WRD=work related demand, FRD=family related demand, WIF=work interference with family, FIW=family interference with work, JS=job satisfaction, FS=family satisfaction.
Figure 4.1 reveals that the model accounts for the standardized direct effects on WIF were 0.54 for WRD, and 0.44 for FRD; and the model accounts for the standardized direct effects on FIW were 0.85 for WRD, and 0.13 for FRD; and the model accounts for the standardized direct effects on JS were -0.94 for WIF, and the model accounts for the standardized direct effects on FS were -0.41 for WIF, and -0.51 for FIW. Therefore, the standardized path coefficient reflected in Figure 4.4 shows all the paths is significant and the model produces overall fit $X^2$ of 23.17 with P-value 0.081.

4.3.4 Hypothesis Testing

Since the proposed measurement relationships were consistent with the data, the structural model was evaluated. An examination of the structural model involves
significance tests for the estimated coefficients (paths), which provide the basis for accepting or rejecting the proposed relationships between latent constructs. Table 4.12 shows the results of the model estimation with parameter estimates of the hypothesized paths and t-values. All the t-value of other variable associated with the loading surpass the critical value of 1.96.

**Table 4.12 Summary of path analysis for hypothesis testing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path from</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work related demand</td>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family related demand</td>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work related demand</td>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family related demand</td>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-34.67</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Significance at 0.05 level, $1.96 \leq p < 2.58$; Significance at 0.01 level, $2.58 \leq p < 3.28$; Significance at 0.001 level, $p \geq 3.28$

**Hypothesis 1:**

Ho: Work related demand has no direct effect on work interference with family.

Ha: Work related demand has a direct effect on work interference with family.

Table 4.12 indicates that the work related demand has significant level at 0.001 of t-value 2.80 which is a critical value of $2.58 \leq p < 3.28$ to accept the proposed hypothesis. The positive relation indication can imply that if the work related demand toward work interference with family become more positive, it due to a significant increase in work interference with family.
**Hyphothesis 2:**

**Ho:** Work related demand has no direct effect on family interference with work.

**Ha:** Work related demand has a direct effect on family interference with work.

Table 4.12 indicates that the work related demand has significant level at 0.001 of t-value 3.61 which is a critical value of $P \geq 3.28$ to accept the proposed hypothesis. The positive relation indication can imply that if the work related demand toward family interference with work become more positive, it due to a significant increase in family interference with work.

**Hyphothesis 3:**

**Ho:** Family related demand has a direct effect on work interference with family.

**Ha:** Family related demand has no direct effect on work interference with family.

Table 4.12 indicates that the family related demand has significant level at 0.001 of t-value 2.33 which is a critical value of $1.96 \leq P < 2.58$ to accept the proposed hypothesis. The positive relation indication can imply that if the family related demand toward work interference with family become more positive, it due to a significant increase in work interference with family.

**Hyphothesis 4:**

**Ho:** Family related demand does not affect on family interference with work.

**Ha:** Family related demand affect on family interference with work.

Table 4.12 indicates that the family related demand has significant level at 0.05 of t-value 2.53 which is a critical value of $1.96 \leq P < 2.58$ to accept the proposed
hypothesis. The positive relation indication can imply that if the family related demand toward family interference with work become more positive, it due to a significant increase in family interference with work.

**Hypothesis 5:**

**Ho:** Work interference with family has no direct effect on job satisfaction.

**Ha:** Work interference with family has a direct effect on job satisfaction.

Table 4.12 indicates that work interference with family has significant level at 0.001 of t-value -34.67 which is a critical value of $P \geq 3.28$ to accept the proposed hypothesis. The negative relation indication can imply that if work interference with family toward job satisfaction become more positive, it due to a significant decrease in job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 6:**

**Ho:** Work interference with family has no direct effect on family satisfaction.

**Ha:** Work interference with family has a direct effect on family satisfaction.

Table 4.12 indicates that work interference with family has significant level at 0.001 of t-value -2.39 which is a critical value of $1.96 \leq p \leq 2.58$ to accept the proposed hypothesis. The negative relation indication can imply that if work interference with family toward family satisfaction become more positive, it due to a significant decrease in family satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 7:**

**Ho:** Family interference with work has no direct effect on family satisfaction.
Ha: Family interference with work has a direct effect on family satisfaction.

Table 4.12 indicates that family interference with work has significant level at 0.001 of t-value -2.96 which is a critical value of \(2.58 < p < 3.28\) to accept the proposed hypothesis. The negative relation indication can imply that if family interference with work toward family satisfaction become more positive, it due to a significant decrease in family satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8:**

**Ho:** Work interference with family cannot mediate work related demand and job satisfaction.

**Ha:** Work interference with family can mediate work related demand and job satisfaction.

Table 4.11 indicates that work interference with family can mediate work related demand and job satisfaction. Because work related demand and work interference with family have direct effect 0.54, at the same time, work interference with family and job satisfaction have direct effect -0.94, work related demand and job satisfaction have indirect effect -0.51, which means Work interference with family can mediate work related demand and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 9:**

**Ho:** Work interference with family cannot mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.

**Ha:** Work interference with family can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.
satisfaction.

Table 4.11 indicates that work interference with family can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction. Because work related demand and work interference with family have direct effect 0.54, at the same time, work interference with family and family satisfaction have direct effect -0.41, work related demand and family satisfaction have indirect effect -0.66, which means Work interference with family can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 10:**

Ho: Work interference with family cannot mediate family related demand and job satisfaction.

Ha: Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and job satisfaction.

Table 4.11 indicates that Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and job satisfaction. Because family related demand and work interference with family have direct effect 0.44, work interference with family and job satisfaction have direct effect -0.94, family related demand and job satisfaction have indirect effect -0.42, which means Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 11:**

Ho: Work interference with family cannot mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.
satisfaction.

**Ha: Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.**

Table 4.11 indicates that Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction. Because family related demand and work interference with family have direct effect 0.44, work interference with family and family satisfaction have direct effect -0.41, family related demand and family satisfaction have indirect effect -0.25, which means Work interference with family can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 12:**

**Ho: Family interference with work cannot mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.**

**Ha: Family interference with work can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.**

Table 4.11 indicates that Family interference with work can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction. Because family related demand and family interference with work have direct effect 0.13, family interference with work and family satisfaction have direct effect -0.51, family related demand and family satisfaction have indirect effect -0.25, which means Family interference with work can mediate family related demand and family satisfaction.
Hyphothesis 13:

Ho: Family interference with work cannot mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.

Ha: Family interference with work can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.

Table 4.11 indicates that Family interference with work can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction. Because work related demand and family interference with work have direct effect 0.85, family interference with work and family satisfaction have direct effect -0.51, work related demand and family satisfaction have indirect effect -0.66, which means Family interference with work can mediate work related demand and family satisfaction.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, discussion of the findings, and recommendations. Once the summary, discussion, and theoretical implications of the hypotheses tested are reported, the practical implications and recommendations are discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are presented. The main topics have been presented as follow:

5.1 Conclusion

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Work related demand

5.2.2 Family related demand

5.2.3 Work-family conflict

5.2.3.1 Work interference with family

5.2.3.2 Family interference with work

5.2.5 Job satisfaction

5.2.6 Family satisfaction

5.3 Implication of the study

5.3.1 Implication for manager of organizations

5.3.2 Implication for Academician and Researchers

5.4 Limitation of the study

5.5 Future research
5.1 Conclusion

The main purpose of this study were threefold (1) to specify the level of agreement between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction (2) to indentify the effect between work/family related demands and work-family conflict, work-family conflict and job/family satisfaction (3) To find work-family conflict mediate work/family related demands and job/family satisfaction.

The major findings reported in chapter 4 can summarized as below.

There were 415 respondents’ questionnaires were used for the study. The employee who work in Service field accounts for 50.12%, Industry for 49.88%. The vast majority of the participants were female which represents 63.86%. Moreover, 51.57% of them are single while 26.02% whose age between 26-30 years old. Furthermore, most of them have below or equal high school education background for 46.27%. The vast majority of the participants who don’t have dependent children represents 46.50%. 33.01% participants who have two dependent elder are the biggest group. Most of participants who work 41-50 hours per week for 48.67%. 79.28% participants who don’t have managerial responsibilities in the organizations. 27.71% participants who have 21-40% family responsibilities are the biggest group.

The result was found that the antecedence of work-family conflict consists work related demand and family related demand, and both of them have neutral level of agreement. The two directions of work-family conflict which are work interference with family and family interference with work have disagree level of agreement. The
consequence of work-family conflict consists job satisfaction and family satisfaction, and both of them have agree level of agreement.

The research investigated the antecedence and consequence of work-family conflict. Structural equation model (SEM) was used to analyze and define the path effect between factors.

Structural equation modeling revealed a good level of fit ($X^2=216.50$, $df=189.00$, $p<0.001$, $GFI=0.96$, $RMSEA=0.018$, $CFI=1.00$, $NFI=1.00$). An examination of the standardized path coefficients among variables showed that all paths have statistically significant effects on job satisfaction where work interference with family, family interference with work have direct effect equivalent -0.99 and -0.57, and family interference with work to family satisfaction path has statistically significant effects on family satisfaction for -0.42. Additionally, significant direct effect on work interference with family for work related demand was 0.61, for family related demand was 0.63. Significant direct effect on family interference with work for work related demand was 0.39, for family related demand was 0.34. The significant, positive and negative signs of all structural paths also supported all hypotheses.

5.2 Discussion

In this section, the outcomes of the survey are discussed in relation to the objective of the study. A few researchers have emphasized on work-family conflict antecedence and consequence. Hence, the current study sought to obtain a deeper
understanding of employee’s work-family conflict in Thailand by incorporating with the Role Theory, Compensation Theory and Spillover Theory. The model was tested using Structural Equation Model. Findings showed that work related demand and family related demand have direct effect on the two directions of work-family conflict, and both of the two directions of work-family conflict have direct effect on job satisfaction, but only family interference with family have direct effect on family satisfaction.

5.2.1 Work related demand

Work related demand is defined by Karasek (1979) as workload requirements which exert pressure on employees for increased output at work, thus making the job hectic and psychologically challenging. More recent definitions of work related demand include broader perspectives and have added social, structural, and organizational dimensions of work.

Mauno et al. (2006) defined job demands as physical, psychological, social, or organizational features of the work, requiring physical or psychological effort and energy from an employee, and are consequently related to physiological or psychological costs (i.e., strain).

The outcome of this research reveals that work related demand mean value of 2.73 which represented that it has neutral level of agreement. Moreover, the work time has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work related demand ($r=0.70$, $p=0.01$), the work flexibility has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work related demand ($r=0.74$, $p=0.01$).
p=0.01), the work involvement has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work related
demand (r=0.68, p=0.01), the work overload has positive correlation at 0.01 level with
work related demand (r=0.66, p=0.01).

5.2.2 Family related demand

According to the definition of work related demand, family related demand was
defined as physical, psychological, social features of the family, requiring physical or
psychological effort and energy from people, and are consequently related to
physiological or psychological costs.

The outcome of this research reveals that family related demand mean value of
2.64 which represented that it has neutral level of agreement. Moreover, the family
involvement has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work related demand (r=0.89,
p=0.01), the family demand has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work related
demand (r=0.91, p=0.01).

5.2.3 Work-family conflict

Work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from
the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is
participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in
the family (work) role (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). Accordingly, the conflict takes
place at the work-life interface. Conflict between work and family is important for
organizations and individuals because it is linked to negative consequences. For example, conflict between work and family is associated with increased absenteeism, increased turnover, decreased performance, and poorer physical and mental health. It is a tight connection between families. Conceptually, conflict between work and family is bi-directional (Carlson and Kacmar, 2000; Eagle, Icenogle, and Maes, 1998; Eagle, Miles, and Icenogle, 1997; Frone, Yardley, and Markel, 1996; Greenhaus and Powell, 2003; Gutek, Searle, Klepa, 1991; Matsui, Ohsawa and Onglotco, 1995; Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, 1996; Williams and Alliger, 1994). Most researchers make the distinction between what is termed work interference with family, and what is termed family interference with work.

5.2.3.1 Work interference with family

Work interference with family is experiences at work interfere with family life, like extensive, irregular, or inflexible work hours, work overload and other forms of job stress, interpersonal conflict at work, extensive travel, career transitions, unsupportive supervisor or organization (Neteneyer, Boles, Mcmurrian, 1996).

The outcome of this research reveals that work interference with family mean value of 2.59 which represented that it has disagree level of agreement. Moreover, the work related factor has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work interference with family \(r=0.54, p=0.01\), and the family related factor has positive correlation at 0.01 level with work interference with family \(r=0.44, p=0.01\).
Additionally, work interference with family was found to have a direct effect on job satisfaction equivalent -0.94, and also have a direct effect on family satisfaction equivalent -0.41. This can signify that work interference with family can influence both job satisfaction and family satisfaction, but work interference with family have a stronger effect on job satisfaction than family satisfaction.

5.2.3.2 Family interference with work

Family interference with work is experiences in the family interfere with work life like presence of young children, primary responsibility for children, elder care responsibilities, interpersonal conflict within the family unit, unsupportive family members (Neteneyer, Boles, Mcmurrian, 1996).

The outcome of this research reveals that family interference with work mean value of 2.57 which represented that it has disagree level of agreement. Moreover, the work related factor has positive correlation at 0.01 level with family interference with work (r=0.85, p=0.01), and the family related factor has positive correlation at 0.01 level with family interference with work (r=0.13, p=0.01).

For family interference with work to job satisfaction in this study, there are two ideas held by different scholars. For example, in Table 5.1, Karthik and Daniel (2004) found a positive relationship from family interference with work to job satisfaction. S.E. Beijer (2007) and Charles R.S. (2000) found a negative relationship from family interference with work to job satisfaction. Furthermore, Lin Qiu (2010) and Nilgün
Anafarta (2010) found there were no relationship between family interference with work and job satisfaction. So in Thailand culture, the hypothesis is that there was not relationship between the two.

Table 5.1 Family interference with work → Job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family interference with work → Job satisfaction (FIW→JS)</th>
<th>Significant Effect</th>
<th>Author/Country/ Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship</td>
<td>Karthik and Daniel, 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative relationship</td>
<td>S.E. Beijer, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles R.S., 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kejia Li, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relationship</td>
<td>Lin Qiu, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nilgün Anafarta, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FIW=Family interference with work JS= Job satisfaction

The path t-value (family interference with work to family satisfaction) equal to -2.96, which is higher than 1.96, so family interference with work have a strong effect on family satisfaction.

This can signify that family interference with work have a stronger effect on family satisfaction.

5.2.5 Job satisfaction

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. Schneider and Snyder (1975) on the other hand defined job satisfaction as a personal evaluation of conditions present in the job, or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job. Then Brief (1998) thought job satisfaction was an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor and is
one of the most frequently examined work-domain consequences of employees’ family to work conflict (Grandey, Cordeiro and Crouter, 2005).

As a result of this research discovered that only work interference with family has significant direct effect on job satisfaction (t-value=-34.67).

5.2.6 Family satisfaction

Ahmad (2005) thought family satisfaction was the extent to which an individual was satisfied with family life.

Large number of empirical studied have shown the two directions of work-family conflict can be used successfully as predictor variables of family satisfaction. They found that if the work-family conflict is higher, the family satisfaction is lower, which is the negative relationship between the two.

Based on the result of the study, both work interference with family and family interference with work have significant direct effects on family satisfaction. For work interference with family to family satisfaction, $r=-0.41$, $t$-value=$-2.39$; for family interference with work to family satisfaction, $r=-0.51$, $t$-value=$-2.96$.

It displays that this study immensely conform to the previous study which already done by Ahmad (1996), Aryee (1999).

5.3 Implication of the study

The outcomes of this study named employee’s work-family conflict in Thailand
were examined by using LISREL 8.7 as shown in chapter 4.

A number of implications can be derived for identifying important aspects of employee’s work-family conflict in Thailand shown as follow.

### 5.3.1 Implication for managers of organizations

Work related demand and family related demand have the positive effect on both the two directions of work-family conflict, and work interference with family has the negative effect on job satisfaction and family satisfaction, family interference with work has the negative effect on family satisfaction.

To managers of the organizations, it is very important to reduce employee’s work-family conflict and improve employee’s job satisfaction and family satisfaction. Because many evidences suggest that work-family conflict predicts job performance (Frone, 1997; Wayne, 2004). Aryee (1992) found a weak but significant negative relationship between work-family conflict and quality of work produced. Frone (1997) found that work-family conflict was negatively related to job performance as measured on a self-report performance scale. Dawn, Joseph, Michele (2009) also found that work-family conflict was negatively related to job performance.

When the employees’ work-family conflict is high, employees will not satisfy with their job, which can cause a bad job performance. It is not good to the company.

What’s more, If the employees are not satisfy with their job, there will be a higher rate of absenteeism. Because employees experience greater conflict in their workplace
and would seek employment elsewhere, perhaps to a potentially ‘less stressful’ place.

So there is a positive relation between work interference with family and the turnover intentions of employees. Indeed, Cohen (1997) asserted work-family conflict could cause employees to quit their job, and his claim has been supported (Good, Sisler and Gentry, 1988).

If a company has a higher rate of absenteeism, the company will not have a brighten future. So the manager should do their best to reduce the employees’ work-family conflict. According to a new research from the University of Minnesota (2011), a flexible workplace environment that allows employees to change when and where they work, based on their individual needs and job responsibilities, can reduce the work-family conflict.

From this study, family domain demands also can influence work-family conflict. Given the wide range of dependent care responsibilities that employees attend to, HR practitioners need to be aware of and address the complete range of family care situations when assisting employees. Organizations can offer a variety of accommodations to help employees meet family needs. HR practitioners must provide employees with the flexibility to manage their own work and family responsibilities in a manner best suited to their particular situations and specific needs. In addition, supervisors should be trained on what available work-life policies the organization offers that promote flexibility to ensure that employees receive assistance from the organization in meeting their work and family obligations.
5.3.2 Implication for Academician and Researchers

1. The empirical findings of the present research confirm that both of the work related demand and family related demand can cause work-family conflict, and work-family conflict two directions have different consequences, in this study, work-interference with family can cause both job satisfaction and family satisfaction, but for family-interference with work only can cause family satisfaction. The model of this study can be well used in the context of Thailand enterprises.

2. Academicians and researcher should focus on the antecedent and consequent factors, which can be extent more various variables into the antecedent and consequent factors which could help ther researchers understand employee’s work-family conflict more clearly.

5.4 Limitation of the study

The present study has some limitations that needs to be taken into account when considering the study and its contributions:

1. This study only consider the two industries in Thailand which are service and industry, actually, there is another industry named agriculture. For the characteristics of different industries, perhaps the finding is not usable for agriculture employees. So the results of this study cannot represent the whole Thailand employee’s conditions. The study is focus on Thailand employee’ s work-family conflict, the background is Thailand culture, as a result any conclusions made may not generalizable to employees in other
cultural settings, especially in terms of that employee who cannot clearly separate their work from their family lives.

2. Given the size of the sample used, it was not possible to include all the possible work and family related demands of work-family conflict in this study. As a result, only the most popular and well-researched factors were examined. Work related demand such as work role conflict, work dedications were omitted. For family related demand such as number of children, spousal condition, number of elder were omitted. Although compared to the antecedences examined in this study, work role conflict, work dedication, number of children, spousal condition, number of elder may be considered minor outcomes, the possibility that these variables could have meaningful effects should not be ignored. The exclusion of these variables may potentially limit the researcher’s ability to make complete inferences about the antecedences of work-family conflict.

3. For the consequences of work-family conflict, in this study, only job satisfaction and family satisfaction are considered. However, actually, there are many factors consist of the consequences of work-family conflict, such as organizational commitment, job turnover, life satisfaction and so on.

5.5 Future research

For the future research regarding to the result is recommended to extent to study more.
1. The agriculture field should take into account in future research. Because agriculture, service, industry are the three main industries in Thailand. This research just focus on service and industry, if agriculture is considered, the result can better represent the Thailand employees’ work-family conflict conditions.

2. Additional antecedences of work-family conflict should be investigated in future research. For example, work related demand also includes work role conflict, work dedication, and family related demand also includes number of children, spousal condition, number of elder, and so on.

3. Additional consequences of work-family conflict should be considered in future research, such as organizational commitment, job turnover, life satisfaction and so on.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)
**Questionnaire**

**Employee's Work-Family Conflict in Thailand**

**Notification**
This questionnaire is a part of a thesis conducted for the requirement of a Master degree of Business Administration of the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. The information acquired from this questionnaire will be confidentially kept and used for academic purpose only.

**Part 1 Individual basic information**

1. **Gender**
   - (1) Male
   - (2) Female

2. **Age**
   - (1) Younger or equal 25 years old
   - (2) 26-30 years old
   - (3) 31-35 years old
   - (4) 36-40 years old
   - (5) 41-45 years old
   - (6) Over than 45 years old

3. **Educational level**
   - (1) High school or below high school
   - (2) Associate degree
   - (3) Bachelor degree
   - (4) Master degree
   - (5) Doctor degree

4. **Occupation Field**
   - (1) Service
   - (2) Industry

5. **Marital Status**
   - (1) Single
   - (2) Married
   - (3) Divorced/Widow

6. **Number of dependents (aged 18 or below) in your family**
   - (1) None
   - (2) 1
   - (3) 2
   - (4) 3
   - (5) More than 3

7. **Number of elderly dependent in your family**
   - (1) None
   - (2) 1
   - (3) 2
   - (4) 3
   - (5) More than 3

8. **Average work hours per week**
   - (1) Below 40 hours
   - (2) 41-50 hours
   - (3) 51-60 hours
   - (4) More than 60 hours

9. **Managerial responsibility**
   - (1) None-managers
   - (2) Lower-level managers
   - (3) Middle-level managers
   - (4) High -level managers

10. **The percent of family responsibilities time you take (including children/elderly-care, cooking, shopping, cleaning, etc.)**
    - (1) 0-20%
    - (2) 21-40%
    - (3) 42-60%
    - (4) 61-80%
    - (5) 81-100%
### Part 2: The Antecedences and Consequences of Thailand employee's work-family conflict

#### Please check(✓)to the extent that you agree with the following items 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### The antecedences of work-family conflict

1. **Work time**
   - 1.1 I think my work time is too long.
   - 1.2 Because of working responsibilities, I have little time to stay with my families.
   - 1.3 My work time is more than the time I stay with my families.

2. **Work flexibility**
   - 2.1 Generally, I cannot control the time at which I start working for the day.
   - 2.2 To meet the need of family life, I cannot coordinate work time.
   - 2.3 I will be punished when I do the part-time job.
   - 2.4 I cannot do job well and take my family responsibility at the same time.

3. **Work involvement**
   - 3.1 Most of my interests are centered around my job.
   - 3.2 I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break.
   - 3.3 Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.
   - 3.4 I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

4. **Work overload**
   - 4.1 I don’t have enough time to get everything done in my job, because there are a lot job to do.
   - 4.2 My workload is very heavy on my job.
   - 4.3 I have to work very hard in my job.
   - 4.4 I have to work too fast to ensure quality of my work.

5. **Family involvement**
   - 5.1 Most of my interests are centered around my family.
   - 5.2 I have very strong ties with my family that would be very difficult to break.
   - 5.3 Most of my personal life goals are family-oriented.
   - 5.4 I like to be absorbed in my family most of the time.

6. **Family Basic Demand**
   - 6.1 I must organize family recreation and entertainment.
   - 6.2 I must do the housework by myself(for example, wash clothes, wash dishes, clean house, etc)
   - 6.3 I must take care of my family members.
   - 6.4 I must spend time with my family members.

7. **Work interference with family**
   - 7.1 The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.
   - 7.2 The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.
7.3 My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.
7.4 Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.
7.5 Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.

**8. Family interference with work**
8.1 The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.
8.2 I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.
8.3 My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.
8.4 Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.
8.5 Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.

**The consequences of work-family conflict**

9. **Job satisfaction**
9.1 I feel close to the people at work.
9.2 I believe management is concerned about me.
9.3 My wages are good.
9.4 I feel good about my job environment.

10. **Family satisfaction**
10.1 Most days I am enthusiastic about my family life.
10.2 I am very satisfied with my family life.
10.3 I find real enjoyment in my family life.
10.4 I like my family life better than the average person does.

**Thanks for your co-operation!**
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE (THAI)
แบบสอบถาม

ปัญหาความขัดแย้งระหว่างการทำงานและครอบครัวของพนักงานในประเทศไทย

ค่าชี้แจง
แบบสอบถามนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของวิทยานิพนธ์ของนักศึกษาปริญญาโทคณะบริหารธุรกิจ จากมหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลธัญบุรี ซึ่งมีการสอบถามความคิดเห็นของท่านจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับ และใช้เพื่อวิจัยประเทศไทยทางวิชาการท่านนั้น

ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว
1. เพศ
   ①ชาย  ②หญิง

2. อายุ
   ①25 ปีหรือน้อยกว่า  ②26-30 ปี  ③31-35 ปี
   ④36-40 ปี  ⑤41-45 ปี  ⑥45 ปีขึ้นไป

3. ระดับการศึกษา
   ①มัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย/ปวช.
   ②อนุปริญญา/ปวส.
   ③ปริญญาตรี
   ④ปริญญาโท
   ⑤สูงกว่าปริญญาโท

4. อุตสาหกรรมที่คุณทำงาน
   ①การบริการ
   ②เกษตรกรรม
   ③ด้านอุตสาหกรรมการผลิต

5. สถานภาพสมรส
   ①โสด  ②สมรส
   ③หย่า/หม้าย

6. จำนวนเด็กอายุต่ำกว่า 16 ปีในครอบครัวของคุณ
   ①ไม่มี  ②1 คน  ③2 คน  ④3 คน  ⑤มากกว่า 3 คน

7. จำนวนผู้สูงอายุในครอบครัวของคุณ
   ①ไม่มี  ②1 คน  ③2 คน  ④3 คน  ⑤มากกว่า 3 คน

8. ชั่วโมงการทำงานเฉลี่ยต่อสัปดาห์
   ①น้อยกว่าหรือเท่ากับ 40 ชั่วโมง  ②41-50 ชั่วโมง
   ③51-60 ชั่วโมง  ④มากกว่า 60 ชั่วโมง

9. ตำแหน่งงานของคุณอยู่ในระดับใดในองค์กร
   ①พนักงานทั่วไป (เช่น ลูกจ้าง, พนักงานบริษัท เป็นต้น)
   ②ผู้บริหารระดับล่าง (เช่น หัวหน้าแผนกต่างๆ เป็นต้น)
   ③ผู้บริหารระดับกลาง (เช่น ผู้จัดการฝ่ายต่างๆ เป็นต้น)
   ④ผู้บริหารระดับสูง (เช่น เจ้าของธุรกิจ, ผู้ถือหุ้น, กรรมการผู้จัดการ เป็นต้น)

10. เวลาที่คุณใช้ในการทำงานที่มีผลต่อการมีคุณภาพชีวิตครอบครัวคิดเป็นร้อยละเท่าไร (รวมถึงการดูแลบุตร ทำอาหาร ซื้อของที่ใช้ภายในบ้าน และทำความสะอาดบ้าน)
   ①%20-40  ②%40-60  ③%60-80  ④%80-100  ⑤%100-120
จากเหตุความขัดแย้งของการทำงานและครอบครัวในประเทศไทย

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ประเด็นความคิดเห็น</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>โปร่งที่เครื่องหมาย (✓) ลงในช่องที่ตรงกับความคิดเห็นของท่าน 1=ไม่เห็นด้วยเป็นอย่างยิ่ง 2=ไม่เห็นด้วย 3=ปานกลาง 4=เห็นด้วย 5=เห็นด้วยเป็นอย่างยิ่ง</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

สาเหตุความขัดแย้งของการทำงานและครอบครัว

1. ระยะเวลาการทำงาน

1.1 ฉันคิดว่าช่วงการทำงานมากเกินไป
1.2 ความรุนแรงของการทำงานส่งผลให้ฉันไม่มีเวลากับครอบครัว
1.3 ฉันใช้เวลาทำงานมากกว่าเวลาที่อยู่กับครอบครัว

2. ความยึดหยุ่นในการทำงาน

2.1 ฉันสามารถเลือกเวลาทำงานได้
2.2 ฉันสามารถจัดการเวลาทำงานเพื่อชีวิตครอบครัวได้
2.3 ฉันสามารถทำงานไม่เต็มเวลาโดยไม่มีผลกระทบต่อการประเมินผลงาน
2.4 ฉันสามารถทำงานได้ดีและมีความรับผิดชอบต่อครอบครัวในเวลาเดียวกัน

3. ภาระงานปัจจุบัน

3.1 ฉันมีภาระงานที่สุดมักจะเกี่ยวข้องกับงาน
3.2 ฉันมีความผูกพันกับงานปัจจุบันมากจนแยกกันไม่ได้
3.3 เป้าหมายที่สำคัญที่สุดในชีวิตของฉันมู่เน้นไปที่งานเป็นสำคัญ
3.4 ฉันมีความสุขในงาน

4. ภาระงานปัจจุบัน

4.1 ฉันไม่มีเวลาพอที่จะทำงานของฉันให้เสร็จทุกอย่าง
4.2 ฉันมีภาระงานมากเกินไป
4.3 ฉันต้องทำงานหนักเกินไป
4.4 ฉันต้องร่างทำงานให้เร็ว ทำให้งานที่ได้มีคุณภาพ

5. การมีส่วนร่วมกับครอบครัว

5.1 ฉันมีส่วนร่วมกับครอบครัวและมีเกี่ยวข้องกับครอบครัว
5.2 ฉันมีความสุขกับครอบครัวและมีชีวิตเดี๋ยวนี้
5.3 เป้าหมายที่สำคัญที่สุดในชีวิตของฉันมู่เน้นไปที่ครอบครัวเป็นสำคัญ
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6. ความคุ้มครองของครอบครัว

6.1 ฉันคิดถึงครอบครัวอยู่ตลอดเวลา

6.2 ฉันคิดถึงการทำงานบ้านสำหรับสมาชิกครอบครัวของฉัน เช่น ซักผ้า ล้างจาน วาดบ้าน ถูบ้าน เป็นต้น

6.3 ฉันคิดถึงสมาชิกในครอบครัวของฉัน

6.4 ฉันตื่นเต้นเวลาเกิดสมาชิกครอบครัว

7. การมีผลกระทบต่อชีวิตครอบครัว

7.1 ภาระงานทำให้ฉันมีปัญหากับชีวิตครอบครัว

7.2 ฉันทุ่มเททำงานทำให้ฉันไม่สามารถดูแลครอบครัวได้อย่างเต็มที่

7.3 ความเครียดจากการทำงานทำให้ฉันบกพร่องต่อหน้าที่ครอบครัว

7.4 หน้าที่การทำงานทำให้ฉันต้องเปลี่ยนแผนการที่กิจกรรมกับครอบครัว

7.5 ฉันไม่สามารถทำงานบ้านหรืองานส่วนตัวได้สำเร็จ เพราะฉันมีการงานที่ทำงานต้องรับผิดชอบมากเกินไป

8. ครอบครัวมีผลกระทบต่อการทำงาน

8.1 ครอบครัวทำให้ฉันมีปัญหาที่บ้าน

8.2 ฉันจับต้องตื่นเต้นงานต่างๆเพราะฉันต้องการให้เวลากับครอบครัว

8.3 ชีวิตครอบครัวของฉันส่งผลกระทบต่อความรู้สึกของฉัน เช่น การทำงาน ซักผ้า ล้างจาน วาดบ้าน ถูบ้าน ทำอาหาร อาบน้ำ ล้างผม แต่งตัว

8.4 ความเครียดในครอบครัวส่งผลกระทบต่อความสามารถในการทำงานของฉัน

8.5 ฉันไม่สามารถทำงานให้เสร็จสมบูรณ์เนื่องจากฉันมีภาระงานบ้านและงานส่วนตัวที่ต้องรับผิดชอบมากมาย

ผลสรุปของความขัดแย้งในการทำงานและครอบครัว

9. ความพึงพอใจในงาน

9.1 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับผู้เรียน

9.2 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับผู้สอน

9.3 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับผู้บริหาร (หัวหน้าครู)

9.4 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับนักเรียน

10. ความพึงพอใจต่อชีวิตครอบครัว

10.1 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับครอบครัวของฉัน

10.2 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับครอบครัวของฉัน

10.3 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับชีวิตครอบครัว

10.4 ฉันมีความสัมพันธ์ที่ดีกับชีวิตครอบครัวของฉันมากกว่าที่เคย
APPENDIX C

GOODNESS OF FIT STATISTICS
Goodness of Fit Statistics

Degrees of Freedom = 15
Minimum Fit Function Chi-Square = 23.17 (P = 0.081)
Normal Theory Weighted Least Squares Chi-Square = 22.97 (P = 0.085)
Estimated Non-centrality Parameter (NCP) = 7.97
90 Percent Confidence Interval for NCP = (0.0 ; 25.02)
Minimum Fit Function Value = 0.056
Population Discrepancy Function Value (F0) = 0.019
90 Percent Confidence Interval for F0 = (0.0 ; 0.060)
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.036
90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA = (0.0 ; 0.063)
P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) = 0.78
Expected Cross-Validation Index (ECVI) = 0.25
90 Percent Confidence Interval for ECVI = (0.23 ; 0.29)
ECVI for Saturated Model = 0.27
ECVI for Independence Model = 28.10
Chi-Square for Independence Model with 45 Degrees of Freedom = 11615.18

Independence AIC = 11635.18
Model AIC = 102.97
Saturated AIC = 110.00
Independence CAIC = 11685.46
Model CAIC = 304.10
Saturated CAIC = 386.56
Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 1.00
Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 1.00
 Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI) = 0.33
Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 1.00
 Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = 1.00
 Relative Fit Index (RFI) = 0.99

Critical N (CN) = 547.33
Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) = 0.0061
Standardized RMR = 0.0069
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.99
Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) = 0.96
Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index (PGFI) = 0.27
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