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Abstract

This research study seeks to further facilitate a cross-cultural study on a work-family balance by developing the Korean language version of the Work-family Conflict (WFC) construct. Our research purpose is to translate and establish construct validity of a Korean version of work-family conflict for use in Korea. Factor analysis was used to uncover the underlying structure of the Korean version of the WFC. Results indicate that the Korean version demonstrates psychometric properties similar to the original English version of the WFC.
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Construct Validation of a Korean Version of the Work-Family Conflict Scale

For several decades, work-family conflict issues have been identified as one of the stressful organizational dynamics impacting the workplace. This trend has become prevalent in modern workplace organizations due to various factors. In an overview of the work-family research literature, Morris (2008) noted that the changing landscape of organizational life creates numerous stressors for employees and their organizations. The changing landscape includes: mergers, acquisitions, lay-offs, spin-offs, competitive advantage demands for globalization, competition for talent, increased technological sophistication, and workforce diversity among others. Given the magnitude of change these events create, it is natural to assume—and previous research has supported—that these changes create conflicts in the interface of “work” and “family” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Within the work-family research, these conflicts have been shown to influence productivity, recruitment, retention, turnover, job satisfaction, morale, loyalty, commitment, motivation, citizenship behaviors, engagement, corporate image, ethical behaviour, customer satisfaction and loyalty (Morris, 2008). Although work-family issues are an emerging topic within HRD (Morris & Madsen, 2007), the role of HRD researchers and scholarly practitioners is significant. Specifically, our HRD expertise is needed in developing resources and interventions that assist employees and organizations ameliorate and/or alleviate stressor demands that contribute to work-family conflict creating value-added opportunities for organizational effectiveness through the development and unleashing of human potential (Gilley, Eggland, & Gilley, 2002; Swanson & Holton, 2009). However, work-family conflict is not a U.S. phenomenon only.

While reducing work-family conflict and keeping work-family balance have been a critical workplace issue within western societies such as American and
European countries, research examining similar workplace issues has emerged in Asian countries as their relatively fast economic development has occurred in recent decades (Choi, Jung, & Cho, 2007; Sakamoto & Spinks, 2008). For example, a study about women’s work-family conflict in Middle East Asian country indicated that women were more suffering from work-family conflicts in jobs than men (Ng, Fosh, & Nalyor, 2002). From a Japanese study, it was found that, for women worker, a causal chain was existed linking parental demands, work-family conflicts, and life strain (Matsui, Ohsawa, & Onglatco, 1995). From a cross-cultural perspective, several studies indicated that life satisfaction is most influenced by work-to-family conflict in Asian cultures, whereas family-to-work conflict has a greater impact in the Western cultures (Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Ayree, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999). For example, in Asian cultures, work issues affecting family life (e.g., heavy workloads interfere with the length of parental time with children) are more influential than family issues affecting work life (e.g., serving school matters for children affects attention to work).

Recently, there has been a growing population of Asian workers in the work force and the participation of Asian workers is projected to grow in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2004). Internationally, women in industrialized Asian countries take roughly half of the workforce population. Globalization of the workforce and business pattern is believed to accelerate this trend more. In this regard, the need for identifying the types and characteristics of work-family conflict and balance within Asian cultural context has been a pressing research issue to understand the global nature of work and family issues and prescribe appropriate interventions needed for organizational improvement and effectiveness in the global workplace.

Work-family conflict is a source of stress requiring supportive cultures and appropriate support services for many employees, regardless of race, gender, or sexual
orientation (Hornsby & Munn, 2009). According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), work-family conflict is “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (p. 77). Due to its significant impact on employee work performance and their workplace attitudes and behaviors, many researchers have investigated various aspects of work-family conflict issues in modern organizations. Some examples included psychological distress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and life satisfaction (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, Burke, & Moffett, 1988).

**Literature Review**

**Work-family Conflict**

Traditionally, researchers have measured work-family conflict using different sub-domains of work-family conflict. For example, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified three forms of work-conflict in: (a) time-based conflict, (b) strain-based conflict, and (c) behavior-based conflict. *Time-based conflict* occurs when the amount of time spent on multiple roles prohibits the individual’s ability to adequately function in one’s work and/or family role (Bartolome & Evans, 1980). Sources of time conflict include: the amount of hours spent on the job and work related travel, overtime, and shiftwork (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Pleck, Staines, & Lang, 1980). In general, studies of work-family conflict tend to overlook the difference between preferred and actual hours of work and empirical studies to identify the relationship between work-family conflict and hour mismatches are much needed (Barnett, 1998). Regarding family-related time-based conflict, it is associated with the amount of time spent on
family matters detracting from the amount of time that could be spent at work (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

*Strain-based conflict* refers to work/family experiences when stressors felt in one role (e.g., home) inhibit the performance in the other role (e.g., work) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Sources of strain-based conflict include fatigue and irritability created from one role interfering with the other role. The pattern of strain-based conflict can be explained by the person-environment fit theory. According to this theory, when a person’s ability does not match the expectations of the role, the lack of fit becomes a source of stress (Nelson & Simmons, 2003). Several research studies have identified that work-related strain conflict has been related to various job variables: job ambiguity and leader support and facilitation (Jones & Butler, 1980; Kopelman, Greenhaus & Connolly, 1983), stressful events at work, job burnout, and depression in the family role (Bartolome & Evans, 1980; Maslach & Jackson, 1982). Family-related strain conflict happens when incongruence between spousal career and family expectations exists (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1982; Chadwick, Albrecht & Kunz, 1976; Eiswirth-Neems & Handal, 1978).

*Behavior-based conflict* occurs when certain types of behavior developed for one role (e.g. work) are inappropriate or dysfunctional when used for the other role (e.g., family) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). An example of behavior-based conflict includes aggressive behaviors that may be required at work are considered inappropriate at home (Hammer, 2003).

Researchers have noted that work–family conflict is a bi-directional relationship with work-based sources of conflict influencing the family and family-based sources of conflict influencing work. Accordingly, many research studies have measured the duality of work–family conflict considering the directions of effect: work interference
with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW) (Duxbury, Higgins, &
Mills, 1992; Frone et al., 1992; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). When the two directions
(WIF and FIW) and three forms of work-family conflict (time-based, strain-based, and
behavior-based conflict) are combined, six dimensions of work–family conflict are
developed: (a) time-based WIF, (b) time-based FIW, (c) strain-based WIF, (d) strain-
based FIW, (e) behavior-based WIF, and (f) behavior-based FIW (Gutek et al., 1991).

**Development of the Work-family Conflict Scale**

From an extensive review of existing studies about work-family conflict
Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) identified 25 different scales measured work-
family conflict in various settings. In doing so, they distinguished the scales whether
they contained direction between work and family and found 12 out of the 25 scales
separated the direction of conflict. Also, they found only seven out of the 25 scales did
distinguish between the forms of conflict (i.e., time, strain, behavior) in their scales.
Considering none of these scales measured the six dimensions of work-family conflict,
Carlson et al. conducted a series of studies to develop a reliable and valid scale
measuring work-family conflict in workplace.

In developing the scale, Carson et al. (2000) generated scale items from
numerous existing measures that included: Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981), Burley
(1989), Duxbury et al. (1992), Frone et al. (1992), Gutek et al. (1991), Kopelman et al.
(1983), Pleck (1978), and Stephens and Sommer (1996). Initially, the researchers
developed 31 items using a content adequacy test following the guidelines by
Schriesheim et al. (1993) (Study 1). From an exploratory factor analysis (EFA)
applying an oblique rotation to identify three factors for the scale (the eigen values for
the three factors were 5.8, 2.8, and 1.7 respectively), they retained 20 items for the
work-family conflict scale. In Study 2, they augmented the scale items by adding 34
new items so each dimension could contain a set of representative items for the scale. Using categorization and rating procedure, the researchers came up with 30 items for the scale to be tested for final validation.

In Study 3, the 30 item scale was tested from a group of 228 graduates of Executive MBA program at a large western university and utilized a structural equation modeling (SEM) to isolate items that performed well across a number of different criteria (i.e., factor loadings less than .50, modification indices to check association with other factors, correlated measurement error either within factors, across factors, or both). From their rigorous statistical procedure, they retained the final 18 items (five were from existing scales and 13 items were new). Another part of Study 3 was also designed to assess dimensionality, reliability, and discriminant validity of the scale by including several antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict during data collection. The antecedents included role conflict, role ambiguity, and social support from both domains of work and family, as well as, work involvement. The consequences, including job satisfaction, family satisfaction, life satisfaction, and organizational commitment, were all found to be significantly related to the work–family conflict scale. The final version of work-family conflict scale included 18 items as shown in the Appendix.

**Problem Statement and Research Question**

While an abundance of studies related to work-family conflict have been found in the literature within the U.S. and some European countries, relatively few research studies have been found involving Asian samples. Similar to Western countries, work-family balance issues have been a critical workplace issue for Asian countries. For example, many for-profit organizations in South Korea reported their employees have been suffering from job stress that was caused by work-family conflict, which also
severely impacted their workplace productivity and performance in general (Choi, Jung, & Cho, 2007). Similar cases were also found from other Asian countries (Sakamoto & Spinks, 2008). Investigating work-family conflict issues in Asian countries has been a pressing research issue among organizational researchers first to identify what antecedent types and characteristics of such conflict exist within Asian cultural context and second to understand the global nature of work and family issues by comparing cross national findings about work-family conflict between the East and the West. Eventually, such findings will help practitioners prescribe appropriate interventions needed for organizational improvement and effectiveness within global work and business environment.

The purpose of our research is to translate and establish the construct validity of a Korean version of the work-family conflict scale (i.e., Carlson et al., 2000) for use in Korea. Consequently, our research question is: Will construct validation of a Korean version of the work-family conflict by Carlson et al. (2000) result in an interpretable factor structure consistent with the original English version? (Are the six dimensions of work–family conflict scale valid for use in Korean organizations?)

**Methodology**

**Sample**

This sample consisted of 106 graduate students from three academic institutions and 319 full time workers from three corporations in Seoul, South Korea. In selecting the sample, we used a purposeful sampling method to include workers both from academic institutions and private sector organizations. Graduate students in the sample were included because they had fulltime jobs while studying in the various graduate programs at the three institutions. Among the 425, 92 respondents (21.9%) of the sample were the age of twenty-seven and below, 229 were (54.5%) between the ages of
28 and 36, and 99 (23.5%) were 37 and above. The sample was 48.2% male (197) and 46% of the sample was married. 277 respondents (65.2%) of the sample were without children. All participants voluntarily and anonymously completed the Korean language version of the 18-item work-family conflict measure.

**Measure**

In work-family conflict research we found that there have been many scales measuring conflict in the literature (e.g., Bedeian, Burke & Moffett, 1998; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Frone, et al., 1992; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991; Kopelman, et al., 1983; MacDermid, 2000; Parasuraman, et al., 1989; Rice, Frone & McFarlin, 1992). In selecting our instrument for the research, however, we considered the following criteria for selection: little variability in psychometric properties, shorter scale to reduce burdens of the respondents, addressing the bi-directional (family to work and work to family) nature of conflict, demonstrating adequate psychometric properties, and addressing all three components of conflict (time, strain, and behavior). From our review of many conflict scales using this selection criteria, the Carlson, et al. (2000) scale was considered most appropriate as it taps bi-directionality in all three components of conflict and contains psychometrically sound properties of work-family conflict.

The English version of the work-family conflict (WFC) is a self-report measure composed of 18 items assessing the six conceptually and empirically distinct dimensions (see Table 1). Each of the six dimensions is assessed with three items. Responses to all items are made on 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

*Forward and backward translation.* In pursuing our research purpose, validating linguistic equivalence between the different language versions of a cross-cultural
measure was the first and important task to be completed. Linguistic equivalence refers to the extent to which matching items on two versions of instrument have the same meaning, nuance, and connotation (Chen & Bates, 2005). In order to establish the linguistic equivalence between the English and Korean version of the WFC, we have utilized a forward-then-back translation procedure adopted by Hui and Triandis (1985). First, a team composed of two graduate students and two university professors proficient in English, but whose mother tongue were Korean, independently translated into Korean each of the items of the WFC instrument. The four translators were asked to use wording and grammar that could be understood by any adolescent in Korea. Once the four versions were gathered and compared, a consolidated version was developed. The consolidated version was then back translated into English by two fully bilingual graduate students. Any discrepancy between the original version in English and the back translated version was analyzed and corrected. Finally, a group of six graduate students was asked to classify each of the items according to the theoretical content of each of the six dimensions measured by the WFC. This task was successfully completed.

Data Collection

The Korean version of WFC was administered to employees in three Korean organizations and three academic institutions during the summer of 2008. One of the researchers visited and contacted coordinators in the organizations and institutions in Korea to collect the research data. Survey instruments were distributed to the sample during lecture, training sessions, or daily employee meetings of each organization. Among the total 425 completed, 106 were collected from three academic institutions in Seoul area, 127 were from a company selling educational programs for Korean corporations, 107 from a pharmaceutical company, and 85 from a training center of a Korean conglomerate.
**Data analysis**

Mirroring the statistical technique used by Carlson, et al. (2000), confirmatory factor analysis was performed using AMOS 16.0 to analyze four separate models: (1) the six-factor model proposed by Carlson, et al.; (2) a three-factor model representing the Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) three types of conflict (i.e., time, strain and behavior); (3) a two-factor model representing the directionality of conflict (i.e., family-to-work and work-to-family) (Duxbury, et al., 1992; Frone et al., 1992; Gutek, et al., 1991); and (4) a single-factor model representing conflict as a general construct. Items were forced to load on a specified factor and the factors were allowed to correlate (Byrne, 2001).

**Results**

**Dimensionality**

Table 1 presents the $X^2$, comparative fit statistic (CFI), and root-mean-square error of approximation for each of the four models. Despite having a $p$-value above the traditionally acceptable .05 value, the remaining indices for the six-factor model were far superior than the other models. Further examination of the six-factor model indicated that factor loadings were all significant at a $p<.001$ level. The standardized factor loadings for each of the 18 items appear in table 2.

**Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of each of the six dimensions was estimated with the coefficient alpha. The reliabilities for each of the six factors exceeds Nunnally’s (1978) conventional .70 level of acceptance: (1) time-based WIF = .89; (2) time-based FIW = .94; (3) strain-based WIF = .93; (4) strain-based FIW = .92; (5) behavior-based WIF = .94; and (6) behavior-based FIW = .93.
Table 1

*Estimates of Fit Indices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Comparative fit index</th>
<th>Root mean square error of approximation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six-factor model</td>
<td>144.47</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor model</td>
<td>2390.94</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model</td>
<td>2987.20</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model</td>
<td>4020.37</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 425*

**Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity was assessed by examining factor correlations obtained from the confirmatory factor analysis. Shown in table 3, the correlations of the six factors ranged from .08 to .66, with only two correlations above .60. Therefore, discriminant validity is demonstrated.

**Factor Structure Tests**

The final test of this construct validation study is the factor structure test to ensure the six-factor model is invariant across gender. This test was performed using the multiple group measurement procedure in AMOS which allows for factor loadings, factor correlations and error variances to held invariant individually and in different combinations, thereby allowing rigorous assessment of the measurement properties of the models (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Bollen, 1989; Byrne, 2001; Marsh, 1995).

Four, two-group versions of the six-factor model were estimated for comparison purposes. The first version, known as the baseline, utilized no constraints (i.e., all aspects of the model were allowed to freely estimate for each dataset). In the second
Table 2

*Completely Standardized Path Loadings of the Six-Factor Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Path Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #2</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #3</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #4</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #5</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #6</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #7</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #8</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #9</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #10</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #11</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #12</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #13</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #14</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based WIF</td>
<td>Item #15</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #16</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #17</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Based FIW</td>
<td>Item #18</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 425*

Table 3

*Discriminant Validity of the Six-Factor Model: Phi Matrix from CFA Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Conflict</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time-based WIF</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time-based FIW</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strain-based WIF</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strain-based FIW</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Behavior-based WIF</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
version, the factor loadings were held invariant, while the factor correlations and error variances were allowed to freely estimate for each dataset. In the third version, the factor loadings and factor correlations were held invariant, and only the error variances were allowed to freely estimate for each dataset. In the final version, the most rigorous of the tests, all aspects of the model were held invariant across the datasets.

As shown in table 4, the results suggest that the gender-divided data sets map well to the six-factor model with respect to the model fit. Model fit results were relatively consistent across the four tested versions. These results suggest stability regardless of gender of respondent.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Comparative fit index</th>
<th>Root mean square error of approximation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No constrains (baseline model)</td>
<td>333.56</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings invariant</td>
<td>379.49</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings &amp; factor correlations invariant</td>
<td>417.64</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings, factor correlations &amp; error variances invariant</td>
<td>445.83</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 425*

**Discussion and Conclusions**

Carlson et al. (2000) facilitated the research on work-family conflict by developing a comprehensive and empirically supported multidimensional measure of the work-family conflict construct. Our goal in the present paper was to extend this work by developing and evaluating a Korean version of the WFC measure. In addition,
we sought to apply a detailed confirmatory factor analytic approach to the assessment of the measurement equivalence of the WFC measure between the Korean and English versions. In order to address our future research needs we thoroughly reviewed the existing literature regarding work-family conflict studies in the U.S. and illustrated the detailed process to develop the WFC scale along with its statistical analysis procedure to finalize the 18-item measure. From our review of the literature, we concluded that the WFC is one of the most statistically sound and valid measures used for work-family conflict studies in the U.S.

From our initial analysis, the study results indicated that the dimensionality, internal consistency, discriminant validity, and factor structure results were all acceptable for the Korean version of the WFC measure as the Korean version contains psychometric properties similar to the original English version of the WFC. In essence, we found that the Korean language version of the WFC measures the same set of six work-family conflicts dimensions originally proposed by Carlson et al. (2000). This implies this study adds further proofs to the validity and reliability of the original English version of the WFC through cross-cultural validation. This study also provides researchers of cross-cultural studies with wider opportunities to use the WFC measure in their studies beyond the U.S. territory.

Many cross-cultural research studies have utilized direct translation methods in translating instruments from one language version to another which caused a series of problems to use the translated version in foreign contexts (Kinzie & Manson, 1987). For example, Cheung and Rensvold (1999) identified two types of measurement invariance: conceptual and psychometric invariance. Among these two types of measurement invariance, conceptual invariance refers whether measures are conceptually equivalent across cultures and satisfying this condition becomes primary prerequisite for using an
instrument in different cultures. In developing a foreign language version of an instrument, therefore, it is critical to use proper procedure to translate one version to another. This study took a more rigorous translation process by using the forward-backward translation approach with subjective and objective evaluations of the translation. The rigorous translation process was believed to enhance the quality of this research and reduced the biases that likely would have occurred in the translation process.

As one of the most westernized countries in Asia, South Korea has grown with an incredible record of economic development since the early 1960s (Scarborough, 1998). Due to the rapid modernization of the society, South Korea has experienced major social changes moving from the traditional Confucianism and Buddhism dominant culture to the modern and westernized culture. We believe that the development of a Korean language version of the WFC would provide an initial environment to conduct cross-cultural analyses of the work-family conflicts issues. Our next task is then utilizing the Korean version of the WFC for future studies. One area of possibility is examining the influence of work-family conflicts on various workplace issues including work performance, employee morale, motivation, and work stress within Korean context. Another potential study is combining the WFC with other work-family related constructs. For example, other than work-family conflicts, work-family enrichment is another measure commonly used for organizational studies and can be used to connect both measures to wholly examine work-family issues within the workplace. Testing the reciprocal relationships and influences of the two measures on other workplace variables would deserve a handful effort of research for future studies. Also, within cross cultural domains, comparison of the WFC between different
countries will be a worthwhile study to identify differences and similarities in work-family conflict issues between different cultures.

**Implications for the field of HRD**

While work-family conflict has been a frequently studied research topic within U.S. organizational and management studies, it is a relatively new study area within the HRD field (Morris & Madsen, 2007). Since balanced work-family relationship for individual employees is considered instrumental in workplace performance as well as workplace well-being for organizational members, identifying the types and characteristics of work-family related issues is central to HRD research. For practitioners, the WFC can be used to guide the efforts for their HRD function in diagnosing work-family related problems and issues and prescribe appropriate training or organizational interventions to address such workplace issues detrimental to organizational health.

Also, due to the new era of globalization, multinational organizations have encountered various workplace issues hindering their pursuit of organizational goals and work-family conflict issue is one of them. Identifying what aspects of work-family conflicts are interfering with other organizational and culture specific variables becomes one critical task that HRD professionals need to know to address diverse work and human needs of their employees domestically and internationally.
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Appendix

Work-family Conflict Scale Items

Time-based work interference with family
1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.

Time-based family interference with work
4. The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.
5. The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.

Strain-based work interference with family
7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.
8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Strain-based family interference with work
10. Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
11. Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
12. Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.

Behavior-based work interference with family
13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.

Behavior-based family interference with work

16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.
17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.

18. The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.