Superwomen: Battles of Work-Family

Chrisanty Victoria Layman*  
Jacob Donald Tanb

a,b Universitas Pelita Harapan, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract
The purpose of this paper to examine the influence of work characteristics and family characteristics towards interference in work and interference in family amongst working Indonesian women. The data for this study were collected using questionnaire directed towards working women who are still holding family related roles. A total of 209 respondents was used in this study. Data analysis was done using Structural Equation Modelling approach using the help of SPPS AMOS. The study found that work characteristics and family characteristics all influence work interference family and family interference with work. In addition, the support of family, partner, network, and other services plays at a significant moderate to either affect positively or negatively towards work interference to family or family interference to work. The study's findings showcased women are involved in the gig economy, when like in the case due the pandemic, many women jump into work for additional income for their households. With working women awareness towards work interference with family, workplaces for women should need to put in place policies that would not let the work compete to her priorities in family. The study showcased that there is a significant moderating effect of support towards work interference with family and family interference with work. And both variable work interference with family and family interference with work could be studied separately.
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Introduction
Women's involvement grows as attention to gender equality arises giving more opportunities for women. Supported by motivation for work, learning, and entrepreneurship, women delve into more significant work, supporting both the traditional family roles and work roles in society. The Central Statistics Agency (BPS) noted that the Labor Force Participation Rate (TPAK) for women has increased from 0.24% to 67.77% since August 2019 (BPS, 2019). TPAK reflects the levels of the working-age population in an active country economically (Asian Development Bank (ADB), 2016). High or low TPAK is also influenced by the number of non-labor force residents. This indicates that during Covid-19, women who were not working are now entering the workforce. Furthermore, women in Indonesia held
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positions in three main industries which include agriculture, forestry, fisheries, wholesale trade, processing industry, etc.

Women comprise 49.6% of the Indonesian population, and most of them are self-employed as women entrepreneurs, actively working, and significant in Indonesia’s economic landscape (The World Bank, 2019). In the scope of the family businesses, according to PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC, 2018), women on average occupy 24% of the board members and 27% of the management team, compared to the global average of 21% and 24% respectively. The positioning of roles for daughters in family business succession is also challenging (Mussolino et al., 2019). According to Xue et al. (2020), women are more likely to consider exiting work when choosing between family and work. Therefore, our study aims to investigate the work-family conflicts (WFC) antecedents in the case of Indonesian women who are actively working. The targeted women can be the status self-employed or employed in the private and public sectors. This study hypothesizes that the antecedents of WFC include family stressors and work stressors that influence work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW).

We investigated the phenomenon of work-family (WF) roles for women to close the possible gap of measures and antecedents of WFC in a single work so that a priority choice had to be made. Given the relevance of such a topic in modern society, acknowledging the ever-evolving nature of Indonesian families is inevitable. Consequently, the role of women entrepreneurs in family firms and their influence on business development requires a more fine-grained analysis of the family dynamic within the family and the business.

Thus, there is an urgency to understand these superwomen that battle WF roles daily. This study will provide multi-dimensional perspectives of working women that evoke subsequent investigations, explaining the phenomena such as the potential positive side of the work-family interface in working Indonesian women.

**Literature Review**

**Study Context**

Researchers must be mindful of the cultural settings where studies about working women or so-called superwomen are conducted (Barkema et al., 2015). Culture, religions, and organizational constraints coexist for these women (Cho et al., 2020), as they strive to overcome their daily challenges, or maybe just to survive the day. However, as much as these women face constraints, opportunities are also present for them to grasp and create values for themselves. This is possible in a loosely regulated emerging economy like Indonesia. Thus, this research will illuminate the motivations, challenges, and opportunities of these superwomen.

**Duty of women**

The duty of women is often tied to domestic housework -often not categorized as part of the workforce- that may affect their availability to pursue careers. Housework responsibilities in Indonesian culture also identify most women as responsible for most housekeeping work caring for children, the sick, or an existing parent in the household (Poggesi, 2020). The importance of women’s role in both family and work is apparent in Indonesian women (Fig. 2), whether they reside in urban or rural settings. The data in the table shows women hold roles in both working and managing households; this becomes different stressors and could create interferences in both family and work.

**Work-family conflict (WFC)**

The intrusion of both the work and family domains with each other is like a spill-over effect from the incompatibility that is bidirectional (Greenhaus & Beuttell, 1985). For instance, work overload reduces time with family; on the other hand, family needs
or responsibilities impede with work responsibilities. Moreover, WFC can produce stress and affect the well-being and behavior of working women (e.g. Geurts et al., 2003).

Female entrepreneurs in Chengdu, China has men supportive and take part in doing the housework while women are at work (Harrison et al., 2020). In contrast other, working women could also experience stress and may even hide their identities as businesswomen. They found such roles devaluing since they are expected to maintain their traditional social positions as mothers and caregivers (Xheneti, 2019). Even strategically complying with social norms by fulfilling their housework responsibilities to gain access to women. Women must establish and maintain dual identities to conform to these expectations.

Gendered stereotypes literature suggests a lack of education, managerial and business skills, and experience correlates with gender equality concerning entrepreneurship in the literature (Noor, 2020). The most important factor includes high levels of conflict between family concerns and work-related issues (Narayanan, 2020). Previous studies also portrayed women’s entrepreneurship as linked to gender equality, however, there are distinctions in the characteristics of women entrepreneurs that are innovative, risk-taking individuals. So victimized women entrepreneurs directly affect women’s experiences both in the family and in entrepreneurial activities. This study then suggests looking at both facets of stressors separately of family and work, also analyzing the possible interference both ways. Mitigating such conflicts, we look upon the support in all areas of partners, family, services, and networks.

**Work domain and Family domain**

Work domain consists of the number of hours spent at work and the inflexible work schedule that could result in role conflicts; on the other hand, a family domain consists of demand from spouse and children, or even other family members that could result in family conflicts (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The demanding conflicts or spillover effects between the two domains – work and family- create WFC. Parasuraman et al. (1996) include the following in the work domain: Autonomy, schedule inflexibility, work-role overload, and job involvement. A positive work role or job satisfaction can minimize WIF and synergize the work-family relationships instead (Beutell & Gopalan, 2019).

In the family domain: Parental demands, instrumental support, information/emotional support, and family involvement. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) emphasized the salience of family domain in regards to family resources that can be employed for WFC to be minimized and then developed into work-family enrichment. Although the two domains can be mutually supportive, the strains coming from the job role and family responsibilities of women and their conflicting effects on WIF and FIW are elucidated in this study.

**Social Support**

According to Kelly (2014), higher social support can reduce work-life conflict and retain women longer in the workforce. To support the working women, they need appropriate instruments and technical support in the family and workplace respectively, emotional encouragement and feedback functions at work and home domain, to have a work-life balance (Michel et al., 2011). Social support can also be different in different domains such as women employees and women entrepreneurs. For women employees, social support minimizes the stressful conflicts and demands in WFC (e.g. Viswesvaran et al., 1999; Kossek et al., 2011).

For these working women, social support may not come from their employees but instead from business networks (Hampton et al., 2009, Jennings & Brush, 2013). Pogessi et al. (2017) specified social support consisting of technical support (in
the work domain such as know-how practices) or instrumental support (in a family domain such as help with children and house chores), in addition to emotional support (both in work and family domain such as listening, caring, and advising from experts) for working women. Hence, overall, social support can minimize the impact of work stressors on WIF and family stressors on FIW.

**Methodology**

*Research Model and Hypothesis*

Based on the premise and support of the literature above, this study then proposes a research model (Fig. 1) from Pogessi et al. (2020) with the following hypotheses with these constructs. *Work-family conflict* (*WFC*) is explained in two variables, *Work Interfering Family* (*WIF*), using the question “After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do.” While the other is *Family Interfering Work* (*FIW*). Using the question “I’m often too tired at work because of the things I have to do at home” (Gutek et al., 1991; Pogessi et al., 2020). Both constructs are measured using a 5 Likert scale.

*Work stressors* are indicated by three different indicators *job involvement* was measured by five-point Likert-type items (Frone et al., 1992, 1997; Frone and Yardley, 1996). *Time committed to work* by a self-reporting, behaviorally anchored item that asked respondents: “How many hours per week do you spend working in your company?” The response was measured by five-point Likert-type items. *Work Flexibility* was measured by five-point Likert-type items (Greenhaus et al., 1987, 1989).

*Family characteristics* are indicated using three different indicators which are *family characteristics, family involvement* scale measured by five-point Likert-type items, and *lastly parental demand* measured by five-point Likert-type items, measured through the presence or absence of children, the number of children, and the age of the children (Greenhaus et al., 1989). Finally, time committed to family was measured by five-point Likert-type items, with the question “How much time do you spend on

**Figure 1. Research Model Proposed**

*Source: Primary data processed, 2022*
childcare?” and “In a working day, how much time do you spend on housework.”

**Social Support** women receive is measured by a self-reporting item that asked respondents: “How relevant is the support received from a partner?” “How relevant is the support received from family? “How relevant is the support received from other networks?” And “How relevant is the support received from other services?” measured by five-point Likert-type items.

- H1a: Work Characteristics influences Work interference with Family.
- H1b: Work Characteristics influence Family interference with Work.
- H2a: Family Characteristics influence Work interference with Family.
- H2b: Family Characteristics influences Family interference with Work.
- H3: Support moderates the effects of work characteristics on Work interference with Family.
- H4: Support moderates the effects of family characteristics on Family interference with Work.
- H5: Support moderates the effects of work characteristics on Family interference with Work.
- H6: Support moderates the effects of family characteristics on Work interference with Family.

**Categorical Variable**

Several categorical profile variables such as age, location, status, length in a relationship, occupation, industry, free time, family time, work time, balanced life score, parental demand score, and flexible nature of work. Furthermore, for women owning businesses data was also collected on what was the form of the businesses they are currently operating and leading either solo business, partnership, or family businesses.

**Data collection and sample**

In this research, the type of research used is descriptive research. The unit of analysis is a specific unit that is calculated in this study as individuals. Survey research collects data through interviews, observations, and questionnaires that are filled in directly as well as questionnaires distributed online (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). A questionnaire is a tool for obtaining primary data in the form of questions where respondents can provide their answers in defined answers. In this study, we used questionnaire questions based on three principles, namely the principle of words, the principle of measurement, and the general appearance of the questionnaire. The questionnaire used is a questionnaire with the content and objectives of the questions that are in accordance with the conceptual variables, formal language, closed type of questions, where there are choices of answers to the questionnaire questions given, and personal data classification in the appropriate questionnaire (Table 1).
Table 1. Research Construct

| Construct                              | Code | Operational                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Work interference with Family (WIF)    | WIF1 | After work, I feel too tired to do some of the things I would like to do    |
|                                        | WIF2 | My partner/family dislikes how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home/ spending family time. |
|                                        | WIF3 | My work takes up time that I would like to spend with family.               |
| Family interference with Work (FIW)    | FIW1 | I am often too tired to do work because of the things I have to do at home. |
|                                        | FIW2 | My family’s demands are so great that it takes away from my work.           |
|                                        | FIW3 | My superiors/peers/colleagues/business partners/ I dislike how often I am preoccupied with my family life while at work. |
|                                        | FIW4 | My family life takes up time that I’d like to spend on work.                |
| Work Characteristics (WC)              | WC1  | In my work, I have so much to do that it takes away from my personal interests. |
|                                        | WC2  | The most important things that happened to me involve my present job        |
|                                        | WC3  | To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.                             |
|                                        | WC4  | I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break. |
|                                        | WC5  | Most of my personal life goals are job oriented.                            |
|                                        | WC6  | I consider my job to be very central to my existence.                       |
|                                        | WC7  | I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.                          |
| Family Characteristics (FC)            | FC1  | The most important thing that happens to me involves my family.             |
|                                        | FC2  | To me, my family is only a small part of who I am.                          |
|                                        | FC3  | I have very strong bonds with my present family which would be very difficult to break. |
|                                        | FC4  | Most of my personal life goals are family oriented.                         |
|                                        | FC5  | I consider my family to be very central to my existence.                    |
|                                        | FC6  | I like to be absorbed in my family most of the time.                       |
| Support (SS)                           | SS1  | How important is the support received from your partner?                    |
|                                        | SS2  | How important is the support received from the whole family?                |
|                                        | SS3  | How important is the support received from services i.e., babysitting, day-care, etc.? |
|                                        | SS4  | How important is the support received from networks such as friends, acquaintances, etc.? |

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

Collecting data in this study using an instrument in the form of a questionnaire that is distributed online. The sample population in the research composes of working women who are still holding family-related roles. The sample size for our study follows the rules of thumb for determining sample size requirements (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). This research study uses the formula to calculate sample size requirements using the number of independent variables N> 50 + 8m, m being the number of independent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). Therefore, to fulfill such requirements this study requires an N > 114 samples.

Data Analysis
The validity test is a “goodness of measure”, which is a test of how well the developed instrument measures certain concepts (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). To test the validity, the test carried out is convergent and discriminant validity (Koubaa et al., 2014). Convergent validity is carried out to test whether the instruments measuring the concept are highly correlated, while discriminant validity shows the extent to which the indicators for each variable differ from one another (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). In testing the validity, the average variance extracted (AVE) value of each item of an accepted variable is ≥ 0.5 (Bagozzi et al., 1991).

Validity & Reliability Test
In addition, testing the discriminant validity is carried out by comparing the calculated r-value (Pearson correlation), the accepted indicator is the indicator with the calculated r value> r table. A reliability test is a test of the reliability and consistency of measuring instruments used to measure certain concepts (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). In testing the consistency of the indicators used, the estimation of the Cronbach Alpha value and the composite reliability (CR) value was carried out with the terms
accepted by Cronbach Alpha $>0.6$ and Composite Reliability (CR) $\geq 0.7$.

### Table 2. Reliability Statistics

|       | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items | Results |
|-------|------------------|------------|---------|
| WIF   | 0.496            | 2          | Reliable|
| FIW   | 0.707            | 3          | Reliable|
| WC    | 0.762            | 4          | Reliable|
| FC    | 0.841            | 4          | Reliable|
| SS    | 0.574            | 4          | Reliable|

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

**Structural Model Evaluation**

The statistical software used in SPSS 25.0 and AMOS 22.0. SPSS for conducting comparative and correlational tests because SPSS provides comprehensive output compared to other statistical software. With the ease of use of the bootstrap method that can be applied to parameter estimation, effect estimation, the sample mean, sample variance, covariance, correlation, model comparison, and comparison of estimation models as well as a more accurate reflection of complex relationships than standard multivariate statistical techniques. In the application of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the assessment of the suitability of the model with the sample data is carried out by interpreting the results of the parameter estimates. There are 2 indices to measure the goodness of model fit in this study, namely: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) $\geq 0.90$ and the Root Mean Square Error RMSEA value with a value of $0.08 - 0.10 = $ mediocre fit and a value of $<0.01 = $ good fit. To test the conceptual model, linear regression analysis through SPSS was carried out for all variables by testing the correlation matrix. In analyzing the effects directly or moderating the relationship, the bootstrap method with AMOS was carried out in the data analysis process. Data analysis was carried out by analyzing the standard error value, which is the basis for testing the hypothesis of each variable with a 95% confidence interval value.

### Table 3. Convergent Validity

|       | WIF | FIW | WC  | FC  |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| AVE   | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.52| 0.59|
| CR    | 0.7 | 0.73| 0.77| 0.85|

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

**Findings and Discussions**

**Validity and Reliability**

The reliability of each variable is tested and showcases adherence to the reliability of 0.7 is acceptable and 0.8 preferable (Pallant, 2020). The constructs of this research showcase good reliability as shown in the results tables below. Two indicators WC3 and FC2 are reverse items, and scores have been reversed before the data run. Each variable showcased the standard factor loading value above 0.5 showcasing the reliability of scale for each variable (Table 2). Furthermore, the inter-item correlation matrix showcases all positive values, indicating values are measuring the underlying constructs they are supposed to.
In addition, each variable has fulfilled the rule of thumb of AVE >0.5 and CR >0.7 to establish good convergent validity (Table 3). Good discriminant validity has also been established based on the comparison of squared correlations < AVE score (Table 4).

| Table 4. Discriminant Validity |
|-------------------------------|
| Estimate | Squared |
| WIF → FIW | 0.534 | 0.285 |
| WIF → WC | 0.073 | 0.005 |
| WIF → FC | 0.141 | 0.020 |
| FIW → WC | 0.278 | 0.077 |
| FIW → FC | -0.012 | 0.000 |
| WC → FC | -0.209 | 0.044 |

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

From the results of run 1, estimates eliminate the ones below 0.5 are eliminated, therefore indicators FIW1, WC1, WC2, WC3, FC1, and FC2 are erased. The rest showed good reliability and validity to proceed in this research study.

Figure 2 shows that male respondents constituted 68 percent of this study's participants, while female respondents.

![Research Model](image)

Source: Primary data processed, 2022
Hypothesis Analysis and Discussion
The data collected from the questionnaire for this study amounts to a total of 209 respondents. The age of majority of women that filled in the questionnaire are 40-49 years old (43%) and 30–39 years old (38%) (Fig. 4 - 9). Respondents are mostly located in Jakarta and Tangerang, 92% are married, had been married for less than a year (20%), 6 -10 years old (14%), 11 – 20 years old (47%), 21 -30 years old (14%). The respondents also showed three main occupations, which are entrepreneurs (22%), manager/director (27%), and employees (34%) with the main industry involved being education (26%), food and beverages (10%), manufacturing (8%), commerce (7%) among other various industries.

Table 5. Regression Weights

| Hypothesis | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P       | Results   |
|------------|----------|------|------|---------|-----------|
| WC → WIF   | 2.21     | 0.692| 3.196| 0.001** | Significant|
| WC → FIW   | -3.378   | 1.286| -2.627| 0.009** | Significant|
| FC → WIF   | 0.225    | 0.107| 2.091| 0.037** | Significant|
| FC → FIW   | -0.53    | 0.123| -4.319| ***     | Significant|
| FC_SS → FIW| -0.012   | 0.006| -2.013| 0.044** | Significant|
| FC_SS → WIF| 0.011    | 0.003| 3.25  | 0.001** | Significant|
| WC_SS → FIW| 0.041    | 0.015| 2.727| 0.006** | Significant|
| WC_SS → WIF| -0.025   | 0.008| -3.121| 0.002** | Significant|

*p-value < 0.10 **value <0.05 ***p-value<0.001
Source: Primary data processed, 2022

The data then run into SPSS AMOS to get the run model in Fig. 2. with the various moderating and covariances relationship to result in the testing of the various hypothesis. Model fit for this study showcased fair fit, with an RMSEA of 0.143, and GFI of 0.831. Results of all regression runs will be discussed in Table 6 below. P-value results that are below 0.10 and below 0.05 is considered to showcase significant influences. The results of the testing hypotheses are showcased in Table 6.

Table 6. Hypotheses Results

| Hypotheses                          | Results   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| H1a Work Characteristics influences Work interference with Family. | Accepted  |
| H1b Work Characteristics influence Family interference with Work. | Accepted  |
| H2a Family Characteristics influences Work interference with Family. | Accepted  |
| H2b Family Characteristics influence Family interference with Work. | Accepted  |
| H3 Support moderates the effects of work characteristics on Work interference with Family. | Accepted  |
| H4 Support moderates the effects of family characteristics on Family interference with Work. | Accepted  |
| H5 Support moderates the effects of work characteristics on Family interference with Work. | Accepted  |
| H6 Support moderates the effects of family characteristics on Work interference with Family. | Accepted  |

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

From the results of hypotheses testing, we could see that all hypothesis has been found significant and all null hypotheses have been rejected. H1a Work characteristics positively influence work interference with family (2,21) at a P-value of 0.001. In contrast work characteristics negatively influences family interference with work (-
3,378) at a P-value of 0.009. This suggests that work characteristics, meaning the more demanding and valued the work is to the respondents, would suggest work interference with family, work taking the time from family interactions. Byron (2005) that stated employees with higher job involvement experienced more WIF than FIW. According to Halinski and Duxbury (2019), workplace characteristics especially flexibility could support workers in preventing interference and even managing the interference. However, this is in contrary to Major et al. (2002) that indicated regardless of the flexibility at work, it is the number of hours that employees put in which directly influences WIF. Further research could include the number of hours spent at home and work.

Meanwhile, H2a shows Family characteristics positively influence WIF (0.225) at a P-value of 0.037, while H2b Family characteristics negatively influence FIW (-0.53) at P-value <0.001. This suggests that when the family is of importance, work will be less found as interference with family. Meanwhile, the more demanding family characteristics will influence how a family could interfere with work (Major et al., 2002). In the US, higher FIW decreased the work exit probability, while WIF increased it (Kubicek et al., 2010). Furthermore, there have been emerging indications that the number of children and their ages did not relate to the number of hours spent at work (e.g. Major et al., 2002; Michel et al., 2011). Overall, high levels of WIF and FIW could drive individuals to retire early at the age of 52-54 (Raymo & Sweeney, 2006), even though most were still based on intentions rather than actual work exits (Xue et al., 2020).

In addition, hypotheses are suggesting a moderating effect of support is found to be all significant (H3 – H6). Work characteristics moderated by support negatively influence work interference with family (-0.025, P-value 0.002) and positively influences family interference with work (0.041, P-value 0.006). This result is consistent with H3 and H4, where work characteristics when receiving support, would decrease WIF. Meanwhile, more work support could also entail more family time and interactions that might result in an increase in family interference with work. The nature of leadership and coworker interactive support in workplaces can determine the level of the WFC; for instance, ambiguity or conflict in the work role positively affects WCF that subsequently influences the well-being of an individual (Beutell & Gopalan, 2019; Jones & Butler, 1980).
Married women tend to experience more WFC than unmarried women (Herman & Gyllstrom, 1977). Family characteristics moderated by support negatively affect family interference with work (-0.012, P-value 0.044) and positively influences work interference with family (0.011, P-value 0.001). With more support for the handling of family, it will decrease the FIW; however, it could also suggest more work could take place due to the many support-taking responsibilities of women from the family. Spouse support can impede high levels of WFC (Holahan & Gilbert, 1979), and husbands who are profeminist usually insulate their wives from external conflicts (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1983).

In addition, there are few running of regression was done to see the effect of different categorical variables on the dependent variable, work interference family (WIF) and family interference work (FIW) (Fig. 4 & 4). Work characteristic positively influences work time, while work time positively influences WIF. If the characteristic of work is more demanding it will influence the work time of respondents, this, therefore, influences the increase of work time to WIF. Furthermore, parental demand was also found to positively influence family characteristics. Meaning that the increase there is in parental demand, the higher the importance of family in family characteristics.

**Crosstab Analysis**

The additional crosstab analysis against several categorical variables reveals more information (Table 7), namely that there are several categories of variables that influence the increase of certain variables. Several findings were concluded based on the crosstab analysis.

Marital status, marital length, occupation, industry, and balance of family work life have a significant correlation with work interference with family. Occupation, industry, and balancing family work life...
have a significant correlation with family interference with work.

Location and free time have a significant correlation with work characteristics. Location, industry, and balancing family work life have a significant correlation with work time. Occupation has a significant correlation with family characteristics. Age, marital status, marital length, occupation, and free time have a significant correlation with parental demand. Location, marital status, and occupation have a significant correlation with family time.

Work interference with family using the decision tree regression (SE: 0.048), the study found that amongst the indicators, support from service (SS3), being absorbed in the work most of the time (WC7), being absorbed in the family most of the time (FC6) and support from families as the most significant to influence how work would interfere with family. Meanwhile, family interference with work (SE: 0.056) indicates how central is the job to my existence (WC6), family time (FT), support from the network (SS4), being absorbed in the work most of the time (WC7), being absorbed in the family most of the time (FC6).

Table 7. Crosstab Analysis

| Age | WIF | FIW | WC | WT | WF | FC | PD | FT |
|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|     | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.000*** | not significant |
| Location | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.043** | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.001**) |
| Marital Status | Significant (0.072**) | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.000*** | not significant |
| Marital Length | Significant (0.000** | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.044** | not significant |
| Occupation | Significant (0.000** | Significant (0.040** | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.043** | Significant (0.043** | Significant (0.000** |
| Business Status | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant |
| Industry | Significant (0.000** | Significant (0.048** | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.000** | not significant |
| Free time | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.000** | not significant | not significant | not significant | Significant (0.000** | not significant |
| Balance Score | Significant (0.000** | Significant (0.003* | not significant | Significant (0.000** | not significant | not significant | not significant | not significant |

* p-value < 0.10 **pvalue <0.05 *** pvalue<0.001
WIF: work interference with family
FIW: family interference with family
WC: work characteristics
WT: work time
WF: work flexibility
FC: family characteristics
PD: parental Demand
FT: family time

Source: Primary data processed, 2022

Conclusion

Superwomen in our study are women who have both stretches in family and work responsibilities. We found through our study that all hypotheses are significant. This shows that to determine the influence of work interference family and family interference with work can be determined by work characteristics and family characteristics. In addition, the support of family, partner, network, and other services plays a significant moderate to either affect positively or negatively towards work interference to family or family interference work. In addition, several categorical
variables showcased a significant correlation which displayed a good predictor of WIF and FIW.

From our study, working women or superwomen will be aware and knowledgeable of the essential balance required in managing the WFC. Women at work can delve into positive psychology that alludes to the synergistic effects of work and family (Allen & Martin, 2017; Beutell & Behson, 2018).

As an implication, this study adds to the theorization of Indonesia’s family dynamics, further highlighting women’s influence over decision-making that intersects between business and family. In particular, it should be realized that both are not free from each other’s influences. A practical implication is for women to implement the appropriate strategies to prioritize the well-being of the family and the success of their work. They must navigate between different modes as they attempt to balance family and work. Services and supports are necessary for the process of managing the interference between the two.

There is ample avenue for future research that could extend to involve superwomen who are involved in the gig economy when like in the case due the pandemic, many women jump into work for additional income for their households. Furthermore, studies in the Indonesian context are emerging in the direction of work-family synergy, family influence in terms of goals and strategies, and the role of women in family businesses.
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